

BRUSSELS MONITOR

A Weekly Review of EU Trade Policy Developments Affecting Japan

4 December 2009

IN THIS ISSUE

- I. *WTO Watch*
EU challenges China before WTO over export restraints on key raw materials
- II. *European Union: Trade*
CFI annuls anti-dumping duties for PET from India on grounds of illegality of the method of calculating export price
- III. *EC Competition*
Paris Court of Appeal makes preliminary reference concerning internet sales
- IV. *European Union: Regulatory*
 - A. Commission voices limited optimism for Copenhagen climate change conference
 - B. Greening of road transport
- V. *Institutions*
Lisbon Treaty enters into force, with hopes for greater democratisation and institutional as well as law-making efficiency
- VI. *Dumping Watch*
 - A. Notice of initiation of partial interim review – polyethylene terephthalate film
 - B. Exemption from anti-dumping duties – bicycle parts
 - C. Exemption from anti-dumping duties - certain bicycle parts
- VII. *The Week Ahead*
 - A. Council
 - B. WTO
 - C. OECD

Brussels Monitor is a product of the Japan Fair Trade Center in cooperation with the international trade practice of the Belgium law firm of Van Bael & Bellis. All questions concerning its content should be addressed to:

*Van Bael & Bellis
Avenue Louise 165
B-1050 Brussels, Belgium
TEL: 32-2-647-7350
FAX: 32-2-640-6499
E-MAIL: ybb@vanbaelbellis.be*

I. WTO Watch

EU challenges China before WTO over export restraints on key raw materials

The EU has taken formal action to bring certain Chinese policies concerning the exportation of key raw materials to the attention of WTO adjudicative bodies. In this respect, the EU, together with the US and Mexico, requested, earlier this year, formal consultations under Article 4 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding with China in relation to certain export restraints on raw materials.

After five months of rounds of consultations, China and the three complainants failed to reach an agreement in order to settle this dispute without the need to resort to an adjudicatory body. The EU, US and Mexico thus requested, on 12 November 2009, the establishment of a Panel, although China blocked it at the Dispute Settlement Body (“DSB”) meeting of 19 November 2009. Under WTO dispute settlement rules, the Member against which a dispute is lodged may block the request for a Panel at the first DSB meeting in which the request is tabled. If complainants include for a second time the request for the establishment of a Panel in the agenda of the following DSB meeting, the establishment of the Panel is understood to be automatic, so that China would no longer be able to block the request for a second time.

The request for the establishment of a WTO panel sets out that China is imposing certain quantitative restrictions on exports of bauxite, coke, fluorspar, silicon carbide, and zinc. Such restrictions are also imposed on certain intermediate products that incorporate some of these inputs. These export restrictions are, according to the complainants, in stark contradiction with the mandate of Article XI:1 of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (“GATT”) which prohibits restrictions on exports other than taxes, duties, and other charges. Quotas imposed on the exportation of goods generally fall within the prohibition of GATT Article XI:1.

The request for consultations also alleges that China imposes export duties on several raw materials and imposes other export restrictions through its export procedures, including via certain charges that must be paid before exportation. In addition, the complainants in this dispute also contend that China administers its export procedures in an unfair way, by not publishing relevant measures that would otherwise allow them to be readily available to foreign governments and traders. The complainants submitted that the lack of publication of restrictions affecting trade in respect of the above-mentioned raw materials amounts to a violation of GATT Article X which requires China to administer its measures in a uniform, impartial, and reasonable manner, and GATT Article VIII which requires that any charges in connection with export be limited to the cost of services rendered.

Moreover, the complainants also consider that the export restraints imposed by China on certain raw materials are inconsistent with different paragraphs of that country’s Accession Protocol, which contains special obligations undertaken by China upon accession to the WTO. In particular, it committed itself to avoiding restrictions on importation of goods other than those listed in a specific annex thereto. For the products listed therein, China committed to only levy export duties on such products thereby committing to refrain itself from imposing quantitative restrictions whatsoever.

The EU, along with the US and Mexico, contend that China seeks to artificially increase the world price of such raw materials since they are fundamental for the production of upstream products. On the one hand, they claim, this would hurt several industries in the territories of the EU, the US and Mexico, whereas on the other hand, Chinese producers of such finished products would be better off

by having the restricted raw materials readily available at home. With these policies, it is alleged, China would distort world prices while keeping prices at a lower level internally.

According to unofficial sources, China, by contrast, would argue that even if such measures are inconsistent with Articles XI:1 of the GATT and China's Accession Protocol, the said measures would still be protected under Article XX g) of the GATT since this provision allows WTO Members to depart from their obligations when the challenged measures are related to the conservation of exhaustive natural resources. Scholars have initiated a debate over this defence, as to whether the Article XX g) exception only covers obligations included in the text of the GATT or if, on the other hand, the Article XX g) exception applies to WTO agreements other than the GATT, i.e., China's Accession Protocol to the WTO.

Should the EU together with the other two complainants win this legal battle, it will be able to retaliate against China by suspending concessions granted by means of the WTO agreements at an amount equivalent to the level of nullification or impairment caused to the European manufacturers affected by such measures. This, in turn, means that customs tariffs may at that stage be imposed punitively on a wide variety of goods of Chinese origin. According to an unofficial source, the relevance of this WTO dispute is such that an eventual level of nullification or impairment found in this case would hit a record in the history of WTO litigation.

II. European Union: Trade

CFI annuls anti-dumping duties for PET from India on grounds of illegality of the method of calculating export price

On 17 November 2009 the European Court of First Instance annulled anti-dumping duties on imports of polyethylene terephthalate ("PET") from India for MTZ Polyfilms Ltd, an Indian exporting producer. The Court established that the Community institutions breached the applicable provisions of the EC anti-dumping law by applying a method for the determination of the export price which is not provided by the Basic Regulation. The Court also ruled that a provision that allows changing the calculation method in reviews should be "interpreted strictly".

The definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of PET from India was imposed in 2001. The Commission then accepted minimum price undertakings offered by MTZ and by four other Indian exporters. In 2003 the Commission initiated a partial interim review of the anti-dumping measures. During that review the Commission determined that the changes observed in the range of product values and the pattern of sales had rendered the minimum import prices "inappropriate" to counteract the injurious effect of dumping. On this basis the undertaking was withdrawn.

In the meantime, the Commission initiated another partial interim review, limited to the recalculation of the dumping margin, which concluded with the amendment of the rate of the anti-dumping duty applicable to MTZ. During the review the Commission used a rather peculiar basis for calculating the export prices for Indian producers who previously benefited from the undertaking. The Commission first analysed export prices to the Community in relation to the minimum import prices of the undertakings. Export prices of a particular company to the Community which were on average well above the minimum import prices were considered to be set "sufficiently independently" from the undertaking and therefore reliable. Conversely, if average export price of a company were close to the minimum export price, they were considered not reliable as being influenced by the undertaking.

In the latter case, the Commission decided to establish the export price on the basis of export prices actually paid or payable to countries outside of the EU.

MTZ brought an action for annulment challenging the legality of the method of calculation of the export price applied by the Community institutions and arguing that the method applied was not provided for by the Basic Regulation. In its statement of defence, the Council claimed that the contested methodology had to be applied as a “most logical” approach in a situation where the institutions decided to reject the export prices to the Community charged by MTZ as being merely a consequence of the minimum import prices set under the undertaking and, therefore, not reliable.

The Court observed that, as a general rule, in a review, the institutions are required to apply the same methodology, including the method of determining the export price, as that used in the initial investigation which led to the imposition of the anti-dumping duty. As an exception, and only where the circumstances have changed, the institutions may apply a methodology other than that used in the initial investigation. That exception, however, must however be interpreted strictly.

In the present case, the Council had not chosen to invoke the exception provided in Basic Regulation which allows changes in methodology in an interim review provided circumstances have changed. However, even if the Council had invoked the exception, the Council could not have calculated a dumping margin in the context of an interim review using a methodology which was not even foreseen in the Basic Regulation.

The Court stressed that the possible need to carry out a prospective analysis of the prices charged by the exporters does not confer on the institutions concerned an implicit power to substitute a methodology based on such an analysis for the methodology expressly prescribed by the Basic Regulation. To the contrary, in an interim review, just as in an initial investigation, the institutions are required to determine the export price in accordance with the respective provisions of the Basic Regulation and, in particular, its Article 2.

The ruling confirms that in any anti-dumping review investigation, the calculation of the dumping margin can only be based on the methodology provided by Article 2 of the Basic Regulation, thus confirming similar rulings by the WTO Appellate Body in the so-called “zeroing” cases.

III. EC Competition

Paris Court of Appeal makes preliminary reference concerning internet sales

The Paris Court of Appeal has made a preliminary reference to the European Court of Justice (“ECJ”) concerning restrictions on internet sales in the context of litigation in the Pierre Fabre Dermo-Cosmétique case (“Pierre Fabre”).

In this case, the French Competition Authority found that Pierre Fabre, a manufacturer of cosmetics, breached Article 81 EC and the equivalent provisions of French law by prohibiting its selective distributors from selling cosmetic products over the internet. The French Competition Authority found that the total ban on internet sales imposed by Pierre Fabre amounted to a restriction of active and passive sales which constituted a hardcore restriction within the meaning of the Vertical Agreements Block Exemption Regulation, which could not be exempted in an individual assessment under Article 81(3) EC. Pierre Fabre brought an action for annulment against this decision before the

Paris Court of Appeal and, pending its appeal, obtained a suspension of the obligation imposed by the decision of the French Competition Authority to amend its selective distribution contracts.

The Commission intervened as *amicus curiae* in the proceedings before the Paris Court of Appeal in support of the French Competition Authority's decision. The Commission argued that a total ban on internet sales by selective distributors amounts to a hardcore restriction within the meaning of the Vertical Agreements Block Exemption Regulation, unless it is objectively justified by exceptional circumstances (for instance, on public security or public health grounds). The Commission also argued that a hardcore restriction constitutes a restriction of competition by object, although this does not exclude the possibility for the restriction to qualify for an exemption under Article 81(3) EC following an individual analysis.

Both Pierre Fabre and the Commission suggested that, should the Paris Court of Appeal have doubts as regards the interpretation of the EC competition rules, it should stay the proceedings and make a preliminary reference to the ECJ. Thus, in view of (i) the compelling arguments put forward by the parties, which interpreted very differently the relevant competition rules, (ii) the silence of the Vertical Agreements Block Exemption Regulation in respect of internet restrictions, and (iii) the non-binding character of the Commission's Vertical Guidelines (which indicate that a total ban on internet sales amount to a hardcore restriction), the Paris Court of Appeal has now asked the ECJ to rule on whether a ban on internet sales would be a hardcore restriction by object within the meaning of Article 81(1) EC and the Vertical Agreements Block Exemption Regulation.

This preliminary reference gives the ECJ the opportunity for the first time to rule on the controversial issue of internet resale restrictions. It remains to be seen whether it will endorse the Commission's approach in this respect.

In addition, it should be noted that the French Competition Authority has recently published its comments concerning the new draft Vertical Agreements Block Exemption Regulation and the new draft Vertical Guidelines, which fine-tune the Commission's approach to internet sales restrictions. In its contribution, the French Competition Authority welcomes the efforts of the Commission and agrees with the proposed changes (including the idea that the use of a website is a form of passive selling unless it contains advertising specifically targeting certain customers). Moreover, the French Competition Authority advocates making it clear that the objective of the rules is to strike the right balance between the interests of internet distribution and bricks-and-mortar distribution, without giving precedence to either of these.

IV. European Union: Regulatory

A. Commission voices limited optimism for Copenhagen climate change conference

On 2 December 2009, the European Commission announced that the Copenhagen conference must produce global, ambitious and comprehensive agreement in order to avert what is widely believed to be a dangerous climate change. The Commission underlined the crucial importance of reaching a global, ambitious and comprehensive climate agreement at the UN climate change conference in Copenhagen on 7-18 December.

According to the Commission's press release, the EU will be working to achieve maximum progress towards finalising an ambitious and legally binding global climate treaty to succeed the Kyoto Protocol in 2013 (the latter ends in 2012). The conference must settle the key political elements of

the treaty and set up a process and mid-2010 deadline for completing the full text. The Copenhagen agreement must also incorporate a “fast start” deal allowing for immediate implementation or preparation of certain actions, including financial assistance to least developed countries.

Commission President José Manuel Barroso and Environment Commissioner Stavros Dimas will both participate in the conference, as will some 90 other world leaders.

President Barroso commented as follows: “In Copenhagen, world leaders must take the bold decisions needed to stop climate change from reaching the dangerous and potentially catastrophic levels projected by the scientific community. We must seize this chance to keep global warming below 2°C before it is too late. But Copenhagen is also an historic opportunity to draw the roadmap to a global low-carbon society, and in so doing unleash a wave of innovation that can revitalise our economies through the creation of new, sustainable growth sectors and ‘green collar’ jobs. The European Union has set the pace with our unilateral commitment to cut emissions 20% by 2020 and our climate financing proposals for developing countries. We will be ready to scale up our emission reduction to 30% provided our partners in both the developed and the developing world take on their fair share of the global effort.”

Commissioner Dimas added: “I very much welcome that several major partners including the US and China have recently put concrete emission targets or actions on the table. The scientific evidence tells us that to keep global warming below 2°C, industrialised countries must cut their emissions to 25-40% below 1990 levels by 2020 while developing countries need to hold their emissions growth at some 15-30% below projected levels in 2020. However, the aggregate offers from developed countries still fall well short of the level of ambition needed, so I urge those countries with weak targets to improve them. Moreover a number of provisions in the current negotiating texts would have the effect of reducing developed countries' targets in practice.”

International negotiations were launched at the end of 2007 to draw up a United Nations agreement on tackling climate change for the period after 2012, when the first commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol expires. For the EU, these negotiations must result in a comprehensive, ambitious, fair, science-based and legally binding global treaty. However, given the slow progress made in the negotiations to date, and a lack of consensus about the shape of the eventual agreement, it is now unlikely that the treaty can be finalised in Copenhagen as originally planned.

As for the “Copenhagen programme”, for just over the first week of the conference, until 15 December, the negotiations will take place at official level. These will be followed, from 16 December until the end of the conference on 18 December, by a high-level segment. This will initially involve ministers and Commissioner Dimas, but from 17 December world leaders are invited to join them. More than 90 have already accepted, including President Barroso. Commissioner Dimas will arrive in Copenhagen on 12 December to participate in an informal international ministerial meeting the next day hosted by Connie Hedegaard, the Danish minister who will also chair the UN conference. Ms Hedegaard has been designated Commissioner for climate action in the next European Commission.

B. Greening of road transport

Road transport currently accounts for about 10% of global greenhouse gas emissions, compared with about 3% each for shipping and aviation. In Europe, the figure is 15%. To tackle the problem,

governments around the world are introducing increasingly stringent regulations covering vehicle emissions.

“The regulatory environment in the US, Europe, Japan and possibly China will be such that it will be almost impossible for automakers to ignore electrification in their vehicles,” said Rod Lache, managing director of Deutsche Bank Securities in New York. Yet with millions of first-time car buyers entering the market in China, India and elsewhere, environmental advocates say carmakers’ greenhouse gas emission cuts will need to be even more aggressive, just to keep up with the growing number of vehicles. “If the car sector is to keep pace, you are looking at annual emission reductions of 5%,” said Jos Dings, director of Transport & Environment. In 2008, according to the group, carmakers cut their fleets’ average CO2 emissions in Europe by 3.3%.

In London, at the end of November 2009, PSA Peugeot Citroen demonstrated for the first time Peugeot’s plug-in Ion and its sister brand Citroen’s C-Zero. The cars can drive 130 km on a single electric charge. At the launch, the French carmaker vowed to become the first automaker to market with a full range of electric vehicles in Europe next year. If so, it will beat its arch-rival Renault, whose chief executive, Carlos Ghosn, is staking his reputation on the success of four planned electric models to be launched in 2011-12. General Motors and BMW intend to demonstrate their latest electric models in December 2009.

But automakers and government regulators are also grappling with unattractive economics. Early electric models will be expensive because of their small sales volumes and high battery costs. Car buyers have, however, historically been unwilling to pay a premium for a cleaner car. Sales projections are modest: Peugeot thinks it will sell 25,000 units a year of its two models by 2015. The carmaker, like others, thinks more people will buy two planned forthcoming hybrids it is launching in 2011-12 which, like others, will have a combustion engine on board and so have a longer driving range.

New lithium ion batteries, which will deliver longer driving ranges, are the second key factor powering the new generation of plug-in hybrid and electric cars. To encourage more people to buy such vehicles, the UK will offer tax breaks of up to £5,000 (\$8,200, €5,470) from 2011. The US plans a tax credit of \$7,500 (€5,000, £4,570) for electric cars and France already offers a similar-sized tax rebate for ultra-low emission cars. Most industry players are also pursuing a wide range of less eye-catching technologies to cut emissions, from smaller engines to improved aerodynamics, use of lighter materials, and “stop-start” systems that switch engines off when cars are stopped in traffic.

Historically consumers have been unwilling to pay a premium for a cleaner car which means a low volume of sales and higher prices. Analysts are also concerned that many customers will abandon rechargeable cars when the hefty tax incentives for them expire. There are hopes however that battery prices will fall as the tax breaks are phased out.

V. *Institutions*

Lisbon Treaty enters into force, with hopes for greater democratisation and institutional as well as law-making efficiency

Following its ratification by the Czech Republic, the Treaty of Lisbon entered into force on 1 December 2009. The Treaty of Lisbon primarily aims to modernise the institutional and decisional framework of the European Union, with streamlined and modern institutions, simplified working

methods and voting rules, and a more effective and efficient decision-making process for a European Union of 27 members.

A number of key changes of general relevance merit attention.

- **EC becomes EU** – The Treaty of Lisbon grants the European Union a single legal personality; it replaces and succeeds the European Community (but not the European Atomic Energy Community).
- **EC Treaty becomes TFEU** – The EC Treaty has been renamed the “Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union” (TFEU) and its articles are re-numbered.
- **Provisions on competition are renumbered** – As a consequence of the EC Treaty’s transformation into the TFEU, former Articles 81 to 89 EC become Articles 101 to 109 TFEU.
- **EC Courts becomes EU Courts** – The Court of Justice of the European Communities is renamed the “Court of Justice of the European Union”.
- **EU Courts are Court of Justice, General Court and Specialised Courts** – The Court of Justice of the European Union is now composed of the Court of Justice and the General Court (formerly named the Court of First Instance) as well as Specialised Courts attached to the General Court (currently, there is only one Specialised Court, i.e., the European Union Civil Service Tribunal).
- **Charter of Fundamental Rights becomes primary legislation** – Article 6(1) of the revised Treaty on European Union (TEU) gives the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights the same legal value as the Treaties.
- **Regulatory acts are open to individual challenge** – Article 263, 4th indent of the TFEU somewhat extends the jurisdiction of the Court as individuals may now institute annulment proceedings against a regulatory act which is of direct concern to them and does not entail implementing measures (and not only against decisions and regulations which are of direct and individual concern to them).

The consolidated version of the Lisbon Treaty can be accessed at:

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ:C:2008:115:SOM:EN:HTML>.

VI. *Dumping Watch*

A. **Notice of initiation of partial interim review – polyethylene terephthalate film**

On 1 December 2009, the Official Journal published a notice of initiation of a partial interim review of the anti-dumping measures applicable to imports of polyethylene terephthalate (PET) film originating in India.

The product concerned is PET film originating in India, currently falling within CN codes ex 3920 62 19 and ex 3920 62 90.

It is recalled that the measures currently in force are a definitive anti-dumping duty imposed by Council Regulation 1292/2007 on imports of PET film originating in India, as amended by Council Regulation 15/2009.

The request was lodged by Garware Polyester Limited (the “applicant”), an exporting producer from India. The request is limited in scope to the examination of dumping as far as the applicant is concerned. The request is based on *prima facie* evidence, provided by the applicant, that the

circumstances on the basis of which measures were established have changed and that these changes are of lasting nature.

In particular, the applicant alleges that there have been significant changes in the production process of the company and that these changes have led to a substantially lower dumping margin since the imposition of the existing measures. A comparison of the applicant's domestic prices and its export prices to the Community indicates that the dumping margin appears to be substantially lower than the current level of the measure. Therefore, the continued imposition of measures at the existing level, which was based on the level of dumping previously established, appears to be no longer necessary to offset dumping.

Having determined, after consulting the Advisory Committee, that sufficient evidence exists to justify the initiation of a partial interim review, the Commission has initiated a review.

All interested parties, if their representations are to be taken into account during the investigation, must make themselves known by contacting the Commission, present their views and submit questionnaire replies or any other information within 37 days of the date of publication of the notice in the Official Journal, unless otherwise specified. All interested parties may also apply to be heard by the Commission within the same 37-day time limit.

The investigation shall be concluded within 15 months of the date of the publication of the notice in the Official Journal.

B. Exemption from anti-dumping duties – bicycle parts

On 1 December 2009, the Official Journal published Commission Decision 2009/867 granting certain parties an exemption from the extension to certain bicycle parts of the anti-dumping duty on bicycles originating in the People's Republic of China imposed by Council Regulation 2474/93, last maintained and amended by Regulation 1095/2005, and lifting the suspension of the payment of the anti-dumping duty extended to certain bicycle parts originating in the People's Republic of China granted to certain parties pursuant to Commission Regulation 88/97.

The product concerned is bicycle parts, currently classifiable within the CN codes 8714 91 10 to 8714 99 90.

It is recalled that after the entry into force of the exemption Regulation, a number of bicycle assemblers submitted requests for exemption from the anti-dumping duty as extended to imports of certain bicycle parts from the People's Republic of China by Regulation 71/97. The Commission published in the Official Journal successive lists of bicycle assemblers for which the payment of the extended anti-dumping duty in respect of their imports of essential bicycle parts declared for free circulation was suspended. Following the publication of the list of parties under examination, a period of examination was selected. This period was defined as from 1 January 2007 to 31 May 2009. A questionnaire was sent to all parties under examination, requesting information on the assembly operations conducted during the relevant period of examination.

The Commission received from certain parties all the information required for the determination of the admissibility of their requests. These parties had already received their suspension with effect from the day of arrival of a first complete application dossier at the Commission premises. The newly requested and provided information was examined and verified, where necessary, at the premises of

the parties concerned. Based on this information, the Commission found that the requests submitted by certain parties are admissible. On the other hand, requests made by certain other parties had to be rejected. A detailed list of the parties benefiting from the exemption as well as of the parties whose applications have been rejected is available at:

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:314:0106:0109:EN:PDF>.

Decision 2009/867 entered into force on 1 December 2009.

C. Exemption from anti-dumping duties - certain bicycle parts

On 1 December 2009, the Official Journal published a Commission Notice concerning the parties exempted, pursuant to Commission Regulation 88/97 on the authorisation of the exemption of imports of certain bicycle parts originating in the People's Republic of China, from the extension by Council Regulation 71/97 of the anti-dumping duty imposed by Council Regulation 2474/93, maintained by Council Regulation 1524/2000 and last amended by Council Regulation 1095/2005: changes in the name and address of certain exempted parties.

The product concerned is bicycle parts, currently classifiable within the CN codes ranging from 8714 91 10 to 8714 99 90.

It is recalled that Commission Regulation 88/97 authorises the exemption from the extended anti-dumping duty on imports of certain bicycle parts originating in the People's Republic of China. This duty resulted from the extension by Council Regulation 71/97 of the anti-dumping duty imposed by Council Regulation 2474/93, maintained by Regulation 1524/2000 and last amended by Council Regulation No 1095/2005.

In this framework, and by successive Commission Decisions, a certain number of bicycle producers have been exempted from the extended anti-dumping duty. The Commission, after having examined the information supplied, has established that the changes in the companies' names and legal addresses do not affect the assembly operations with regard to the stipulations of the exemption Regulation and therefore the Commission does not consider that these changes should affect the exemption from the extended anti-dumping duty. Hence references to certain companies as mentioned in the Notice should be read as reported in the Annex to the Notice. The full text of the Notice is available at:

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2009:291:0009:0011:EN:PDF>.

VII. The Week Ahead

A. Council

- 7 December 2009: Transport, Telecom and Energy Council – Energy part (Brussels)
- 7-8 December 2009: General Affairs and External Relations Council (Brussels)
- 10-11 December 2009: European Council (Brussels)

B. WTO

- 7-18 December 2009: UN Climate Change Conference - Copenhagen

- 8-10 December 2009: Trade Policy Review Body - Georgia

C. OECD

- 6-8 December 2009: Higher Education Spaces and Places: for Learning, Innovation and Knowledge Exchange, conference organised by the Directorate for Education and the Centre for Effective Learning Environments. Riga, Latvia.
- 7 December 2009: Trade Policy and the Economic Crisis, Tokyo Policy Forum with presentation by Ken Ash, Director of OECD Trade and Agriculture Directorate. OECD Tokyo Centre, Tokyo, Japan.
- 7-8 December 2009: The Crisis and Beyond: International Investment for a Stronger, Cleaner, Fairer Economy, global forum on International Investment, organised by the Directorate for Financial and Enterprise Affairs.
- 7-8 December 2009: Innovation Strategy: Education and Competencies, workshop organised by the International Energy Agency and the French government. International Energy Agency, Paris, France.
- 7-18 December 2009: UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, COP15. Participation of the Secretary-General. Copenhagen, Denmark.
- 8 December 2009: Health at a Glance 2009, Les Ateliers de l'OCDE media briefing, in French, to present OECD's work on health issues: "Comment conjuguer contrôle des dépenses de santé et amélioration des soins?" Organised by the OECD and the AJEF as part of a monthly series.
- 8-10 December 2009: Empowering E-Consumers: Strengthening Consumer Protection in the Internet Economy, conference organised by Directorate for Science, Technology and Industry, with participation of the Secretary-General. Washington DC, USA.
- 8-11 December 2009: Food Crisis Prevention Network, meeting organised by the OECD Sahel and West Africa Club and the CILSS. Bamako, Mali.
- 9 December 2009: Foreign Bribery: Who Pays the Price, roundtable marking International Anti-Corruption Day and 10th anniversary of the entry into force of the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention. Open to the media.
- 9-10 December 2009: "Quels choix face à la crise?", conference organised by Les Echos, with participation of the OECD. Maison de la Chimie, Paris.
- 9-10 December 2009: Land acquisition in West Africa: Reconciling development and investment, strategy and policy group meeting organised by the OECD Sahel and West Africa Club. Bamako, Mali.
- 11 December 2009: Nanotechnology/Manufactured Nanomaterials workshop for the Central and Eastern Europe region: one in a series of regional workshops on Awareness-Raising for

Developing and Transition Countries organised by the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), the Inter-Organisation Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC), and OECD Environment Directorate. Lodz, Poland.

- 11 December 2009: Sustainable Development Sector Strategies, workshop organised by the Environment Directorate.
- 11 December 2009: OECD statistics news releases: Composite Leading Indicators.

*