

Official Journal of the European Union

L 20



English edition

Legislation

Volume 58

27 January 2015

Contents

II *Non-legislative acts*

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS

- ★ **Information on the signing and provisional application of the Agreement between the European Union and the Kingdom of Norway on reciprocal access to fishing in the Skagerrak for vessels flying the flag of Denmark, Norway and Sweden** 1

REGULATIONS

- ★ **Council Implementing Regulation (EU) 2015/108 of 26 January 2015 implementing Regulation (EU) No 36/2012 concerning restrictive measures in view of the situation in Syria** 2
- ★ **Council Implementing Regulation (EU) 2015/109 of 26 January 2015 implementing Regulation (EC) No 560/2005 imposing certain specific restrictive measures directed against certain persons and entities in view of the situation in Côte d'Ivoire** 4
- ★ **Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2015/110 of 26 January 2015 imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of certain welded tubes and pipes of iron or non-alloy steel originating in Belarus, the People's Republic of China and Russia and terminating the proceeding for imports of certain welded tubes and pipes of iron or non-alloy steel originating in Ukraine following an expiry review pursuant to Article 11(2) of Council Regulation (EC) No 1225/2009** 6
- ★ **Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2015/111 of 26 January 2015 establishing measures to alleviate a serious threat to the conservation of the sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*) stock in the Celtic Sea, Channel, Irish Sea and southern North Sea** 31
- Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2015/112 of 26 January 2015 establishing the standard import values for determining the entry price of certain fruit and vegetables 34

EN

Acts whose titles are printed in light type are those relating to day-to-day management of agricultural matters, and are generally valid for a limited period.

The titles of all other acts are printed in bold type and preceded by an asterisk.

Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2015/113 of 26 January 2015 determining the quantities to be added to the quantity fixed for the subperiod from 1 April to 30 June 2015 under the tariff quotas opened by Regulation (EC) No 539/2007 in the egg sector and for egg albumin	36
Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2015/114 of 26 January 2015 determining the quantities to be added to the quantity fixed for the subperiod from 1 April to 30 June 2015 under the tariff quota opened by Regulation (EC) No 536/2007 for poultrymeat originating in the United States of America	38
Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2015/115 of 26 January 2015 determining the quantities to be added to the quantity fixed for the subperiod from 1 April to 30 June 2015 under the tariff quotas opened by Regulation (EC) No 1384/2007 for poultrymeat originating in Israel	40

DECISIONS

★ Council Decision (EU) 2015/116 of 26 January 2015 appointing the members and alternate members of the Committee of the Regions for the period from 26 January 2015 to 25 January 2020	42
★ Council Implementing Decision (CFSP) 2015/117 of 26 January 2015 implementing Decision 2013/255/CFSP concerning restrictive measures against Syria	85
★ Council Implementing Decision (CFSP) 2015/118 of 26 January 2015 implementing Decision 2010/656/CFSP renewing the restrictive measures against Côte d'Ivoire	87

II

(Non-legislative acts)

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS

Information on the signing and provisional application of the Agreement between the European Union and the Kingdom of Norway on reciprocal access to fishing in the Skagerrak for vessels flying the flag of Denmark, Norway and Sweden

The European Union and the Kingdom of Norway signed, on 15 January 2015 in Brussels, the Agreement on reciprocal access to fishing in the Skagerrak for vessels flying the flag of Denmark, Norway and Sweden ⁽¹⁾.

The Agreement accordingly applies provisionally from 15 January 2015 pursuant to Article 9 thereof.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 224, 30.7.2014, p. 3.

REGULATIONS

COUNCIL IMPLEMENTING REGULATION (EU) 2015/108

of 26 January 2015

implementing Regulation (EU) No 36/2012 concerning restrictive measures in view of the situation in Syria

THE COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION,

Having regard to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EU) No 36/2012 of 18 January 2012 concerning restrictive measures in view of the situation in Syria and repealing Regulation (EU) No 442/2011 ⁽¹⁾, and in particular Article 32(1) thereof,

Whereas:

- (1) On 18 January 2012, the Council adopted Regulation (EU) No 36/2012.
- (2) By its judgments of 13 November 2014 in Cases T-653/11, T-654/11 and T-43/12, the General Court of the European Union annulled the Council's decision to include Aiman Jaber, Khaled Kaddour, Mohammed Hamcho and Hamcho International on the list of persons and entities subject to restrictive measures set out in Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 36/2012.
- (3) Aiman Jaber, Khaled Kaddour, Mohammed Hamcho and Hamcho International should be included again on the list of persons and entities subject to restrictive measures, on the basis of new statements of reasons.
- (4) Regulation (EU) No 36/2012 should therefore be amended accordingly,

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

Article 1

Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 36/2012 shall be amended as set out in the Annex to this Regulation.

Article 2

This Regulation shall enter into force on the day of its publication in the *Official Journal of the European Union*.

This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.

Done at Brussels, 26 January 2015.

For the Council
The President
E. RINKĒVIČS

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 16, 19.1.2012, p. 1.

ANNEX

The following persons and entity shall be inserted in the list of persons and entities set out in Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 36/2012.

I. LIST OF NATURAL AND LEGAL PERSONS, ENTITIES OR BODIES REFERRED TO IN ARTICLE 14 AND ARTICLE 15(1)(a)

A. PERSONS

	Name	Identifying information	Reasons	Date of listing
18.	Mohammed (محمد) Hamcho (حمشو)	Date of birth: 20 May 1966. Passport No 002954347	Prominent Syrian businessman, owner of Hamcho International, close to key figures of the Syrian regime, including President Bashar al-Assad and Maher al-Assad. Since March 2014, he has held the position of Chairman for China of the Bilateral Business Councils following his appointment by the Minister of Economy, Khodr Orfali. Mohammed Hamcho benefits from and provides support to the Syrian regime and is associated with persons benefiting from and supporting the regime.	27.1.2015
28.	Khalid (خالد) (a.k.a. Khaled) Qaddur (قدور) (a.k.a. Qadour, Qaddour, Kaddour)		Prominent Syrian businessman, close to Maher al-Assad, a key figure of the Syrian regime. Khalid Qaddur benefits from and provides support to the Syrian regime and is associated with persons benefiting from and supporting the regime.	27.1.2015
33.	Ayman (أيمن) Jabir (جابر) (a.k.a. Aiman Jaber)	Place of birth: Latakia	Prominent Syrian businessman, close to key figures of the Syrian regime such as Maher al-Assad and Rami Makhoulf. He has also provided support to the regime by facilitating the importation of oil from Overseas Petroleum Trading to Syria through his company El Jazireh. Ayman Jabir benefits from and provides support to the regime and is associated with persons benefiting from and supporting the regime.	27.1.2015

B. ENTITIES

	Name	Identifying information	Reasons	Date of listing
3.	Hamcho International (a.k.a. Hamsho International Group)	Baghdad Street, PO Box 8254 Damascus Tel. +963 112316675 Fax +963 112318875 Website: www.hamshointl.com E-mail: info@hamshointl.com and hamshogroup@yahoo.com	Hamcho International is a large Syrian holding company owned by Mohammed Hamcho. Hamcho International benefits from and provides support to the regime and is associated with a person benefiting from and supporting the regime.	27.1.2015

COUNCIL IMPLEMENTING REGULATION (EU) 2015/109
of 26 January 2015
implementing Regulation (EC) No 560/2005 imposing certain specific restrictive measures directed
against certain persons and entities in view of the situation in Côte d'Ivoire

THE COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION,

Having regard to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EC) No 560/2005 of 12 April 2005 imposing certain specific restrictive measures directed against certain persons and entities in view of the situation in Côte d'Ivoire ⁽¹⁾, and in particular Article 11a(1) thereof,

Whereas:

- (1) On 12 April 2005, the Council adopted Regulation (EC) No 560/2005.
- (2) On 20 November 2014, the Sanctions Committee established pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 1572 (2004) concerning Côte d'Ivoire deleted one person from the list of persons subject to the measures set out in paragraphs 9 to 12 of that Resolution.
- (3) The list of persons subject to restrictive measures set out in Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 560/2005 should therefore be amended accordingly,

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

Article 1

Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 560/2005 is amended as set out in the Annex to this Regulation.

Article 2

This Regulation shall enter into force on the day of its publication in the *Official Journal of the European Union*.

This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.

Done at Brussels, 26 January 2015.

For the Council
The President
J. DÜKLAVS

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 95, 14.4.2005, p. 1.

ANNEX

The entry in Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 560/2005 for the following person is deleted:

Alcide DJÉDJÉ

COMMISSION IMPLEMENTING REGULATION (EU) 2015/110**of 26 January 2015**

imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of certain welded tubes and pipes of iron or non-alloy steel originating in Belarus, the People's Republic of China and Russia and terminating the proceeding for imports of certain welded tubes and pipes of iron or non-alloy steel originating in Ukraine following an expiry review pursuant to Article 11(2) of Council Regulation (EC) No 1225/2009

THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION,

Having regard to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EC) No 1225/2009 of 30 November 2009 on protection against dumped imports from countries not members of the European Community ⁽¹⁾ ('the basic Regulation'), and in particular Article 9(4) and Article 11(2) and (5) thereof,

Whereas:

A. PROCEDURE**1. Measures in force**

- (1) The Council, following an anti-dumping investigation ('the previous investigation'), by Regulation (EC) No 1256/2008 ⁽²⁾, imposed a definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of certain welded tubes and pipes of iron or non-alloy steel currently falling within CN codes ex 7306 30 41, ex 7306 30 49, ex 7306 30 72 and ex 7306 30 77 originating in Belarus, the People's Republic of China ('PRC'), Russia, Thailand and Ukraine ('the definitive anti-dumping measures'). The measures took the form of an *ad valorem* duty ranging between 10,1 % and 90,6 %.

2. Request for an expiry review

- (2) Following the publication of a notice of impending expiry ⁽³⁾ of the definitive anti-dumping measures in force, the Commission received on 18 September 2013 a request for the initiation of an expiry review of these measures pursuant to Article 11(2) of the basic Regulation. The request was lodged by the Defence Committee of the welded steel tubes industry of the European Union ('the applicant') on behalf of producers representing a major proportion of the total Union production of welded tubes and pipes, in this case more than 25 %.
- (3) The request was based on the grounds that the expiry of the measures would be likely to result in a continuation or recurrence of dumping and injury to the Union industry.

3. Initiation of an expiry review

- (4) Having determined, after consulting the Advisory Committee, that sufficient evidence existed for the initiation of an expiry review, the Commission announced on 19 December 2013, by a notice published in the *Official Journal of the European Union* ⁽⁴⁾ ('the Notice of Initiation'), the initiation of an expiry review pursuant to Article 11(2) of the basic Regulation.

4. Investigation**4.1. Review investigation period and period considered**

- (5) The investigation of the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping and injury covered the period from 1 October 2012 to 30 September 2013 ('the review investigation period' or 'RIP'). The examination of the trends relevant for the assessment of the likelihood of a continuation or recurrence of injury covered the period from 1 January 2010 to the end of the review investigation period ('the period considered').

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 343, 22.12.2009, p. 51.

⁽²⁾ OJ L 343, 19.12.2008, p. 1.

⁽³⁾ OJ C 136, 15.5.2013, p. 25.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ C 372, 19.12.2013, p. 21.

4.2. *Parties concerned by the proceeding*

- (6) The Commission officially advised the applicant, other known Union producers, exporting producers in Belarus, the PRC, Russia and Ukraine ('the countries concerned'), unrelated importers and users known to be concerned, as well as representatives of the countries concerned of the initiation of the expiry review. Interested parties were given the opportunity to make their views known in writing and to request a hearing within the time limit set out in the Notice of Initiation.
- (7) All interested parties who so requested and showed that there were particular reasons why they should be heard were granted a hearing.

4.2.1. Sampling in respect of exporting producers

- (8) In view of the apparent large number of exporting producers in the PRC, Russia and Ukraine, sampling was envisaged in the Notice of Initiation, in accordance with Article 17 of the basic Regulation. In order to enable the Commission to decide whether sampling would be necessary and, if so, to select a sample, the above parties were requested to make themselves known to the Commission within 15 days of the initiation of the review and to provide the Commission with the information requested in the Notice of Initiation.
- (9) In the end, the Commission did not receive sampling replies from exporting producers in the PRC. One sampling reply was received from one exporting producer in Ukraine. Three sampling replies were received from exporting producers in Russia. Hence, the Commission considered that sampling of exporting producers was not necessary.

4.2.2. Sampling in respect of importers and Union producers

- (10) In view of the apparent large number of unrelated importers in the Union, sampling was envisaged in the Notice of Initiation, in accordance with Article 17 of the basic Regulation. In order to enable the Commission to decide whether sampling would be necessary and, if so, to select a sample, the above parties were requested to make themselves known to the Commission within 15 days of the initiation of the review and to provide the Commission with the information requested in the Notice of Initiation. Given that no reply has been received from any unrelated importer, sampling was not applied to unrelated importers.
- (11) In view of the large number of Union producers involved in this proceeding, the Notice of Initiation announced that the Commission had provisionally selected a sample of Union producers for the determination of injury in accordance with Article 17 of the basic Regulation. That pre-selection had been made by using the information available to the Commission at initiation stage and it was based on the producers' sales volume, production volume and geographical location in the Union. The sample corresponded to the largest representative volume of production and sales which could be reasonably investigated within the time available, representing 52 % of the total production and sales to unrelated customers in the EU of the Union industry. In addition, the sample was representative in terms of geographical location of the companies as it covered four different Member States. EU producers were consulted about the proposed sample on the date of publication of the Notice of Initiation. Given that no additional producers came forward and no comments were received on the sample, the proposed sample was confirmed.
- (12) The Commission sought and verified all the information deemed necessary for a determination of the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping, likelihood of continuation or recurrence of injury and of the Union interest. To this end, the Commission sent questionnaires to the exporting producers and Union producers selected in the sample. Verification visits were carried out at the premises of the following companies:

(a) producers in the Union:

- Arcelor Mittal Karvina, Czech Republic,
- Arcelor Mittal Krakow, Poland,
- Arvedi Tubi Acciaio s.p.A, Cremona, Italy,
- Tata Steel UK Limited, Corby, UK;

- (b) exporting producer in Belarus:
 - Mogilev Metallurgical Works, Mogilev, Belarus;
- (c) trader related to the exporting producer in Ukraine:
 - Interpipe Europe SA, Lugano, Switzerland;
- (d) producer in Russia:
 - Pervouralsk New Pipe Plant, Pervouralsk, Russia;
- (e) producer in the analogue country:
 - Robor Ltd Johannesburg, South Africa.

B. PRODUCT CONCERNED AND LIKE PRODUCT

1. Product concerned

- (13) The product concerned is welded tubes and pipes, of iron or non-alloy steel, of circular cross-section and of an external diameter not exceeding 168,3 mm, excluding line pipe of a kind used for oil or gas pipelines, casing and tubing of a kind used in drilling for oil and gas, precision tubes and tubes and pipes with attached fittings suitable for conducting gases or liquids for use in civil aircraft, currently falling within CN codes ex 7306 30 41, ex 7306 30 49, ex 7306 30 72 and ex 7306 30 77, originating in Belarus, the PRC, Russia and Ukraine.
- (14) The investigation has shown that the different types of the product concerned all share the same basic physical, chemical and technical characteristics and are basically used for the same purposes.

2. Like product

- (15) The welded tubes and pipes produced and sold in the Union by the Union industry and the welded tubes and pipes produced and sold in the countries concerned and the analogue country were found to have essentially the same physical, chemical and technical characteristics and the same basic uses as the welded tubes and pipes produced in the countries concerned and sold for export to the Union. They are therefore considered to be alike within the meaning of Article 1(4) of the basic Regulation.

C. LIKELIHOOD OF CONTINUATION OR RECURRENCE OF DUMPING

- (16) In accordance with Article 11(2) of the basic Regulation, the Commission examined whether the expiry of the existing measures would be likely to lead to a continuation or recurrence of dumping from the four countries concerned.
- (17) All the four countries under investigation exported negligible quantities of the product concerned during the review investigation period. Therefore, there is no likelihood of continuation of dumping for any of the four countries under investigation. The assessment was limited to the likelihood of recurrence of dumping using export prices to other third countries. As in the previous investigation, exports to Belarus were disregarded for this purpose.

NON-MARKET ECONOMY COUNTRIES

1. Analogue Country

- (18) Pursuant to the provisions of Article 2(7)(a) of the basic Regulation, Belarus and the PRC are not considered market economy countries. In the previous investigation, the USA was used as an analogue country for the purposes of establishing the normal value. In the Notice of Initiation the USA was envisaged to be used as an analogue country in this expiry review, as suggested by the applicant.

- (19) The Commission received comments from Mogilev as well as from the Belarusian authorities. No comments were received from interested parties in the PRC.
- (20) The Belarusian parties argued USA was not an appropriate choice due to alleged links between the sole cooperating US producer and the Union industry.
- (21) The Belarusian parties suggested to use Russia as analogue country as the Russian steel industry is allegedly similar to that of Belarus due to their common ties to the former Soviet Union.
- (22) However, the investigation established that the value of natural gas was not reflected properly in the cost of production of the sole cooperating producer in Russia (see recital 69 below). Moreover, the cooperation from this producer in Russia was not sufficient (see recital 61 below). Therefore, the choice of Russia was not considered appropriate.
- (23) The Commission also identified other third countries exporting the product concerned to the Union. The Commission contacted producers in 14 known steel producing countries. These included countries such as Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Serbia, South Africa, South Korea and Taiwan.
- (24) In the end, the Commission did not receive any cooperation from US producers. However, it did receive full questionnaire replies from producers in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and in South Africa. Due to the significant size of its producer's domestic sales, the Commission considered South Africa to be the most appropriate choice.

BELARUS

1. Preliminary remark

- (25) The largest known producer in Belarus, OJSC Mogilev Metallurgical Works ('Mogilev') cooperated in the investigation. However, Mogilev did not export the product concerned to the Union during the review investigation period. Therefore, information of likely export prices to the Union was based on export prices to other third countries, as indicated in recital 27 below.

2. Likely dumping during the review investigation period

2.1. Determination of the normal value

- (26) The normal value for Belarus was established per product type for the like product on the basis of domestic sales prices to unrelated customers in the ordinary course of trade in South Africa (the analogue country). When there were no sales of a product type of the like product in the ordinary course of trade, or where a product type was not sold in representative quantities on the domestic market of South Africa, the Commission constructed the normal value by adding to the cost of production of the like product selling, general and administrative expenses and profit.

2.2. Determination of the likely export price

- (27) During the review investigation period, Mogilev did not export the product concerned to the Union. Thus, the likely export price was established on the basis of sales prices to other third countries.

2.3. Comparison

- (28) The comparison between the normal value and the likely export price was made on an ex-works basis. In order to ensure a fair comparison account was taken of differences which affect price comparability in accordance with Article 2(10) of the basic Regulation.

- (29) Allowances for differences in transport costs, rebates, discounts and level of trade were made where applicable.

2.4. *Likely dumping during the review investigation period*

- (30) On the basis of the above, the likely dumping margin within the meaning of Article 11(2) of the basic Regulation was established at 28,4 %.

3. **Development of exports should measures be repealed**

3.1. *Production capacity of the exporting producers*

- (31) The production lines of Mogilev were utilized both for the production of welded tubes and pipes and for the production of hollow sections (only a minor production step separates the production of the two products). Mogilev produced significant volumes of hollow sections and exported them to, inter alia, the Union, as there are no anti-dumping duties in force on these goods. In addition, Mogilev produced welded pipes with a diameter exceeding 168,3 mm ('large pipes'), which are not subject to anti-dumping duties in the Union.
- (32) On the basis of the current product mix, the spare capacity of Mogilev is calculated to be around 20 000 tonnes, or around 5 % of Union consumption.
- (33) Thus, should measures be repealed, there is a risk that Mogilev will sell significant quantities of welded pipes to the Union market at dumped prices.
- (34) Following disclosure, Mogilev claimed that its actual spare capacity is significantly lower due to a bottleneck in hydraulic testing. However, hydraulic testing is only a minor step in the overall production process of the product concerned, and such a bottleneck is therefore relatively easy to eliminate. The argument to establish the spare capacity of the plant on the basis of the bottleneck in hydraulic testing equipment can therefore not be accepted.

3.2. *Shifting production from other products produced on the same facilities*

- (35) As indicated in recital 31 above, it is currently more lucrative for Mogilev to produce hollow sections, as these are not subject to anti-dumping duties, while welded pipes are subject to anti-dumping duties in the Union. Indeed, during the review investigation period the production was heavily focused on products not subject to anti-dumping duties in the Union, which accounted for the large majority of products produced. In the absence of measures on welded pipes, it can be expected that Mogilev will produce a more balanced product mix, shifting capacities from products currently not subject to measures to welded pipes.
- (36) Thus, there is a substantial risk that Mogilev will at least partially shift production from products currently not subject to anti-dumping duties to welded pipes for the Union market at dumped prices should measures be repealed.
- (37) Following disclosure, Mogilev argued that it would not immediately shift its product mix from hollow sections to welded tubes and pipes, since for a number of years it has been selling hollow sections in much higher proportions than welded tubes and pipes and there would not be reasons to change such practice.
- (38) In this respect, it should be pointed out that the EU is Mogilev's biggest market for hollow sections and that Mogilev currently does not sell any welded tubes and pipes in the Union market. Mogilev did not provide any evidence that should measures be repealed, the proportion of sales to the EU between the different products would not change. Therefore, the conclusion that should the measures be repealed, Mogilev will likely produce a more balanced product mix and at least partially shift production from hollow sections to welded tubes and pipes for the Union market is maintained.

3.3. *Attractiveness of the Union market*

- (39) As mentioned in recital 27 above, there were no Belarusian exports of the product concerned to the Union during the review investigation period. Thus, the likelihood of risk for trade diversion to the Union market should measures be repealed would have to be based on the following:
- prevailing selling prices to other export markets,
 - prevailing prices on the Union market, both of the Union industry and of other sources of imports, and
 - sales behaviour by Mogilev for products not subject to anti-dumping duties.
- (40) When comparing the average sales price of Mogilev to other countries with those on the Union market, a significant level of undercutting can be found. Compared to the Union industry's average sales price, the level of undercutting ranges between 30 % and 50 %. Prices of Mogilev are also lower than other sources of imports to the Union market such as India and Turkey.
- (41) The likely attractiveness of the Union market is also reinforced by the fact that Mogilev already has existing sales channels currently used for sales of other products, which could also be used to sell the product concerned should measures be repealed.
- (42) In light of the above, the Commission concludes that, should measures be repealed, there is a significant risk of redirection of exports to the Union market at dumped prices as the Union market is much more attractive in terms of prices.
- (43) Following disclosure, Mogilev claimed that the significant increase of its sales of welded tubes and pipes on the domestic market and on the Russian market throughout the period considered had not been properly considered. In this respect, it should be noted that the increase in sales volumes on these markets has been confirmed during the investigation. In its comments after disclosure, Mogilev further confirmed that welded tubes and pipes are sold at prices which are lower than prevailing market prices on the EU market. Therefore, the fact that the sales volumes of these products in both the domestic market and the Russian market have been increasing over time does not reduce or eliminate the risk of redirection to the Union market, due to the EU more attractive prices. Mogilev's claim is therefore rejected.

4. **Conclusion on the likelihood of recurrence of dumping**

- (44) The available spare capacity in Belarus, the risk of switching production from other products to the product concerned and the attractive price level on the Union market lead to the conclusion that there is a risk of an increase in Belarusian dumped exports of the product concerned should the measures in force be allowed to lapse.

PRC

1. **Preliminary remarks**

- (45) As stated in recital 9 above, the Commission received no reply from the PRC. Thus, in the absence of cooperation from exporting producers in the PRC, the overall analysis, including the dumping calculation, is based on facts available pursuant to Article 18 of the basic Regulation. The Chinese authorities were informed of the Commission's intention to apply Article 18 of the basic Regulation and to base its findings on facts available.
- (46) Therefore, the likelihood of a continuation or recurrence of dumping was assessed by using the expiry review request, combined with other sources of information such as trade statistics on imports and exports (Eurostat and Chinese export data) and Metal Bulletin.
- (47) The absence of cooperation affected the comparison of the normal value with the export price of the various product types. It was considered appropriate to establish both the normal value and the export price on a global basis, namely based on average values, in accordance with Article 18 of the basic Regulation.

2. Likely dumping during the review investigation period

2.1. Determination of the normal value

- (48) The normal value for the PRC was established on the basis of the average domestic sales price to unrelated customers in the ordinary course of trade in South Africa (the analogue country).

2.2. Determination of the likely export price

- (49) In the absence of cooperation of any Chinese exporting producers, the export prices had to be based on facts available, in accordance with Article 18 of the basic Regulation.
- (50) The Commission first analysed the statistics from Eurostat. However, the imported quantities of the product imported from the PRC were very limited and, thus, their prices were considered unrepresentative. For this reason, the likely export price was established on the basis of Chinese trade statistics on exports to third countries.

2.3. Comparison

- (51) The comparison between the normal value and the likely export price was made on an ex-works basis. In order to ensure a fair comparison account was taken of differences which affect price comparability in accordance with Article 2(10) of the basic Regulation.
- (52) Allowances for differences in transport costs, insurance costs, non-refundable VAT, export costs, rebates and discount were made where applicable.

2.4. Likely dumping during the review investigation period

- (53) On the basis of the above, the likely dumping margin within the meaning of Article 11(2) of the basic Regulation was 39,3 %.

3. Development of exports should measures be repealed

3.1. Production capacity of the exporting producers

- (54) In the absence of cooperation from any Chinese exporting producer, the following sources have been used:
- information provided by the applicant,
 - available publications (for example Metal Bulletin),
 - information collected in the previous investigation.
- (55) The Chinese welded pipes industry is known as being by far the biggest in the world. Metal Bulletin has reported an annual output for welded pipes of around 35 million tonnes in 2012. The applicant estimated that the production capacity of welded pipes in the PRC exceeds by far 45 million tonnes per year. The total spare capacity would then exceed 10 million tonnes, which represents 25 times the total EU apparent consumption of welded pipes.
- (56) Thus, should measures be repealed, there is a substantial risk that Chinese exporting producers will sell significant quantities of welded pipes to the Union market at dumped prices.

3.2. Attractiveness of the Union market

- (57) In the absence of cooperation from any Chinese exporting producer, findings are based on facts available. To this end, the risk for trade diversion to the Union market should measures be repealed is based on publicly available sources.

- (58) Publicly available sources such as Metal Bulletin reported a Chinese price level far below the average sales price of the Union industry of 848 EUR/tonne and the average import prices into the Union from major exporting countries such as India and Turkey. Compared to the Union industry's average sales price, the level of undercutting ranges between 30 % and 50 %. This certainly shows the attractiveness of the Union market and the ability of the Chinese to compete by price should measures be repealed.
- (59) In light of the above, the Commission concluded that due to the substantial price difference mentioned above there is a significant risk of trade diversion from lower-priced third countries to the more lucrative Union market should measures be repealed.

4. Conclusion on the likelihood of recurrence of dumping

- (60) The available spare capacity in the PRC and the attractive price level in the Union market lead to the conclusion that there is a risk of significant increase in Chinese dumped exports of the product concerned should the measures in force be allowed to lapse.

MARKET ECONOMY COUNTRIES

RUSSIA

1. Preliminary remarks

- (61) Two Russian exporting producers representing some 75 % of Russian production that submitted sampling replies later informed the Commission that they did not intend to reply to the exporting producer's questionnaire. Only one small producer without exports to the Union and insignificant exports to other countries cooperated with the investigation by replying to the questionnaire and accepting a verification visit. Given the significant non-cooperation from exporting producers in Russia, the overall analysis, including the dumping calculation, is based on facts available pursuant to Article 18 of the basic Regulation. The non-cooperating Russian exporting producers as well as the Russian authorities were informed of the Commission's intention to apply Article 18 of the basic Regulation and to base its findings on facts available.
- (62) Therefore, the likelihood of a continuation or recurrence of dumping was assessed by using the expiry review request, combined with other sources of information such as Eurostat trade statistics on imports, Russian export statistics and Metal Bulletin.
- (63) The significant non-cooperation affected the comparison of the normal value with the export price of the various product types. It was considered appropriate to establish both the normal value and the export price on a global basis, namely based on average values, in accordance with Article 18 of the basic Regulation.
- (64) The Commission noted that statistics from Eurostat reported some imports of the product concerned from Russia. However, the quantities were very limited and thus prices of these imports were considered unrepresentative. Therefore, information of likely export prices to the Union was based on export prices to other third countries, as indicated in recital 73 below.

2. Likely dumping during the review investigation period

2.1. Determination of the normal value

- (65) As mentioned in recital 61 above, the significant non-cooperation from exporting producers in Russia forced the Commission to use facts available in establishing a normal value. To this end, the information submitted by the cooperating Russian producer was used.
- (66) Normal value was determined in accordance with Article 2(2) first sentence, of the basic Regulation. It was first established whether the total domestic sales quantity of the like product during the review investigation period was representative in comparison to Russian export sales to third countries. Domestic sales were found representative if sales volumes of the like product represented 5 % or more of Russian export sales to third countries.

- (67) It was subsequently examined whether the like product was sold in the ordinary course of trade pursuant to Article 2(4) of the basic Regulation. This was done by establishing the proportion of profitable domestic sales to independent customers for the product type concerned.
- (68) In order to perform the ordinary course of trade test the average cost of production was considered. With regard to manufacturing costs, and in particular energy costs, as far as gas is concerned, it was examined whether the gas prices paid by the single collaborating exporting producer reasonably reflected the costs associated with the production and distribution of gas.
- (69) It was found that the domestic gas price paid by the exporting producers was around 30 % of the export price of natural gas from Russia. In this regard, all available data indicated that domestic gas prices in Russia are regulated prices, which are far below market prices paid in unregulated export markets for Russian natural gas. Since gas costs were not reasonably reflected in the exporting producer's records as provided for in Article 2(5) of the basic Regulation, they had to be adjusted accordingly. In the absence of sufficiently representative, undistorted gas prices relating to the Russian domestic market, it was considered appropriate to base the adjustment, in accordance with Article 2(5) of the basic Regulation, on the basis of information from other representative markets. The adjusted price was based on the average price of Russian gas when sold for export at the German/Czech border (Waidhaus), adjusted for local distribution costs. Waidhaus is the main hub for Russian gas sales to the EU, which is both the largest market for the Russian gas and has prices reasonably reflecting costs. It can therefore be considered to be a representative market within the meaning of Article 2(5) of the basic Regulation.
- (70) Consequently, the Commission used for the ordinary course of trade test the average cost of production after the adjustment for the gas cost.
- (71) The normal value was thus established as the average price of the profitable domestic sales during the review investigation period, since the volume of profitable sales represented 80 % or less of the total sales volume.

2.2. Determination of the likely export price

- (72) The significant non-cooperation from exporting producers in Russia forced the Commission to use facts available in establishing the export price. Information from the sole cooperating Russian producer could not be used as this producer did not export the product concerned to the EU and exported only insignificant quantities to other third countries.
- (73) For this reason, and given that the exports from Russia to the Union were insignificant, the likely export price was established on the basis of Russian export statistics, using exports to other third countries. Exports to other third countries were made in significant quantities.
- (74) Since the sole cooperating Russian producer exclusively produced so-called 'black pipes' (that means non-galvanized pipes), only information relating to black pipes was used to establish export price. According to Russian export statistics, the overwhelming majority of Russian exports also relates to black pipes.
- (75) Following disclosure, the sole cooperating Russian producer claimed that its export prices should have been used as they account for more than 10 % of its total sales. However, these sales only account for less than 2 % of the total exports reported by Russian export statistics. On this basis, the conclusion that the export prices of this producer cannot be used due to their insignificant quantity is maintained.

2.3. Comparison

- (76) The comparison between the normal value and the likely export price was made on an ex-works basis. In order to ensure a fair comparison account was taken of differences which affect price comparability in accordance with Article 2(10) of the basic Regulation.
- (77) Allowances for differences in transport costs were made where applicable.

2.4. *Likely dumping during the review investigation period*

- (78) On the basis of the above, the likely dumping margin within the meaning of Article 11(2) of the basic Regulation was at 38, 7 %.

3. **Development of exports should measures be repealed**

3.1. *Production capacity of the exporting producers*

- (79) The applicant estimated that the spare capacity of the product concerned in Russia exceeds the total consumption on the EU market. The applicant based its estimate on information published in Metal Expert. Furthermore, the applicant assumed a capacity utilisation of 56 %, which is confirmed by the information submitted by the cooperating producer.
- (80) Thus, should measures be repealed, there is a substantial risk that Russian exporting producers will sell significant quantities of welded pipes to the Union market at dumped prices.
- (81) Following disclosure, the non-cooperating Russian producers referred to in recital 61 above claimed that the Commission would have disregarded information concerning an alleged attractiveness of other markets including the Russian market and spare capacities in Russia submitted by these producers.
- (82) In this respect, it should be pointed out that the information concerning spare capacities regarded a wider product range, including hollow sections and large-diameter pipes. That information is therefore less relevant than the information provided by the applicant. Furthermore, even on the basis of the 60 %-70 % capacity utilisation rate claimed by the Russian producers, the resulting spare capacity would account for most of the consumption on the EU market.
- (83) As regards the information provided by the non-cooperating Russian producers concerning an alleged attractiveness of other markets including the Russian market, it should first be stated that due to non-cooperation, this data could not be verified. Second, such information contradicts the information obtained during the investigation, as set out in recitals 84 to 86 below, which is based on official Russian export statistics and which has not been challenged by the two non-cooperating Russian producers.

3.2. *Attractiveness of the Union market*

- (84) According to the Russian trade statistics, the average Russian export price of 647 EUR/tonne is far below the average sales price of the Union industry of 848 EUR/tonne and in line with average import prices into the Union from major exporting countries such as India and Turkey.
- (85) According to the same trade statistics, 33 % of all Russian exports are sold to Azerbaijan, Russia's most important export market. The sales price to Azerbaijan is 586 EUR/tonne, and therefore significantly lower than the EU industry's sales price of 848 EUR/tonne, and even lower than prices charged by other main exporters to the Union such as India or Turkey. Moreover the Russian exports to Azerbaijan are equivalent to around 15 % of EU consumption. Hence there is a risk that there exports will be redirected to the EU should the measures be repealed.
- (86) In light of the above, the Commission concluded that there is a significant risk of trade diversion to the Union market should measures be repealed.

4. **Conclusion on the likelihood of recurrence of dumping**

- (87) The available spare capacity in Russia and the attractive price level in the Union market lead to the conclusion that there is a risk of an increase in Russian dumped exports of the product concerned to the Union should the measures in force be allowed to lapse.

- (88) Following disclosure, interested parties argued that maintaining the measures in force against Russia while terminating the measures in force against Ukraine (see below) amounts to discrimination, since Russia and Ukraine allegedly had similar spare capacities.
- (89) This claim is not supported by the findings of the investigation, which established significant spare capacities in Russia accounting for at least most of the consumption on the EU market. On the other hand, for Ukraine, it was established that the available spare capacities for exports to all countries are limited. Due to this significant difference in spare capacities, the claim of discrimination is therefore rejected.

UKRAINE

1. Preliminary remarks

- (90) Only one Ukrainian exporting producer, the 'Interpipe Group' ('Interpipe'), cooperated during the investigation. Interpipe accounts for the significant part of the Ukrainian production and for almost the totality of the very few Ukrainian exports to the Union. There are at least 4 known Ukrainian producers who do not cooperate, but according to trade statistics their exports to the EU are insignificant.
- (91) In the light of insignificant Ukrainian exports to the Union, the likely export price was established on the basis of sales prices of Interpipe to other third countries as described in recital 17 above.

2. Likely dumping during the review investigation period

2.1. Determination of the normal value

- (92) The Commission first examined whether the total volume of domestic sales for the sole cooperating exporting producer, Interpipe, was representative, in accordance with Article 2(2) of the basic Regulation. The domestic sales are representative if the total domestic sales volume of the like product to independent customers on the domestic market constituted at least 5 % of total export sales volume of the product concerned to other third countries during the review investigation period. On this basis, the total sales by Interpipe of the like product on the domestic market were representative.
- (93) The Commission subsequently identified the product types sold domestically that were identical or comparable with the product types sold for export by Interpipe.
- (94) The Commission then examined whether the domestic sales of Interpipe for each product type that is identical or comparable with a product type sold for export were representative, in accordance with Article 2(2) of the basic Regulation. The domestic sales of a product type are representative if the total volume of domestic sales of that product type to independent customers during the review investigation period constituted at least 5 % of the total volume of export sales of the identical or comparable product type. The Commission established that for the majority of product types domestic sales were made in representative quantities.
- (95) The Commission next defined the proportion of profitable sales to independent customers on the domestic market for each product type during the review investigation period in order to decide whether to use actual domestic sales for the calculation of the normal value, in accordance with Article 2(4) of the basic Regulation.
- (96) The normal value is based on the actual domestic price per product type, irrespective of whether those sales are profitable or not, if:
- (a) the sales volume of the product type, sold at a net sales price equal to or above the calculated cost of production, represented more than 80 % of the total sales volume of this product type; and
 - (b) the weighted average sales price of that product type is equal to or higher than the unit cost of production.
- (97) In this case, the normal value is the weighted average of the prices of all domestic sales of that product type during the review investigation period.

- (98) The normal value is the actual domestic price per product type of only the profitable domestic sales of the product types during the review investigation period, if:
- (a) the volume of profitable sales of the product type represents 80 % or less of the total sales volume of this type; or
 - (b) the weighted average price of this product type is below the unit cost of production.
- (99) The analysis of domestic sales showed that the normal value was calculated as a weighted average of the prices of all domestic sales during the review investigation period or a weighted average of the profitable sales only depending on the product type.
- (100) When there were no sales of a product type of the like product in the ordinary course of trade, or where a product type was not sold in representative quantities on the domestic market, the Commission constructed the normal value in accordance with Article 2(3) and (6) of the basic Regulation.
- (101) Normal value was constructed by adding the following to the cost of production of the like product of Interpipe during the review investigation period:
- the selling, general and administrative expenses incurred by Interpipe on domestic sales of the like product, in the ordinary course of trade, during the review investigation period, and
 - the profit realised by Interpipe on domestic sales of the like product, in the ordinary course of trade, during the review investigation period.

2.2. *Determination of the likely export price*

- (102) In the absence of any significant Ukrainian exports to the Union, the likely export price was established on the basis of sales prices of Interpipe to other third countries as described in recital 17 above, which were made in significant quantities.
- (103) All sales of Interpipe were made directly to unrelated customers in the third countries. The sales price was thus established on the basis of prices paid or payable by these independent customers.

2.3. *Comparison*

- (104) The comparison between the normal value and the likely export price was made on an ex-works basis. In order to ensure a fair comparison account was taken of differences which affect price comparability in accordance with Article 2(10) of the basic Regulation.
- (105) Allowances for differences in transport costs and credit costs were made where applicable.

2.4. *Likely dumping during the review investigation period*

- (106) On the basis of the above, the likely dumping margin within the meaning of Article 11(2) of the basic Regulation was 16 %.
- (107) Following disclosure, interested parties claimed that the Commission had established continuation of dumping for Ukraine at a level of 16 %. However, this claim is unfounded as it seems to be based on a misunderstanding. Indeed, as indicated in recital 17 above, all countries including Ukraine exported negligible quantities of the product concerned to the EU during the review investigation period. Therefore, no reasonable conclusions can be drawn from those quantities and no continuation of dumping was established in respect of Ukraine. The claim is therefore rejected.

3. Development of exports should measures be repealed

Production capacity of the exporting producers

- (108) In the previous investigation, the Commission established that the production capacity in Ukraine exceeded 400 000 tonnes per year. However, since this investigation two of the known producers stopped producing welded pipes, namely Lugansk Tube Plant and the Interpipe Nizhnedneprovsky Tube Rolling Plant, one of the facilities of the Interpipe Group. Since there are no confirmed additions of production capacity in Ukraine since that time, current capacities are significantly lower than during the previous investigation.
- (109) As regards utilisation of the capacity referred to in recital 108 above, Interpipe has shown to operate at close to full capacity utilisation during the review investigation period when taking the technical limitations of the plant into account.
- (110) Another important aspect is the geographical location of the Ukrainian plants. These are mostly located in the East of Ukraine and are either directly or indirectly affected by the present security situation in that part of the country. It is therefore uncertain to what extent these companies can fully utilize their production capacity.
- (111) Following disclosure, interested parties argued that a non-negligible part of the Ukrainian production is located outside the area affected by the present security situation. However, it should be pointed out that also companies outside this area are indirectly affected by the security situation, for example through short supply of raw materials. It is therefore concluded that most Ukrainian plants are either directly or indirectly affected by the present security situation. The claim is therefore rejected.
- (112) At the same time, given the particular situation of Ukraine after the end of the review investigation period, construction business could be expected to absorb extra capacities in the domestic market after the security situation normalizes. The like product is also used for construction purposes, for example for load-bearing, fence tubing, protection means and scaffoldings.
- (113) Given the reduction in production capacity and the expected increasing domestic demand, it is concluded that the available spare capacities for exports to all countries are limited.
- (114) Following disclosure, interested parties argued that there is substantial spare capacity in Ukraine. However, these claims were not supported by actual evidence and were therefore rejected.
- (115) Interested parties further claimed that Interpipe announced that it would substantially increase its exports to the EU by around 60 %, which contradicts the argument concerning the limited Ukrainian spare capacities available for export. However, this claim cannot be accepted. Interpipe's announcement refers to the company in general and not specifically to the product concerned. Even if it were relevant for the product concerned, the substantial increase of around 60 % would only result in a market share in the EU of around 0,5 %, which is still considered negligible. This argument does therefore not contradict the conclusion that the available spare capacities for exports to all countries are limited.
- (116) The same interested parties argued that spare capacities should not be used as an element in the dumping analysis, because capacity utilisation is not considered a meaningful indicator of injury in the injury analysis, as stated in recital 139 below.
- (117) This claim cannot be accepted. The purpose of these two assessments is different. In the injury analysis, it is assessed whether a low capacity utilisation can be considered a sign of injury of the Union industry, which is not necessarily the case when the remaining capacity can be used for the production of other products. The dumping analysis focuses on spare capacity itself, i.e. idle capacity which is not used for the production of any products and therefore readily available for the production of the product concerned.

4. Conclusion on the likelihood of recurrence of dumping

- (118) The limited available spare capacity in Ukraine and the limited risk for redirection of dumped exports leads to the conclusion that there is no risk of any significant increase in Ukrainian dumped exports of the product concerned should the measures in force be allowed to lapse. It is therefore unlikely that an expiry of the anti-dumping measures against Ukraine will lead to a recurrence of dumping in non-negligible quantities within the meaning of Article 5(7) of the basic Regulation.

D. DEFINITION OF THE UNION INDUSTRY

- (119) During the review investigation period, the like product was manufactured by around 20 producers in the Union. The output of these producers (established on the basis of the information collected from the cooperating producers and on the data from the review request for the other Union producers) is therefore deemed to constitute the total Union production. All these producers constitute the Union industry within the meaning of Article 4(1) of the basic Regulation
- (120) As explained above under recital 11, due to the large number of Union producers, a sample was selected. For the purpose of the injury analysis, the injury indicators have been established at the following two levels:
- the macroeconomic elements (production, capacity, sales volume, market share, growth, employment, productivity, average unit prices, magnitude of dumping margins and recovery from the effects of past dumping) were assessed at the level of the Union industry, on the basis of the information collected from the cooperating producers and, for the other Union producers, on an estimation based on data from the review request,
 - the analysis of microeconomic elements (stocks, wages, profitability, return on investments, cash flow, ability to raise capital and investments) was carried out for the sampled Union producers on the basis of their information.

E. SITUATION ON THE UNION MARKET**1. Union consumption**

- (121) Union consumption was established on the basis of the sales volumes of the Union industry's own production destined for the Union market and the import volumes data on the Union market obtained from Eurostat statistics.
- (122) Throughout the period considered, the EU consumption has decreased by 28 %. It decreased by 6 %, in 2011, by 8 percentage points in 2012 and by another 10 percentage points during the review investigation period. The declining trend can be partly explained by a certain degree of technical substitution as for water pipes there is a tendency to substitute the steel pipe with alternative products like copper, plastic or stainless steel.

	2010	2011	2012	RIP
Total EU consumption (tonne)	561 955	528 191	460 847	404 394
<i>Index (2010 = 100)</i>	100	94	82	72

- (123) Following disclosure, interested parties claimed that the EU consumption was significantly understated. However, these parties did not provide any reliable evidence to support their claim, which therefore cannot be accepted.

2. Imports from Belarus, the PRC and Russia

- (124) Since the investigation established that there is no likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping from Ukraine (see recitals 17 and 118 above), the few imports from this country have not been considered together with imports from the other countries concerned in the analysis below.
- (125) In order to make an assessment as to the cumulation of the imports from Belarus, the PRC and Russia, the individual situation of the three countries was examined in the light of the conditions set out in Article 3(4) of the basic Regulation.

- (126) As regards the quantities and dumping margins and given the insignificant volume of imports during the review investigation period, the Commission carried out a prospective analysis of the likely export volumes and dumping margins by country, should measures be repealed. It revealed that volumes would likely increase to levels above those reached in the review investigation period and certainly exceed the negligibility threshold, if measures were repealed (see recitals 33, 56 and 80 above). Similarly, the Commission established that the likely dumping margins would be significant, should measures be repealed (see recitals 30, 53 and 78 above).
- (127) As regards the average import price, the negligible quantities of imports cannot be used for reaching conclusive findings.
- (128) However, the investigation also showed that the conditions of competition between the relevant operators were similar. The investigation showed that the product concerned imported from Belarus, the PRC and Russia and the like product produced and sold by the Union industry were alike in all their essential physical and technical characteristics.
- (129) On the basis of the above, the criteria set out in Article 3(4) of the basic Regulation were met with regard to Belarus, the PRC and Russia. Imports from these three countries were therefore examined cumulatively.

(a) *Volume*

- (130) The volume of imports of the product concerned from Belarus, the PRC and Russia into the Union decreased by 60 %, from around 7 000 tonnes in 2010 to around 2 900 tonnes in the review investigation period. It increased by 31 % in 2011, before decreasing by 62 percentage points in 2012 and by another 28 percentage points in the review investigation period.

	2010	2011	2012	RIP
Volume of imports from Belarus	25	55	0,1	—
<i>Index (2010 = 100)</i>	100	222	0	0
Market share of imports from Belarus	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %
Price imports from Belarus (EUR /tonne)	677	1 246	600	—
<i>Index (2010 = 100)</i>	100	184	89	—
Volume of imports from the PRC	712	375	458	118
<i>Index (2010 = 100)</i>	100	53	64	17
Market share of imports from the PRC	0,1 %	0,1 %	0,1 %	0,0 %
Price imports from the PRC (EUR /tonne)	636	1 052	1 347	2 102
<i>Index (2010 = 100)</i>	100	165	212	330
Volume of imports from Russia	6 396	8 937	4 440	2 790
<i>Index (2010 = 100)</i>	100	140	69	44
Market share of imports from Russia	1,1 %	1,7 %	1,0 %	0,7 %
Price imports from Russia(EUR /tonne)	470	506	513	462

	2010	2011	2012	RIP
<i>Index (2010 = 100)</i>	100	108	109	98
Volume of imports from countries concerned	7 133	9 367	4 898	2 908
<i>Index (2010 = 100)</i>	100	131	69	41
Market share of imports from countries concerned	1,3 %	1,8 %	1,1 %	0,7 %
Price imports from countries concerned (EUR /tonne)	488	532	591	528
<i>Index (2010 = 100)</i>	100	109	121	111

Source: Comext.

(b) *Market share*

- (131) The corresponding market share held by exporters from Belarus, the PRC and Russia on the Union market decreased from 1,3 % in 2010 to 0,7 % in the review investigation period. In detail, the market share increased from 1,3 % in 2010 to 1,8 % in 2011, before decreasing to 1,1 % in 2012 and further to 0,7 % in the review investigation period.

(c) *Prices*

(i) *Price evolution*

- (132) Between 2010 and the review investigation period, the average price of imports of the product concerned originating in Belarus, the PRC and Russia increased by 11 % from 488 EUR/tonne in 2010 to 528 EUR/tonne in the review investigation period. Specifically, prices increased by 9 % in 2011 and by 12 % in 2012, before decreasing by 10 % in the review investigation period.

(ii) *Price undercutting*

- (133) The very few sales of the product concerned from the PRC and Russia to the Union during the review investigation period cannot be relied upon to draw any meaningful conclusion. A comparison was therefore made between the prices of the like product produced and sold by the Union industry and those of the product under investigation produced in Belarus, the PRC and Russia and sold to the rest of the world. Such comparison showed significant undercutting.

3. Imports from other third countries

	2010	2011	2012	RIP
Volume of imports from India	25 720	48 704	58 619	53 007
Market share of imports from India	4,6 %	9,2 %	12,7 %	13,1 %
Volume of imports from Turkey	83 654	83 753	98 742	69 757
Market share of imports from Turkey	14,9 %	15,9 %	21,4 %	17,2 %
Volume of imports from Ukraine	956	573	944	1 147
Market share of imports from Ukraine	0,2 %	0,1 %	0,2 %	0,3 %

	2010	2011	2012	RIP
Volume of imports from other third countries	34 948	42 714	38 518	30 374
Market share of imports from other third countries	6,2 %	8,1 %	8,4 %	7,5 %

- (134) Imports from Turkey and India increased over the period considered. The market share of imports from Ukraine remained at very low level. The market share of imports from other third countries remained relatively stable over the period considered.
- (135) Following disclosure, interested parties argued that the 12 % loss in market share of the Union industry has been almost wholly absorbed by the increasing market share of India and Turkey taken together and that low priced imports from India and Turkey are likely to be the main reasons for the fragile situation of the Union industry. In this respect, it should be pointed out that the purpose of the present investigation is to examine whether the repeal of the measures in force against the three countries for which a likelihood of recurrence of dumping has been established will likely lead to recurrence of injury to the Union industry. During the investigation, it was confirmed that there was a significant undercutting as to sales of products from Belarus, the PRC and Russia to the rest of the world. Therefore, should the measures be repealed, dumped exports from these countries to the EU would likely recur, with the likely increase of injury of the EU industry as consequence. The circumstance that imports from Turkey and India might have increased over the period considered does not affect this assessment on likelihood of recurrence of dumping and injury.

4. Situation of the Union industry

- (136) Pursuant to Article 3(5) of the basic Regulation, the Commission examined all relevant economic factors and indices having a bearing on the state of the Union industry.

4.1. Macroeconomic elements

(a) Production

- (137) From a level of around 437 000 tonnes in 2010, the Union industry's production decreased by 37 % during the period considered. Specifically, it declined by 14 % in 2011, by 19 percentage points in 2012 and by another 4 percentage points in the review investigation period. The drop in production was linked to a drop in consumption, but it was more pronounced due to increasing imports from India and Turkey.

	2010	2011	2012	RIP
Production (tonnes)	437 492	376 106	294 260	277 483
Index (2010 = 100)	100	86	67	63

(b) Capacity and capacity utilisation rates

- (138) Production capacity was more than 1 700 000 tonnes in 2010 and it decreased by 16 % over the period considered. The decrease was due to the fact that some EU producers have reduced the number of daily production shifts.

	2010	2011	2012	RIP
Production capacity (tonnes)	1 761 677	1 621 386	1 318 459	1 485 339
<i>Index (2010 = 100)</i>	100	92	75	84
Capacity utilisation	25 %	23 %	22 %	19 %
<i>Index (2010 = 100)</i>	100	93	90	75
<i>Source:</i> Investigation				

- (139) Capacity utilisation was 25 % in 2010. It declined to 23 % in 2011, to 22 % in 2012 and further to 19 % in the review investigation period. The low capacity utilisation rates are mainly explained by the fact that products outside the scope of this investigation (primarily hollow sections) can be produced on the same production equipment used for welded tubes and pipes. Therefore, the capacity utilisation rates are not necessarily a meaningful indicator of injury for this particular industry.

(c) *Sales volume*

- (140) The sales of the Union industry of its own production to unrelated customers in the EU decreased by 16 % in 2011, by 21 percentage points in 2012 and further by 3 percentage points in the review investigation period. Altogether, between 2010 and the review investigation period, these sales decreased by around 40 %. This was due to the drop in consumption and the increase of imports from India and Turkey.

	2010	2011	2012	RIP
EU Sales volume to unrelated customers (tonne)	409 544	343 080	259 127	247 201
<i>Index (2010 = 100)</i>	100	84	63	60
<i>Source:</i> Investigation				

(d) *Market share*

- (141) The market share held by the Union industry was 73 % in 2010. It decreased to 65 % in 2011 and further to 56 % in 2012 before picking up to 61 % in the review investigation period. Altogether, the market share held by the Union industry over the period considered decreased by 12 percentage points.

	2010	2011	2012	RIP
Market share of the Union industry	73 %	65 %	56 %	61 %
<i>Index (2010 = 100)</i>	100	89	77	84
<i>Source:</i> Investigation				

(e) *Growth*

- (142) Between 2010 and the review investigation period, when the Union consumption decreased by 28 %, the volume of sales to unrelated customers in the EU decreased by 40 %. This has resulted in a 12 percentage points market share loss for the Union industry over the period considered. Thus, there was no growth for the Union industry during the period considered.

(f) *Employment*

- (143) The number of employees of the Union industry decreased by 13 % in 2011, by 27 percentage points in 2012 and further by 3 percentage points in the review investigation period. Overall, employment of the Union industry declined by 43 % over the period considered, that is from more than 1 600 persons to less than 1 000 persons.

	2010	2011	2012	RIP
Employment (persons)	1 655	1 446	991	939
<i>Index (2010 = 100)</i>	100	87	60	57

Source: Investigation

(g) *Productivity*

- (144) Productivity of the Union industry's workforce, measured as output (tonnes) per person employed per year, starting from a level of 264 tonnes per employee, first slightly decreased by 2 % in 2011. It further increased by 14 percentage points in 2012 and remained stable in the review investigation period. Altogether, productivity of the Union industry increased by 12 % over the period considered.

	2010	2011	2012	RIP
Productivity (tonne per employee)	264	260	297	296
<i>Index (2010 = 100)</i>	100	98	112	112

Source: Investigation

(h) *Factors affecting sales prices*

- (145) Unit prices for Union industry's sales to unrelated customers increased by 5 % in 2011 and by 1 percentage point in 2012 before decreasing by 4 percentage points in the review investigation period. Altogether, these prices increased by 2 % over the period considered from a level of 833 EUR/tonne to 848 EUR/tonne in the review investigation period.

	2010	2011	2012	RIP
Unit price EU market (EUR/tonne)	833	871	881	848
<i>Index (2010 = 100)</i>	100	105	106	102

Source: Investigation

(i) *Magnitude of dumping margin*

- (146) The investigation established a likelihood of recurrence of dumping at significant margins the magnitude of which cannot be considered to be negligible for Belarus, the PRC and Russia.

- (147) As indicated above, the Commission has not found likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping for Ukraine.

(j) *Recovery from past dumping*

- (148) The macro-indicators examined above show that, although the anti-dumping measures have partially achieved their intended result of removing injury suffered by the Union producers, the industry is still very fragile and vulnerable. Indeed, over the period considered the production volume decreased by 37 %, sales volume to unrelated customers in the EU decreased by 40 % and employment decreased by 43 %. In addition, the Union industry's share on the EU market dropped from 73 % in 2010 to 61 % in the review investigation period. Thus, no actual recovery from the past dumping could be established and it is considered that the Union industry remains very vulnerable to the injurious effects of any dumped imports in the Union market.

4.2. *Microeconomic elements*

(a) *Stocks*

- (149) The level of closing stocks of the sampled Union producers has been nearly stable until 2011. It has increased by 14 percentage points in 2012 before decreasing by 10 percentage points during the review investigation period. The level of stock during the review investigation period was thus 5 % higher than during 2010.

	2010	2011	2012	RIP
Closing stock (tonnes)	13 892	14 039	16 012	14 556
<i>Index (2010 = 100)</i>	100	101	115	105

Source: Investigation

(b) *Wages*

- (150) Over the period considered, the labour costs decreased by 29 %. Specifically, they decreased by 2 % in 2011, by 15 percentage points in 2012 and by another 12 percentage points during the review investigation period. The overall decrease over the period considered is driven by the decrease in employment.

	2010	2011	2012	RIP
Annual labour cost (EUR)	20 602 275	20 266 132	17 140 089	14 578 317
<i>Index (2010 = 100)</i>	100	98	83	71

Source: Investigation

- (151) Over the period considered, the labour costs per employee have risen by 25 %. This is likely a temporary situation related to redundancy costs caused by the significant decrease of employees.

	2010	2011	2012	RIP
Annual labour cost per employee (EUR)	12 449	14 015	17 296	15 525
<i>Index (2010 = 100)</i>	100	113	139	125

(c) *Profitability and return on investments*

- (152) During the period considered, the profitability of the sampled Union producers' sales on the EU market, expressed as a percentage of net sales, improved from a loss of more than 7 % in 2010 to a profit of almost 1 % during the review investigation period. More specifically, the sampled Union producers' loss reduced from 7,3 % in 2010 to 5 % in 2011 and to 0,6 % in 2012, before turning slightly profitable at a level of 0,8 % in the review investigation period.

	2010	2011	2012	RIP
Profitability of EU (% of net sales)	– 7,3 %	– 5,0 %	– 0,6 %	0,8 %
<i>Index (2010 = 100)</i>	– 100	– 69	– 8	12
ROI (profit in % of the net book value of investment)	– 19,2 %	– 11,8 %	0,5 %	4,3 %
<i>Index (2010 = 100)</i>	– 100	– 62	3	22

Source: Investigation

- (153) The increase in profitability is explained by the fact that sales prices over the period considered increased by 2 % whereas production costs (predominantly hot rolled coils which account for more than 60 % of the production cost) decreased by 6 % over the same period, together with the significant decrease in annual labour costs. Hence, the sampled Union producers have been in a position to progressively apply profitable prices to their customers on the EU market.
- (154) The return on investments ('ROI'), expressed as the profit as a percentage of the net book value of investments, broadly followed the profitability trend. It improved from a loss of 19,2 % in 2010 to a loss of 11,8 % in 2011 and further to a profit of 0,5 % in 2012 and a profit of 4,3 % in the review investigation period.

(d) *Cash flow and ability to raise capital*

- (155) The net cash flow from operating activities stood at around – 44 million EUR in 2010. It increased to around – 7 million EUR in 2011, to nearly 17 million EUR in 2012 and to around 20 million EUR in the review investigation period. None of the sampled Union producers indicated that they experienced difficulties to raise capital. The improvement can be accounted for the decrease of the costs of production and labour costs and slight increase in the prices.

	2010	2011	2012	RIP
Cash flow (own and retailer's brand) (EUR)	– 44 322 891	– 7 033 547	16 927 597	20 202 074
<i>Index (2010 = 100)</i>	– 100	– 16	38	46

Source: Investigation

(e) *Investments*

- (156) The sampled Union producers' annual investments in the production of the like product decreased by 34 % in 2011, increased by 90 percentage points in 2012 and finally decreased by 59 percentage points in the review investigation period. Over the period considered, investment, which was intended for the maintenance and renewal of existing equipment and not for capacity increase purposes, decreased by 3 %.

	2010	2011	2012	RIP
Net investments (EUR)	1 149 094	757 750	1 789 210	1 111 661
<i>Index (2010 = 100)</i>	100	66	156	97

Source: Investigation

5. Conclusion on injury

- (157) A number of indicators, in particular the financial indicators, improved significantly over the period considered. The profitability improved from a loss of more than 7 % to a profit of 0,8 % which is however still below the target profit of 5 % from the previous investigation. The return on investment improved from a loss of more than 19 % to a profit of more than 4 % and the cash flow level improved from – 44 million EUR to 20 million EUR. These factors suggest that the industry was able to partially recover.
- (158) On the other hand, some indicators experienced a negative development between 2010 and the review investigation period. The production volume decreased by 37 %, capacity utilisation decreased by 25 %, sales volume to unrelated customers in the EU decreased by 40 %, the Union industry's market share decreased by 12 percentage points and employment decreased by 43 %.
- (159) The anti-dumping measures have partially achieved their objective by removing some of the injury suffered by the Union industry as a consequence of dumped imports from the countries concerned. The Union industry has become slightly profitable again, but at the expense of its market share on the Union market. The Union industry has been able to improve its financial situation by favouring prices over volumes. Therefore it is clear that the Union industry has not yet fully recovered from the effects of past dumping, and is still in a fragile situation, thus very vulnerable to any recurrence of dumped imports.
- (160) Even if the fragile situation of the Union industry was qualified as a material injury, this cannot be attributed to the imports from the countries concerned. The three countries concerned (for Ukraine the investigation established that there is no likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping) represent a cumulative market share of less than 1 % on the EU market. In the absence of any price pressure from the countries concerned, the Union industry has been able to maintain prices at a level which is sufficient to be profitable, though considerably below the target profit.

F. LIKELIHOOD OF RECURRENCE OF INJURY

1. Imports from the PRC, Belarus and Russia

- (161) On the basis of the above trends indicate that the anti-dumping measures have partially achieved their intended result of removing injury suffered by the Union producers. On the other hand, as evidenced by the negative development of a number of injury indicators, the industry is still in a very fragile situation.
- (162) As mentioned above, exporters in each of the three countries concerned have the spare capacity to increase their exports very rapidly. Given the more lucrative prices on the EU market compared to some third country markets, it is likely that significant quantities currently exported to these countries will be redirected to the EU market in case the anti-dumping measures would lapse. This increase of dumped imports at prices undercutting the Union industry prices will likely increase the price pressure on the Union market, thus worsening the already fragile situation of the Union industry. Such an abrupt development was already observed in the previous investigation, when the market share of EU imports from the three countries tripled in only three and a half years, that is from 6,2 % in 2004 to 18,7 % in the IP (1 July 2006 to 30 June 2007). The exporting producers in the PRC, Belarus and Russia have thus already shown their capability to rapidly increase export volumes to the Union.

- (163) Therefore, on the basis of the above, it can be concluded that there is a likelihood of recurrence of injury in case the measures were repealed.

2. Imports from Ukraine

- (164) Bearing in mind the conclusion of non-likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping from Ukraine, no further analysis is required here on the likelihood of recurrence of injury.

G. UNION INTEREST

- (165) In accordance with Article 21 of the basic Regulation the Commission examined whether the maintenance of the existing anti-dumping measures would be against the interest of the Union as a whole. The determination of the Union interest was based on an appreciation of all the various interests involved. All interested parties were given the opportunity to make their views known pursuant of Article 21(2) of the basic Regulation.

1. Interest of the Union industry

- (166) The investigation has shown that the Union industry is still very fragile. The anti-dumping measures have partially achieved their objective by removing some of the injury suffered by the Union industry as a consequence of dumped imports from the countries concerned. The Union industry has become slightly profitable again, but at the expense of its market share on the Union market. The Union industry has been able to improve its financial situation by favouring prices over volumes due to the measures in force. The termination of the measures will increase the price pressure on the Union market and lead to losses again. It is therefore in the interest of the Union industry to maintain the measures.

2. Interest of the importers and users

- (167) The Commission contacted more than 100 unrelated importers and users in the Union in order to seek cooperation none of which responded. This can be explained by very small export volumes of each of the countries concerned to the Union market. In any case, there are no factors suggesting that importers or users would be disproportionately affected if measures were to be extended.
- (168) In light of the above it is therefore considered that the situation of importers and users in the Union is unlikely to be substantially affected by the extension of the measures.

3. Risk of supply shortages/competition on the EU market

- (169) The EU consumption decreased by 28 % over the period considered, reaching around 400 000 tonnes in the review investigation period. The Union industry's capacity has continuously exceeded EU demand over the period considered, reaching a level of nearly 1 500 000 tonnes in the review investigation period. There is sufficient competition between the EU producers. In addition, the Union industry is operating at a capacity utilisation rate of only 19 % during the review investigation period because it produces different products (product concerned and other products such as hollow sections) on the same production equipment. Therefore, in case of increased demand, the Union industry has the spare capacity to increase its production by altering its production mix. Imports from other third countries not subject to measures, notably India and Turkey can also satisfy part of the demand.
- (170) Given the above considerations, it cannot be concluded that maintaining the anti-dumping measures would likely result in a shortage of supply on the EU market or a restriction of competition on the EU market.

4. Conclusion on Union interest

- (171) The above indicates that the negative effects of a continuation of measures would be limited and in any case not disproportionate to the benefits of the prolongation of measures for the Union industry.

H. ANTI-DUMPING MEASURES

- (172) All parties were informed of the essential facts and considerations on the basis of which it was intended to recommend that the existing measures be maintained. They were also granted a period to submit comments subsequent to that disclosure. The submissions and comments were duly taken into consideration where warranted.
- (173) It follows from the above that, as provided for by Article 11(2) of the basic Regulation, the anti-dumping measures applicable to imports of certain welded tubes and pipes of iron or non-alloy steel originating in Belarus, the People's Republic of China and Russia should be maintained. It is recalled that these measures consist of an *ad valorem* duty at different rates.
- (174) As far as Ukraine is concerned, based on the findings of no likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping (see recitals 17 and 118 above) the measures should be repealed and the proceeding terminated.
- (175) The individual company anti-dumping duty rates specified in this Regulation are solely applicable to imports of the product concerned produced by these companies and thus by the specific legal entities mentioned. Imports of the product concerned manufactured by any other company not specifically mentioned in the operative part of this Regulation with its name and address, including entities related to those specifically mentioned, cannot benefit from these rates and shall be subject to the duty rate applicable to 'all other companies'.
- (176) A company may request the application of these individual anti-dumping duty rates if it changes subsequently the name of its entity. The request must be addressed to the Commission ⁽¹⁾. The request must contain all the relevant information enabling to demonstrate that the change does not affect the right of the company to benefit from the duty rate which applies to it. If the change of name of the company does not affect its right to benefit from the duty rate which applies to it, a notice informing about the change of name will be published in the *Official Journal of the European Union*.
- (177) This Regulation is in accordance with the opinion of the Committee established by Article 15(1) of the basic Regulation,

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

Article 1

1. A definitive anti-dumping duty is hereby imposed on imports of welded tubes and pipes, of iron or non-alloy steel, of circular cross-section and of an external diameter not exceeding 168,3 mm, excluding line pipe of a kind used for oil or gas pipelines, casing and tubing of a kind used in drilling for oil or gas, precision tubes and tubes and pipes with attached fittings suitable for conducting gases or liquids for use in civil aircraft, currently falling within CN codes ex 7306 30 41, ex 7306 30 49, ex 7306 30 72 and ex 7306 30 77 (TARIC codes 7306 30 41 20, 7306 30 49 20, 7306 30 72 80 and 7306 30 77 80) and originating in Belarus, the People's Republic of China and Russia.

2. The rate of the definitive anti-dumping duty applicable to the net free-at-Union-frontier price, before duty, for the products described in paragraph 1 and produced by the companies below shall be as follows:

⁽¹⁾ European Commission, Directorate-General for Trade, Directorate H, Rue de la Loi 170, 1040 Brussels, Belgium.

Country	Company	Anti-dumping duty	TARIC additional code
The People's Republic of China	All companies	90,6 %	—
Russia	TMK Group (Seversky Pipe Plant Open Joint Stock Company and Joint Stock Company Taganrog Metallurgical Works)	16,8 %	A892
	OMK Group (Open Joint Stock Company Vyksa Steel Works and Joint Stock Company Almetjvesk Pipe Plant)	10,1 %	A893
	All other companies	20,5 %	A999
Belarus	All companies	38,1 %	—

3. Unless otherwise specified, the provisions in force concerning customs duties shall apply.

Article 2

The anti-dumping proceeding concerning imports of the product mentioned in Article 1(1) originating in Ukraine is hereby terminated.

Article 3

This Regulation shall enter into force on the day following that of its publication in the *Official Journal of the European Union*.

This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.

Done at Brussels, 26 January 2015.

For the Commission

The President

Jean-Claude JUNCKER

COMMISSION IMPLEMENTING REGULATION (EU) 2015/111**of 26 January 2015****establishing measures to alleviate a serious threat to the conservation of the sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*) stock in the Celtic Sea, Channel, Irish Sea and southern North Sea**

THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION,

Having regard to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union,

Having regard to Regulation (EU) No 1380/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 on the Common Fisheries Policy, amending Council Regulations (EC) No 1954/2003 and (EC) No 1224/2009 and repealing Council Regulations (EC) No 2371/2002 and (EC) No 639/2004 and Council Decision 2004/585/EC ⁽¹⁾, and in particular Article 12(1) thereof,

Whereas:

- (1) Article 12 of Regulation (EU) No 1380/2013 provides that emergency measures can be taken on duly justified imperative grounds of urgency relating to a serious threat to the conservation of marine biological resources. The Commission at the reasoned request of a Member State or on its own initiative, may, in order to alleviate this threat, adopt such emergency measures in the form of immediately applicable implementing acts applicable for a maximum period of six months.
- (2) According to scientific advice from the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) as well as from the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*) in the Celtic Sea, Channel, Irish Sea and southern North Sea (ICES divisions IVb,c and VIIa, d-h) suffers from a rapid decline in biomass, because of a combination of declining recruitment and increasing fishing mortality. The spawning stock biomass is converging towards the lowest historically observed level. The current fishing mortality is almost four times as high as the stock can sustain. ICES therefore advises to implement measures to reduce substantially fishing mortality throughout the range of the stock.
- (3) The United Kingdom by letter of 19 December 2014 has requested that the Commission take action under Article 12 of Regulation (EU) No 1380/2013, with a view to closing ICES area VIIe to pelagic fisheries targeting sea bass during January to April 2015 in order to reduce fishing pressure by protecting the sea bass spawning aggregations. The request has been communicated to Belgium, France, Ireland, the Netherlands as well as to the North Western Waters and to the North Sea Advisory Councils. Belgium, France and the Netherlands have sent their comments to the Commission.
- (4) The comments made by France relate to the applicability of Article 12 of Regulation (EU) No 1380/2013, to threats caused by fishing activities and the procedure, to the proof of a serious threat, and to the risk of discrimination between fisheries. Belgium responded positively to the United Kingdom request. The Netherlands suggested the extension of actions to cover wider areas and other fisheries. With regard to the scope and the procedure of Article 12 of Regulation (EU) No 1380/2013 it should be noted that this provision is not limited to any cause and can thus be applied to any threat, be it caused by fishing activities or by other causes, and the time limits provided for by that Article are justified by the urgency of the need to address the serious threat. The proof of a serious threat to sea bass in the case at hand is based on scientific evidence, as set out below.
- (5) Sea bass aggregate in concentrations in particular areas during December to April to spawn. The sea bass stock depends on this reproduction phase. Targeted fisheries on these spawning aggregations is conducted during that period and contributes significantly to the overall fishing mortality of the stock and especially to the reduction in numbers of adult fish that can successfully reproduce. Catch statistics confirm that such fishing practice removes mainly adult fish which can therefore no longer contribute to the reproduction of this stock.
- (6) According to the scientific assessment by ICES and STECF commercial fishing by pelagic trawls is responsible for more than 25 % of the fishing mortality.
- (7) The finding of a serious threat to the conservation of marine biological resources follows from the risk of serious harm to the reproductive capacity of the stock, due to a steep decline of the spawning stock biomass, in combination with the expectation that continued targeted fishing may inflict unsustainable damage on the

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 354, 28.12.2013, p. 22.

spawning stock. The Commission considers that duly justified imperative grounds of urgency exist because (1) the spawning season has started and (2) the fishing on these spawning stocks has also started. Scientific evidence supports immediate action as necessary during the ongoing spawning season of sea bass by taking measures which apply immediately and remain in effect until 30 April 2015.

- (8) It is therefore urgent to take measures in order to prohibit the targeted fishing of sea bass by way of pelagic trawling during the highly sensitive spawning season between January and 30 April 2015. Further delay in providing protection to the stock would considerably reduce or eliminate the effectiveness of the emergency measures. In order to reinforce the effectiveness of these measures operators should also be enjoined not to accept transshipments and landings of sea bass caught during the period of application of this Regulation.
- (9) In order to provide effective protection to spawning aggregations, which are highly variable in location, the emergency measures should cover the entire distribution area of the stock, i.e. the Celtic Sea, Channel, Irish Sea and southern North Sea (ICES divisions IVb,c and VIIa,d-h) and include fisheries using pelagic trawls. In addition ICES areas VIIj,k are included to prevent displacement in fishing activity as stock distribution is not fully determined.
- (10) The alternative measures suggested by France would not achieve the same result as the measure contained in this Regulation, because their effectiveness is uncertain. Furthermore, in order to provide further protection to the stock of sea bass, additional measures in respect of the impact of other fisheries may also be required at a later stage.
- (11) France has provided information which demonstrates that vessels using pelagic gears with mesh sizes between 32 and 69 mm do not target sea bass and that any by-catch of such vessels has a minimal impact on the stock.
- (12) The situation of the sea bass stock in the covered areas meets all the criteria of duly justified imperative grounds of urgency relating to a serious threat to the conservation of this stock and the Commission may hence adopt the measures contained in this Regulation pursuant to Article 12 of Regulation (EU) No 1380/2013 on its own initiative and going beyond the request of the United Kingdom.
- (13) The measures provided for in this Regulation will be submitted for the opinion of the Committee for Fisheries and Aquaculture,

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

Article 1

Subject matter

This Regulation sets emergency measures for the stock of sea bass in ICES divisions IVb,c, VIIa,d-k to alleviate imminent and serious harm to that stock.

Article 2

Measures

During the period of application of this Regulation, it shall be prohibited to fish for sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*) in ICES divisions IVb,c, VIIa,d-k using pelagic trawls (referred to as OTM — midwater otter trawls, PTM — midwater pair trawls) with a cod end mesh size of 70 mm or greater.

For vessels using those gears, it shall also be prohibited to retain on board, relocate, tranship or land sea bass caught during the period of application of this Regulation in the same area.

Member States shall report catches of sea bass by pelagic (OTM or PTM) gears to the Commission 14 days after the end of each month.

*Article 3***Entry into force**

This Regulation shall enter into force on the day following that of its publication in the *Official Journal of the European Union*.

It shall apply until 30 April 2015.

This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.

Done at Brussels, 26 January 2015.

For the Commission

The President

Jean-Claude JUNKER

COMMISSION IMPLEMENTING REGULATION (EU) 2015/112**of 26 January 2015****establishing the standard import values for determining the entry price of certain fruit and vegetables**

THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION,

Having regard to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union,

Having regard to Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 establishing a common organisation of the markets in agricultural products and repealing Council Regulations (EEC) No 922/72, (EEC) No 234/79, (EC) No 1037/2001 and (EC) No 1234/2007 ⁽¹⁾,

Having regard to Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 543/2011 of 7 June 2011 laying down detailed rules for the application of Council Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 in respect of the fruit and vegetables and processed fruit and vegetables sectors ⁽²⁾, and in particular Article 136(1) thereof,

Whereas:

- (1) Implementing Regulation (EU) No 543/2011 lays down, pursuant to the outcome of the Uruguay Round multilateral trade negotiations, the criteria whereby the Commission fixes the standard values for imports from third countries, in respect of the products and periods stipulated in Annex XVI, Part A thereto.
- (2) The standard import value is calculated each working day, in accordance with Article 136(1) of Implementing Regulation (EU) No 543/2011, taking into account variable daily data. Therefore this Regulation should enter into force on the day of its publication in the *Official Journal of the European Union*,

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

Article 1

The standard import values referred to in Article 136 of Implementing Regulation (EU) No 543/2011 are fixed in the Annex to this Regulation.

Article 2

This Regulation shall enter into force on the day of its publication in the *Official Journal of the European Union*.

This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.

Done at Brussels, 26 January 2015.

For the Commission,

On behalf of the President,

Jerzy PLEWA

Director-General for Agriculture and Rural Development

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 347, 20.12.2013, p. 671.

⁽²⁾ OJ L 157, 15.6.2011, p. 1.

ANNEX

Standard import values for determining the entry price of certain fruit and vegetables

(EUR/100 kg)		
CN code	Third country code ⁽¹⁾	Standard import value
0702 00 00	EG	340,0
	IL	160,5
	MA	109,9
	TR	147,7
	ZZ	189,5
0707 00 05	JO	229,9
	TR	174,5
	ZZ	202,2
0709 93 10	MA	227,9
	TR	214,8
	ZZ	221,4
0805 10 20	EG	47,8
	MA	62,4
	TN	53,6
	TR	66,4
	ZZ	57,6
0805 20 10	IL	102,5
	MA	90,9
	ZZ	96,7
0805 20 30, 0805 20 50, 0805 20 70, 0805 20 90	EG	87,6
	IL	110,1
	JM	118,0
	MA	140,2
	TR	118,6
	ZZ	114,9
	TR	63,9
0805 50 10	ZZ	63,9
	BR	65,4
0808 10 80	CL	89,3
	MK	26,7
	US	184,8
	ZZ	91,6
0808 30 90	CL	265,9
	US	138,7
	ZZ	202,3

⁽¹⁾ Nomenclature of countries laid down by Commission Regulation (EU) No 1106/2012 of 27 November 2012 implementing Regulation (EC) No 471/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council on Community statistics relating to external trade with non-member countries, as regards the update of the nomenclature of countries and territories (OJ L 328, 28.11.2012, p. 7). Code 'ZZ' stands for 'of other origin'.

COMMISSION IMPLEMENTING REGULATION (EU) 2015/113**of 26 January 2015****determining the quantities to be added to the quantity fixed for the subperiod from 1 April to 30 June 2015 under the tariff quotas opened by Regulation (EC) No 539/2007 in the egg sector and for egg albumin**

THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION,

Having regard to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union,

Having regard to Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 establishing a common organisation of the markets in agricultural products and repealing Council Regulations (EEC) No 922/72, (EEC) No 234/79, (EC) No 1037/2001 and (EC) No 1234/2007 ⁽¹⁾, and in particular Article 188(2) and (3) thereof,

Whereas:

- (1) Commission Regulation (EC) No 539/2007 ⁽²⁾ opened annual tariff quotas for imports of egg products and egg albumin.
- (2) The quantities covered by the applications for import licences lodged from 1 to 7 December 2014 for the subperiod from 1 January to 31 March 2015 less than those available. The quantities for which applications have not been lodged should therefore be determined and these should be added to the quantity fixed for the following quota subperiod.
- (3) In order to ensure the efficient management of the measure, this Regulation should enter into force on the day of its publication in the *Official Journal of the European Union*,

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

Article 1

The quantities for which import licence applications have not been lodged pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 539/2007, to be added to the subperiod from 1 April to 30 June 2015, are set out in the Annex to this Regulation.

Article 2

This Regulation shall enter into force on the day of its publication in the *Official Journal of the European Union*.

This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.

Done at Brussels, 26 January 2015.

For the Commission,

On behalf of the President,

Jerzy PLEWA

Director-General for Agriculture and Rural Development

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 347, 20.12.2013, p. 671.

⁽²⁾ Commission Regulation (EC) No 539/2007 of 15 May 2007 opening and providing for the administration of tariff quotas in the egg sector and for egg albumin (OJ L 128, 16.5.2007, p. 19).

ANNEX

Order No	Quantities not applied for, to be added to the quantities available for the subperiod from 1 April to 30 June 2015 (in kg, shell egg equivalent)
09.4015	108 000 000
09.4401	3 632 368
09.4402	9 854 500

COMMISSION IMPLEMENTING REGULATION (EU) 2015/114**of 26 January 2015****determining the quantities to be added to the quantity fixed for the subperiod from 1 April to 30 June 2015 under the tariff quota opened by Regulation (EC) No 536/2007 for poultrymeat originating in the United States of America**

THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION,

Having regard to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union,

Having regard to Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 establishing a common organisation of the markets in agricultural products and repealing Council Regulations (EEC) No 922/72, (EEC) No 234/79, (EC) No 1037/2001 and (EC) No 1234/2007 ⁽¹⁾, and in particular Article 188(2) and (3) thereof,

Whereas:

- (1) Commission Regulation (EC) No 536/2007 ⁽²⁾ opened an annual tariff quota for imports of poultrymeat products originating in the United States of America.
- (2) The quantities covered by the applications for import licences lodged from 1 to 7 December 2014 for the subperiod from 1 January to 31 March 2015 are less than those available. The quantities for which applications have not been lodged should therefore be determined and these should be added to the quantity fixed for the following quota subperiod.
- (3) In order to ensure the efficient management of the measure, this Regulation should enter into force on the day of its publication in the *Official Journal of the European Union*,

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

Article 1

The quantities for which import licence applications have not been lodged pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 536/2007, to be added to the subperiod from 1 April to 30 June 2015, are set out in the Annex to this Regulation.

Article 2

This Regulation shall enter into force on the day of its publication in the *Official Journal of the European Union*.

This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.

Done at Brussels, 26 January 2015.

For the Commission,

On behalf of the President,

Jerzy PLEWA

Director-General for Agriculture and Rural Development

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 347, 20.12.2013, p. 671.

⁽²⁾ Commission Regulation (EC) No 536/2007 of 15 May 2007 opening and providing for the administration of a tariff quota for poultrymeat allocated to the United States of America (OJ L 128, 16.5.2007, p. 6).

ANNEX

Order No	Quantities not applied for, to be added to the quantities available for the subperiod from 1 April to 30 June 2015 (kg)
09.4169	16 008 750

COMMISSION IMPLEMENTING REGULATION (EU) 2015/115**of 26 January 2015****determining the quantities to be added to the quantity fixed for the subperiod from 1 April to 30 June 2015 under the tariff quotas opened by Regulation (EC) No 1384/2007 for poultrymeat originating in Israel**

THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION,

Having regard to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union,

Having regard to Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 establishing a common organisation of the markets in agricultural products and repealing Council Regulations (EEC) No 922/72, (EEC) No 234/79, (EC) No 1037/2001 and (EC) No 1234/2007 ⁽¹⁾, and in particular Article 188(2) and (3) thereof,

Whereas:

- (1) Commission Regulation (EC) No 1384/2007 ⁽²⁾ opened annual tariff quotas for imports of poultrymeat products originating in Israel.
- (2) The quantities covered by the applications for import licences lodged from 1 to 7 December 2014 for the subperiod from 1 January to 31 March 2015 are less than those available. The quantities for which applications have not been lodged should therefore be determined, and these should be added to the quantity fixed for the following quota subperiod.
- (3) In order to ensure the efficiency of the measure, this Regulation should enter into force on the day of its publication in the *Official Journal of the European Union*,

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

Article 1

The quantities for which import licence applications have not been lodged pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 1384/2007, to be added to the subperiod from 1 April to 30 June 2015, are set out in the Annex to this Regulation.

Article 2

This Regulation shall enter into force on the day of its publication in the *Official Journal of the European Union*.

This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.

Done at Brussels, 26 January 2015.

For the Commission,

On behalf of the President,

Jerzy PLEWA

Director-General for Agriculture and Rural Development

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 347, 20.12.2013, p. 671.

⁽²⁾ Commission Regulation (EC) No 1384/2007 of 26 November 2007 laying down detailed rules for the application of Council Regulation (EC) No 2398/96 as regards opening and providing for the administration of certain quotas for imports into the Community of poultrymeat products originating in Israel (OJ L 309, 27.11.2007, p. 40).

ANNEX

Order No	Quantities not applied for, to be added to the quantities available for the subperiod from 1 April to 30 June 2015 (in kg)
09.4091	140 000
09.4092	830 000

DECISIONS

COUNCIL DECISION (EU) 2015/116

of 26 January 2015

appointing the members and alternate members of the Committee of the Regions for the period from 26 January 2015 to 25 January 2020

THE COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION,

Having regard to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), and in particular Articles 300(3) and 305 thereof,

Having regard to Council Decision 2014/930/EU of 16 December 2014 determining the composition of the Committee of the Regions ⁽¹⁾,

Having regard to the proposals made by each Member State,

Whereas:

- (1) Article 300(3) of the TFEU requires that members or alternate members of the Committee of the Regions, besides being representatives of regional or local bodies, either hold a regional or local authority electoral mandate or are politically accountable to an elected assembly.
- (2) Article 305 of the TFEU provides for the members of the Committee of the Regions and an equal number of alternate members to be appointed by the Council for five years in accordance with the proposals made by each Member State.
- (3) As the term of office of the members and alternate members of the Committee of the Regions is due to expire on 25 January 2015, new members and alternate members should be appointed.
- (4) That appointment will be followed at a later date by the appointment of the other members and alternate members whose nominations have not been communicated to the Council before 22 January 2015,

HAS ADOPTED THIS DECISION:

Article 1

The following are hereby appointed to the Committee of the Regions for the period from 26 January 2015 to 25 January 2020:

- as members, the persons listed by Member State in Annex I;
- as alternate members, the persons listed by Member State in Annex II.

Article 2

This Decision shall enter into force on the date of its adoption.

Done at Brussels, 26 January 2015.

For the Council

The President

E. RINKĒVIČS

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 365, 19.12.2014, p. 143.

ANNEX I

ПРИЛОЖЕНИЕ I — ANEXO I — PŘÍLOHA I — BILAG I — ANHANG I — I LISA
ΠΑΡΑΡΤΗΜΑ I — ANNEX I — ANNEXE I — PRILOG I — ALLEGATO I — I PIELIKUMS
I PRIEDAS — I. MELLÉKLET — ANNESS I — BIJLAGE I — ZAŁĄCZNIK I
ANEXO I — ANEXA I — PRÍLOHA I — PRILOGA I — LIITE I — BILAGA I

Членове/Miembros/Členové/Medlemmer/Mitglieder/Liikmed

Μέλη/Members/Membres/Članovi/Membri/Locekļi

Nariai/Tagok/Membri/Leden/Członkowie

Membros/Membri/Členovia/Člani/Jäsenet/Ledamöter

BELGIË/BELGIQUE/BELGIEN

Mr Jan DURNEZ

Vlaams Volksvertegenwoordiger

Mr Alain HUTCHINSON

Conseiller communal et échevin à Saint-Gilles

Mr Hicham IMANE

Député wallon

Mr Jean François ISTASSE

Conseiller communal

Mr Karl-Heinz LAMBERTZ

Mitglied des Parlamentes der Deutschsprachigen Gemeinschaft

Mr Michel LEBRUN

Conseiller communal à Viroinval

Mr Bartolomeus (Bart) SOMERS

Vlaams Volksvertegenwoordiger

Mr Luc VAN DEN BRANDE

Voorzitter Raad van Bestuur Vlaams — Europees Verbindingsagentschap (VLEVA)

Mr Karl VANLOUWE

Vlaams Volksvertegenwoordiger

Mr Karim VAN OVERMEIRE

Vlaams Volksvertegenwoordiger

Mr Jean-Luc VANRAES

Gemeenteraadslid in Ukkel en Voorzitter van het OCMW

Ms Olga ZRIHEN

Députée wallonne

БЪЛГАРИЯ

Mr Hasan AZIS

Mayor of Kardjali Municipality

Ms Tanya HRISTOVA

Mayor of Gabrovo Municipality

Mr Vladimir KISSIOV

Councillor, Municipality of Sofia

Mr Krassimir KOSTOV

Mayor of Shumen Municipality

Mr Madzhid MANDADZHA

Mayor of Stambolovo Municipality

Mr Krasimir MIREV

Mayor of Targovishte Municipality

Mr Vladimir MOSKOV

Mayor of Gotse Delchev Municipality

Ms Detelina NIKOLOVA

Mayor of Dobrich Municipality

Mr Beytula SALI

Mayor of Samuil Municipality

Mr Zhivko TODOROV

Mayor of Stara Zagora Municipality

Mr Lyudmil VESSELINOV

Mayor of Popovo Municipality

Mr Zlatko ZHIVKOV

Mayor of Montana Municipality

ČESKÁ REPUBLIKA

Mr Ondřej BENEŠÍK

councillor of Strání municipality

Ms Štěpánka FRAŇKOVÁ

councillor of the City of Pardubice

Mr Dan JIRÁNEK
councillor of the City of Kladno

Mr Stanislav JURÁNEK
councillor of Jihomoravský Region

Ms Adriana KRNÁČOVÁ
councillor of the City of Prague

Mr Roman LÍNEK
councillor of Pardubický Region

Mr Josef NOVOTNÝ
councillor of Karlovarský Region

Mr Petr OSVALD
councillor of the City of Plzeň

Mr Martin PŮTA
councillor of Liberecký Region

Ms Jana VAŇHOVÁ
councillor of Ústecký Region

Mr Oldřich VLASÁK
councillor of the City of Hradec Králové

Mr Jiří ZIMOLA
councillor of the South Bohemian Region

DANMARK

Mr Per BØDKER ANDERSEN
Councillor

Mr Erik FLYVHOLM
Mayor

Mr Jens Christian GJESING
Second Deputy Mayor

Mr Jens Bo IVE
Mayor

Mr Thomas KASTRUP-LARSEN
Mayor

Mr Jess LAURSEN
Regional Councillor

Mr Henrik Ringbæk MADSEN
Regional Councillor

Mr Karsten Uno PETERSEN
Regional Councillor

Mr Mark PERERA CHRISTENSEN
Second Deputy Mayor

DEUTSCHLAND

Frau Barbara DUDEN
Mitglied der Hamburgischen Bürgerschaft

Frau Hella DUNGER-LÖPER
Staatssekretärin, Bevollmächtigte des Landes Berlin beim Bund und Europabeauftragte

Herr Hans-Jörg DUPPRÉ
Landrat des Landkreises Südwestpfalz

Herr Peter FRIEDRICH
Minister für Bundesrat, Europa und internationale Angelegenheiten; Baden-Württemberg

Frau Ulrike HILLER
Mitglied des Senats, Bevollmächtigte der Freien Hansestadt Bremen beim Bund und für Europa

Frau Birgit HONÉ
Staatssekretärin für Europa und Regionale Landesentwicklung, Niedersächsische Staatskanzlei

Frau Jacqueline KRAEGE
Staatssekretärin, Bevollmächtigte des Landes Rheinland-Pfalz beim Bund und für Europa, für Medien und Digitales

Frau Uta-Maria KUDER
Mitglied der Landesregierung von Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, Justizministerin

Frau Helma KUHN-THEIS
Mitglied des Gemeinderates Weiskirchen

Herr Heinz LEHMANN
Mitglied des Sächsischen Landtags

Dr Helmuth MARKOV
Mitglied der Landesregierung Brandenburg, Minister der Justiz und für Europa und Verbraucherschutz

Dr Beate MERK

Staatsministerin für Europaangelegenheiten und regionale Beziehungen des Freistaates Bayern

Frau Dagmar MÜHLENFELD

Oberbürgermeisterin der Stadt Mülheim an der Ruhr

Herr Detlef MÜLLER

Mitglied des Landtages Mecklenburg-Vorpommern

Dr Martina MÜNCH

Mitglied des Landtages Brandenburg

Frau Regina POERSCH

Mitglied des Landtages von Schleswig-Holstein

Herr Wolfgang SCHMIDT

Staatsrat der Senatskanzlei, Bevollmächtigter des Senats der Freien und Hansestadt Hamburg beim Bund, bei der Europäischen Union und für auswärtige Angelegenheiten

Dr Michael SCHNEIDER

Staatssekretär, Bevollmächtigter des Landes Sachsen-Anhalt beim Bund

Herr Tilman TÖGEL

Mitglied des Landtages von Sachsen-Anhalt

Herr Markus TÖNS

Mitglied des Landtags Nordrhein-Westfalen

Herr Hans-Josef VOGEL

Bürgermeister der Stadt Arnsberg

Herr Mark WEINMEISTER

Staatssekretär für Europaangelegenheiten, Land Hessen

Dr Babette WINTER

Staatssekretärin für Europa und Kultur in der Thüringer Staatskanzlei

EESTI

Ms Urve ERIKSON

Member of Tudulinna Rural Municipality Council

Mr Mihkel JUHKAMI

Mayor of Rakvere City

Mr Kurmet MÜÜRSEPP

Member of Antsla Rural Municipality Council

Mr Uno SILBERG

Member of Kose Rural Municipality Council

Mr Urmas SUKLES

Mayor of Haapsalu City

Mr Toomas VITSUT

Member of Tallinn City Council

ΕΛΛΑΣ

Mr Konstantinos AGORASTOS

Head of the Region of Thessaly

Mr Stavros ARNAOUTAKIS

Head of the Region of Crete

Mr Nikolaos CHIOTAKIS

Municipal Councillor of Kifissia

Mr Alexandros KAHRIMANIS

Head of the Region of Epirus

Mr Stavros KALAFATIS

Municipal Councillor of Thessaloniki

Mr Dimitrios KALOGEROPOULOS

Politically accountable to the Municipal Council of Maroussi

Mr Georgios KAMINIS

Mayor of Athens

Mr Apostolos KATSIFARAS

Head of the Region of Western Greece

Mr Ioannis KOURAKIS

Municipal Councillor of Heraklion

Mr Ioannis SGOUROS

Regional Councillor, Region of Attica

Mr Spyridon SPYRIDON

Municipal Councillor of Poros

Mr Apostolos TZITZIKOSTAS

Head of the Region of Central Macedonia

ESPAÑA

D^a Rita BARBERÁ NOLLA

Alcaldesa de Valencia

D^a Yolanda BARCINA ANGULO

Presidenta de Navarra

D. José Ramón BAUZÁ DÍAZ

Presidente del Gobierno de las Islas Baleares

D. Abel CABALLERO ÁLVAREZ

Alcalde de Vigo

D^a M^a Dolores de COSPEDAL GARCÍA

Presidenta de la Junta de Comunidades de Castilla-La Mancha

D^a Susana DÍAZ PACHECO

Presidenta de Andalucía

D. Alberto FABRA PART

Presidente de la Comunidad Valenciana

D. Javier FERNÁNDEZ FERNÁNDEZ

Presidente del Principado de Asturias

D. Alberto GARRE LÓPEZ

Presidente de Murcia

D. Ignacio GONZÁLEZ GONZÁLEZ

Presidente de Madrid

D. Francesc HOMES I MOLIST

Consejero de Presidencia

D^a Nuria MARÍN MARTÍNEZ

Alcaldesa de Hospitalet de Llobregat

D^a Cristina MAZAS PÉREZ-OLEAGA

Consejera de Economía, Hacienda y Empleo de Cantabria

D. José Antonio MONAGO TERRAZA

Presidente de la Junta de Extremadura

D. Alberto NÚÑEZ FEIJÓO

Presidente de la Xunta de Galicia

D. Paulino RIVERO BAUTE
Presidente del Gobierno de Canarias

D^a Luisa Fernanda RUDÍ ÚBEDA
Presidenta de Aragón

D. Pedro SANZ ALONSO
Presidente de La Rioja

D. Iñigo de la SERNA HERNÁIZ
Alcalde de Santander

D. Iñigo URKULLU RENTERÍA
Presidente del Gobierno Vasco

Sr. D. Juan VICENTE HERRERA
Presidente de la Junta de Castilla y León

FRANCE

M. Jean-François BARNIER
Maire du Chambon-Feugerolles

M. Laurent BEAUVAIS
Président du Conseil régional de Basse-Normandie

M. Jacques BLANC
Maire de La Canourgue

Mme Danièle BOEGLIN
Vice-Présidente du Conseil général de l'Aube

Mme Claudette BRUNET-LECHENAULT
Vice-présidente du Conseil général de Saône-et-Loire

M. François DECOSTER
Conseiller régional du Nord-Pas-de-Calais

M. Michel DELEBARRE
Conseiller municipal de Dunkerque

M. Jean-Louis DESTANS
Président du Conseil général de l'Eure

Mme Rose-Marie FALQUE
Maire d'Azerailles

M. Claude GEWERC
Président du Conseil régional de Picardie

M. Pierre HUGON

Vice-président du Conseil général de la Lozère

Mme Annabelle JAEGER

Conseillère régionale de Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur

Mme Anne-Marie KEISER

Vice-présidente du Conseil général de la Gironde

M. Pierre MAILLE

Président du Conseil général du Finistère

M. Pascal MANGIN

Conseiller régional d'Alsace

M. Charles MARZIANI

Vice-président du Conseil régional de Midi-Pyrénées

M. Pierrick MASSIOT

Président du Conseil régional de Bretagne

Mme Françoise MESNARD

Maire de Saint-Jean d'Angély

M. Jean-Vincent PLACE

Conseiller régional d'Île-de-France

M. Didier ROBERT

Président du Conseil régional de La Réunion

M. Stéphan ROSSIGNOL

Conseiller régional du Languedoc-Roussillon

M. Christophe ROUILLON

Maire de Coulaines

M. René SOUCHON

Président du Conseil régional d'Auvergne

M. Bernard SOULAGE

Vice-président du Conseil régional de Rhône-Alpes

HRVATSKA

Ms Snježana BUŽINEC

Mayor of the Municipality of Jakovlje

Mr Nikola DOBROSLAVIĆ

Prefect of Dubrovnik-Neretva County

Mr Valter FLEGO
Prefect of Istra County

Mr Bruno HRANIĆ
Mayor of the Municipality of Vidovec

Mr Danijel MARUŠIĆ
Prefect of Brod-Posavina County

Mr Vojko OBERSNEL
Mayor of the City of Rijeka

Ms Jelena PAVIČIĆ VUKIČEVIĆ
Councillor in the City of Zagreb Assembly

Mr Predrag ŠTROMAR
Prefect of Varaždin County

Mr Željko TURK
Mayor of the City of Zaprešić

IRELAND

Ms Maria BYRNE
Limerick City and County Council

Ms Kate FEENEY
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council

Ms Mary FREEHILL
Dublin City Council

Mr Jerry LUNDY
Sligo County Council

Mr Kieran MCCARTHY
Cork City Council

Mr Hughie MCGRATH
Tipperary County Council

Mr Neale RICHMOND
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council

Mr Enda STENSON
Leitrim County Council

Ms Rose CONWAY-WALSH
Mayo County Council

ITALIA

Sig. Giovanni ARDIZZONE

Consigliere regionale e Presidente della Assemblea regionale della Regione Siciliana

Sig. Matteo BESOZZI

Presidente Provincia di Novara

Sig. Matteo Luigi BIANCHI

Sindaco del Comune di Morazzone (VA)

Sig. Vincenzo BIANCO

Sindaco di Catania

Sig. Raffaele CATTANEO

Consigliere regionale e Presidente del Consiglio regionale della Regione Lombardia

Sig. Rosario CROCETTA

Presidente della Regione Siciliana

Sig. Luciano D'ALFONSO

Presidente della Regione Abruzzo

Sig. Mauro D'ATTIS

Consigliere comunale di Brindisi

Sig. Salvatore DE MEO

Sindaco di Fondi (LT)

Sig. Paolo DI LAURA FRATTURA

Presidente della Regione Molise

Sig.ra Micaela FANELLI

Sindaco del Comune di Riccia (CB)

Sig. Piero FASSINO

Sindaco del Comune di Torino

Sig. Domenico GAMBACORTA

Presidente Provincia di Avellino

Sig. Franco IACOP

Consigliere regionale e Presidente del Consiglio regionale della Regione Friuli Venezia Giulia

Sig. Arno KOMPATSCHER

Presidente e Consigliere della Provincia Autonoma di Bolzano

Sig.ra Catiuscia MARINI

Presidente della Regione Umbria

Sig. Ignazio MARINO
Sindaco di Roma Capitale

Sig. Alessandro PASTACCI
Presidente Provincia di Mantova

Sig. Francesco PIGLIARU
Presidente della Regione Sardegna

Sig. Augusto ROLLANDIN
Presidente della Regione autonoma della Valle D'Aosta

Sig. Enrico ROSSI
Presidente della Regione Toscana

Sig.ra Simonetta SALIERA
Consigliere regionale e Presidente dell'Assemblea regionale della Regione Emilia-Romagna

Sig. Luca ZAIA
Presidente della Regione Veneto

Sig. Nicola ZINGARETTI
Presidente della Regione Lazio

KYΠΡΟΣ

Mr George GEORGIOU
Mayor of Kato Polemidia

Mr Louis KOUMENIDES
President of the Community Council of Kato Lefkara

Ms Eleni LOUCAIDES
Deputy Mayor of Nicosia

Ms Louisa MAVROMMATI
Deputy Mayor of Engomi

Mr Charalampos PITTAS
Mayor of Morfou

LATVIJA

Ms Inga BĒRZIŅA
Member of Kuldīga Municipal Council

Ms Ligita GINTERE
Member of Jaunpils Municipal Council

Mr Andris JAUNSLEINIS

Member of Ventspils Municipal Council

Mr Aleksandrs LIELMEŽS

Member of Mālpils Municipal Council

Mr Leonīds SALCEVIČS

Member of Jēkabpils City Council

Mr Dainis TURLAIS

Member of Rīga City Council

Mr Jānis VĪTOLIŅŠ

Member of Ventspils City Council

LIETUVA

Mr Arnoldas ABRAMAVIČIUS

Member of Zarasai District Municipal Council

Mr Vytautas GRUBLIAUSKAS

Member of Klaipėda City Municipal Council

Mr Vytautas KANEVIČIUS

Member of Kazlų Rūda Municipal Council

Mr Virginijus KOMSKIS

Member of Pagėgiai Municipal Council

Mr Andrius KUPČINSKAS

Member of Kaunas City Municipal Council

Mr Ričardas MALINAUSKAS

Member of Druskininkai Municipal Council

Mr Mindaugas SINKEVIČIUS

Member of Jonava District Municipal Council

Mr Vytautas VIGELIS

Member of Švenčionys District Municipal Council

Mr Povilas ŽAGUNIS

Member of Panevėžys District Municipal Council

LUXEMBOURG

Madame Simone BEISSEL

échevin de la Ville de Luxembourg

Monsieur Roby BIWER

membre du conseil communal de la Commune de Bettembourg

Madame Agnès DURDU

membre du conseil communal de la Commune de Wincrange

Monsieur Ali KAES

bourgmestre de la Commune de Tandel

Monsieur Marc SCHAEFER

bourgmestre de la Commune de Vianden

MAGYARORSZÁG

Mr János ÁRGYELÁN

Representative of County Council of Fejér Megye

Mr István DR. BÓKA

Mayor of Balatonfüred

Mr Róbert DUDÁS

Mayor of Village Mátraballa

Mr Jácint HORVÁTH

Representative of Local Government of Nagykanizsa with county rights

Mr László Lóránt DR. KERESZTES

Representative Of Local Government of Pécs with county rights

Mr Raymund KOVÁCS

Representative Of Local Government of District 16 of Budapest

Ms Anna MAGYAR

Vice-President of County Council of Csongrád Megye

Mr László MAJTHÉNYI

President of County Council of Vas Megye

Mr József RIBÁNYI

Vice-President of County Council of Tolna Megye

Mr Oszkár SESZTÁK

President of County Council of Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg Megye

Mr Róbert SZABÓ
President of County Council of Heves Megye

Mr Zoltán VARGA
Representative of County Council of Békés Megye

MALTA

Dr Samuel AZZOPARDI
Mayor of Rabat, Gozo

Mr Peter BONELLO
Mayor of San Ġiljan

Mr Joseph CORDINA
Mayor of Xaghra

Mr Paul FARRUGIA
Mayor of Hal Tarxien

Dr Marc SANT
Councillor, Hal Lija Local Council

NEDERLAND

Mr R.E. (Ralph) DE VRIES
member of the Executive Council of the Province of Utrecht

Mr A. (Bert) GIJSBERTS
member of the Executive Council of the Province of Flevoland

Mr O. (Onno) HOES
mayor of Maastricht

Mr J.F.M. (Hans) JANSSEN
mayor of Oisterwijk

Mrs A. (Annemiek) JETTEN
mayor of Sluis

Mr C.H.J. (Cor) LAMERS
mayor of Schiedam

Mr H.J.J. (Henri) LENFERINK
mayor of Leiden

Mrs W.H. (Hester) MAIJ
member of the Executive Council of the Province of Overijssel

Mr W.B.H.J. (Wim) VAN DE DONK
Governor chair of the Council and of the Executive Council of the Province of Noord-Brabant

Mr R.A.M. (Rogier) VAN DER SANDE
member of the Executive Council of the Province of Zuid-Holland

Mr G.A.A. (Bas) VERKERK
mayor of Delft

Mr B.S. (Bote) WILPSTRA
member of the Executive Council of the Province of Groningen

ÖSTERREICH

Herr Landesrat Dr Christian BUCHMANN
Regierungsmitglied mit politischer Verantwortung gegenüber dem Landtag (Mitglied der Steirischen Landesregierung)

Herr Bürgermeister und Landeshauptmann Dr Michael HÄUPL
Verantwortlichkeit gegenüber einer gewählten Versammlung (Gemeinderat bzw. Landtag von Wien)

Herr Landeshauptmann Mag. Dr Peter KAISER
Mandat mit politischer Verantwortlichkeit gegenüber einer gewählten Versammlung (Landeshauptmann von Kärnten)

Herr Bürgermeister Dipl.-Ing. Markus LINHART
Auf Wahlen beruhendes Mandat (Direktwahl als Bürgermeister der Landeshauptstadt Bregenz durch die Bevölkerung)

Herr Landeshauptmann Hans NIESSL
Mandat mit politischer Verantwortlichkeit gegenüber einer gewählten Versammlung (Landeshauptmann von Burgenland)

Herr Landeshauptmann Dipl. Ing. Dr Erwin PRÖLL
Mandat mit politischer Verantwortlichkeit gegenüber einer gewählten Versammlung (Landeshauptmann von Niederösterreich)

Herr Bürgermeister Dr Heinz SCHADEN
Auf Wahlen beruhendes Mandat (Direktwahl als Bürgermeister der Landeshauptstadt Salzburg durch die Bevölkerung)

Herr Dr Franz SCHAUSBERGER
Direkte Verantwortlichkeit gegenüber einer gewählten Versammlung (des Landtags von Salzburg)

Herr Landesrat Mag. Dr Michael STRUGL MBA
Mandat mit politischer Verantwortlichkeit gegenüber einer gewählten Versammlung (Mitglied der oberösterreichischen Landesregierung)

Herr Landtagspräsident DDr. Herwig VAN STAA
Auf Wahlen beruhendes Mandat (Präsident des Tiroler Landtages)

Herr Bürgermeister Hanspeter WAGNER
Auf Wahlen beruhendes Mandat (Direktwahl als Bürgermeister von Breitenwang in Tirol durch die Bevölkerung)

Herr Landeshauptmann Mag. Markus WALLNER
Gegenüber einer gewählten Versammlung politisch verantwortlich (Landeshauptmann von Vorarlberg)

POLSKA

Paweł ADAMOWICZ
Prezydent Miasta Gdańska

Jarosław DWORZAŃSKI
radny województwa podlaskiego

Olgiert GEBLEWICZ
radny województwa zachodniopomorskiego

Adam JARUBAS
radny województwa świętokrzyskiego

Lech JAWORSKI
radny m.st. Warszawy

Zbigniew PODRAZA
Prezydent Dąbrowy Górniczej

Jacek PROTAS
radny województwa warmińsko-mazurskiego

Marek SOWA
radny województwa małopolskiego

Witold STĘPIEŃ
radny województwa łódzkiego

Mieczysław STRUK
radny województwa pomorskiego

Adam STRUZIŁ
radny województwa mazowieckiego

Stanisław SZWABSKI
Radny Rady Miasta Gdyni

Marek TRAMŚ
radny powiatu polkowickiego

Tadeusz TRUSKOLASKI
Prezydent Miasta Białegostoku

Ludwik WĘGRZYN
radny powiatu bocheńskiego

Marek WOŹNIAK
radny województwa wielkopolskiego

Dariusz Zygmunt WRÓBEL
burmistrz Opola Lubelskiego

Jerzy ZAJĄKAŁA
wójt gminy Łubianka

PORTUGAL

Vasco Ilídio ALVES CORDEIRO
Presidente do Governo Regional dos Açores

José Maria DA CUNHA COSTA
Presidente da Câmara Municipal de Viana do Castelo

Basílio Adolfo DE MENDONÇA HORTA DA FRANCA
Presidente da Câmara Municipal de Sintra

Álvaro DOS SANTOS AMARO
Presidente da Câmara Municipal da Guarda

António Luís DOS SANTOS DA COSTA
Presidente da Câmara Municipal de Lisboa

Alberto João CARDOSO GONÇALVES JARDIM
Presidente do Governo Regional da Madeira

João Nuno FERREIRA GONÇALVES DE AZEVEDO
Presidente da Câmara Municipal de Mangualde

António GONÇALVES BRAGANÇA FERNANDES
Presidente da Câmara Municipal da Maia

José Luís PEREIRA CARNEIRO
Presidente da Câmara Municipal de Baião

José Agostinho RIBAU ESTEVES
Presidente da Câmara Municipal de Aveiro

Carlos Manuel RODRIGUES PINTO DE SÁ
Presidente da Câmara Municipal de Évora

Luís Filipe SOROMENHO GOMES
Presidente da Câmara Municipal de Vila Real de Santo António

ROMÂNIA

Mr Cristian ADOMNIȚEI
President of Iași County Council

Mr Csaba BORBOLY
President of Harghita County Council

Mr Ovidiu Ion BRĂILOIU
Mayor of Eforie, Constanța County

Mr Vasile Silvian CIUPERCĂ
President of Ialomița County Council

Mr Emil DRĂGHICI
Mayor of Vulcana-Băi, Dâmbovița County

Mr Gheorghe FALCĂ
Mayor of Arad, Arad County

Mr Răducu George FILIPESCU
President of Călărași County Council

Mrs Mariana GÂJU
Mayor of Cumpăna, Constanța County

Mr Victor MORARU
Mayor of Amara, Ialomița County

Mr Cătălin George MUNTEANU
Mayor of Codlea, Brașov County

Mr Alin-Adrian NICA
Mayor of Dudeștii Noi Timiș County

Mr Emilian OPREA
Mayor of Chitila town, Ilfov County

Mr Ion PRIOTEASA
President of Dolj County Council

Mr Adrian ȚUȚUIANU
President of Dâmbovița County Council

Mr Mihai STEPANESCU
Mayor of Reșița city, Caraș-Severin County

SLOVENIJA

Mr Peter BOSSMAN
Mayor of the Municipality of Piran

Ms Jasna GABRIČ
Mayor of the Municipality of Trbovlje

Mr Aleksander JEVŠEK
Mayor of the Municipality of Murska Sobota

Ms Andreja POTOČNIK
Member of the Municipal Council of the Municipality of Tržič

Mr Franci ROKAVEC
Mayor of the Municipality of Litija

Mr Robert SMRDELJ
Mayor of the Municipality of Pivka

Mr Ivan ŽAGAR
Mayor of the Municipality of Slovenska Bistrica

SLOVENSKO

Mr Vladimír BAJAN
Mayor of Petržalka (District of Bratislava)

Mr Milan BELICA
Chairman of Nitra Self — Governing Region

Mr Peter CHUDÍK
Chairman of Prešov Self — Governing Region

Mr Jozef DVONČ
Mayor of Nitra

Mr Pavol FREŠO
Chairman of Bratislava Self — Governing Region

Mr Augustín HAMBÁLEK
Vice — Chairman of Trnava Self — Governing Region

Mr Jaroslav HLINKA
Mayor of Košice — South

Mr Ivo NESROVNAL
Mayor of Bratislava (Capital of the Slovak Republic)

Mr István ZACHARIAŠ
Vice — Chairman of Košice Self — Governing Region

SUOMI

Mr Ilpo HAALISTO
local councillor of Nousiainen

Ms Pauliina HAIJANEN
city councillor of Laitila

Ms Sirpa HERTELL
city councillor of Espoo

Ms Anne KARJALAINEN
city councillor of Kerava

Mr Antti LIIKKANEN
city councillor of Rovaniemi

Ms Gun-Mari LINDHOLM
Member of Åland Islands Parliament

Mr Markku MARKKULA
city councillor of Espoo

Mr Ossi MARTIKAINEN
local councillor of Lapinlahti

Ms Satu TIETARI
local councillor of Säkyä

SVERIGE

Martin ANDREASSON
Ledamot i regionfullmäktige, Västra Götalands läns landsting

Ulrika CARLEFALL LANDERGREN
Ledamot i kommunfullmäktige, Kungsbacka kommun

Jelena DRENJANIN
Ledamot i kommunfullmäktige, Huddinge kommun

Heléne FRITZON
Ledamot kommunfullmäktige, Kristianstads kommun

Lotta HÅKANSSON HARJU
Ledamot i kommunfullmäktige, Järfälla kommun

Tore HULT
Ledamot i kommunfullmäktige, Alingsås kommun

Ewa-May KARLSSON
Ledamot i kommunfullmäktige, Vindelns kommun

Anders KNAPE
Ledamot i kommunfullmäktige, Karlstads kommun

Paul LINDQUIST
Ledamot i landstingsfullmäktige, Stockolms läns landsting

Monalisa NORRMAN
Ledamot i regionfullmäktige, Jämtlands läns landsting

Yoomi RENSTRÖM
Ledamot i kommunfullmäktige, Ovanåkers kommun

Ilmar REEPALU
Ledamot i kommunfullmäktige, Malmö kommun

UNITED KINGDOM

ANNEX II

ПРИЛОЖЕНИЕ II — ANEXO II — PŘÍLOHA II — BILAG II — ANHANG II — II LISA
ΠΑΡΑΡΤΗΜΑ II — ANNEX II — ANNEXE II — PRILOG II — ALLEGATO II — II PIELIKUMS
II PRIEDAS — II. MELLÉKLET — ANNESS II — BIJLAGE II — ZAŁĄCZNIK II
ANEXO II — ANEXA II — PRÍLOHA II — PRILOGA II — LIITE II — BILAGA II

Заместник-членове/Suplentes/Náhradníci/Suppleanter/Stellvertreter/Asendusliikmed
Αναπληρωτές/Alternate members/Suppléants/Zamjenici članova/Supplenti/Aizstājēji
Pakaitiniai nariai/Póttagok/Membri Supplenti/Plaatsvervangers/Zastępcy członków
Suplentes/Supleanti/Náhradníci/Nadomestni člani/Varajäsenet/Suppleanter

BELGIË/BELGIQUE/BELGIEN

Mr Jean-Paul BASTIN

Bourgmestre de la Ville de Malmédy

Ms Anne-Marie CORBISIER

Conseillère communale à Montigny-le-Tilleul

Mr Hendrik (Rik) DAEMS

Vlaams Volksvertegenwoordiger

Mr Rudy DEMOTTE

Ministre-Président de la Fédération Wallonie-Bruxelles

Ms Brigitte GROUWELS

Brussels Volksvertegenwoordiger

Mr Andries GRYFFROY

Vlaams Volksvertegenwoordiger

Mr Marc HENDRICKX

Vlaams Volksvertegenwoordiger

Mr Joël RIGUELLE

Député bruxellois

Mr Antoine TANZILLI

Conseiller communal à la Ville de Charleroi

Mr Wouter VANBESIEN

Vlaams Volksvertegenwoordiger

Mr Wilfried VANDAELE

Vlaams Volksvertegenwoordiger

Mr Koenraad (Koen) VAN DEN HEUVEL

Vlaams Volksvertegenwoordiger

БЪЛГАРИЯ

Mr Nida AHMEDOV

Mayor of Kaolinovo Municipality

Mr Ivan ALEKSIEV

Mayor of Pomorie Municipality

Ms Malina Edreva AUDOIN

Councillor, Municipality of Sofia

Mr Stanislav BLAGOV

Mayor of Svishtov Municipality

Mr Nikolay IVANOV

Mayor of Vratsa Municipality

Mr Atanas KAMBITOV

Mayor of Blagoevgrad Municipality

Ms Dimitranka KAMENOVA

Mayor of Berkovitsa Municipality

Ms Sebihan MEHMED

Mayor of Krumovgrad Municipality

Ms Anastasiya MLADENOVA

Chair of the Municipal Council, Municipality of Peshtera

Mr Fahri MOLAYSENOV

Mayor of Madan Municipality

Mr Emil NAIDENOV

Mayor of Gorna Malina Municipality

Mr Georgi SLAVOV

Mayor of Yambol Municipality

ČESKÁ REPUBLIKA

Mr Jiří BĚHOUNEK

councillor of Vysočina Region

Mr Jan BIRKE

councillor of Královohradecký Region

Mr Pavel BRANDA

councillor of Rádlo municipality

Mr Ivo GRÜNER

councillor of Plzeňský Region

Mr Tomáš HUDEČEK
councillor of the City of Prague

Ms Sylva KOVÁČIKOVÁ
councillor of the Town of Bílovec

Mr Jan MAREŠ
councillor of the City of Chomutov

Mr Stanislav MIŠÁK
councillor of Zlínský Region

Mr Martin NETOLICKÝ
councillor of Pardubický Region

Mr Jiří ROZBOŘIL
councillor of Olomoucký Region

Ms Václava ZELENKOVÁ
councillor of Račíněves municipality

Mr Robert ZEMAN
councillor of the Town of Prachatice

DANMARK

Ms Kirstine Helene BILLE
Deputy Mayor

Mr Henrik BRADE JOHANSEN
Councillor

Miss Lotte CEDERSKJOLD ENGSIG-KARUP
Councillor

Mr Martin HULGAARD
Deputy Mayor

Mr Peter KOFOD POULSEN
Regional Councillor

Ms Jane Strange NIELSEN
Regional Councillor

Mr Per NØRHAVE
Councillor

Mr Henrik QVIST
Regional Councillor

Mr John SCHMIDT ANDERSEN

Mayor

DEUTSCHLAND

Herr Sven AMBROSY

Landrat des Kreises Friesland

Herr Stefan ENGSTFELD

Mitglied des Landtags von Nordrhein-Westfalen

Herr Jörg FELGNER

Staatssekretär im Ministerium der Finanzen des Landes Sachsen-Anhalt

Herr Ralf GEISTHARDT

Mitglied des Landtages von Sachsen-Anhalt

Herr Harry GLAWE

Mitglied der Landesregierung von Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, Minister für Wirtschaft, Bau und Tourismus, sowie Mitglied des Landtages Mecklenburg-Vorpommern

Dr Roland HEINTZE

Mitglied der Hamburgischen Bürgerschaft

Herr Heinz-Joachim HÖFER

Bürgermeister der Stadt Altenkirchen

Dr Fritz JAECKEL

Staatsminister, Sächsische Staatskanzlei

Herr Norbert KARTMANN

Mitglied des Hessischen Landtags

Dr Hermann KUHN

Mitglied der Bremischen Bürgerschaft

Herr Dieter LAUINGER

Minister für Migration, Justiz und Verbraucherschutz, Mitglied der Landesregierung Thüringen

Herr Clemens LINDEMANN

Landrat des Saarpfalz-Kreises

Frau Helma OROSZ

Oberbürgermeisterin der Stadt Dresden

Herr Jan PÖRKSEN

Staatsrat für Arbeit, Soziales, Familie und Integration, Freie und Hansestadt Hamburg

Frau Anne QUART

Staatssekretärin für Europa und Verbraucherschutz, Ministerium der Justiz und für Europa und Verbraucherschutz des Landes Brandenburg

Prof. Dr Wolfgang REINHART

Mitglied des Landtags von Baden-Württemberg

Dr Franz RIEGER

Mitglied des Bayerischen Landtags, Vorsitzender des Ausschusses für Bundes- und Europaangelegenheiten sowie regionale Beziehungen

Frau Isolde RIES

Erste Vizepräsidentin des Landtags des Saarlandes

Herr Sven RISSMANN

Mitglied des Abgeordnetenhauses von Berlin

Herr Holger RUPPRECHT

Mitglied des Landtages Brandenburg

Frau Anke SPOORENDONK

Ministerin für Justiz, Kultur und Europa, Mitglied der Landesregierung von Schleswig-Holstein

Herr Andreas TEXTER

Mitglied des Landtages Mecklenburg-Vorpommern

Herr Nils WIECHMANN

Mitglied des Landtags von Rheinland-Pfalz

EESTI

Mr Andres JAADLA

Member of Rakvere City Council

Mr Georg LINKOV

Mayor of Hiiu Rural Municipality

Mr Randel LÄNTS

Member of Viljandi City Council

Mr Rait PIHEL GAS

Mayor of Ambla Rural Municipality

Mr Jan TREI

Mayor of Viimsi Rural Municipality

Mr Mart VÕRKLA EV

Mayor of Rae Rural Municipality

ΕΛΛΑΣ

Mr Kostas BAKOGIANNIS

Head of the Region of Sterea Ellada

Mr Dimitrios BIRMPAS

Mayor of Aigaleo

Mr Ioannis BOUTARIS

Mayor of Thessaloniki

Mr Fotios CHATZIDIAKOS

Mayor of Rhodes

Mr Panagiotis KATSIVELAS

Mayor of Trifylia

Mr Charalampos KOKKINOS

Regional Councillor, Region of South Aegean

Mr Dimitrios MARAVELIAS

Regional Councillor, Region of Attica

Mrs Anna PAPADIMITRIOU

Regional Councillor, Region of Attica

Mr Dimitrios PETROVITS

Deputy Head of the Region of Evros

Mr Dimitrios PREVEZANOS

Mayor of Skiathos

Mr Konstantinos SIMITSIS

Municipal Councillor of Kavala

Mr Petros SOULAS

Mayor of Kordelio-Evosmos

ESPAÑA

D. Roger ALBINYANA I SAIGÍ

Secretario de Asuntos Exteriores de la Generalitat de Catalunya

D. Enrique BARRASA SÁNCHEZ

Director-General de Inversiones y Acción Exterior de Extremadura

D. Roberto Pablo BERMÚDEZ DE CASTRO Y MUR

Consejero de Presidencia del Gobierno de Aragón

D^a Sol CALZADO GARCÍA

Secretaria de Acción Exterior Junta de Andalucía

D. Borja COROMINAS FISAS

Director-General de Asuntos Europeos y Cooperación con el Estado de la Comunidad de Madrid

D^a María de DIEGO DURANTEZ

Directora General de Relaciones Institucionales y Acción Exterior de Castilla y León

D^a Angeles ELORZA ZUBIRÍA

Secretaria Gral. de Acción Exterior del Gobierno Vasco

D. Jesús GAMALLO ALLER

Director-General de Relaciones Exteriores y con la UE Xunta de Galicia

D^a Teresa GIMÉNEZ DELGADO DE TORRES

D.G. Desarrollo Estrategia Económica y AAEE Consejería de Empleo y Economía de la Junta de Castilla-La Mancha

D. Javier GONZÁLEZ ORTIZ

Consejero de Economía, Hacienda y Seguridad de Canarias

D. Javier LEÓN DE LA RIVA

Alcalde de Valladolid

D. Guillermo MARTÍNEZ SUÁREZ

Consejero de Presidencia del Principado de Asturias

D. Fernando MARTÍNEZ-MAILLO TORIBIO

Presidente de la Diputación Provincial de Zamora

D. Esteban MAS PORTELL

Delegado del Gobierno de las Islas Baleares en Bruselas

D^a María Victoria PALAU TÁRREGA

Directora General de Relaciones con la Unión Europea

D. Manuel PLEGUEZUELO ALONSO

Director-General Participación ciudadana UE y Acción Exterior de Murcia

D. Emilio del RIO SANZ

Consejero de Presidencia y de Justicia de La Rioja

D. Ramón ROPERO MANCERA

Alcalde de Villafranca de los Barros

D. Jordi SAN JOSÉ I BUENAVENTURA

Alcalde de Sant Feliú de Llobregat (Barcelona)

D. Juan Luis SÁNCHEZ DE MUNIÁIN LACASA

Consejero de Cultura, Turismo y Relaciones Institucionales de Navarra

D^a Inmaculada VALENCIA BAYÓN

Directora General de Economía y Asuntos Europeos de Cantabria

FRANCE

M. Pierre BERTRAND

Vice-président du Conseil général du Bas-Rhin

Mme Josette BOREL-LINCERTIN
Vice-présidente du Conseil régional de Guadeloupe

Mme Nathalie COLIN-OESTERLE
Conseillère régionale de Lorraine

M. Guillaume CROS
Conseiller régional de Midi-Pyrénées

Mme Nassimah DINDAR
Présidente du Conseil général de La Réunion

Mme Karine DOGNIN-SAUZE
Adjointe au maire de Lyon

Mme Marie-Guite DUFAY
Présidente du Conseil régional de Franche-Comté

M. Daniel DUGLERY
Conseiller régional d'Auvergne

M. Nicolas FLORIAN
Conseiller régional d'Aquitaine

Mme Emmanuelle de GENTILI
Première adjointe au maire de Bastia

Mme Karine GLOANEC-MAURIN
Vice-présidente du Conseil régional du Centre

M. Hervé HOCQUARD
Conseiller régional d'Île de France

M. Jean-Louis JOSEPH
Vice-président au Conseil régional de Provence-Alpes-Côte-d'Azur

Mme Mireille LACOMBE
Conseillère générale du Puy-de-Dôme

Mme Blandine LEFEBVRE
Maire de Saint Nicolas d'Aliermont

M. Dominique LEVEQUE
Maire d'Aÿ

M. Didier MARIE
Conseiller général de Seine-Maritime

Mme Rachel PAILLARD
Maire de Bouzy

M. Daniel PERCHERON

Président du Conseil régional du Nord-Pas-de-Calais

M. François-Xavier PRIOLLAUD

Maire de Louviers

M. Christophe ROSSIGNOL

Conseiller régional du Centre

M. Jean-Louis TOURENNE

Président du Conseil général d'Ille-et-Vilaine

M. Michel VAUZELLE

Président du Conseil régional de Provence-Alpes-Côte-d'Azur

M. André VIOLA

Président du Conseil général de l'Aude

HRVATSKA

Mr Martin BARIČEVIĆ

Mayor of the Municipality of Jasenice

Ms Viviana BENUSI

Deputy Prefect of Istra County

Mr Tulio DEMETLIKA

Mayor of the City of Labin

Ms Jasna PETEK

Deputy Prefect of Krapina-Zagorje County

Mr Dinko PIRAK

Mayor of the City of Čazma

Mr Slavko PRIŠČAN

Mayor of Municipality of Rovišće

Ms Josipa RIMAC

Mayor of the City of Knin

Mr Alojz TOMAŠEVIĆ

Prefect of Pozega-Slavonia County

Mr Ivan VUČIĆ

Prefect of Karlovac County

IRELAND

Ms Deirdre FORDE
Cork County Council

Mr Michael MURPHY
Tipperary County Council

Mr Jimmy MCCLEARN
Galway County Council

Mr Declan MCDONNELL
Galway City Council

Mr Niall MCNELIS
Galway City Council

Ms Fiona O'LOUGHLIN
Kildare County Council

Mr William PATON
Carlow County Council

Mr Maurice QUINLIVAN
Limerick City and County Council

Ms Mary SHIELDS
Cork City Council

ITALIA

Sig. Alvaro ANCISI
Consigliere Comunale di Ravenna

Sig.ra Francesca BALZANI
Assessore del Comune di Milano

Sig.ra Benedetta BRIGHENTI
Vice Sindaco del Comune di Castelnovo Rangone (MO)

Sig.ra Bianca Maria D'ANGELO
Assessore e Consigliere regionale della Regione Campania

Sig. Antonio DECARO
Sindaco del Comune di Bari

Sig. Giuseppe DI PANGRAZIO
Consigliere regionale e Presidente del Consiglio regionale della Regione Abruzzo

Sig. Marco DUS

Consigliere Comunale di Vittorio Veneto (TV)

Sig. Massimo FEDERICI

Presidente Provincia di La Spezia

Sig. Carlo FIDANZA

Assessore di Velese (CO)

Sig. Stefano Bruno GALLI

Consigliere regionale della Regione Lombardia

Sig.ra Paola GIORGI

Assessore e Consigliere regionale della Regione Marche

Sig. Isidoro GOTTARDO

Consigliere Comunale di Sacile (PN)

Sig. Onofrio INTRONA

Consigliere regionale e Presidente del Consiglio regionale della Regione Puglia

Sig.ra Carmen Patrizia MURATORE

Consigliere regionale della Regione Liguria

Sig. Leoluca ORLANDO

Sindaco del Comune di Palermo

Sig. Roberto PELLA

Sindaco del Comune di Valdengo (BI)

Sig. Giuseppe RINALDI

Presidente Provincia di Rieti

Sig. Clodovaldo RUFFATO

Consigliere regionale e Presidente del Consiglio regionale della Regione Veneto

Sig. Vito SANTARSIERO

Consigliere regionale della Regione Basilicata

Sig. Antonio SCALZO

Consigliere regionale e Presidente del Consiglio regionale della Regione Calabria

Sig. Giorgio SILLI

Consigliere Comunale di Prato

Sig. Marco TROMBINI

Presidente Provincia di Rovigo

Sig. Giuseppe VARACALLI

Sindaco del Comune di Gerace

Sig. Nicola VENDOLA

Presidente della Regione Puglia

ΚΥΠΡΟΣ

Mr Kyriakos CHATZITTOFIS

Mayor of Agios Athanasios

Mr Constantinos HADJIKAKOU

Municipal Councilor of Famagusta Municipality

Mr Panikos HADJITHEORIS

President of Community Council of Armou

Mr George IAKOVOU

President of the Community Council of Agioi Trimithias

Mr Stavros STAVRINIDES

Municipal Councillor of Strovolos Municipality

LATVIJA

Mr Gunārs ANSINŠ

Member of Liepāja City Council

Mr Jānis BAIKS

Member of Valmiera City Council

Mr Gints KAMINSKIS

Member of Auce Municipal Council

Mr Sergejs MAKSIMOVŠ

Member of Viļaka Municipal Council

Mr Aivars OKMANIS

Member of Rundāle Municipal Council

Ms Olga VEIDIŅA

Member of Rīga City Council

Mr Hardijs VENTS

Member of Pārgauja Municipal Council

LIETUVA

Mr Algimantas GAUBAS

Member of Šiauliai District Municipal Council

Mr Jonas JARUTIS

Member of Kupiškis District Municipal Council

Ms Daiva MATONIENĖ

Member of Šiauliai City Municipal Council

Mr Algirdas NEIBERKA

Member of Vilkaviškis District Municipal Council

Mr Jonas PINSKUS

Member of Vilnius City Municipal Council

Ms Zinaida TRESNICKAJA

Member of Visaginas Municipal Council

Mr Algirdas VRUBLIAUSKAS

Member of Alytus District Municipal Council

Mr Deivydas VYNIAUTAS

Member of Mažeikiai District Municipal Council

Ms Odeta ŽERLAUSKIENĖ

Member of Skuodas District Municipal Council

LUXEMBOURG

Monsieur Gusty GRAAS

échevin de la Commune de Bettembourg

Monsieur Tom JUNGEN

bourgmestre de la Commune de Roeser

Madame Martine MERGEN

membre du conseil communal de la Ville de Luxembourg

Madame Sam TANSON

échevin de la Ville de Luxembourg

Monsieur Pierre WIES

bourgmestre de la Commune de Larochette

MAGYARORSZÁG

Ms Boglárka BÁNNÉ DR. GÁL

Vice-President of County Council of Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén Megye

Mr János Ádám KARÁCSONY

Representative of local government of Village Tahitótfa

Mr Attila KISS

Mayor of Hajdúböszörmény

Mr Béla KOCSY

Representative of local government of District 2 of Budapest

Mr Sándor KOVÁCS

President of County Council of Jász-Nagykun-Szolnok Megye

Mr Zoltán NÉMETH

President of County Council of Győr-Moson-Sopron Megye

Mr Attila DR. PÁL

President of County Council of Zala Megye

Mr Tamás Gergő SAMU

Representative of County Council of Békés Megye

Mr Gábor DR. SIMON

Representative of Local Government of Miskolc with county rights

Mr Ferenc TEMERINI

Representative of Local Government of Soltvadkert

Ms Kata TÜTTŐ

Representative of Local Government of District 12 of Budapest

Mr Botond DR. VÁNTSA

Deputy-Mayor of Szigetszentmiklós

MALTA

Mr Jesmond AQUILINA

Deputy Mayor of Hal Qormi

Mr Paul BUTTIGIEG

Councillor, Qala Local Council

Mr Frederick CUTAJAR
Mayor of Santa Lucija

Mr Mario FAVA
Councillor, Swieqi Local Council

Mr Anthony MIFSUD
Councillor, Imtarfa Local Council

NEDERLAND

Mr A. (Ahmed) ABOUTALEB
mayor of Rotterdam

Mr B.J. (Bert) BOUWMEESTER
mayor of Coevorden

Mr Th.J.F.M. (Theo) BOVENS
Governor: chair of the Council and of the Executive Council of the Province of Limburg

Mr H. (Henk) BRINK
member of the Executive Council of the Province of Drenthe

Mr B.J. (Ben) DE REU
member of the Executive Council of the Province of Zeeland

Mr R. (Rob) JONKMAN
member of the Executive Council of Opsterland

Mr J.H.J. (Hans) KONST
member of the Executive Council of the Province of Fryslân

Mrs E.M. (Elvira) SWEET
member of the Executive Council of the Province of Noord-Holland

Mrs Dr J.M.E. (Annemieke) TRAAK
member of the Executive Council of the Province of Gelderland

Mr N.A. (André) VAN DE NADORT
mayor of Ten Boer

Mrs I.K. (Ingrid) VAN ENGELSHOVEN
member of the Executive Council of 's Gravenhage

Mr C.L. (Cornelis) VISSER
mayor of Twenterand

ÖSTERREICH

Frau Vizebürgermeisterin und Landeshauptmann-Stellvertreterin Mag^a Renate BRAUNER
Verantwortlichkeit gegenüber einer gewählten Versammlung (Mitglied der Wiener Stadt- bzw. Landesregierung)

Herr Landtagsabgeordneter Christian ILLEDITS

Auf Wahlen beruhendes Mandat (Abgeordneter zum Burgenländischen Landtag)

Frau Landtagspräsidentin Dr Brigitta PALLAUF

Auf Wahlen beruhendes Mandat (Präsidentin des Salzburger Landtages)

Herr Landtagsabgeordneter Bürgermeister Johannes PEINSTEINER

Auf Wahlen beruhendes Mandat (Direktwahl als Bürgermeister von Sankt Wolfgang in Oberösterreich durch die Bevölkerung)

Herr Landeshauptmann Günther PLATTER

Mandat mit politischer Verantwortlichkeit gegenüber einer gewählten Versammlung (Landeshauptmann von Tirol)

Herr Landesrat Mag. Michael SCHICKHOFER

Regierungsmitglied mit politischer Verantwortung gegenüber dem Landtag (Mitglied der Steirischen Landesregierung)

Frau Landesrätin Mag. Barbara SCHWARZ

Mandat mit politischer Verantwortlichkeit gegenüber einer gewählten Versammlung (Mitglied der Niederösterreichischen Landesregierung)

Herr Landtagsabgeordneter Herwig SEISER

Abgeordneter zum Kärntner Landtag und Klubobmann der SPÖ-Fraktion (auf Wahlen beruhendes Mandat)

Herr Landtagspräsident Kommerzialrat Viktor SIGL

Auf Wahlen beruhendes Mandat (Abgeordneter zum Oberösterreichischen Landtag)

Herr Landtagspräsident Mag. Harald SONDEREGGER

Präsident des Landtags von Vorarlberg (auf Wahlen beruhendes Mandat)

Frau Gemeinderätin Landtagsabgeordnete Prof.in Dr.in Elisabeth VITOUCH

Gemeinderat und Landtag von Wien (auf Wahlen beruhendes Mandat)

Herr Geschäftsführender Gemeinderat und Abgeordneter zum Nationalrat Hannes WENINGER

Gemeinde Gießhübl in Niederösterreich (auf Wahlen beruhendes Mandat)

POLSKA

Adam BANASZAK

radny województwa kujawsko-pomorskiego

Stanisław BODYS

burmistrz Miasta Rejowiec Fabryczny

Andrzej BUŁA

radny województwa opolskiego

Piotr CAŁBECKI

radny województwa kujawsko-pomorskiego

Bogdan DYJUK

radny województwa podlaskiego

Robert GODEK
radny powiatu strzyżowskiego

Arkadiusz GODLEWSKI
radny Miasta Katowice

Marzena KEMPIŃSKA
radny powiatu świeckiego

Józef KOTYŚ
radny województwa opolskiego

Andrzej KUNT
burmistrz Kostrzyna nad Odrą

Lucjan KUŹNIAR
radny województwa podkarpackiego

Mirosław LECH
wójt gminy Korycin

Marek OLSZEWSKI
wójt gminy Lubicz

Władysław ORTYL
radny województwa podkarpackiego

Joachim SMYŁA
radny powiatu lublinieckiego

Hanna ZDANOWSKA
Prezydent Miasta Łodzi

PORTUGAL

Américo Jaime AFONSO PEREIRA
Presidente da Câmara Municipal de Vinhais

Vítor Manuel CHAVES DE CARO PROENÇA
Presidente da Câmara Municipal de Alcácer do Sal

Luís Miguel CORREIA ANTUNES
Presidente da Câmara Municipal da Lousã

João CUNHA E SILVA
Vice-Presidente do Governo Regional da Madeira

Luís Manuel DOS SANTOS CORREIA
Presidente da Câmara Municipal de Castelo Branco

Isaura Maria ELIAS CRISÓSTOMO BERNARDINO MORAIS

Presidente da Câmara Municipal de Rio Maior

Paulo Jorge FRAZÃO BATISTA SANTOS

Presidente da Câmara Municipal da Batalha

Francisco Manuel LOPES

Presidente da Câmara Municipal de Lamego

Vitor Manuel MARTINS GUERREIRO

Presidente da Câmara Municipal de São Brás de Alportel

António Benjamim PEREIRA

Presidente da Câmara Municipal de Esposende

Aníbal SOUSA REIS COELHO DA COSTA

Presidente da Câmara Municipal de Ferreira do Alentejo

Rodrigo VASCONCELOS DE OLIVEIRA

Subsecretário Regional da Presidência para as Relações Externas — Açores

ROMÂNIA

Mr Gheorghe CATRINOIU

Mayor of Fetești

Mr Ciprian DOBRE

President of Mureș County Council

Mr Alexandru DRĂGAN

Position: Mayor of Tașca, Neamț County

Mr Ștefan ILIE

Mayor of Luncavița, Tulcea County

Mr Cornel NANU

Mayor of Cornu, Prahova County

Mr Robert Sorin NEGOIȚĂ

Mayor of Bucharest 3rd District

Mr Marian PETRACHE

President of Ilfov County Council

Mr Silviu PONORAN

Mayor of Zlatna town, Alba County

Mr Emil PROȘCAN

Mayor of Mizil town, Prahova County

Mr Mihai Adrian ȘTEF
President of Satu Mare County Council

Mr Adrian Ovidiu TEBAN
Mayor of Cugir town, Alba County

Mr Florin Grigore TECĂU
President of Argeș County Council

Mr Horia TEODORESCU
President of Tulcea County Council

Mr Istvan VAKAR
Vice-president of Cluj County Council

Mr Ion Marcel VELA
Mayor of Caransebeș, Caraș-Severin County

SLOVENIJA

Ms Mojca ČEMAS STJEPANOVIČ
Mayor of the Municipality of Črnomelj

Mr Anton KOKALJ
Member of the Municipal Council of the Municipality of Vodice

Mr Branko LEDINEK
Mayor of the Municipality of Rače-Fram

Mr Gregor MACEDONI
Mayor of the Municipality of Novo mesto

Mr Tomaž ROŽEN
Mayor of the Municipality of Ravne na Koroškem

Mr Miran SENČAR
Mayor of the Municipality of Ptuj

Ms Tanja VINDIŠ FURMAN
Member of the Municipal Council of the Municipality of Maribor

SLOVENSKO

Mr Martin BERTA
Vice — Chairman of Bratislava Self — Governing Region

Mr Ján BLCHÁČ
Mayor of Liptovský Mikuláš

Mr Radoslav ČUHA

Vice — Chairman of Prešov Self — Governing Region

Mr Ján FERENČÁK

Mayor of Kežmarok

Mr Daniel LORINC

Mayor of Kladzany

Mr Tibor MIKUŠ

Chairman of Trnava Self — Governing Region

Mr Jozef PETUŠÍK

Mayor of Dolný Lopašov

Mr Richard TAKÁČ

Vice — Chairman of Trenčín Self — Governing Region

Ms Andrea TURČANOVÁ

Mayor of Prešov

SUOMI

Ms Tiina ELOVAARA

city councillor of Tampere

Mr Patrik KARLSSON

city councillor of Vantaa

Ms Katri KULMUNI

city councillor of Tornio

Mr Veikko KUMPUMÄKI

city councillor of Kemi

Ms Hannele LUUKKAINEN

deputy city councillor of Helsinki

Mr Matias MÄKYNEN

city councillor of Vaasa

Ms Sanna PARKKINEN

local councillor of Liperi

Mr Antero SAKSALA

local councillor of Pirkkala

Mr Wille VALVE

Member of Åland Islands Parliament

SVERIGE

Ms Åsa ÅGREN WIKSTRÖM

Ledamot i kommunfullmäktige, Umeå kommun

Mr Carl Fredrik GRAF

Ledamot i kommunfullmäktige, Halmstads kommun

Ms Carola GUNNARSSON

Ledamot i kommunfullmäktige, Sala kommun

Ms Ewa LINDSTRAND

Ledamot i kommunfullmäktige, Timrå kommun

Ms Agneta LIPKIN

Ledamot i landstingsfullmäktige, Norrbottens läns landsting

Mr Kenth LÖVGREN

Ledamot i regionfullmäktige, Gävleborgs läns landsting

Mr Roger MOGERT

Ledamot i kommunfullmäktige, Stockholms kommun

Mr Anders ROSÉN

Ledamot i kommunfullmäktige, Halmstads kommun

Ms Marie-Louise RÖNNMARK

Ledamot i kommunfullmäktige, Umeå kommun

Mr Carl Johan SONESSON

Ledamot i regionfullmäktige, Skåne läns landsting

Mr Rolf SÄLLRYD

Ledamot i regionfullmäktige, Kronobergs läns landsting

Ms Marie SÄLLSTRÖM

Ledamot i landstingsfullmäktige, Blekinge läns landsting

UNITED KINGDOM

COUNCIL IMPLEMENTING DECISION (CFSP) 2015/117
of 26 January 2015
implementing Decision 2013/255/CFSP concerning restrictive measures against Syria

THE COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION,

Having regard to the Treaty on European Union, and in particular Article 31(2) thereof,

Having regard to Council Decision 2013/255/CFSP of 31 May 2013 concerning restrictive measures against Syria ⁽¹⁾, and in particular Article 30(1) thereof,

Whereas:

- (1) On 31 May 2013, the Council adopted Decision 2013/255/CFSP.
- (2) By its judgments of 13 November 2014 in Cases T-653/11, T-654/11 and T-43/12, the General Court of the European Union annulled the Council's decision to include Aiman Jaber, Khaled Kaddour, Mohammed Hamcho and Hamcho International on the list of persons and entities subject to the restrictive measures set out in Annex I to Decision 2013/255/CFSP.
- (3) Aiman Jaber, Khaled Kaddour, Mohammed Hamcho and Hamcho International should be included again on the list of persons and entities subject to restrictive measures, on the basis of new statements of reasons.
- (4) Decision 2013/255/CFSP should therefore be amended accordingly,

HAS ADOPTED THIS DECISION:

Article 1

Annex I to Decision 2013/255/CFSP shall be amended as set out in the Annex to this Decision.

Article 2

This Decision shall enter into force on the day of its publication in the *Official Journal of the European Union*.

Done at Brussels, 26 January 2015.

For the Council
The President
E. RINKĒVIČS

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 147, 1.6.2013, p. 14.

ANNEX

The following persons and entity shall be inserted in the list of persons and entities set out in Annex I to Decision 2013/255/CFSP.

I. LIST OF NATURAL AND LEGAL PERSONS, ENTITIES OR BODIES REFERRED TO IN ARTICLES 27 AND 28

A. PERSONS

	Name	Identifying information	Reasons	Date of listing
18.	Mohammed (محمد) Hamcho (حمشو)	Date of birth: 20 May 1966 Passport No 002954347	Prominent Syrian businessman, owner of Hamcho International, close to key figures of the Syrian regime, including President Bashar al-Assad and Maher al-Assad. Since March 2014, he has held the position of Chairman for China of the Bilateral Business Councils following his appointment by the Minister of Economy, Khodr Orfali. Mohammed Hamcho benefits from and provides support to the Syrian regime and is associated with persons benefiting from and supporting the regime.	27.1.2015
28.	Khalid (خالد) (a.k.a. Khaled) Qaddur (قدور) (a.k.a. Qadour, Qaddour, Kaddour)		Prominent Syrian businessman, close to Maher al-Assad, a key figure of the Syrian regime. Khalid Qaddur benefits from and provides support to the Syrian regime and is associated with persons benefiting from and supporting the regime.	27.1.2015
33.	Ayman (أيمن) Jabir (جابر) (a.k.a. Aiman Jabber)	Place of birth: Latakia	Prominent Syrian businessman, close to key figures of the Syrian regime such as Maher al-Assad and Rami Makhlouf. He has also provided support to the regime by facilitating the importation of oil from Overseas Petroleum Trading to Syria through his company El Jazireh. Ayman Jabir benefits from and provides support to the regime and is associated with persons benefiting from and supporting the regime.	27.1.2015

B. ENTITIES

	Name	Identifying information	Reasons	Date of listing
3.	Hamcho International (a.k.a. Hamsho International Group)	Baghdad Street, PO Box 8254 Damascus Tel. +963 112316675 Fax +963 112318875 Website: www.hamshointl.com E-mail: info@hamshointl.com and hamshogroup@yahoo.com	Hamcho International is a large Syrian holding company owned by Mohammed Hamcho. Hamcho International benefits from and provides support to the regime and is associated with a person benefiting from and supporting the regime.	27.1.2015

COUNCIL IMPLEMENTING DECISION (CFSP) 2015/118
of 26 January 2015
implementing Decision 2010/656/CFSP renewing the restrictive measures against Côte d'Ivoire

THE COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION,

Having regard to the Treaty on European Union, and in particular Article 31(2) thereof,

Having regard to Council Decision 2010/656/CFSP of 29 October 2010 renewing the restrictive measures against Côte d'Ivoire ⁽¹⁾, and in particular Article 6(1) thereof,

Whereas:

- (1) On 29 October 2010, the Council adopted Decision 2010/656/CFSP.
- (2) On 20 November 2014, the Sanctions Committee established pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 1572 (2004) concerning Côte d'Ivoire deleted one person from the list of persons subject to the measures imposed by paragraphs 9 to 12 of that Resolution.
- (3) The list of persons subject to restrictive measures as set out in Annex I to Decision 2010/656/CFSP should therefore be amended accordingly,

HAS ADOPTED THIS DECISION:

Article 1

Annex I to Decision 2010/656/CFSP is amended as set out in the Annex to this Decision.

Article 2

This Decision shall enter into force on the day of its publication in the *Official Journal of the European Union*.

Done at Brussels, 26 January 2015.

For the Council
The President
J. DÜKLAVS

ANNEX

The entry in Annex I to Decision 2010/656/CFSP for the following person is deleted:

Alcide DJÉDJÉ

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 285, 30.10.2010, p. 28.

