

Official Journal

of the European Communities

ISSN 0378-6978

L 287

Volume 29

10 October 1986

English edition

Legislation

Contents

I *Acts whose publication is obligatory*

Commission Regulation (EEC) No 3082/86 of 9 October 1986 fixing the import levies on cereals and on wheat or rye flour, groats and meal	1
Commission Regulation (EEC) No 3083/86 of 9 October 1986 fixing the premiums to be added to the import levies on cereals, flour and malt	3
Commission Regulation (EEC) No 3084/86 of 9 October 1986 fixing the minimum levies on the importation of olive oil and levies on the importation of other olive oil sector products	5
Commission Regulation (EEC) No 3085/86 of 7 October 1986 opening an invitation to tender for the sale for export of baled tobacco held by the Greek intervention agency	8
Commission Regulation (EEC) No 3086/86 of 7 October 1986 opening an invitation to tender for the sale for export of baled tobacco held by the Italian intervention agency	10
Commission Regulation (EEC) No 3087/86 of 9 October 1986 fixing the amounts to be levied in the beef sector on products which left the United Kingdom during the week 22 to 28 September 1986	12
★ Commission Regulation (EEC) No 3088/86 of 9 October 1986 suspending advance fixing of the import levy for rice	14
Commission Regulation (EEC) No 3089/86 of 9 October 1986 fixing the import levies on white sugar and raw sugar	15
Commission Regulation (EEC) No 3090/86 of 9 October 1986 fixing the amount of the subsidy on oil seeds	16

Contents (continued)	Commission Regulation (EEC) No 3091/86 of 9 October 1986 fixing the export refunds on cereals and on wheat or rye flour, groats and meal	19
	Commission Regulation (EEC) No 3092/86 of 9 October 1986 fixing the export refunds on malt	23

II *Acts whose publication is not obligatory*

Commission

86/497/EEC :

- ★ **Commission Decision of 7 October 1986 accepting undertakings given in connection with the anti-dumping proceeding concerning imports of silicon carbide originating in the People's Republic of China, Norway, Poland and the USSR, and terminating the investigation regarding imports of that product originating in the People's Republic of China, Norway, Poland, Czechoslovakia, the USSR and Yugoslavia** 25

I

(Acts whose publication is obligatory)

COMMISSION REGULATION (EEC) No 3082/86

of 9 October 1986

fixing the import levies on cereals and on wheat or rye flour, groats and meal

THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,

Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community,

Having regard to the Act of Accession of Spain and Portugal,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EEC) No 2727/75 of 29 October 1975 on the common organization of the market in cereals⁽¹⁾, as last amended by Regulation (EEC) No 1579/86⁽²⁾, and in particular Article 13 (5) thereof,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EEC) No 1676/85 of 11 June 1985 on the value of the unit of account and the exchange rates to be applied for the purposes of the common agricultural policy⁽³⁾, and in particular Article 3 thereof,

Having regard to the opinion of the Monetary Committee,

Whereas the import levies on cereals, wheat and rye flour, and wheat groats and meal were fixed by Commission Regulation (EEC) No 2010/86⁽⁴⁾ and subsequent amending Regulations ;

Whereas, if the levy system is to operate normally, levies should be calculated on the following basis :

— in the case of currencies which are maintained in relation to each other at any given moment within a band of 2,25 %, a rate of exchange based on their central

rate, multiplied by the corrective factor provided for in the last paragraph of Article 3 (1) of Regulation (EEC) No 1676/85,

— for other currencies, an exchange rate based on the arithmetic mean of the spot market rates of each of these currencies recorded for a given period in relation to the Community currencies referred to in the previous indent, and the aforesaid coefficient ;

Whereas these exchange rates being those recorded on 8 October 1986 ;

Whereas the aforesaid corrective factor affects the entire calculation basis for the levies, including the equivalence coefficients ;

Whereas it follows from applying the detailed rules contained in Regulation (EEC) No 2010/86 to today's offer prices and quotations known to the Commission that the levies at present in force should be altered to the amounts set out in the Annex hereto,

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION :

Article 1

The import levies to be charged on products listed in Article 1 (a), (b) and (c) of Regulation (EEC) No 2727/75 shall be as set out in the Annex hereto.

Article 2

This Regulation shall enter into force on 10 October 1986.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 281, 1. 11. 1975, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 139, 24. 5. 1986, p. 29.

⁽³⁾ OJ No L 164, 24. 6. 1985, p. 1.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No L 173, 1. 7. 1986, p. 1.

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

Done at Brussels, 9 October 1986.

For the Commission

Frans ANDRIESEN

Vice-President

ANNEX

to the Commission Regulation of 9 October 1986 fixing the import levies on cereals and on wheat or rye flour, groats and meal

(ECU/tonne)

CCT heading No	Description	Levies	
		Portugal	Third country
10.01 B I	Common wheat, and meslin	3,93	174,03
10.01 B II	Durum wheat	27,84	240,84 ⁽¹⁾ ⁽⁵⁾
10.02	Rye	41,33	160,71 ⁽⁶⁾
10.03	Barley	10,99	172,20
10.04	Oats	74,55	146,22
10.05 B	Maize, other than hybrid maize for sowing	—	171,99 ⁽²⁾ ⁽³⁾
10.07 A	Buckwheat	—	0
10.07 B	Millet	10,99	115,08 ⁽⁴⁾
10.07 C II	Grain sorghum, other than hybrid sorghum for sowing	—	167,96 ⁽⁴⁾
10.07 D I	Triticale	(7)	(7)
10.07 D II	Canary seed; other cereals	—	0 ⁽⁵⁾
11.01 A	Wheat or meslin flour	19,31	257,22
11.01 B	Rye flour	71,67	238,02
11.02 A I a)	Durum wheat groats and meal	56,40	387,56
11.02 A I b)	Common wheat groats and meal	19,97	276,91

⁽¹⁾ Where durum wheat originating in Morocco is transported directly from that country to the Community, the levy is reduced by 0,60 ECU/tonne.

⁽²⁾ In accordance with Regulation (EEC) No 486/85 the levies are not applied to imports into the French overseas departments of products originating in the African, Caribbean and Pacific States or in the 'overseas countries and territories'.

⁽³⁾ Where maize originating in the ACP or OCT is imported into the Community the levy is reduced by 1,81 ECU/tonne.

⁽⁴⁾ Where millet and sorghum originating in the ACP or OCT is imported into the Community the levy is reduced by 50 %.

⁽⁵⁾ Where durum wheat and canary seed produced in Turkey are transported directly from that country to the Community, the levy is reduced by 0,60 ECU/tonne.

⁽⁶⁾ The import levy charged on rye produced in Turkey and transported directly from that country to the Community is laid down in Council Regulation (EEC) No 1180/77 and Commission Regulation (EEC) No 2622/71.

⁽⁷⁾ The levy applicable to rye shall be charged on imports of the product falling within subheading 10.07 D I (triticale).

COMMISSION REGULATION (EEC) No 3083/86

of 9 October 1986

fixing the premiums to be added to the import levies on cereals, flour and malt

THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,

Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community,

Having regard to the Act of Accession of Spain and Portugal,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EEC) No 2727/75 of 29 October 1975 on the common organization of the market in cereals⁽¹⁾, as last amended by Regulation (EEC) No 1579/86⁽²⁾, and in particular Article 15 (6) thereof,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EEC) No 1676/85 of 11 June 1985 on the value of the unit of account and the exchange rates to be applied for the purposes of the common agricultural policy⁽³⁾, and in particular Article 3 thereof,

Having regard to the opinion of the Monetary Committee,

Whereas the premiums to be added to the levies on cereals and malt were fixed by Commission Regulation (EEC) No 2011/86⁽⁴⁾ and subsequent amending Regulations;

Whereas, if the levy system is to operate normally, levies should be calculated on the following basis:

- in the case of currencies which are maintained in relation to each other at any given moment within a band of 2,25 %, a rate of exchange based on their central rate, multiplied by the corrective factor provided for in the last paragraph of Article 3 (1) of Regulation (EEC) No 1676/85,
- for other currencies, an exchange rate based on the arithmetic mean of the spot market rates of each of

these currencies recorded for a given period in relation to the Community currencies referred to in the previous indent, and the aforesaid coefficient;

Whereas these exchange rates being those recorded on 8 October 1986;

Whereas, on the basis of today's cif prices and cif forward delivery prices, the premiums at present in force, which are to be added to the levies, should be altered to the amounts set out in the Annex hereto,

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

Article 1

1. The premiums referred to in Article 15 of Regulation (EEC) No 2727/75 to be added to the import levies fixed in advance in respect of cereals and malt originating in Portugal shall be zero.
2. The premiums referred to in Article 15 of Regulation (EEC) No 2727/75 to be added to the import levies fixed in advance in respect of cereals and malt originating in third countries shall be as set out in the Annex hereto.

Article 2

This Regulation shall enter into force on 10 October 1986.

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

Done at Brussels, 9 October 1986.

For the Commission

Frans ANDRIESEN

Vice-President

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 281, 1. 11. 1975, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 139, 24. 5. 1986, p. 29.

⁽³⁾ OJ No L 164, 24. 6. 1985, p. 1.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No L 173, 1. 7. 1986, p. 4.

ANNEX

to the Commission Regulation of 9 October 1986 fixing the premiums to be added to the import levies on cereals, flour and malt from third countries

A. Cereals and flour

(ECU/tonne)

CCT heading No	Description	Current 10	1st period 11	2nd period 12	3rd period 1
10.01 B I	Common wheat, and meslin	0	0	0	0
10.01 B II	Durum wheat	0	0	0	0
10.02	Rye	0	0	0	0
10.03	Barley	0	0	0	0
10.04	Oats	0	0	0	0
10.05 B	Maize, other than hybrid maize for sowing	0	0	0	0
10.07 A	Buckwheat	0	0	0	0
10.07 B	Millet	0	0	0	0
10.07 C II	Grain sorghum, other than hybrid sorghum for sowing	0	0	0	0
10.07 D	Other cereals	0	0	0	0
11.01 A	Wheat or meslin flour	0	0	0	0

B. Malt

(ECU/tonne)

CCT heading No	Description	Current 10	1st period 11	2nd period 12	3rd period 1	4th period 2
11.07 A I (a)	Unroasted malt, obtained from wheat; in the form of flour	0	0	0	0	0
11.07 A I (b)	Unroasted malt, obtained from wheat, other than in the form of flour	0	0	0	0	0
11.07 A II (a)	Unroasted malt, other than that obtained from wheat, in the form of flour	0	0	0	0	0
11.07 A II (b)	Unroasted malt, other than that obtained from wheat, other than in the form of flour	0	0	0	0	0
11.07 B	Roasted malt	0	0	0	0	0

COMMISSION REGULATION (EEC) No 3084/86

of 9 October 1986

fixing the minimum levies on the importation of olive oil and levies on the importation of other olive oil sector products

THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,

Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community,

Having regard to the Act of Accession of Spain and Portugal,

Having regard to Council Regulation No 136/66/EEC of 22 September 1966 on the establishment of a common organization of the market in oils and fats⁽¹⁾, as last amended by Regulation (EEC) No 1454/86⁽²⁾, and in particular Article 16 (2) thereof,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EEC) No 1514/76 of 24 June 1976 on imports of olive oil originating in Algeria⁽³⁾, as last amended by Regulation (EEC) No 1201/85⁽⁴⁾, and in particular Article 5 thereof,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EEC) No 1521/76 of 24 June 1976 on imports of olive oil originating in Morocco⁽⁵⁾, as last amended by Regulation (EEC) No 436/85⁽⁶⁾, and in particular Article 5 thereof,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EEC) No 1508/76 of 24 June 1976 on imports of olive oil originating in Tunisia⁽⁷⁾, as last amended by Regulation (EEC) No 436/85, and in particular Article 5 thereof,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EEC) No 1180/77 of 17 May 1977 on imports into the Community of certain agricultural products originating in Turkey⁽⁸⁾, as last amended by Regulation (EEC) No 435/85⁽⁹⁾, and in particular Article 10 (2) thereof,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EEC) No 1620/77 of 18 July 1977 laying down detailed rules for the importation of olive oil from Lebanon⁽¹⁰⁾;

Whereas by Regulation (EEC) No 3131/78⁽¹¹⁾ the Commission decided to use the tendering procedure to fix levies on olive oil;

Whereas Article 3 of Council Regulation (EEC) No 2751/78 of 23 November 1978 laying down general rules for fixing the import levy on olive oil by tender⁽¹²⁾ specifies that the minimum levy rate shall be fixed for each of the products concerned on the basis of the situation on

the world market and the Community market and of the levy rates indicated by tenderers;

Whereas in the collection of the levy, account should be taken of the provisions in the Agreements between the Community and certain third countries; whereas in particular the levy applicable for those countries must be fixed taking as a basis for calculation the levy to be collected on imports from the other third countries;

Whereas, with regard to Turkey and the Maghreb countries, the provisions of this Regulation should be without prejudice to the additional amount to be determined in accordance with the agreements between the Community and these third countries;

Whereas application of the rules recalled above to the levy rates indicated by tenderers on 6 and 7 October 1986 leads to the minimum levies being fixed as indicated in Annex I to this Regulation;

Whereas the import levy on olives falling within subheadings 07.01 N II and 07.03 A II of the Common Customs Tariff and on products falling within subheadings 15.17 B I and 23.04 A II of the Common Customs Tariff must be calculated from the minimum levy applicable on the olive oil contained in these products; whereas, however, the levy charged for olive oil may not be less than an amount equal to 8 % of the value of the imported product, such amount to be fixed at a standard rate; whereas application of these provisions leads to the levies being fixed as indicated in Annex II to this Regulation,

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

Article 1

The minimum levies on olive oil imports are fixed in Annex I.

Article 2

The levies applicable on imports of other olive oil sector products are fixed in Annex II.

Article 3

This Regulation shall enter into force on 10 October 1986.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No 172, 30. 9. 1966, p. 3025/66.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 133, 21. 5. 1986, p. 8.

⁽³⁾ OJ No L 169, 28. 6. 1976, p. 24.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No L 124, 9. 5. 1985, p. 1.

⁽⁵⁾ OJ No L 169, 28. 6. 1976, p. 43.

⁽⁶⁾ OJ No L 52, 22. 2. 1985, p. 2.

⁽⁷⁾ OJ No L 169, 28. 6. 1976, p. 9.

⁽⁸⁾ OJ No L 142, 9. 6. 1977, p. 10.

⁽⁹⁾ OJ No L 52, 22. 2. 1985, p. 1.

⁽¹⁰⁾ OJ No L 181, 21. 7. 1977, p. 4.

⁽¹¹⁾ OJ No L 370, 30. 12. 1978, p. 60.

⁽¹²⁾ OJ No L 331, 28. 11. 1978, p. 6.

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

Done at Brussels, 9 October 1986.

For the Commission

Frans ANDRIESSEN

Vice-President

ANNEX I

Minimum import levies on olive oil

(ECU/100 kg)

CCT heading No	Non-member countries
15.07 A I a)	70,00 ⁽¹⁾
15.07 A I b)	68,00 ⁽¹⁾
15.07 A I c)	60,00 ⁽¹⁾
15.07 A II a)	79,00 ⁽²⁾
15.07 A II b)	95,00 ⁽³⁾

⁽¹⁾ For imports of oil falling within this tariff subheading and produced entirely in one of the countries listed below and transported directly from any of those countries to the Community, the levy to be collected is reduced by :

- (a) Lebanon : 0,60 ECU/100 kg ;
- (b) Turkey : 11,48 ECU/100 kg ^(*) provided that the operator furnishes proof of having paid the export tax applied by that country ; however, the repayment may not exceed the amount of the tax in force ;
- (c) Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco : 12,69 ECU/100 kg ^(*) provided that the operator furnishes proof of having paid the export tax applied by that country ; however, the repayment may not exceed the amount of the tax in force.

^(*) These amounts may be increased by an additional amount to be determined by the Community and the third countries in question.

⁽²⁾ For imports of oil falling within this tariff subheading :

- (a) produced entirely in Algeria, Morocco or Tunisia and transported directly from any of those countries to the Community, the levy to be collected is reduced by 3,86 ECU/100 kg ;
- (b) produced entirely in Turkey and transported directly from that country to the Community, the levy to be collected is reduced by 3,09 ECU/100 kg.

⁽³⁾ For imports of oil falling within this tariff subheading :

- (a) produced entirely in Algeria, Morocco or Tunisia and transported directly from any of those countries to the Community, the levy to be collected is reduced by 7,25 ECU/100 kg ;
- (b) produced entirely in Turkey and transported directly from that country to the Community, the levy to be collected is reduced by 5,80 ECU/100 kg.

ANNEX II

Import levies on other olive oil sector products

(ECU/100 kg)

CCT heading No	Non-member countries
07.01 N II	14,96
07.03 A II	14,96
15.17 B I a)	34,00
15.17 B I b)	54,40
23.04 A II	4,80

COMMISSION REGULATION (EEC) No 3085/86

of 7 October 1986

opening an invitation to tender for the sale for export of baled tobacco held by
the Greek intervention agency

THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN
COMMUNITIES,

Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European
Economic Community,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EEC) No 727/70 of
21 April 1970 on the common organization of the market
in raw tobacco ⁽¹⁾, as last amended by Regulation (EEC)
No 1576/86 ⁽²⁾, and in particular Article 7 ⁽⁴⁾ thereof,

Whereas Commission Regulation (EEC) No 3389/73 ⁽³⁾,
as last amended by Regulation (EEC) No 3263/85 ⁽⁴⁾, lays
down the procedure and conditions for the sale of tobacco
held by intervention agencies;

Whereas, on account of the problems caused by the
storage of baled tobacco, and in particular the costs of
storage, an invitation to tender should be opened for the
sale of the tobacco in lots; whereas this tobacco should be
intended for export, without refund;

Whereas payment for all these lots is made before the
tobacco is removed; whereas it should be provided that,
at the request of the successful tenderer, the security
should be released progressively as the quantities of
tobacco are exported;

Whereas the measures provided for in this Regulation are
in accordance with the opinion of the Management
Committee for Tobacco,

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

Article 1

Seven lots of baled raw tobacco from the 1984 harvest,
held by the Greek intervention agency, with a total weight
of 5 886 452 kilograms divided by varieties as shown in
the Annex hereto, shall be sold for export.

Article 2

The sale shall take place in accordance with the tendering
procedure provided for in Regulation (EEC) No 3389/73.

Article 3

The deadline for the submission of tenders at the head-
quarters of the Commission of the European Communi-
ties shall be at 3 p.m. local time, on 3 December 1986.

Article 4

The closing date referred to in Article 9 (1) of Regulation
(EEC) No 3389/73 for removal of the tobacco by the
successful tenderer shall be:

- (a) at the end of the fourth month following the date of
publication of the result of the tendering procedure in
the *Official Journal of the European Communities*,
in respect of at least one-third of the lots;
- (b) at the end of the sixth month following the said date
for the remaining tobacco.

Article 5

1. The security specified in Article 5 of Regulation
(EEC) No 3389/73 must be lodged with and by the
Ypiresia Diachirisis Agoron Georgikon Proionton
(YDAGEP) Acharnon 5, GR-Athens 108.

2. The Commission shall inform the relevant inter-
vention agency forthwith of the result of the sale by
tender. The agency shall immediately release the secur-
ities of tenderers whose tenders were inadmissible or who
were unsuccessful.

Save as otherwise provided in the second subparagraph of
Article 7 of Regulation (EEC) No 3389/73, the securities
of the successful tenderer or tenderers shall be released
once the conditions laid down in Article 7 (c) of that
Regulation have been fulfilled.

3. On application by the person concerned, the secur-
ity shall be released by instalments in proportion to the
quantities of tobacco in respect of which the proof
referred to in Article 7 (c) of the said Regulation has been
furnished.

Article 6

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

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 94, 28. 4. 1970, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 139, 24. 5. 1986, p. 1.

⁽³⁾ OJ No L 345, 15. 12. 1973, p. 47.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No L 311, 22. 11. 1985, p. 22.

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

Done at Brussels, 7 October 1986.

For the Commission

Frans ANDRIESEN

Vice-President

ANNEX

Lot No	Variety	Harvest	Weight (kilograms)
1	Basmas	1984	316 106
2	Katerini	1984	968 535
3	Kaba Koulak classic	1984	1 277 295
4	Elassona	1984	408 425
5	Kaba Koulak non classic	1984	767 517
6	Tsebelia	1984	1 554 063
7	Mavra	1984	594 511
Total			5 886 452

COMMISSION REGULATION (EEC) No 3086/86

of 7 October 1986

opening an invitation to tender for the sale for export of baled tobacco held by the Italian intervention agency

THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,

Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EEC) No 727/70 of 21 April 1970 on the common organization of the market in raw tobacco⁽¹⁾, as last amended by Regulation (EEC) No 1576/86⁽²⁾, and in particular Article 7 (4) thereof,

Whereas Commission Regulation (EEC) No 3389/73⁽³⁾, as last amended by Regulation (EEC) No 3263/85⁽⁴⁾, lays down the procedure and conditions for the sale of tobacco held by intervention agencies;

Whereas, on account of the problems caused by the storage of baled tobacco, and in particular the costs of storage, an invitation to tender should be opened for the sale of the tobacco in lots; whereas this tobacco should be intended for export, without refund;

Whereas payment for all these lots is made before the tobacco is removed; whereas it should be provided that, at the request of the successful tenderer, the security should be released progressively as the quantities of tobacco are exported;

Whereas the measures provided for in this Regulation are in accordance with the opinion of the Management Committee for Tobacco,

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

Article 1

Two lots of baled raw tobacco from the 1984 harvest, held by the Italian intervention agency, with a total weight of 2 795 123 kilograms divided by varieties as shown in the Annex hereto, shall be sold for export.

Article 2

The sale shall take place in accordance with the tendering procedure provided for in Regulation (EEC) No 3389/73.

Article 3

The deadline for the submission of tenders at the headquarters of the Commission of the European Communities shall be at 3 p.m., local time, on 4 December 1986.

Article 4

The closing date referred to in Article 9 (1) of Regulation (EEC) No 3389/73 for removal of the tobacco by the successful tenderer shall be:

- (a) at the end of the fourth month following the date of publication of the result of the tendering procedure in the *Official Journal of the European Communities*, in respect of at least one-third of the lots;
- (b) at the end of the sixth month following the said date for the remaining tobacco.

Article 5

1. The security specified in Article 5 of Regulation (EEC) No 3389/73 must be lodged with and by the Azienda di Stato per gli interventi nel mercato agricolo, sezione specializzata per il tabacco (AIMA), via Duccio Galimberti 47, 00136 I-Roma.

2. The Commission shall inform the relevant intervention agency forthwith of the result of the sale by tender. The agency shall immediately release the securities of tenderers whose tenders were inadmissible or who were unsuccessful.

Save as otherwise provided in the second subparagraph of Article 7 of Regulation (EEC) No 3389/73, the securities of the successful tenderer or tenderers shall be released once the conditions laid down in Article 7 (c) of that Regulation have been fulfilled.

3. On application by the person concerned, the security shall be released by instalments in proportion to the quantities of tobacco in respect of which the proof referred to in Article 7 (c) of the said Regulation has been furnished.

Article 6

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

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 94, 28. 4. 1970, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 139, 24. 5. 1986, p. 1.

⁽³⁾ OJ No L 345, 15. 12. 1973, p. 47.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No L 311, 22. 11. 1985, p. 22.

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

Done at Brussels, 7 October 1986.

For the Commission

Frans ANDRIESSEN

Vice-President

ANNEX

Lot No	Variety	Harvest	Weight (kilograms)
1	Burley	1984	1 300 186
2	Burley	1984	1 494 937
Total			2 795 123

COMMISSION REGULATION (EEC) No 3087/86
of 9 October 1986

**fixing the amounts to be levied in the beef sector on products which left the
United Kingdom during the week 22 to 28 September 1986**

THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,
Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European
Economic Community,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EEC) No 1347/86
of 6 May 1986 on the granting of a premium for the
slaughter of certain adult bovine animals in the United
Kingdom ⁽¹⁾,

Having regard to Commission Regulation (EEC) No
1695/86 of 30 May 1986 laying down detailed rules for
the application of the premium for the slaughter of
certain adult bovine animals for slaughter in the United
Kingdom ⁽²⁾, and in particular Article 7 (1) thereof,

Whereas, under Article 3 of Regulation (EEC) No
1347/86, an amount equivalent to the amount of the vari-
able slaughter premium granted in the United Kingdom
is levied on meat and meat preparations from animals on
which it has been paid, when they are consigned to other
Member States or to non-member countries;

Whereas, under Article 7 (1) of Regulation (EEC) No
1695/86 the amounts to be charged on departure from
the territory of the United Kingdom of the products listed

in the Annex to the said Regulation must be fixed each
week by the Commission;

Whereas, accordingly, the amounts to be levied on
products which left the United Kingdom during the week
22 to 28 September 1986 should be fixed,

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

Article 1

Pursuant to Article 3 of Regulation (EEC) No 1347/86,
the amounts to be levied on the products referred to in
Article 7 (1) of Regulation (EEC) No 1695/86 which left
the territory of the United Kingdom during the week 22
to 28 September 1986 shall be those set out in the Annex.

Article 2

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

It shall apply with effect from 22 September 1986.

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

Done at Brussels, 9 October 1986.

For the Commission

Frans ANDRIESEN

Vice-President

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 119, 8. 5. 1986, p. 40.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 146, 31. 5. 1986, p. 56.

ANNEX

Amounts to be levied on products which left the territory of the United Kingdom during
the week 22 to 28 September 1986

(ECU/100 kg net weight)

CCT heading No	Description	Amount
1	2	3
ex 02.01 A II a) and ex 02.01 A II b)	Meat of adult bovine animals, fresh, chilled or frozen : 1. Carcases, half-carcases or 'compensated' quarters 2. Separated or unseparated forequarters 3. Separated or unseparated hindquarters 4. Other : aa) Unboned (bone-in) bb) Boned or boneless	 26,26474 21,01179 31,51769 21,01179 35,98269
ex 02.06 C I a)	Meat salted, in brine, dried or smoked, of adult bovine animals : 1. Unboned (bone-in) 2. Boned or boneless	 21,01179 29,94180
ex 16.02 B III b) 1	Other prepared or preserved meat or meat offal, containing meat or offal of adult bovine animals : aa) Uncooked ; mixtures of cooked meat or offal and uncooked meat or offal : 11. Containing 80 % or more by weight of beef meat excluding offals and fat 22. Other	 29,94180 21,01179

COMMISSION REGULATION (EEC) No 3088/86
of 9 October 1986
suspending advance fixing of the import levy for rice

THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,
Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EEC) No 1418/76 of 21 June 1976 on the common organization of the market in rice ⁽¹⁾, as last amended by Regulation (EEC) No 3768/85 ⁽²⁾, and in particular the first paragraph of Article 13 (7) thereof,

Whereas Article 13 (7) of Regulation (EEC) No 1418/76 provides that the provisions concerning advance fixing of the levy may be suspended if the market situation shows that the application of such provisions will or is likely to cause difficulties;

Whereas, in view of the monetary situation, there is a danger that the continuation of the present system could give rise to speculative operations; whereas the advance fixing of the import levy for rice should therefore be suspended;

Whereas the measures provided for in this Regulation are in accordance with the opinion of the Management Committee for Cereals,

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

Article 1

Advance fixing of the import levy for the products referred to in Article 1 of Regulation (EEC) No 1418/76 is hereby suspended from 10 October until 3 November 1986.

Article 2

This Regulation shall enter into force on 10 October 1986.

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

Done at Brussels, 9 October 1986.

For the Commission

Frans ANDRIESSEN

Vice-President

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 166, 25. 6. 1976, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 362, 31. 12. 1985, p. 8.

COMMISSION REGULATION (EEC) No 3089/86

of 9 October 1986

fixing the import levies on white sugar and raw sugar

THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,
Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community,

Having regard to the Act of Accession of Spain and Portugal,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EEC) No 1785/81 of 30 June 1981 on the common organization of the markets in the sugar sector ⁽¹⁾, as last amended by Regulation (EEC) No 934/86 ⁽²⁾, and in particular Article 16 (8) thereof,

Whereas the import levies on white sugar and raw sugar were fixed by Commission Regulation (EEC) No 2051/86 ⁽³⁾, as last amended by Regulation (EEC) No 3068/86 ⁽⁴⁾;

Whereas it follows from applying the detailed rules contained in Regulation (EEC) No 2051/86 to the infor-

mation known to the Commission that the levies at present in force should be altered to the amounts set out in the Annex hereto,

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

Article 1

The import levies referred to in Article 16 (1) of Regulation (EEC) No 1785/81 shall be, in respect of white sugar and standard quality raw sugar, as set out in the Annex hereto.

Article 2

This Regulation shall enter into force on 10 October 1986.

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

Done at Brussels, 9 October 1986.

For the Commission

Frans ANDRIESSEN

Vice-President

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 177, 1. 7. 1981, p. 4.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 87, 2. 4. 1986, p. 1.

⁽³⁾ OJ No L 173 1. 7. 1986, p. 91.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No L 285, 8. 10. 1986, p. 28.

ANNEX

to the Commission Regulation of 9 October 1986 fixing the import levies on white sugar and raw sugar

(ECU/100 kg)		
CCT heading No	Description	Levy
17.01	Beet sugar and cane sugar, in solid form : A. White sugar : flavoured or coloured sugar B. Raw sugar	50,96 46,49 ⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ Applicable to raw sugar with a yield of 92 % ; if the yield is other than 92 %, the levy applicable is calculated in accordance with the provisions of Article 2 of Regulation (EEC) No 837/68.

COMMISSION REGULATION (EEC) No 3090/86

of 9 October 1986

fixing the amount of the subsidy on oil seeds

THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,

Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community,

Having regard to the Act of Accession of Spain and Portugal,

Having regard to Council Regulation No 136/66/EEC of 22 September 1966 on the establishment of a common organization of the market in oils and fats⁽¹⁾, as last amended by Regulation (EEC) No 1454/86⁽²⁾, and in particular Article 27 (4),

Having regard to Council Regulation (EEC) No 1678/85 of 11 June 1985 fixing the conversion rates to be applied in agriculture⁽³⁾, as last amended by Regulation (EEC) No 2332/86⁽⁴⁾,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EEC) No 1569/72 of 20 July 1972 laying down special measures for colza, rape and sunflower seed⁽⁵⁾, as last amended by Regulation (EEC) No 1474/84⁽⁶⁾, and in particular Article 2 (3) thereof,

Having regard to the opinion of the Monetary Committee,

Whereas the amount of the subsidy referred to in Article 27 of Regulation No 136/66/EEC was fixed by Commission Regulation (EEC) No 2778/86⁽⁷⁾, as last amended by Regulation (EEC) No 3005/86⁽⁸⁾;

Whereas the target price and the monthly increments in the target price for colza, rape and sunflower seed for the

1986/87 marketing year have been fixed in Council Regulations (EEC) No 1457/86⁽⁹⁾ and (EEC) No 1458/86⁽¹⁰⁾;

Whereas it follows from applying the detailed rules contained in amended Regulation (EEC) No 2778/86 to the information known to the Commission that the amount of the subsidy at present in force should be altered to the amount set out in the Annexes hereto,

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

Article 1

1. The amounts of the subsidy and the exchange rates referred to in Article 33 (2) and (3) of Commission Regulation (EEC) No 2681/83⁽¹¹⁾ shall be as set out in the Annexes hereto.

2. The amount of the compensatory aid referred to in Article 14 of Council Regulation (EEC) No 475/86⁽¹²⁾ and Article 12 of Council Regulation (EEC) No 476/86⁽¹³⁾ shall be as shown in Annex II to this Regulation for sunflower seed harvested in Spain and Portugal.

Article 2

This Regulation shall enter into force on 10 October 1986.

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

Done at Brussels, 9 October 1986.

For the Commission

Frans ANDRIESEN

Vice-President

⁽¹⁾ OJ No 172, 30. 9. 1966, p. 3025/66.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 133, 21. 5. 1986, p. 8.

⁽³⁾ OJ No L 164, 24. 6. 1985, p. 11.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No L 204, 28. 7. 1986, p. 1.

⁽⁵⁾ OJ No L 167, 25. 7. 1972, p. 9.

⁽⁶⁾ OJ No L 143, 30. 5. 1984, p. 4.

⁽⁷⁾ OJ No L 256, 9. 9. 1986, p. 7.

⁽⁸⁾ OJ No L 280, 1. 10. 1986, p. 40.

⁽⁹⁾ OJ No L 133, 21. 5. 1986, p. 12.

⁽¹⁰⁾ OJ No L 133, 21. 5. 1986, p. 14.

⁽¹¹⁾ OJ No L 266, 28. 9. 1983, p. 1.

⁽¹²⁾ OJ No L 53, 1. 3. 1986, p. 47.

⁽¹³⁾ OJ No L 53, 1. 3. 1986, p. 51.

ANNEX I

Aids to colza and rape seed

(amounts per 100 kilograms)

	Current month	2nd month	3rd month	4th month	5th month	6th month
1. Gross aids (ECU):						
— Spain	0,610	0,610	0,610	0,610	0,610	0,610
— Portugal	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000
— Other Member States	31,937	31,933	31,682	31,826	31,970	32,466
2. Final aids (1):						
(a) Seed harvested and processed in:						
— Federal Republic of Germany (DM)	77,22	77,25	76,72	77,19	77,56	79,08
— Netherlands (Fl)	87,01	87,04	86,42	86,95	87,37	89,04
— BLEU (Bfrs/Lfrs)	1 489,82	1 489,40	1 477,29	1 483,21	1 489,78	1 507,88
— France (FF)	219,85	219,60	217,22	217,59	218,44	222,70
— Denmark (Dkr)	272,13	272,08	269,90	271,12	272,33	276,20
— Ireland (£ Irl)	24,104	24,072	23,830	23,892	23,984	24,103
— United Kingdom (£)	17,423	17,337	17,054	17,085	17,116	17,293
— Italy (Lit)	48 454	48 423	47 868	48 211	48 417	49 180
— Greece (Dr)	3 164,48	3 122,13	3 011,92	2 975,52	2 977,11	2 932,70
(b) Seed harvested in Spain and processed:						
— in Spain (Pta)	88,94	88,94	88,94	88,94	88,94	88,94
— in another Member State (Pta)	3 797,19	3 794,86	3 755,64	3 743,05	3 762,14	3 803,10
(c) Seed harvested in Portugal and processed:						
— in Portugal (Esc)	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
— in another Member State (Esc)	4 627,27	4 589,20	4 529,04	4 533,33	4 549,04	4 575,12

(1) The final amount of aid for 'double zero' colza and rape seed must be increased by 1,25 ECU/100 kilograms converted into national currency at the agricultural conversion rate applicable to the Member State where the seeds are harvested.

ANNEX II

Aids to sunflower seed

(amounts per 100 kilograms)

	Current month	2nd month	3rd month	4th month	5th month
1. Gross aids (ECU):					
— Spain	1,720	1,720	1,720	1,720	1,720
— Portugal	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000
— Other Member States	38,262	38,853	39,444	39,547	39,935
2. Final aids:					
(a) Seed harvested and processed in (1):					
— Federal Republic of Germany (DM)	92,47	93,88	95,30	95,69	96,64
— Netherlands (Fl)	104,19	105,78	107,36	107,80	108,86
— BLEU (Bfrs/Lfrs)	1 785,22	1 812,93	1 840,63	1 844,51	1 862,59
— France (FF)	263,73	267,93	271,85	271,83	274,48
— Denmark (Dkr)	326,06	331,10	336,15	337,01	340,32
— Ireland (£ Irl)	28,921	29,384	29,843	29,864	30,155
— United Kingdom (£)	21,003	21,374	21,744	21,727	21,936
— Italy (Lit)	58 085	58 992	59 757	60 040	60 628
— Greece (Dr)	3 819,05	3 861,60	3 874,57	3 825,13	3 861,62
(b) Seed harvested in Spain and processed:					
— in Spain (Pta)	250,77	250,77	250,77	250,77	250,77
— in another Member State (Pta)	3 678,77	3 764,93	3 851,10	3 829,81	3 885,28
(c) Seed harvested in Portugal and processed:					
— in Portugal (Esc)	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
— in Spain (Esc)	6 221,16	6 279,25	6 361,34	6 356,13	6 413,55
— in another Member State (Esc)	5 997,64	6 053,63	6 132,78	6 127,75	6 183,11
3. Compensatory aids:					
— in Spain (Pta)	3 604,69	3 690,86	3 777,02	3 760,56	3 816,03
— in Portugal (Esc)	5 976,06	6 032,06	6 111,20	6 107,58	6 162,94

(1) For seed harvested in the Community as constituted at 31 December 1985 and processed in Spain, the amounts shown in 2 (a) to be multiplied by 1,037269.

ANNEX III

Exchange rate of the ECU to be used for converting final aids into the currency of the processing country when the latter is a country other than the country of production

(value of 1 ECU)

	Current month	2nd month	3rd month	4th month	5th month	6th month
DM	2,084760	2,080370	2,076030	2,071950	2,071950	2,060800
Fl	2,359840	2,356760	2,353560	2,350280	2,350280	2,340930
Bfrs/Lfrs	43,270100	43,286800	43,303300	43,320200	43,320200	43,361400
FF	6,833290	6,835700	6,839290	6,843650	6,843650	6,854720
Dkr	7,868760	7,883240	7,895930	7,909730	7,909730	7,952720
£ Irl	0,763369	0,765855	0,769104	0,772547	0,772547	0,784119
£	0,722213	0,724324	0,726495	0,728643	0,728643	0,734685
Lit	1 444,58	1 446,53	1 448,29	1 449,87	1 449,87	1 454,15
Dr	139,80900	143,19300	146,17000	148,36400	148,36400	154,92800
Esc	152,11600	153,28900	154,45100	155,58600	155,58600	158,33100
Pta	137,84400	138,50900	139,03600	139,69200	139,69200	141,04900

COMMISSION REGULATION (EEC) No 3091/86

of 9 October 1986

fixing the export refunds on cereals and on wheat or rye flour, groats and meal

THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,

Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community,

Having regard to the Act of Accession of Spain and Portugal,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EEC) No 2727/75 of 29 October 1975 on the common organization of the market in cereals⁽¹⁾, as last amended by Regulation (EEC) No 1579/86⁽²⁾, and in particular the fourth subparagraph of Article 16 (2),

Having regard to the opinion of the Monetary Committee,

Whereas Article 16 of Regulation (EEC) No 2727/75 provides that the difference between quotations or prices on the world market for the products listed in Article 1 of that Regulation and prices for those products in the Community may be covered by an export refund;

Whereas Article 2 of Council Regulation (EEC) No 2746/75 of 29 October 1975 laying down general rules for granting export refunds on cereals and criteria for fixing the amount of such refunds⁽³⁾, provides that when refunds are being fixed, account must be taken of the existing situation and the future trend with regard to prices and availabilities of cereals on the Community market on the one hand, and prices for cereals and cereal products on the world market on the other; whereas the same Article provides that it is also important to ensure equilibrium and the natural development of prices and trade on cereal markets and, furthermore, to take into account the economic aspect of the proposed exports and the need to avoid disturbances on the Community market;

Whereas Article 3 of Regulation (EEC) No 2746/75 defines the specific criteria to be taken into account when the refund on cereals is being calculated;

Whereas these specific criteria are defined, as far as wheat and rye flour, groats and meal are concerned, in Article 4 of Regulation (EEC) No 2746/75; whereas furthermore, when the refund on these products is being calculated, account must be taken of the quantities of cereals required for their manufacture; whereas these quantities were fixed in Commission Regulation No 162/67/EEC⁽⁴⁾, as amended by Regulation (EEC) No 1607/71⁽⁵⁾;

Whereas the world market situation or the specific requirements of certain markets may make it necessary to

vary the refund for certain products according to destination;

Whereas the refund must be fixed once a month; whereas it may be altered in the intervening period;

Whereas, if the refund system is to operate normally, refunds should be calculated on the following basis:

- in the case of currencies which are maintained in relation to each other at any given moment within a band of 2,25 % a rate of exchange based on their central rate, multiplied by the corrective factor provided for in the last paragraph of Article 3 (1) of Council Regulation (EEC) No 1676/85⁽⁶⁾,
- for other currencies, an exchange rate based on the arithmetic mean of the spot market rates of each of these currencies recorded over a given period in relation to the Community currencies referred to in the previous indent and the aforesaid coefficient;

Whereas it follows from applying the detailed rules set out above to the present situation on the market in cereals, and in particular to quotations or prices for these products within the Community and on the world market, that the refunds should be as set out in the Annex hereto;

Whereas, pursuant to Article 275 of the Act of Accession of Spain and Portugal, refunds may be granted in the case of exports to Portugal; whereas, in the light of the situation and the level of prices no refund should be fixed in the case of exports to Portugal;

Whereas the measures provided for in this Regulation are in accordance with the opinion of the Management Committee for Cereals,

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

Article 1

The export refunds on the products listed in Article 1 (a), (b) and (c) of Regulation (EEC) No 2727/75, exported in the natural state, shall be as set out in the Annex hereto.

The refund on export to Portugal has not been fixed.

Article 2

This Regulation shall enter into force on 10 October 1986.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 281, 1. 11. 1975, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 139, 24. 5. 1986, p. 29.

⁽³⁾ OJ No L 281, 1. 11. 1975, p. 78.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No 128, 27. 6. 1967, p. 2574/67.

⁽⁵⁾ OJ No L 168, 27. 7. 1971, p. 16.

⁽⁶⁾ OJ No L 164, 24. 6. 1985, p. 1.

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

Done at Brussels, 9 October 1986.

For the Commission

Frans ANDRIESSEN

Vice-President

ANNEX

to the Commission Regulation of 9 October 1986 fixing the export refunds on cereals and
on wheat or rye flour, groats and meal

CCT heading No	Description	(ECU/tonne) Refund
10.01 B I	Common wheat and meslin for exports to : — Switzerland, Austria, Liechtenstein, Ceuta and Melilla — Tunisia — zone II b) — other third countries	110,00 32,00 120,00 20,00
10.01 B II	Durum wheat for exports to : — Switzerland, Austria and Liechtenstein — zone I — other third countries	5,00 ⁽³⁾ 195,00 ⁽³⁾ 10,00 ⁽³⁾
10.02	Rye for exports to : — Switzerland, Austria and Liechtenstein — other third countries	5,00 10,00
10.03	Barley for exports to : — Switzerland, Austria, Liechtenstein, Ceuta and Melilla — zone II b) — other third countries	110,00 105,00 20,00
10.04	Oats for exports to : — Switzerland, Austria and Liechtenstein — zone I — other third countries	— 95,00 —
10.05 B	Maize, other than hybrid maize for sowing for exports to : — Switzerland, Austria and Liechtenstein — zone I, zone V and the German Democratic Republic — other third countries	10,00 20,00 —
10.07 B	Millet	—
10.07 C II	Grain sorghum, other than hybrid sorghum for sowing	—
ex 11.01 A	Wheat flour — of an ash content of 0 to 520 — of an ash content of 521 to 600 — of an ash content of 601 to 900 — of an ash content of 901 to 1 100 — of an ash content of 1 101 to 1 650 — of an ash content of 1 651 to 1 900	166,00 166,00 146,00 135,00 125,00 112,00

CCT heading No	Description	Refund (ECU / tonne)
ex 11.01 B	Rye flour : — of an ash content of 0 to 700 — of an ash content of 701 to 1 150 — of an ash content of 1 151 to 1 600 — of an ash content of 1 601 to 2 000	166,00 166,00 166,00 166,00
11.02 A I a)	Durum wheat groats and meal : — of an ash content of 0 to 1 300 ⁽¹⁾ — of an ash content of 0 to 1 300 ⁽²⁾ — of an ash content of 0 to 1 300 — of an ash content of more than 1 300	311,00 ⁽³⁾ 294,00 ⁽³⁾ 262,00 ⁽³⁾ 247,00 ⁽³⁾
11.02 A I b)	Common wheat groats and meal : — of an ash content of 0 to 520	166,00

⁽¹⁾ Meal of which less than 10 % by weight is capable of passing through a sieve of 0,250 mm mesh.

⁽²⁾ Meal of which less than 10 % by weight is capable of passing through a sieve of 0,160 mm mesh.

⁽³⁾ With the exception of the quantities referred to in the Commission's Decision of 19 March 1986.

N.B. The zones are those defined in Regulation (EEC) No 1124/77 (OJ No L 134, 28. 5. 1977), as last amended by Regulation (EEC) No 3817/85 (OJ No L 368, 31. 12. 1985).

COMMISSION REGULATION (EEC) No 3092/86

of 9 October 1986

fixing the export refunds on malt

THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,

Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community,

Having regard to the Act of Accession of Spain and Portugal,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EEC) No 2727/75 of 29 October 1975 on the common organization of the market in cereals⁽¹⁾, as last amended by Regulation (EEC) No 1579/86⁽²⁾, and in particular the fourth subparagraph of Article 16 (2) thereof,

Having regard to the opinion of the Monetary Committee,

Whereas Article 16 of Regulation (EEC) No 2727/75 provides that the difference between quotations or prices on the world market for the products listed in Article 1 of those Regulations and prices for those products within the Community may be covered by an export refund;

Whereas Article 2 of Council Regulation (EEC) No 2746/75 of 29 October 1975 laying down general rules for granting export refunds on cereals and criteria for fixing the amount of such refunds⁽³⁾, provides that when refunds are being fixed account must be taken of the existing situation and the future trend with regard to prices and availabilities of cereals on the Community market on the one hand and prices for cereals and cereal products on the world market on the other; whereas the same Article provides that it is also important to ensure equilibrium and the natural development of prices and trade on cereal markets and, furthermore, to take into account the economic aspect of the proposed exports, and the need to avoid disturbances on the Community market;

Whereas Council Regulation (EEC) No 2744/75 of 29 October 1975 on the import and export system for products processed from cereals and from rice⁽⁴⁾, as last amended by Regulation (EEC) No 1588/86⁽⁵⁾, defines the specific criteria to be taken into account when the refund on these products is being calculated;

Whereas it follows from applying these detailed rules to the present situation on the market in products processed

from cereals and rice that the export refund should be fixed at an amount which will cover the difference between Community prices and world market prices;

Whereas the world market situation or the specific requirements of certain markets may make it necessary to vary the refund for certain products according to destination;

Whereas, if the refund system is to operate normally, refunds should be calculated on the following basis:

- in the case of currencies which are maintained in relation to each other at any given moment within a band of 2,25 %, a rate of exchange based on their central rate, multiplied by the corrective factor provided for in the last paragraph of Article 3 (1) of Council Regulation (EEC) No 1676/85⁽⁶⁾,
- for other currencies, an exchange rate based on the arithmetic mean of the spot market rates of each of these currencies recorded for a given period in relation to the Community currencies referred to in the previous indent and the aforesaid coefficient;

Whereas the refund must be fixed once a month; whereas it may be altered in the intervening period;

Whereas, pursuant to Article 275 of the Act of Accession of Spain and Portugal, refunds may be granted in the case of exports to Portugal; whereas, in the light of the situation and the level of prices no refund should be fixed in the case of exports to Portugal;

Whereas the measures provided for in this Regulation are in accordance with the opinion of the Management Committee for Cereals,

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

Article 1

The export refunds on malt listed in Article 1 (d) of Regulation (EEC) No 2727/75 subject to Regulation (EEC) No 2744/75 shall be as set out in the Annex hereto.

The refund on export to Portugal has not been fixed.

Article 2

This Regulation shall enter into force on 10 October 1986.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 281, 1. 11. 1975, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 139, 24. 5. 1986, p. 29.

⁽³⁾ OJ No L 281, 1. 11. 1975, p. 78.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No L 281, 1. 11. 1975, p. 65.

⁽⁵⁾ OJ No L 139, 24. 5. 1986, p. 47.

⁽⁶⁾ OJ No L 164, 24. 6. 1985, p. 1.

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

Done at Brussels, 9 October 1986.

For the Commission

Frans ANDRIESSEN

Vice-President

ANNEX

to the Commission Regulation of 9 October 1986 fixing the export refunds on malt

<i>(ECU/tonne)</i>	
CCT heading No	Refund
11.07 A I b)	146,30
11.07 A II b)	190,88
11.07 B	222,46

II

(Acts whose publication is not obligatory)

COMMISSION

COMMISSION DECISION

of 7 October 1986

accepting undertakings given in connection with the anti-dumping proceeding concerning imports of silicon carbide originating in the People's Republic of China, Norway, Poland and the USSR, and terminating the investigation regarding imports of that product originating in the People's Republic of China, Norway, Poland, Czechoslovakia, the USSR and Yugoslavia

(86/497/EEC)

THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,

Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EEC) No 2176/84 of 23 July 1984 on protection against dumped or subsidized imports from countries not members of the European Economic Community⁽¹⁾, and in particular Articles 10 and 11 thereof,

After consultations within the Advisory Committee as provided for under the above Regulation,

Whereas :

A. Procedure

- (1) In May 1984 the Commission received a complaint lodged by the European Council of Chemical Manufacturers' Federations (CEFIC) on behalf of all Community producers of silicon carbide.
- (2) The complaint contained evidence of dumping and of material injury resulting therefrom, which was considered sufficient to justify the initiation of a proceeding. The Commission accordingly announced, by a notice published in the *Official*

Journal of the European Communities⁽²⁾, the initiation of an anti-dumping proceeding concerning imports into the Community of silicon carbide falling within Common Customs Tariff subheading 28.56 A, corresponding to NIMEXE code 28.56-10, and originating in the People's Republic of China, Czechoslovakia, Norway, Poland, the USSR, Spain, and Yugoslavia, and commenced an investigation.

- (3) The Commission officially so advised the exporters and importers known to be concerned, the representatives of the exporting countries, and the complainants, and gave the parties directly concerned the opportunity to make known their views in writing and to request a hearing.
- (4) All of the known producers and exporters, as well as most of the known importers, made their views known in writing or in the course of hearings, which were granted to all those who requested them.
- (5) Submissions were made on behalf of users' associations and by users themselves.
- (6) The Commission sought and verified all information it deemed to be necessary for the purposes of a preliminary determination from the following companies, where necessary carrying out investigations at their premises :

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 201, 30. 7. 1984, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 202, 1. 8. 1984, p. 5.

EEC producers :

- Elektroschmelzwerk Kempten GmbH, München, Federal Republic of Germany,
- Lonza-Werke GmbH, Waldshut-Tiengen, Federal Republic of Germany,
- Pechiney Electrometallurgie (ex SOFREM), Paris, France,
- Samim Abrasivi SpA, San Michele all'Adige, Italy;

Non-EEC producers and exporters :

- Navarro SA Madrid, Spain,
- Arendal Smelteverk A/S, Eydehavn, Norway,
- Norton A/S, Lillesand, Norway,
- Orkla Exolon A/S & Co., Orkanger, Norway,
- Tovarna Dusika, Ruse, Yugoslavia,
- Representation of the China National Machinery and Equipment Import & Export Corporation, Köln, Federal Republic of Germany;

EEC importers :

- Internat SA, Liège, Belgium,
 - SA Barascud Abrasifs-Chimie, 81102 Castres, France,
 - Société Derognat et Cie, 21200 Comblanchien, France,
 - DFG (Gremilliet) 88207 Remiremont, France,
 - Mineralien-Werke Duisburg GmbH, Duisburg, Federal Republic of Germany,
 - Mineralien-Werke Kuppenheim GmbH, Kuppenheim, Federal Republic of Germany,
 - Alfred Hempel GmbH & Co., Düsseldorf, Federal Republic of Germany,
 - Kerimpex Handelsgesellschaft GmbH, Selb, Federal Republic of Germany,
 - Werner Kessl Gießereibedarf GmbH, Bärnwinkel, Federal Republic of Germany,
 - Gesellschaft für Metallurgie Hafner und Polte GmbH, Düsseldorf, Federal Republic of Germany,
 - Wilfried Post GmbH, Gut Junkerswald, Federal Republic of Germany,
 - Thyssen Schulte Metallurgie GmbH, Dortmund, Federal Republic of Germany,
 - Smyris Abrasivi srl, Pero (Mi), Italy,
 - Veneta Mineraria SpA, Milano, Italy,
 - Carborundum Abrasives GB Ltd, Manchester, United Kingdom,
 - Union Carbide UK Limited, Glossop, United Kingdom,
 - Tennant Metallurgical Ltd, Sheffield, United Kingdom.
- (7) The investigation of dumping covered the period from 1 July 1983 to 30 June 1984.
- (8) In view of Article 380 (3) of the Act of Accession of Spain and Portugal, the results of the investigation

in respect of imports from Spain will be dealt with separately, under the terms of Council Regulation (EEC) No 812/86 of 14 March 1986 on protection against imports that are the subject of dumping between the Community of Ten and the new Member States, or between the new Member States, during the period throughout which the transitional measures, laid down by the Act of Accession of Spain and Portugal, apply ⁽¹⁾.

B. Normal value*Yugoslavia*

- (9) In the case of Yugoslavia, the sole producer manufactures only two basic grades of black silicon carbide, all of which, according to the evidence presented, is exported in a semi-finished state. Since there were therefore no domestic sales prices on which to base normal value, it was decided in this case — as in the case of Norway (see points 15 to 17) — to use constructed values. The full production, selling, and overhead costs for the product during the investigation period were taken into account, as recorded in the cost accounts of the producer. To these costs was added a reasonable profit based on what this producer normally earns on his domestic market from sales of artificial corundum, an analogous products.

Non-market economy countries

- (10) With the exception of Spain, referred to under point 8, and Norway, the remaining exports covered by the investigation originate in State trading countries. In order to establish whether the imports from these countries were dumped, the Commission had to take account of the fact that the People's Republic of China, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the USSR do not have market economies, and determinations therefore had to be based on the normal value in a market-economy country. In this connection, the complainants had suggested the Yugoslav market.
- (11) The Commission decided not to accept this suggestion, for the following reasons. The silicon carbide customs heading covers a wide range of product grades, with a similarly wide range of market prices, used primarily for applications in the abrasives, refractory and metallurgical fields. As already mentioned under point 9, the Yugoslav producer was found to manufacture only two product grades, these being exported in a semi-finished state. In view of these facts, and in particular the extremely restricted range of product grades, and the incomplete production process stated to be operated by

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 78, 24. 3. 1986, p. 1.

this manufacturer, the Commission did not consider that the normal values established in Yugoslavia would be a technically satisfactory basis for the determination of normal value in respect of the non-market economy exporters concerned in the proceeding.

Yugoslav producer. However, no evidence for these allegations was produced, and none of the findings made by the Commission, while investigating the Yugoslav producer, support these allegations.

Norway

(12) The Spanish producer was found to possess a complete production process and reasonably wide range of product grades, sold as finished products, not only for export but mainly in the domestic market. However, the Commission did not adopt this alternative basis for normal value in the non-market economy exporting countries, because of the comparatively protected nature of the Spanish market and the fact that there is only one producer on this market.

(15) In seeking to determine the normal value for the three Norwegian companies, the Commission had to take account of the relatively small quantities of the product which are normally sold on their domestic market. It was found, in fact, that during the reference period of the investigation some 96 % by value of these producers' turnover was for export sales, approximately half of total exports being to the Community.

In general, therefore, sales on the domestic market were too small to permit a valid comparison with export sales of the like product to the Community.

In the case of only one of these three companies — and for three of the product grades sold by it out of a total of nine taken into consideration — were domestic sales found which attained the threshold of 5 % by volume of the equivalent product grades exported to the Community market. The use of this threshold in such cases was established by the Commission in Regulation (EEC) No 3643/84 in the anti-dumping proceeding concerning imports of electronic typewriters from Japan⁽¹⁾. Consequently, for the three product grades mentioned and for this one company, normal value was provisionally determined on the basis of the domestic prices.

(13) The Commission concluded that it would be appropriate and not unreasonable to determine normal value for the non-market economy exporters on the basis of constructed value in Norway. The completeness of the range of product grades sold and of the production process operated by the Norwegian producers was an important factor in this conclusion. The fact that, as remarked below (point 15), the restricted nature of the Norwegian market rendered obligatory reference in the majority of cases to constructed values rather than domestic prices was not considered to be disadvantageous to non-market economy exporters, in view of the comparative advantage enjoyed by the Norwegian companies in this highly energy-intensive type of production.

(16) Given the lack of adequate quantities of domestic sales to permit a proper comparison in the case of all other product grades produced by the Norwegian companies, it was necessary to determine normal value for these grades on another basis. The companies themselves proposed the use of export prices to third countries for this purpose.

This suggestion was not accepted by the Commission as it was not in a position to confirm that export prices to markets other than the Community were not in fact dumped prices. In addition, the period covered by the investigation was one of major fluctuation for certain important world currencies, which would have added a further element of uncertainty to any choice of an appropriate third country export market on which to base normal value.

(14) Several exporters and one importer raised objections to the use of Norway as an analogue country for the purpose of normal value, referring to differences in the physical characteristics of the products manufactured in some of the non-market economies as compared with those manufactured in Norway. The Commission's reply to these objections was that the wide variety of product grades for which normal values were established in Norway already permits a better comparison of each of these product grades with those that are sold by non-market economy exporters. In so far as differences in physical characteristics subsisted after such a comparison of appropriate product grades, these could be dealt with by allowances as explained in Section D, 'Comparison', below. While the exporters mentioned above did not make proposals as to alternative analogue countries, the importer mentioned, on the other hand, criticized the Commission's decision to discard the choice of Yugoslavia for this purpose, alleging that the reasons advanced for this decision in point 11 did not correspond with the real situation of the

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 335, 22. 12. 1984, p. 43.

- (17) For the reasons set out above, normal value was provisionally determined on the basis of constructed values in Norway. Constructed values were established on the basis of costs, presented by the companies during the investigation, for each major product grade produced and sold by them. These product costs consisted of the actual expenses of producing the grade concerned, as reflected in the records of the companies for the period covered by the investigation. Where this cost of production did not already incorporate fixed costs, including selling, administrative and other general expenses, a percentage factor corresponding to that used by the company was added to take account of these expenses. This percentage factor appeared reasonable in the light of all the financial data verified during the investigation. A reasonable profit margin was then added to the above costs. In order to ensure that this profit margin reflected each company's performance over a representative period, it was decided to take for this purpose, from the audited sets of accounts presented by the companies, the average operating profit earned over the three most recent financial calendar years leading up to the investigation period.

In view of the extremely restricted proportion of domestic sales mentioned earlier, and since audited accounts did not apportion profits geographically, overall operating profits (and not specifically domestic profits) were taken to constitute the most reasonable basis for the determination of profit margin. It should be noted in this respect that all three companies produced and sold only silicon carbide material, and that the information provided by them indicates that in 1983/84 the profitability on Norwegian domestic sales — where these existed — was in general higher than, or at least equal to, overall profitability.

- (18) There have been extensive contacts over a long period of time with Norwegian exporters, in the form of meetings and exchanges of correspondence, concerning provisional findings. At all stages, these producers have contested the Commission's findings of dumping and injury, and for analogous reasons in all three cases. Their objections to normal value findings are grouped under two main headings. In the first place, they object to constructed values being used to determine normal value at all, as discussed under point 19, below. In the second place, they object to the way in which constructed values have been calculated, as discussed under points 20 to 23.

Norwegian producers' objection to use of constructed values as basis for normal value

- (19) The argument has been advanced by the Norwegian producers that using constructed values, at

least in the present case, is contrary to commercial logic in that it entails imputing a fixed and equal proportion of profit to each product grade, thus denying a producer with cost advantages the opportunity to compete freely, and to set selling prices, with profit margins which differ according to the product grade and to the competitive situation.

In the absence of any verifiable evidence which would have permitted the allocation of profit margins differing according to product grade, the Commission was obliged to allocate costs, as indicated by the companies during the investigation, and profits in a uniform manner on the basis of turnover, which ensured that they were completely absorbed by the sales of the same period.

Norwegian producers' objections to Commission's calculation of constructed values

- (20) The Norwegian producers were informed, prior to the on-the-spot investigation by the Commission's services, that costs would be extensively examined. They collaborated, providing extensive cost and financial accounting data from the companies' internal records and independently audited annual accounts, as well as commercial and technical information. All companies were found to operate management accounting systems which took account of the differing variable costs of the main product categories. Selling and general administrative overheads were in general allocated over all product grades in conformity with each company's practice during the investigation period. As far as both variable and fixed costs are concerned therefore, no objections were raised at that stage by the companies to this form of constructing costs for individual product categories.

When the preliminary results of the investigation were discussed, showing dumping in varying degrees on several of each company's product grades, two main objections to the way constructed values had been calculated were voiced. These objections were put forward, in slightly differing formulations, by all three companies.

- (21) The first objection concerned the profit margins used in establishing the constructed values. The method of calculating these has already been described in point 17. The companies claim that 'a reasonable margin of profit', within the meaning of Article 2 (3) (b) (ii) of Regulation (EEC) No 2176/84, has not been used in determining constructed value.

The basis of this objection appears to be the size of the profit margins found. These were larger than the profit margins attributed to other Norwegian industries for which constructed values had been determined in anti-dumping proceedings in past years. These proceedings, however, involved industries and companies experiencing losses or very reduced profits at the time of the investigation concerned, and for which an accurate profit margin was not available on the basis of the industry's or company's own recent performance. This cannot be said of the present proceeding, however, since the profit margins used are the audited real profits of the companies involved. Moreover, in this case averages of several years' profits were calculated, in order to avoid a possibly unfair determination based on one exceptionally profitable year. Indeed, one of the companies had itself described one of the years included in its average as the worst year for profitability in its history since 1945. The real profits earned, where they exist and can be accurately determined, evidently constitute the most reasonable measure of profitability to use for this purpose — and the one least likely to be unfair or discriminatory.

- (22) The second objection concerned the remaining components of the constructed values: the costs. In general, all three companies pointed out detailed corrections that were necessary to the findings provisionally presented to them and, where these corrections could be justified on the basis of the evidence collected during the investigation, the Commission has modified those findings. However, at the time of the first presentation of preliminary findings, each company also raised the same point: their methods of costing product grades, employed hitherto, were not adequately reflecting technical and commercial realities. They argued that this had been known to the companies for some time, but that the Commission's investigation had accelerated this realization. They requested the time and the opportunity to present new material to the Commission on the basis of revised criteria. The Commission had considerable doubts as to the correctness of such a procedure, but decided to accede to this request and to examine carefully the submissions on their individual merits, without prejudice however to the question of whether such information could validly be taken into consideration in its provisional findings, since it was presented after the conclusion of the on-the-spot investigation.

The new material presented differed in scope and completeness from company to company, but was similar in purpose in all cases. Apart from detailed points relating to the evidence already collected, which have already been mentioned, each Norwe-

gian producer claimed that important changes were necessary in certain costing criteria — justified largely on technical grounds — and that these criteria should be used retroactively to modify the initial investigation findings. Some modifications proposed on this basis were wide ranging — one company claimed to have completely reorganized its costing system as a result — but, quantitatively, the most significant result in all cases was to diminish significantly the costs and therefore the normal values of metallurgical and wiresawing product grades, for which the highest levels of dumping had been preliminary determined. At a later stage in the proceeding one of the companies submitted arguments for the revision of overhead allocation criteria, which would have had in practice a similar result on certain product grades.

- (23) The Commission considers that — despite the extensive arguments and technical explanations put forward — no new facts have been presented by the companies in this field to justify the virtually complete abandonment of the findings made during its investigation. On the other hand, where the supplementary submissions contained new evidence on points of detail which bore an objectively verifiable relationship to the data already checked during the investigation, this was taken into account and findings were appropriately corrected by the Commission. As already explained, the constructed values in Norway were based exclusively on information presented by the companies themselves and verified in relation to accounting and costing systems which had been in everyday use in those companies for a considerable time, and which were in use throughout the investigation period.

One of the companies, before the investigation, drew attention to the fact that, although many grades of silicon carbide are often sold by reference to quality specifications that are defined by agreement with the individual customer concerned, its costing system was designed to reflect actual costs only in terms of broad product categories, which are normally distinguished by differences in chemical composition, colour, grain size, and application. The latter was, however, exactly the basis on which the Commission collected evidence and conducted its investigation. At the same time, this company indicated that its cost reporting was fully integrated into its accounting and management procedures, and this was found to be true also of the remaining Norwegian companies. The importance of the accounting and costing systems in use by the companies at the time of investigation lies not only in the objectively verifiable character of the evidence which they provided but also in their use by management over a long period leading up

to and including that of the investigation. These systems therefore, in addition to recording the companies' results according to the criteria known to management at the time, have provided the framework within which management decisions, including pricing decisions, were taken. It is thus not possible to accept the claims that the Commission should adopt product costs estimated retroactively on the basis of radically revised criteria, in the place of those costs calculated by the normal management accounting procedures in force in the companies prior to, and during, the investigation period. Taking up a different position would imply that, in a case involving constructed values as a basis for normal value, the Commission would be departing from the figures used by the companies in the relevant period.

C. Export Prices

- (24) Export prices were determined on the basis of the prices actually paid or payable for the products sold for export to the Community.

D. Comparison

- (25) In comparing normal value with export prices, the Commission took account, where appropriate, of all differences affecting price comparability where claims of a direct relationship of these differences to the sales under consideration could be satisfactorily demonstrated. This was the case for differences in conditions and terms of sale, such as transport, credit terms, ancillary costs, packing, handling, and agents' commission. Also, where applicable, allowances claimed by interested parties were made for differences in physical characteristics.

All comparisons were made at ex works level.

- (26) A Community importer of the product from the USSR criticized the making of comparisons at the ex works level, based on Article 2 (9) of Regulation (EEC) No 2176/84. The importer in question bought at a price which included the cost of transport over a long distance from the USSR to its premises. Such costs are important in the case of this material, which is of relatively low value in relation to its weight and volume. The Commission is obliged to exclude transport costs from the 'export price' at the Community frontier, if such costs are included in the price paid by the importer.

- (27) The same importer has suggested that the requirement for 'like product', contained in Article 2 (12) of Regulation (EEC) No 2176/84, is not satisfied by the use of Norwegian constructed values as a basis for normal value.

The reasons for this choice have been explained above in points 10 to 14. Moreover, the granting of an allowance for a difference in physical characteristics of the imported product does not by itself demonstrate that a sufficiently similar product has not been chosen for comparison.

E. Dumping margin

- (28) The above preliminary examination of the facts shows the existence of dumping in respect of the People's Republic of China, Norway, Poland and the USSR, the margins of dumping being equal to the amount by which the normal value as established exceeds the price for export to the Community, this dumping margin being expressed as a percentage of the total cif export price to the Community of the product investigated.

- (29) These margins vary according to the importing Member State and the product grade of silicon carbide concerned. The weighted average margins (as defined below in point 30) are as follows for three of the exporting countries concerned:

	EEC overall margin
People's Republic of China	31,5 %
Poland	8,9 %
USSR	23,2 %

In general the above producers exported only one or at most two different product grades of black silicon carbide. The great majority of the quantities imported into the Community from these countries concerned macro grits or the lumps from which such grits can be manufactured, for use in the production of abrasive appliances or in refractory and wiresawing applications. All such imports, with the exception of a very small quantity of abrasive grits from Poland, were dumped.

- (30) In the case of Norway the margins also vary, according to the exporter and to the grade of silicon carbide concerned. As already explained, the three Norwegian companies manufacture a complete range of grades of this material. Although a large number of the grades were undumped, when the dumping margins which had been found by the

Commission (mainly for grades sold in the largest quantities) were aggregated and weighted in relation to total exports to the Community of the grades investigated — without giving credit for the amount by which export prices exceeded normal value in the case of undumped grades — overall margins of dumping were found for each company as follows :

Exporter	EEC overall margin
Arendal Smelteverk A/S	5,1 %
Norton A/S	6,2 %
Orkla Exolon A/S & Co	1,7 %

The overall margins set out, however, do not illustrate what the Commission considers to be an important feature of these findings — namely the concentration of more significant levels of dumping in two particular categories which accounted for some 35 % of the total quantities exported to the EEC by Norway. The dumping margins found on first metallurgical grades (with a minimum SiC content of 85 %) were in fact 40,6 and 14,6 % for the two larger exporters, the smallest of the three exporters not being significantly concerned with exports of this product category during the investigation period; for wiresawing grain mixes the range over all the three exporters was between 8,9 and 5,0 %.

In arriving at the above dumping margins, the Commission did not include in its calculations certain by-products and waste materials. It considers that the data used, relating to these companies' normal product sales and constructed values, provide a representative measure of the overall levels of dumping on exports to the Community.

- (31) One of the Norwegian companies, which stated that it considered itself to be the exporter primarily targetted by the original complaint, claimed that the large disparity between the very high levels of dumping alleged in that complaint and the much more modest overall levels found in the investigation (which it nevertheless strongly contests, for the reasons set out in points 18 to 22), demonstrated the invalidity of the proceeding, which had been opened on the basis of a complaint motivated by commercial considerations and not backed by adequate evidence. The argument was particularly directed towards the indication of dumping contained in the complaint, which compared the domestic price in Norway of a relatively high quality abrasive grade with export prices of much lower level metallurgical material. The Commission could not accept this view: a proceeding is not invalidated simply because it results in showing

certain data contained in the complaint to be incorrect. The investigation is designed precisely to show whether the allegations contained in a complaint are supported in fact. Furthermore, while overall dumping levels may have been found to be modest, this could not be said of certain specific levels.

- (32) For imports originating in Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia no dumping was found. Consequently, the proceeding in respect of these imports should be terminated.

F. Injury

- (33) With regard to the injury caused by the dumped imports, the evidence available to the Commission shows that imports into the Community from the People's Republic of China, Norway, Poland and the USSR of silicon carbide increased from 36 966 tonnes in 1981 to 47 094 tonnes in 1984 (48 051 tonnes in 1985), which represents an increase of 27 % (30 % in 1985). At the same time, Community consumption of this material had returned to a level of 128 348 tonnes in 1984 as against 127 348 tonnes in 1981, having fallen back by 10 and 14 %, respectively, in 1982 and 1983.
- (34) Consequently, the market share held by silicon carbide originating in the countries mentioned under the previous point progressed from 28,8 % in 1981 to 36,9 % in 1984. Over the same period, the market share of Community producers fell from 62,2 % in 1981 to 52,5 % in 1984 as a percentage of Community consumption. The impact of the dumped imports in the loss of sales by Community producers is demonstrated by the fact that, on the basis of consumption figures in the Community for 1981 and 1984, which are practically identical, the increase in the combined market share of the countries mentioned accounts for slightly less than the fall in market share of the Community producers.
- (35) The effect of the lost market share mentioned under the previous point is not completely reflected in the production figures of Community industry. Approximately 100 000 tonnes of silicon carbide products were produced by the four Community producers in 1984, against 103 500 tonnes in 1981 — which already represented a depressed level in comparison with 1980 (115 000 tonnes). No Community producer significantly increased its production during this period while, in the case of the smallest producer, it fell by some 27 %. Capacity utilization also recovered in 1984, to 97 % of the levels of 1981 as a Community average, although remaining low by comparison with 1980, which was the last year of satisfactory — but not full — capacity working for the Commu-

nity industry. No producer in 1984 significantly improved his capacity utilization over the 1981 figure, and one producer remained seriously below it. During the intervening period, it should be noted, production fell to approximately 87 000 tonnes in both 1982 and 1983. While it can be seen that the above figures demonstrate a certain recovery in production in 1984, this appears, on the basis of the evidence available, to be largely related to increased exports from the Community, an ephemeral improvement since much of the additional export volume can be attributed to temporary exchange rate movements.

- (36) Other economic indices referring to the Community producers demonstrate the pressure under which they were placed, largely as a result of dumped imports, during the period 1981 to 1983/84. The number of people permanently employed in the Community industry fell from 1 453 to 1 311 over the same period. Within these totals considerable numbers were involved in part-time working or technical lay-off: whereas in 1980 only 10 employees had been concerned, this total progressed to 528 in 1982 and was 387 in 1983.

In spite of these rationalization efforts, the overall profitability of sales of silicon carbide by the four Community producers diminished sharply. Whereas all these companies had been making profit or were near to break-even point in 1980, three of the companies made losses throughout the period from 1981 to 1983/84, and the profitability of the fourth company had descended to break-even at the end of the period.

While the general situation over all silicon carbide grades was one of diminished, or eliminated, profitability, evidence available concerning a more detailed analysis of certain individual companies' costs and profits, by main product grades, shows that the metallurgical sector of silicon carbide production and sales underwent a much more severe pressure than that indicated by the general figures.

The importance of this sector may be judged from the fact that metallurgical grades account for some 45 % of the total silicon carbide production volume of Community producers. The severity of

the pressure is indicated by the fact that the major Community producers, accounting for two-thirds of Community production, experienced steadily growing losses in this area of activity between 1981 and 1983/84, so that by the end of this period their sales income from metallurgical silicon carbide covered only some 80 % of the total production, selling and administrative costs of this sector. This particular situation is referred to again in points 37 and 38 below.

- (37) The Commission also examined whether the sale in the Community of silicon carbide from those exporters found to be dumping had been made at prices below the prices charged for equivalent qualities and product grades by the Community producers. Two factors concerning such a price comparison should be pointed out beforehand, however.

In the first place, the Commission found evidence that the level of prices in the Community had already undergone considerable depression before the opening of the investigation period. Over several years up to 1983, the selling prices of Community producers had either fallen or had risen much less quickly than their costs. While demand for silicon carbide in the Community stagnated over this period — or receded in certain years — the market share captured by imports from the exporters concerned nevertheless increased rapidly at the expense of the Community producers' share, as described in points 33 and 34. The inadequate levels of Community producers' selling prices were due to low-priced imports, rather than stagnant demand; this is shown by 1. the loss of previously established long-term customers by the Community industry to the exporters, 2. the movements in market share mentioned immediately above, and 3. the other market and economic data summarized in points 35 to 42.

Second, in the case of some non-market economy exporters, the allowances granted for differences in physical characteristics (point 25) were incorporated into the price comparison for injury assessment purposes, so that the gross difference in price actually found on the market — which naturally did not take account of any such allowance — was much larger than the percentages shown below.

Comparing, on this basis, the weighted average resale prices of these imports during the investigation period with the equivalent prices of the Community producers gave the following results. In general, imports from the People's Republic of China were found to undercut local producers' prices by an average of 30 %, imports from Poland by 16 %, and imports from the USSR by 22 %. In the case of Norway, the situation is more complex, due partly to the much wider range of product grades and importing Member States involved, and partly to a particular situation regarding one important market sector. Over a wide range of standard product grades, which included wiresawing grain mixes, but excluded first metallurgical grades, a range of undercutting was found which varied between 0 and 24 %, with an average of 11 %.

In the case of first metallurgical grades, which concerned approximately one-fifth of all Norwegian imports of silicon carbide into the Community during the investigation period (but a much larger proportion of such imports into one of the Member States), undercutting was also found, of 18 % in the case of one Norwegian producer and of 21 to 33 % in the case of one other, in comparison with those Community producers' prices which were relatively unaffected by the price pressure from Norwegian imports; these cases were, for example, where the clients of Community producers had maintained purchase agreements at the price levels of earlier periods, or undertaken purchases on the basis of standard offer prices. (It will be recalled from point 30 that only two of the three Norwegian producers were significantly involved in this particular market sector.)

- (38) One Norwegian producer has argued on price undercutting, with particular reference to this product sector and to the competitive action of one Community producer, that price cutting moves were not initiated by him but merely followed the prices adopted by the Community industry.

Such a claim would be difficult to verify conclusively. The available data shows that, in this product sector, the Community industry has frequently matched the prices of Norwegian imports. The exporter concerned has alleged that this provides proof that his own extensive price cutting has not caused material injury to the Community producers. However, as already described in point 37,

price undercutting by this Norwegian exporter has been found to be practised in this sector, although not in such a generalized manner as in the case of other product grades. The Community producers most committed in this sector have in fact increasingly adapted their pricing levels to those of Norwegian imports in order to avoid being undercut and losing further sales. The injury inflicted in this sector on Community producers is not therefore to be evaluated only on the basis of the price undercutting which could still be observed in the investigation period, but also in relation to the pronounced sectoral losses of Community producers described in point 36. The extent of these losses contradicts the allegation of the Norwegian exporter, since they provide rather a clear measure of the damage suffered by Community industry in seeking to defend its market share against unfairly priced imports.

- (39) A further argument advanced by certain of the Norwegian producers also concerns the profitability of Community producers, whereby it is claimed that an allegation of material injury is not supported by, and is indeed inconsistent with, the financial reports for 1984 of certain companies in the Community. An improvement in the performance of the Community industry in 1984 has already been mentioned in point 35, but neither the official company reports in question, which the Commission has examined, nor the other evidence available to the Commission sustain this argument. The reports are not particularly specific in their comments, and give hardly any quantified information regarding the silicon carbide activities of the companies concerned, which in fact possess significant activities outside this area. In addition, the fact that the reports refer with satisfaction to the evolution in silicon carbide activities in 1984 must be viewed in the light of the losses made by these activities in the immediately preceding years: there is no contradiction here with the remarks already made about profitability — and especially sectoral profitability within the silicon carbide product grades — in point 36. Similarly, arguments put forward by Norwegian industry concerning an important capital investment undertaken by one of the Community producers do not appear to the Commission to cast doubt on claims of injury suffered by that producer, whose investment was made to replace outdated installations with more efficient equipment, rather than to enlarge capacity.

(40) In establishing the impact of the dumped imports on the Community industry the Commission has considered the effect of all dumped imports from all exporting countries and producers concerned. There were wide variations in the market shares of Community consumption held by exporters found to be dumping. Within the total share of 39,6 % mentioned in point 41 below, 30,3 % were held by Norway (24,7 % in 1981), while the remaining four countries accounted together for 9,3 % (5,1 % in 1981). Certain of the exporters argued that the impact of their own exports on the Community should be considered in isolation and judged not to have caused material injury in view of the low and/or decreasing level of their share in this market. In analysing whether cumulation was appropriate in such cases, the Commission took into account the comparability in terms of physical characteristics of the imported products with those produced in the Community, the volumes imported and the level of prices of the imported products compared with that of the competing grades produced in the Community. On the basis of this examination, it concluded that dumped imports from the exporters concerned should be considered as contributing to the material injury suffered by Community industry, and that these imports were made under such conditions that, should the Commission treat any one exporter in isolation, it would be acting in a discriminatory manner against the rest. Therefore, it was decided that dumped imports from all exporters should be cumulated in establishing the injury sustained.

(41) The Commission has examined the possibility of other factors, such as imports from other sources or a continuing downward trend in demand, causing the injury to Community industry. With regard to the former of these alternative or supplementary causes of injury, the information available concerning import volumes is completely at odds with such a possibility since, over the period from 1981 to 1984, while the combined market share of exports of silicon carbide to the Community originating in the People's Republic of China, Norway, Poland, Spain and the USSR progressed from 29,8 to 39,6 %, the share of all other exporters together remained practically constant at 8 %. Thus, the fall in the share of Community consumption held by Community industry may be directly attributed to the increase in imports from the countries named above, without any increase in imports from other exporters.

With regard to the trend of demand, it has already been mentioned in point 31 that overall Community consumption fell in 1982 and 1983, regaining

in 1984 the level of 1981. However, it has been established that, in spite of this fall back in demand, imports of silicon carbide from exporters found to have been dumping increased by 27 %, while Community producers' sales fell by 13 000 tonnes, or 19 %, between 1981 and 1984.

(42) One exporter has cited the failure of the Commission to investigate the affiliate of a Community producer, situated in a third country, which exports significant quantities of silicon carbide to the Community, as a form of procedural discrimination.

The Commission does not share this view. The exporter concerned was not named in the complaint filed by the Community industry, and there was no obligation upon the related Community producer to introduce its affiliate into the proceeding in the absence of allegations of dumping and injury, nor was the Commission obliged to investigate the company concerned in the absence of a substantial complaint. In any case, the Commission normally takes into consideration the possibility that exporters not included in the proceeding may be responsible for injury to Community industry, as it has done in point 41 above. The examination mentioned there of other possible factors in the injury caused has not given any reason to suppose that this affiliate bears any such responsibility.

(43) As already explained in point 8, the findings made with regard to imports into the Community, as it was constituted on 31 December 1985, of silicon carbide from Spain will be dealt with separately. With regard to injury considerations, however, it is only necessary to underline at this stage that, when the effects of these imports are excluded, the injury to Community industry, resulting from the dumped imports from other exporters mentioned in the complaint, remains material.

(44) On the basis of the preceding analysis the Commission preliminarily determined that dumped imports of silicon carbide from the People's Republic of China, Norway, Poland and the USSR have caused material injury to the Community industry concerned. The extent of this injury is to be assessed primarily in terms of the price undercutting, and of the lost profitability, in certain sectors resulting from price depression, during the investigation period, as described in points 36 and 37.

G. Community interest

- (45) The representatives of Community processing industries, and of individual companies, have argued that the introduction of protective measures would not be in the Community interest because it would make them less competitive with imports of final products originating in third countries. These arguments were strongly related to particular market sectors, especially those of foundry briquette manufacture and the lower-priced range of abrasive grinding tools. In the latter case, it was additionally argued that protective measures on silicon carbide abrasive grains would also render such grinding tools less competitive on third country markets, to which many of the companies concerned exported.
- (46) As in the case of any raw material or component, such price increases can be expected to have a certain incidence on the costs of the processing industries, but the extent to which the industries would be harmed depends on how far these cost increases can be transferred to their customers through higher selling prices without loss of sales volume. This may be prevented, for example, by competitive pressure from imported processed products, or by a reduction in consumption on account of the price elasticity of demand in this market sector. However, only one company provided evidence to the Commission as to the specific effect of an increase in the price of silicon carbide on its production costs, and no evidence was given as to the likely effects of increased prices of the processors' products on their total sales. In these circumstances, any evaluation of the possible impact of increases in the price of silicon carbide on the processing industries must remain purely speculative. After carefully weighing the above arguments against the serious difficulties for Community industry which can be directly attributed to the dumping of this material, the Commission has concluded that the taking of action against such dumping is in the Community's interest.

H. Undertakings

- (47) The representatives of the exporters of the People's Republic of China, Norway, Poland and the USSR were informed of the findings of the preliminary investigation and commented on them. Subsequently, they offered satisfactory undertakings, the effects of which are that the import prices to the Community of silicon carbide originating in these countries will eliminate the injury found in the course of the investigation for exports from the People's Republic of China and the USSR, where the margin of injury was lower than the dumping

margins determined, and will eliminate the dumping found in respect of Polish exports. In the case of the Norwegian exporters, the undertakings given will eliminate the margins of dumping or injury, whichever is the lowest, in respect of those product grades for which the Commission's preliminary findings indicate both injury and significant dumping.

In view of the above, and considering that circumstances in the present case make the application of such measures appropriate, the undertakings offered by the exporters mentioned above are considered acceptable and the investigation may, therefore, be terminated without the imposition of anti-dumping duties on material imported from these four countries.

- (48) No objections were raised in the Advisory Committee to accepting the undertakings offered by the People's Republic of China, Norway, Poland and the USSR,

HAS DECIDED AS FOLLOWS:

Article 1

The undertakings offered by the Representation of the China National Machinery and Equipment Import & Export Corporation in Köln, Federal Republic of Germany, by Arendal Smelteverk A/S, Eydehavn, Norway, by Norton A/S, Lillesand, Norway, by Orkla Exolon A/S & Co., Orkanger, Norway, by Inter-Vis, Warsaw, Poland, and by v/o Stankoimport, Moscow, USSR, in connection with the anti-dumping proceeding concerning imports of silicon carbide originating in the People's of China Norway, Poland and the USSR, and falling within sub-heading 28.56 A of the Common Customs Tariff corresponding to NIMEXE code 28.56-10, are hereby accepted.

Article 2

The investigation in connection with the anti-dumping proceeding referred to in Article 1 is hereby terminated.

Article 3

The investigation in connection with the anti-dumping proceeding concerning imports of silicon carbide originating in Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia is hereby terminated.

Done at Brussels, 7 October 1986.

For the Commission

Willy DE CLERCQ

Member of the Commission

COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

THE AGRICULTURAL SITUATION IN THE COMMUNITY

1985 REPORT

Report published in conjunction with the 'Nineteenth General Report on the Activities of the European Communities'

This report is the eleventh published version of the annual Report on the Agricultural Situation in the Community. It contains analyses and statistics on the general situation (economic environment and world market), the factors of production, the structures and situation of the markets in the various agricultural products, the obstacles to the common agricultural market, the position of consumers and producers, and the financial aspects. The general prospects and the market outlook for agricultural products are also dealt with.

439 pp., 11 fig.

Published in: Danish, German, Greek, English, French, Italian and Dutch

Catalogue number: CB-44-85-670-EN-C

ISBN 92-825-5794-4

Price (excluding VAT) in Luxembourg:

ECU 22,28 BFR 1 000 IRL 16 UKL 13.20 USD 19



OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES
L-2985 Luxembourg