

January 2022



ADHYATAN

TPM Newsletter

Issue 1 of 2022

Visit us at: www.tpm.in

Follow us on LinkedIn: [TPM Solicitors & Consultants](#)



| | |
|---|---------|
| The Month in Flashback | 3 |
| Key Highlights | 4 |
| Cover Story: India’s Sugar Subsidies – WTO Panel Decision | 5 |
| Insight: Non-Imposition of Duties – Need for a Speaking Order | 8 |
| Trade Remedies Updates: Trade Remedial Actions in India |10 |
| Trade Remedies Updates: Trade Remedial Actions against India |11 |
| Trade Remedies Updates: Other Trade Remedial Actions |11 |
| Other Trade Updates: Foreign Trade Policy |15 |
| Other Trade Updates: Free Trade Agreement |16 |
| Other Trade Updates: BIS Updates |16 |

Trade Remedial Actions in India

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------|----|
| Number of investigations initiated | | 0 |
| Number of findings issued | | 1 |
| Duties imposed or continued | | 8 |
| Duties recommended but not imposed | | 1 |
| Ongoing anti-dumping investigations | | 30 |
| Ongoing anti-subsidy investigations | | 3 |
| Ongoing safeguard investigations | | 0 |

Other Trade Updates

| | | |
|--|-------|-----|
| Number of non-tariff notifications by India | | 5 |
| Number of non-tariff notifications by others | | 258 |

India

The Ministry of Finance accepted recommendation of DGTR and levied anti-dumping duty on 7 products in December 2021.

The Ministry of Finance has imposed anti-dumping duty on imports of 7 products from various countries, taking into account the recommendations issued by the DGTR. The MoF has imposed anti-dumping duty on products including Decor Paper, Certain Flat Rolled Products of Aluminium, Axle for Trailers in Completely Knock Down and Semi Knock Down Condition, Sodium Hydrosulphite, Calcined Gypsum Powder, Silicone Sealants, Hydrofluorocarbon (HFC) Component R-32 and Hydrofluorocarbon (HFC) Blends.

European Union

European Commission proposes a new tool to counter the use of economic coercion by third countries. (12 Dec)

The European Parliament and Member States raised concerns regarding the practices of certain third countries to coerce the Union or its members to take or withdraw policy measures. The European Commission (“EC”) in order to address such concerns has confirmed to examine a possible instrument which could be adopted in order to dissuade or offset coercive actions by third countries.

With the implementation of anti-coercion instrument, the country which disapproves of a policy adopted or planned by the EU, will be vulnerable to countermeasures. In case a third country, threatens or adopts measures which affect trade or investment with the intention of pressurizing EU Member States, the EU will formally and publicly take determine if such measures by a third country constitute economic coercion. The EU will engage in a direct negotiation / arbitration / mediation with such third country. In case a solution is not found by such negotiations, the countermeasures may be applied after receiving inputs from various stakeholders. The EU will declare a deadline for ceasing such coercion, if the third country continues its measures, the countermeasures may be applied by EU post such deadline. The countermeasures will cease once the third country comes to terms with the EU and coercion stops.

The WTO Agreement on Agriculture was one of the agreements negotiated during the Uruguay Round. As per the provisions of the Agreement, members committed to reduce domestic support measures and export subsidies, and increase market access, over a period. The least developed countries were not required to make any reductions. The products included within the purview of this agreement are those normally considered as part of agriculture, excluding fishery and forestry products as well as rubber, jute, sisal, abaca and coir.

The recent WTO Panel report in *India – Measures Concerning Sugar and Sugarcane (DS579)* has significant implication for domestic support measures concerning agricultural products and export subsidies given by various developing country members of the WTO. In the present dispute, Australia, Brazil and Guatemala (“the complainants”) challenged India’s domestic support to sugarcane producers and export subsidies pertaining to sugar or sugarcane. The domestic support included mandatory minimum prices for sugarcane and non-exempt direct payment and other policies such as Tamil Nadu’s transitional production incentive, Andhra Pradesh’s purchase tax remittance and Karnataka’s incentive price payments. The export subsidies challenged before the Panel were Production Assistance Scheme, Buffer Stock Scheme, Marketing and Transportation Scheme and Duty-Free Import Authorization (DFIA) Scheme.

Issues involved and Findings of the Panel

The WTO Agreement on Agriculture provides that in absence of specific commitment with regards to agricultural support measures, the developing members shall not provide support to agricultural producers in excess of 10% of the total value of production of an agricultural product during a particular year. Article 9 of the Agreement also prohibits direct subsidies contingent on export performance.

The complainants contended primarily that India acted inconsistently with Article 7 because domestic support measures by Indian government exceeded the permitted level of 10% of the total sugarcane production. Further, the complainants contended that various measures by the Indian government constituted prohibited export subsidies. India contended that the complainants failed to prove that Indian market support measures exceeds *de minimis* level of 10% of the total value of sugarcane production and also that India’s Production Assistance Scheme, Buffer Stock Scheme, the Marketing and Transportation Scheme, and the DFIA constitute subsidies. India also contested that the requirements of Article 3 of

Australia, Brazil and Guatemala challenged the domestic support and export subsidies provided by India pertaining to sugar and sugarcane.

The domestic support challenged included mandatory minimum prices for sugarcane, Tamil Nadu’s transitional productive incentive, Andhra Pradesh’s purchase tax remittance, and Karnataka’s incentive price payments.

The export subsidies challenged included Production Assistance Scheme, Buffer Stock Scheme, Marketing and Transportation Scheme and Duty-Free Import Authorization.

The Panel found that India violated a number of requirements of WTO Agreements.

the Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (ASCM) is not yet applicable to India and India has a phase out period of 8 years as per Article 27 of the Agreement to eliminate export subsidies. This phase out period would be considered from the time when India crossed GNP per capita USD 1000 per annum. India claimed that market price support can be said to exist only when the government or its agents pay for or procure the product in question. India argued that the complainants failed to demonstrate the existence of a financial contribution and benefit with respect to all concerned schemes. India also argued that in order to establish existence of an export subsidy under Article 9.1 of the Agreement on Agriculture, it is necessary to demonstrate the actual disbursement of funds. With regards to DFIA scheme, it was pointed out that as per the ASCM, where duties and taxes are exempted or remitted on an exported product, it would not be considered as a subsidy, if the exemption or remission is limited to the duties and taxes levied on the product when consumed in domestic market.

The Panel opined that while calculating aggregate support measurers in terms of the Agreement on Agriculture, all measures are to be included unless the measures are shown to be exempted or otherwise specifically excluded. India had not invoked any exemptions of the Agreement on Agriculture. The Panel also opined that subsidy cannot be limited to government expenditure or revenue foregone. This interpretation was supported with methodology for calculation of market price support and objectives of the Agreement on Agriculture i.e., “to correct and prevent distortion in agricultural market, including through, substantial progressive reductions in agricultural support and protection”.

The Panel, as per the legal standard explained above, concluded following:

- Even where the government had not purchased the concerned agricultural product, it may be considered that the government had provided market price support.
- The Panel found cumulative non-exempt domestic support to sugarcane producers in excess of the permitted level i.e., 10% of the total sugarcane production.
- The Panel concluded that Production Assistance Scheme, Buffer Stock Scheme and Marketing and Transportation Scheme are provided by the government or their agencies to producers of sugarcane (an agricultural product), and constituted subsidies benefitting sugar mills. Such subsidies were found to be contingent on export performance.
- As regards DFIA, the Panel found that India had not demonstrated that there is no excess remission or exemption on

The Panel found that India had provided subsidy in the form of minimum support price, even if the government had not purchased the product.

The Panel also found that the cumulative non-domestic support to sugarcane producers exceeded the permitted level of 10%.

Subsidies such as Production Assistance Scheme, Buffer Stock Scheme and Marketing and Transportation Scheme constituted export subsidies, which are prohibited.

DFIA was also found to be conferring benefit in excess of exemption of duties and taxes levied on domestic sales of the product.

exported product and the benefit was limited to duties and taxes levied on product when sold for consumption in the domestic market.

- Regarding differential treatment of developing countries, the Panel was not persuaded with India's contention that a member graduating from Annex VII i.e., upon crossing GNP per capita of USD 1000 per year, continue to receive same treatment as other developing country members i.e., an eight-year phase out period from not allowing grant of export subsidies. The Panel concluded that eight-year transition period runs from 1st January 1995, i.e., the date of entry into force of the WTO Agreement.

In addition to the above findings, the Panel concluded that these Schemes were subsidies contingent on export performance and were therefore, inconsistent with Article 3 of the SCM Agreement. The Panel has recommended the withdrawal of these subsidies within a period of 120 days.

Conclusion

This dispute was significant, involving certain key domestic measures concerning sugarcane and other export-oriented schemes. This is the second dispute after India – Export Related Measures – DS541 to address the issue of graduation of developing countries under the ASCM and has significant importance considering various developing countries about to graduate i.e., cross the threshold of USD 1000 gross GNP per capita per year in the future. The approach taken by the Panel in both these disputes adversely impact not just India, but also other developing countries which crossed or will cross the threshold at a later point of time. The developing countries which were initially given this relaxation had similar or better economic conditions than the countries graduating now. Not allowing the same time period to countries like India leads to inequitable treatment, as may not have been originally envisaged.

The Panel also found that the period allowed to India for phase out of subsidies as a developing country was over.

The Panel has recommended that India withdraws the export subsidies within a period of 120 days.

This is the second dispute concerning the issue of phase out of export subsidies by developing countries, where the Panel has differed with India's position that it is permitted to maintain subsidies as a developing country.

The Ministry of Finance on 8th December 2021 issued an Office Memorandum stating its decision not to impose anti-dumping duty recommended by the DGTR on imports of Caprolactam from European Union, Korea RP, Russia and Thailand. The DGTR had issued its final findings on 27th September 2021 pursuant to a detailed investigation spanning a period of 12 months. Anti-dumping duties were thereafter recommended to be imposed on imports of Caprolactam in order to remedy the injury caused to the Indian industry due to the dumped goods.

The Office Memorandum (OM) of the Ministry of Finance provides that the Ministry considered the findings and recommendations issued by the DGTR. Nevertheless, the recommendations of the DGTR have not been accepted in light of the “overall public interest”.

However, in the recent judgement of Jubilant Ingrevia Limited vs Union of India and Others, Hon’ble CESTAT set aside the OM issued by the Ministry of Finance which stated the decision of non-imposition of anti-dumping duty on imports of Choline Chloride from China PR, Malaysia and Vietnam, as recommended by the DGTR. The CESTAT, while setting aside the OM, held that the Ministry of Finance was required to record reasons, showing considerations made before reaching a decision, especially where the Ministry of Finance decides not to follow the recommendations made by the DGTR.

Pursuant to the decision of the CESTAT, it is being considered that the Ministry of Finance is required to record a reasoned order or a speaking order clearly providing for the considerations made for arriving at the decision. The OM in question merely indicates that the decision to not impose duty is taken considering the “overall public interest”. The OM does not appear to meet the requirements laid down by the Tribunal, as it does not shed light on the factors examined by the Ministry of Finance to conclude that imposition of anti-dumping duty on Caprolactam would not be in the overall public interest.

On the other hand, the DGTR in its final findings analysed, in detail, the impact of imposition of anti-dumping duty on the larger public interest. The DGTR examined the submissions by the domestic industry as well as all other interested parties. Accordingly, the DGTR concluded that the impact of imposition of duty was very low on the end-users and would only provide a level playing field to the Indian industry, thus enabling them to compete with imports.

In a recent decision, the CESTAT had held that where the Ministry of Finance decided not to impose duties, it was required to record reasons to indicate considerations before reaching the decision. This was especially necessary in a case where the Ministry of Finance decides not to follow the recommendations made by the DGTR.

In a recent case, concerning imports of Caprolactam imported from European Union, Korea RP, Russia and Thailand, the DGTR recommended imposition of duties. However, the Ministry of Finance only indicated that recommendations had not been accepted considering “overall public interest”.

Further, it was noted that the duties would remedy injury caused to the domestic industry and if such industry is wiped out, the users would also suffer. Based on such factors, the DGTR concluded that the imposition of duty would not be against the public interest at large. The decision becomes more relevant considering that one of the companies, in fact, a Central Government Public Sector Undertaking, was out of production for a long period of eight years and had very recently recommenced production.

The OM issued by the Ministry of Finance does not provide sufficient justification for non-imposition of duties. Considering the findings of the CESTAT, it is doubtful that merely stating that non-imposition of duties is in overall public interest would discharge the obligation of issuing a reasoned order, particularly when the Ministry of Finance has decided not to follow the recommendations of the DGTR. Further, the requirement for a reasoned order has been emphasized time and again by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. It has been held that where an order affects the right of a citizen or a person, it is implicit that the principles of natural justice or fair play require recording of germane and precise relevant reasons as part of fair procedure. Therefore, while the decision to not impose duties is within the powers of the Central Government, it must provide reasons for making such determinations. Having regard to such legal position, the approach being taken by the Central Government may not be sustained by the CESTAT. The Indian Industry concerned has 90 days to prefer an appeal before the CESTAT.

Considering that the DGTR had examined the issue of public interest in detail in its finding, the OM issued does not explain why the Ministry of Finance took a different view.

In view of the absence of an adequate speaking order explaining facts considered by the Ministry, such OM may be open to challenge before the CESTAT. An appeal may be filed within 90 days.

Trade Remedial Actions in India

Duties recommended

- Anti-dumping duty on imports of Caustic Soda from Japan, Iran, Qatar and Oman. (16 Dec)

Duties recommended but not imposed

- Anti-dumping duty on imports of Caprolactam from European Union, Korea RP, Russia and Thailand. (08 Dec)

Termination of investigation

- Sunset review investigation on imports of Flexible Slabstock Polyol from Thailand. (30 Dec)

Customs Notifications

- Imposition of anti-dumping duty on imports of Certain Flat Rolled Products of Aluminium from China PR. (06 Dec)
- Extension of anti-dumping duty imposed on imports of Axle for Trailers from China PR to imports of Axle for Trailers in Completely Knock Down and Semi Knock Down Condition from China PR. (13 Nov)
- Imposition of anti-dumping duty on imports of Sodium Hydrosulphite from China PR and Korea RP. (17 Dec)
- Imposition of anti-dumping duty on imports of Calcined Gypsum Powder from Iran, Oman, Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates. (17 Dec)
- Imposition of anti-dumping duty on imports of Hydrofluorocarbon (HFC) Component R-32 from China PR. (21 Dec)
- Imposition of anti-dumping duty on imports of Silicone Sealants from China PR. (21 Dec)
- Imposition of anti-dumping duty on imports of Hydrofluorocarbon (HFC) Blends from China PR. (22 Dec)
- Imposition of anti-dumping duty on imports of Decor Paper from China PR. (27 Dec)

Trade Remedial Actions against India

European Union

Initiation of anti-dumping investigation into imports of Ceramic Tiles from India and Turkey. (13 Dec)

The European Commission initiated an anti-dumping investigation into imports of the subject goods from India and Turkey on receipt of an application from the European Ceramic Tile Manufacturers' Association (CET). In view of large number of exporters, 3 producers from India have been selected as sample by the Commission.

USA

Imposition of anti-dumping duty on imports of Utility Scale Wind Towers from India and Malaysia and anti-subsidy duty on imports of Utility Scale Wind Towers from India (06 Dec)

US DOC has imposed anti-dumping duty on imports of utility scale wind towers from India and Malaysia pursuant to the affirmative final determinations by US DOC and USITC. The US DOC has also imposed anti-subsidy duty on imports of the same product from India. The duties imposed would be equivalent to the dumping margin, that is 54.03% and subsidy margins, as high as 397.70%.

Other Trade Remedial Actions

Argentina

- Initiation of anti-dumping investigation into imports of Nebulizadores from China PR and Taiwan. (03 Dec)
- Continuation of definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of Porcelain Insulators from Brazil, China PR and Colombia. (03 Dec)
- Initiation of sunset review investigation of anti-dumping duty on imports of Radiators from China PR. (03 Dec)
- Imposition of definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of Glass Plates, even with support, for mosaics or similar decorations from Turkey and Thailand. (23 Dec)
- Initiation of anti-dumping investigation into imports of Methacrylate Plates from China PR. (23 Dec)

Australia

- Preliminary affirmative determination issued in anti-dumping and anti-subsidy investigations on imports of Clear Float Glass from Malaysia and UAE. (14 Dec)
- Final determination issued in review investigation of anti-dumping duty on imports of Steel Reinforcing Bars from Korea RP and Spain. (15 Dec)
- Final determination issued in the anti-dumping investigation into imports of Concrete Underlay Film from Malaysia. (15 Dec)
- Final determination issued in exemption inquiry of anti-dumping duty on imports of Hollow Structural Sections from China PR, Korea RP, Malaysia and Taiwan. (16 Dec)
- Final determination issued in exemption inquiry of anti-dumping duty on imports of certain Aluminium Extrusions from China PR, Malaysia, Vietnam. (16 Dec)
- Final determination issued in exemption inquiry of anti-dumping duty on imports of Zinc Coated (Galvanised) Steel from China PR, India, Korea RP, Malaysia Vietnam and Taiwan. (20 Dec)
- Final determination issued in anti-dumping investigation into imports of Aluminium Zinc Coated Steel of a width equal to or greater than 600 millimetres from Korea RP, Taiwan and Vietnam. (29 Dec)

Canada

- CBSA issues affirmative final determination in expiry review of anti-dumping duty on imports of certain Flat Hot-rolled Carbon and Alloy Steel Sheet and Strip. (6 Dec)
- Initiation of expiry review investigation of anti-dumping duty on imports of certain Gypsum Board from USA. (14 Dec)
- Initiation of normal value review of normal value and export price applicable to imports of certain Oil Country Tubular Goods specific to insulated tubing and cavum insulated tubing from China PR. (17 Dec)
- CBSA issues affirmative final determination in the anti-dumping investigation into imports of Oil Country Tubular Goods from Mexico. (22 Dec)

China PR

- Initiation of review investigation of anti-dumping duty on imports of Non-Dispersion Shifted Single-Mode Optical Fibers from Japan and Korea RP. (31 Dec)

European Union

- Initiation of anti-absorption investigation of anti-dumping duty on certain Woven and/or Stitched Glass Fibre Fabrics from Egypt. (01 Dec)
- Initiation of anti-circumvention investigation of anti-dumping duty on imports of certain Woven and/or Stitched Glass Fibre Fabrics from China PR and Egypt consigned from Turkey. (15 Dec)

European Union (Contd.)

- Imposition of anti-dumping duty on imports of certain Utility Scale Steel Wind Towers from China PR. (16 Dec)
- Initiation of review investigation of safeguard duty on imports of certain Steel Products. (17 Dec)
- Imposition of definitive anti-dumping and anti-subsidy duties on imports of Aluminium Converter Foil from China PR. (22 Dec)

Eurasian Economic Union

- Continuation of anti-dumping duty on imports of Melamine from China PR. (14 Dec)

Mexico

- Initiation of anti-dumping investigation into imports of High Carbon Ferromanganese from Korea RP. (01 Dec)
- Continuation of anti-subsidy duty on imports of Iron or No-Alloy Steel Wire Rod originating in Ukraine regardless of the country of origin. (10 Dec)
- Extension of anti-subsidy duty on imports of Seamless Steel Pipe from Japan. (13 Dec)

Malaysia

- Final affirmative determination issued in anti-dumping investigation into imports of Stranded Steel Wire for Prestressing Concrete from China PR. (23 Dec)

Turkey

- Initiation of anti-dumping investigation into imports of Hinges and other similar articles from China PR. (17 Dec)

Ukraine

- Termination of anti-dumping investigation on imports of Aluminium Ladders from Belarus, China PR, Poland and Slovak Republic. (08 Dec)
- Imposition of anti-dumping duty on imports of Thermal Insulation Materials from Belarus and Russia. (08 Dec)
- Imposition of anti-dumping duty on imports of Particle Board from Belarus and Russia. (24 Dec)
- Continuation of anti-dumping duty on imports of Fibreboard of wet production method from Russia. (24 Dec)
- Imposition of anti-dumping duty into imports of Plywood from Belarus. (24 Dec)
- Initiation of anti-dumping investigation into imports of Glass Containers from Belarus. (29 Dec)

USA

- Initiation of sunset review of anti-dumping duty on imports of Carbon and Alloy Steel Cut-to Length Plates from Austria, Belgium, Brazil, China PR, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Korea, South Africa, Taiwan and Turkey and anti-subsidy duty on imports from China PR. (01 Dec)
- Initiation of sunset review of anti-dumping and anti-subsidy duty on imports of Coated Paper suitable for high-quality print graphic using sheet-fed presses from China PR and Indonesia. (01 Dec)
- Initiation of sunset review of anti-dumping duty on imports of Heavy Forged Hand Tools, with or without handles from China PR. (01 Dec)
- Initiation of sunset review of anti-dumping duty on imports of Iron Construction Castings from Brazil, Canada and China PR and anti-subsidy duty on imports from Brazil. (01 Dec)
- Initiation of sunset review of anti-dumping duty on imports of Stainless Steel Plates in Coils from Belgium, South Africa, Taiwan and anti-subsidy duty on imports from South Africa. (01 Dec)
- DOC issues affirmative final determination in the expedited sunset review of anti-subsidy duty on imports of Narrow Woven Ribbons with Woven Selvedge from China PR. (03 Dec)
- DOC issues affirmative preliminary determination in the anti-subsidy investigation into imports of Urea Ammonium Nitrate Solutions from Russia and Trinidad and Tobago. (03 Dec)
- DOC issues affirmative final determination in the sunset review of anti-subsidy duty on imports of Heavy Walled Rectangular Welded Carbon Steel Pipes and Tubes from Turkey. (06 Dec)
- Continuation of anti-dumping duty on imports of Potassium Permanganate from China PR. (09 Dec)
- Imposition of anti-subsidy duty on imports of certain Mobil Access Equipment and Subassemblies thereof from China PR. (10 Dec)
- Imposition of anti-dumping duty on imports of Polyester Textured Yarn from Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand and Vietnam. (14 Dec)
- DOC issues affirmative final determination in the anti-circumvention investigation of anti-dumping and anti-subsidy duty on imports of Uncoated Paper from Brazil, China PR and Indonesia by Uncoated Paper Rolls from Brazil, China PR and Indonesia. (14 Dec)
- Revocation of anti-dumping duty in imports of certain Off-Grid Small Portable Crystalline Silicon Photovoltaic Panels from China PR. (17 Dec)
- DOC issues affirmative final determination in the expedited sunset review of anti-dumping duty on imports of certain Hot-rolled Flat-rolled Carbon-Quality Steel Products from Russia. (22 Dec)

Foreign Trade Policy

Enlistment under Appendix 2E to issue Certificate of Origin (08 Dec)

The DGFT has authorised two more agencies listed under Appendix 2E of FTP 2015-20 to issue Certificate of Origin (Non-Preferential) (CoO NP) with effect from 1st November 2021.

- Powerloom Development & Export Promotion Council (PDEXCIL)
- Vadodara Chamber of Commerce & Industry (VCCI)

Amendment in the Handbook of Procedure (31 Dec)

The last date for submitting online applications for the following schemes stands revised to 31st January 2022:

- MEIS
 - Exports made between 1st July 2018 to 31st March 2019, with late cut of 10%;
 - Exports made between 1st April 2019 to 31st December 2020, with late cut of 5%;
- SEIS for services exported between 1st April 2018 to 31st March 2020, with late cut of 5%;
- 2% additional ad hoc incentive under para 3.25 of the FTP for exports between 1st January 2020 to 31st March 2022, with no late cut;
- ROSCTL for exports between 7th March 2018 to 31st December 2020 with no late cut;
- ROSL for exports upto 6th March 2019, for which claims have not been disbursed under scrip mechanism with no late cut.

Manual Application for Export Obligation Discharge Certificate or Closure under Advance Authorization (“AA”) Scheme (31 Dec)

An option to file manual/physical applications for Export Obligation Discharge Certificate, which has been issued prior to 1st December 2020, has been extended after concerns were raised about the difficulty in the filing process. For such applications, Regional Authorities have to upload closure letters in the online system, after approval of the physical files, and update the status of the AA suitably.

Free Trade Agreement

Trade deal between India and UAE has been finalized

Bilateral trade agreement negotiations between India and UAE have been completed and PM Narendra Modi is expected to make an announcement during his visit to the West Asian country in 2022. The trade between India and the Gulf countries is expected to receive a boost with this move.

Free Trade Agreement talks between India and UK to begin in early 2022

India and UK are set to begin formal negotiations for a free trade agreement (FTA) early next year as both sides have continued their engagement since forming the working groups in October.

India and Taiwan have begun talks on a Free Trade Agreement

India and Taiwan have started talks for a free trade pact and have also discussed the creation of a semiconductor manufacturing hub in India as an effort to cater the growing demand for the chips needed for products like cellphones and cars.

India and Australia are expected to conclude talks on an interim FTA soon

Australia and India are set to conclude negotiations for an interim free trade agreement soon. Both nations are expected to complete the Comprehensive Economic Cooperation Agreement (CECA), by the end of 2022.

India to conclude Free Trade Agreement with Israel by June 2022

Israel Ambassador Naor Gilon confirmed that the free trade agreement (FTA) between India and Israel will be concluded by June of 2022.

Bureau of Indian Standards

Introduction of Quality Control Order (29 Nov)

- Quality Control Order concerning Methylene Chloride (Dichloromethane) has been amended and will come into force on the 20th May 2022.
- Quality Control Order concerning Ortho Phosphoric Acid has been amended and will come into force on the 10th June 2022.

Establishment of Standards (01 Dec)

The following standards have been established on 26th November 2021.

- Textile-Quantitative Chemical Analysis (IS 9068 : 2021/ISO 1833-1:2020)
- Stainless Steel Decking Plates for Cane Mud Filters (IS 13929 :2021)

Introduction of Quality Control Order (08 Dec)

- Quality Control Order concerning Air Conditioner and its related Parts, Hermetic Compressors and Temperature Sensing Controls has been amended and will come into force from 8th December 2021.

Amendment in Quality Control Order (22 Dec)

- Quality Control Order concerning Refrigerating Appliances has been amended and will come into force from 22nd December,2021.

Establishment of Standards (22 Dec)

The following Standards will come into force on 30th May 2022:

- Vinyl Acetate Monomer (ISI 12345:1988)
- Methyl Acrylate (IS 14707:1999)
- Ethyl Acrylate (IS 14708:1999)

Amendment in Quality Control Order (24 Dec)

- Quality Control Order concerning Bicycles - Retro Reflective Devices has been amended and will come into force from 24th December 2021.

About Us

TPM was founded in 1999 at a time when the practice of trade remedies in India was in its infancy and there were only a handful of firms in the field. While other firms added these services to their existing portfolios, TPM dealt exclusively in cases in the domain of trade remedies.

TPM began its journey with a staff of merely 2 professionals. Today, it has a team of more than 40 professionals including Cost Accountants, Chartered Accountants, Company Secretaries, Lawyers, Engineers and MBAs.

From the beginning, TPM was focused on providing consultancy in the field of trade remedies. TPM helps domestic producers suffering due to cheap and unfair imports into India to avail the necessary protection under the umbrella of the WTO Agreements. TPM has also assisted the domestic producers in other countries to avail similar measures in their respective countries. Besides assisting domestic producers in India and other countries, TPM also assists exporters and importers facing trade remedial investigations in India or other countries. TPM has assisted Indian exporters facing investigations in a number of jurisdictions such as Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Egypt, European Union, GCC, Indonesia, Korea RP, Turkey and USA.

TPM has an enviable experience in the field, of more than 700 cases. Its unique experience in the field sets it apart from other firms. While the firm is primarily dedicated to trade remedies, it also provides services in the field of trade policy, non-tariff barriers, competition law, trade compliance, indirect taxation, trade monitoring and analysis. It also represents industries before the Government in matters involving customs policy.

TPM Consultants

Ish Kriti, J-209, Saket, New Delhi – 17



[011 – 4989 2200](tel:011-49892200)



info@tpm.in



www.tpm.in



[TPM Solicitors
& Consultants](#)

Disclaimer: The information contained in this document is intended for informational purposes only and does not constitute legal opinion or advice. This document is not intended to address the circumstances of any particular individual or corporate body. Readers should not act on the information provided herein without appropriate professional advice after a thorough examination of the facts and circumstances of a particular situation. There can be no assurance that the judicial/quasi judicial authorities may not take a position contrary to the views mentioned herein. Unless stated otherwise, TPM does not grant the copyright for the information provided. All pictures copyright to their respective owner(s). TPM does not claim ownership of any of the pictures displayed in the document unless stated otherwise.