

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

TAB 30

European Commission > EU and the world > External Trade



WHAT WE DO

TRADE ISSUES

CENTRE

HOME

Site map

Contact

Register

Search

Print Page

Important legal notice



Respecting the Rules

TRADE POLICY INSTRUMENTS

UPDATED 02-06

Overview - Legislation, reports and texts - Ongoing WTO negotiations - Refunds - Complaints

> EU & WTO

> EU AND GLOBAL TRADE

> SECTORAL ISSUES

> BILATERAL TRADE RELATIONS

> RESPECTING THE RULES

- Dispute settlement
- Trade Barriers Regulation
- **Anti-dumping**
- Anti-subsidy
- Safeguards
- Injurious Pricing Instrument
- TDI-Enlargement
- TDI-Small & Medium-sized Enterprises
- Monitoring of third country commercial Defence Actions

Anti-dumping

Anti-dumping investigation on Chinese and Vietnamese Footwear: questions and answers

Brussels, 23 February 2006



What is anti-dumping?

What is dumping?

Dumping is the sale of a product for export at less than its normal value (i.e.: profitable domestic sales prices or cost of manufacture plus a small allowance for selling, general and administrative costs and profit margin) in the market where it is produced. Dumping can happen for a range of reasons:

- It can be maintained as a short-term predatory pricing strategy by exporters designed to put competitors in an export market out of business.
- It can be the result of market intervention or state subsidy of a company's production that enables it to artificially lower the cost of export.

Predatory pricing of this kind is illegal under WTO rules if it harms producers in the export market. Of course, dumping also harms exporters in third countries, who are unable to compete with artificially cheap exports from the dumping country.

States are entitled to use WTO anti-dumping rules to ensure that predatory pricing does not unfairly harm their domestic producers. Proportionate to the size of its economy, the European Union is a very moderate user of anti-dumping measures, initiating less cases, and imposing less measures, than most other major economies including the US, India. China is also a big user of anti-dumping measures.

How is an anti-dumping investigation launched?

The European Commission undertakes investigations into complaints of dumping filed by European industry. To initiate an investigation, a credible complaint has to be received from producers representing 25% or more of European production of the product in question. Investigations last between 12 and 15 months. EU investigators collect economic and commercial data through questionnaires and on-site investigations.

A dumping investigation investigates three things: 1) if dumping is taking place; 2) if injury is being caused to European producers competing against dumped imports and 3) if acting to remove that injury is in wider European economic interests.

How do you know if dumping is taking place?

It is only possible to categorically identify dumping by undertaking a detailed analysis of the conditions in which exports are produced.

Reducing market share for European producers is not, in itself, evidence of dumping. European companies face tough competition from exports and in some sectors this competition has reduced EU producer's share of the EU domestic markets. Some EU

producers have relocated production outside of Europe and their share of the EU market now appears as imports rather than domestic production. So reduction in market share alone is not evidence of dumping.

Rising imports are not, in themselves, evidence of dumping. Competitive exporters are consistently seeking to raise their exports to Europe. Imports of both textiles and shoes to the European Union from China have surged since 1 January 2005 when quotas on these imports were lifted and importers were able to place new orders with highly competitive producers there. Although this shift in production and the fall in unit prices that such new economies of scale for exporters can bring can be unnerving for European producers they do not necessarily represent unfair trade, and they alone are not evidence of dumping.

The clearest prima facie evidence of dumping is usually a drop in export unit prices for the product in question sold to the Community when compared to equivalent costs elsewhere - although this can be simply the result of technological innovation or industry rationalisation. A drop in export unit prices of this kind will often produce a rise in export/import volumes as importers move to the cheapest producer in the market - which is why dumping is usually associated with rising import volumes. So a fall in unit prices for exports are not in itself evidence of dumping.

Only an investigation of the conditions of production of an exported product can produce unequivocal evidence that it is being exported below normal value.

Are anti-dumping measures "protectionism"?

No. Acting to limit the damaging effects of dumping is not protectionism - dumping is contrary to any understanding of what constitutes fair trade. Anti-dumping measures use a tariff to raise the price of illegally under-priced imports to better reflect their actual value.

The "lesser duty" rule used in Europe (but not, for example, in the United States) means that our measures either:

- close the margin of dumping, which is the difference between the export price of the dumped product and its true value **or**;
- close the margin of injury, which is the difference between the export price of the dumped item and the sales price for the equivalent EU product, **whichever is less**.

This means that an anti-dumping duty can still leave an imported product cheaper than the equivalent EU product, and it ensures that anti-dumping measures cannot be used to make imports more expensive than the equivalent EU product.

Anti-dumping measures counter the effect of illegal under-pricing through state subsidy or predatory commercial practice; **they do not shield European producers from tough but legitimate competition**. Anti-dumping measures do not take the form of quantitative restrictions or import quotas, there is no ban on the goods in question and **no limit to their export to Europe**.

Anti-dumping measures will not save uncompetitive European producers - but they will create a market in which comparative advantage is exercised fairly.

But don't consumers benefit from cheap imports - however they are produced?

This is in many cases true - although if aggressive pricing eliminates meaningful competition and prices are then raised again the benefits can be short-lived. European rules on anti-dumping require that the Commission must weight the potential costs to consumers, importers and retailers in acting to address dumping. If the costs imposed elsewhere in the European economy by raising the price of under-priced imports are greater than the loss to the European economy through unfair pricing, the Commission has the option of not acting.

It is worth noting that we do not usually regard consumers as being entitled to enjoy cheap goods by any means - for example, most people think cheaper goods do not justify tolerance of abusive labour standards or damagingly weak environmental standards. Dumping is illegal in international trade law and is often based on state intervention in free and fair competition. The extent to which we are willing to tolerate it is a decision that needs to be weighed very carefully indeed.

Don't developing countries like China and Vietnam have a right to use state intervention to build up infant industries to enable them to compete on the world

market?

Developing countries do need to be given room to nurture infant industry. This is a principle that the European Union has put at the heart of its negotiating position in the Doha Round of WTO negotiations. However, the Chinese and Vietnamese footwear industries are now massive, highly competitive industries with global reach. Moreover, they are entirely capable of retaining their extraordinary competitiveness without exporting at dumped prices.

The Anti-dumping investigation on Chinese and Vietnamese leather footwear**How did you select the representative sample of Chinese and Vietnamese companies for the investigation?**

The rules for carrying out an anti-dumping investigation are set out in the 1994 WTO Anti-Dumping Agreement. These rules are transposed into EU law.

It is of course not possible to investigate all companies subject to a complaint related to an economy the size of China. WTO rules require that in these circumstances the investigation treat a "statistically valid" sample of companies. The companies investigated in China by the European Commission represent approximately 15% of the Chinese footwear production sector.

- Most of the companies investigated in the sample were nominated by the Chinese and Vietnamese governments for the purpose of the investigation.
- EU investigators worked closely with Chinese and Vietnamese governments and travelled to both countries to offer technical assistance before the actual investigation started- highly unusual in an anti-dumping investigation.

You denied Market Economy Status (MES) to all of the companies in both the Chinese and Vietnamese sample - why?

Although the companies were designated by the Chinese and Vietnamese governments as model producers the Commission was not able to confirm that any of the companies sampled were operating in market economy conditions. In all cases there was clear evidence of state intervention or non-standard accounting practice. It is clear that these conditions have obtained in China and Vietnam for some time.

These conditions included:

- Non-commercial loans or capital grants from the state;
- Restrictions on selling on the Chinese domestic market - for example, production licenses granted only for the manufacture of products for export;
- Non-enforcement of international accounting standards;
- Improper evaluation of assets;
- Non-commercial conditions for land-use: it is not possible to own land in China, but EU investigators found clear evidence of factories being provided with land by the state rent-free;
- Other forms of state intervention: all the Chinese and Vietnamese companies were not able to show that "in fact and in law" they are free from unfair state intervention.

It has been suggested that the non-granting of MES makes a finding of dumping inevitable. This is not true. The decision means only that a third and analogous country, is used to determine sales and cost data that cannot reliably be determined in the country under investigation itself. It does not in any way imply that a finding of dumping is inevitable.

How does the "analogue country" procedure work?

The rules for the analogue country procedure are set out in the 1994 WTO Anti-dumping Agreement. An investigation that is not able to gather credible data from a non-market economy is required to use a country in which the general capacity of production closely approximates that of the investigated country. The intention is to allow investigators to model the costs of production in the exporter country **as if that country operated on market economy conditions.**

Most importantly, the intention is **not** to choose a country that recreates the conditions of production in the investigated country **because by definition those conditions are not known, or have been distorted by the fact that market economy conditions do not operate**. The analogue country allows investigators to model what those costs might be if market economy conditions prevailed.

In this investigation Brazil has been used because its footwear sector, production range and export capacity is of analogous size to that of China and Vietnam.

Where we are able to determine undistorted costs in China and Vietnam the European Commission has adjusted its analogue model accordingly.

For example: Brazilian shoemakers use leather of much lower quality than Chinese producers who produce for export to Europe. Because Chinese producers import the great majority of this leather (often from Europe) it is possible to accurately assess its part in production costs.

You excluded Special Technology Advanced Footwear (STAF) leather shoes and children's shoes from the investigation - why?


STAF leather shoes are leather sports shoes with high-technology moulded or shock-absorbing soles. They were excluded from the investigation because they are not produced in Europe in sufficient quantity to qualify as potentially harmed by dumping. Young children need three to four pairs of new shoes a year. The burden of a duty is potentially greater on children shoes because the price is lower. Moreover, parents should not see hurdles put in the way to them buying good quality shoes for their children. Although the Commission believes measures will not lead to significant price rises for consumers it will not recommend imposing these costs on families with children at this stage.

Did the European Commission investigation find dumping?

Yes. As a result of the state intervention in leather footwear production in China and Vietnam European Commission investigators have shown that leather footwear is being dumped on the European market. The investigations suggest that Chinese leather footwear is being sold in Europe at about 80% of its normal value, and Vietnamese shoes are being sold at about 50% of their normal value.

Can you show that dumping of Chinese and Vietnamese leather footwear is causing serious injury to EU producers?

Yes. EU production of leather footwear has fallen by 30% since 2001, accompanied by a steady fall in import prices and a tripling in imports for leather shoes from China and Vietnam over the same period. Before 2001 European leather footwear production was falling at about 13% a year. Profit margins in the European footwear industry since 2001 have fluctuated between 0-2%, and this figure represents the successful companies: more than 40000 jobs have been lost in the EU footwear sector since 2001 and more than 1000 footwear companies have closed.



Macro trends in leather footwear import prices 2001-2005 (2001=100)

European Commission investigators now have evidence that Chinese and Vietnamese exporters have been dumping leather footwear on the European market for this period. Until 2005 imports were restricted by quotas which made competition with dumped products possible, despite a serious fall in production, reinvestment, employment and a rise in foreclosure. With the ending of the quota system there is clear evidence that European producers have suffered serious injury from illegally under-priced imports.


This is **not** to argue that the competitive pressure on EU producers of footwear is related solely to dumped goods. EU leather footwear production is adapting to changes in global production and competition. But there is clear evidence that illegally under-priced exports from China and Vietnam have exacerbated these intense competitive pressures.

Have you assessed the wider impact of measures on the European economy?

Yes; the Commission is legally bound to do so. Because a duty on imports can raise costs "downstream" for importers, retailers and consumers to Commission is required to ensure that measures are proportionate and reflect the wider European interest. In this case, on balance, the evidence suggests that limited action is in the European economic interest.

What would the impact of measures be on importers and consumers?

The average import price for footwear subject to this investigation is about 8.5 euros. The average retail price is about 35 euros, although shoes in this category can retail for much more. At the average retail price an anti-dumping duty represents about 7% of the average sale price. If the burden of the duty is equally shared by all intermediaries in the supply chain, the cost of a pair of 35 euro shoes would rise by less than a euro.



EU footwear market

For every 100 pairs of shoes bought by Europeans, 35 are leather footwear. About nine in every hundred pairs will be subject to measures. The element of the duty that is passed on through the supply chain to retailers can be offset against products not subject to anti-dumping measures or other costs. Again, anything but the smallest rises in prices for consumers is unlikely.

Since 2001 average import prices for the kinds of shoes subject to this investigation have fallen by about 28%, but consumer prices have stayed stable or actually risen slightly. This suggests that retailers have some margin to absorb the additional cost of an anti-dumping duty.

Chinese textiles and now Chinese shoes?

This is an entirely misleading comparison. The textile issue concerned fairly traded textile imports, albeit subject to a dramatic and sudden increase in volume following the lifting of quotas on Chinese textiles on 1 January 2005. The European Union addressed the problem with the Chinese through a mutually agreed transition period of quantitative restrictions that provided a short adjustment period for European producers and annually-increasing quotas for exports from China leading to full liberalisation in 2008. The European Commission never suggested that Chinese textile exports were unfair or traded illegally. It acted with the Chinese to cushion the impact of a massive shift in global trading patterns in textiles.

In the case of footwear, the allegation is that goods are being traded in a way that is both unfair and illegal under World Trade Organization rules. The European Commission has a legal obligation to investigate such a claim and a legal right to protect European producers against such practice.

▲ [Back to top](#)

Peter Mandelson

EU Trade Commissioner

**Statement to the Press:
Anti-dumping investigation into
Chinese and Vietnamese leather shoes**

*Check Against Delivery
Seul le texte prononcé fait foi
Es gilt das gesprochene Wort*

Press Room

Brussels, 23 February 2006

Recommendation to Member States

This is the first phase of the European Commission's investigation into allegations of dumping of leather footwear on the European market by China and Vietnam.

There is compelling evidence of serious state intervention on a large and strategic industrial scale in the footwear sector in China and Vietnam. Along with wide evidence of substantially flawed accounting practice, we have found clear evidence of non-commercial loans or capital grants from the state to producers; improper evaluation of assets; non-commercial rates for land-use and important tax breaks for exports.

These disguised subsidies allow Chinese and Vietnamese producers to export leather shoes to Europe at below the true cost of production in their own countries.

Natural comparative advantage is being topped up with anti-competitive behaviour.

This state-supported dumping is causing serious injury to European industry. The contraction of European production mirrors closely the rise in under-priced imports from China and Vietnam. I cannot curb these imports or block their rise. I can, however, remedy the injury of below-cost pricing.

I am recommending to Member States and to my Commission colleagues that a provisional anti-dumping duty of 19.4% for China and 16.8% for Vietnam be introduced.

This recommendation reflects my judgement of the Community's overall economic interest.

I am recommending to Member States that children's shoes and high-tech sports shoes be excluded from the provisional measures I am announcing today. A duty on children shoes would disproportionately affect families with young children and, in my view, would not be in the public interest. For sport shoes, our investigation suggests that there is no longer sufficient production of these shoes in Europe for injury to have been caused.

I am also mindful of the interests of retailers who, prior to my announcement, will have bought and placed goods in transit. I am therefore taking the unprecedented step of recommending that this duty be phased in over a period of six months, beginning at about 4%, not immediately, but in April. The full duty will be in place before the end of the 6 month period for these provisional measures and the damaging effects of dumping will be counteracted. This is a balanced solution.

During this preliminary phase I am launching immediate discussions with both China and Vietnam to encourage them to rectify this unfair trade in footwear. I have spoken to Vietnamese and Chinese Ministers this morning. I welcome their willingness to address the findings of our investigations and to engage constructively in talks.

I can also announce today that on the basis of analysis by the Commission services, I will be recommending to Member States that in the case of allegations of dumping of safety shoes from India and China no provisional measures will be imposed. That investigation will continue but no immediate action will be taken.

Defence against unfair trade is specifically sanctioned by the WTO. I do not use trade defence instruments lightly or casually. On the other hand, it would be irresponsible to ignore clear evidence when this is presented. I will continue to act on this basis and with a strict application of the rules.

Consumer interests

Addressing unacceptable trade practice has been criticised in the strongest possible language by some in the retail sector. They have threatened to pass the costs of any duty on to the consumer using alarmist and speculative language in some cases.

Moreover, there is clear evidence that although leather footwear import prices to the EU over the last five years have fallen by more than 20% consumer prices have remained stable and even risen slightly. Let's be clear what's involved.

Let's be clear. A duty would be just over 1.5 euro on average wholesale prices of 8.5 euro. These shoes sell for between 40-100 euro. The idea that this duty will lead to a consumer price rise of 20% is totally fanciful. I hope importers will retain a sense of proportion in their further comment; not least as I am bending over backwards to cushion the impact of my action on them.

But here is the critical point. Imposing a duty on dumped goods is not a question of asking consumers to subsidise uncompetitive European producers. European leather shoe producers are being asked to bear the costs of unacceptable trade practice.

And, of course, it would appear that the savings from importing dumped goods are not always being passed on to consumers, which suggests an adequate margin of comfort for importers and retailers to adjust to the duty being introduced.

This is not protectionism

I do not accept that acting to limit the damaging effects of this dumping is protectionism. Indeed, my view is that free trade suffers when unfair trade is allowed to flourish.

Europe's 'lesser duty' anti-dumping rule clearly ensures that anti-dumping measures cannot be used to make imports more expensive than the equivalent EU product – and they can and often do leave the competing export much cheaper than the European equivalent.

We are not targeting China or Vietnam's natural advantage. We are targeting their anti-competitive behaviour.

I need to be crystal clear: anti-dumping measures will not take the form of quantitative restrictions or import quotas. There is no ban on the goods in question and no limit to their export to Europe. We are not closing the door to fairly exported Chinese and Vietnamese goods. In fact that door is open wide.

For those who might be tempted to suggest that Europe is seeking to use its trade defence instruments to block Chinese trade - I would simply point out, that even when this case is included the share of EU-China trade affected by anti-dumping investigations or measures is still less than 2%. 2% of a rapidly growing exports growth by China.

Shoes are not textiles

I do not accept any comparison with textile imports from China. The textile issue concerned fairly traded textile imports, albeit subject to a dramatic and disproportionate increase in volume following the lifting of quotas on Chinese textiles on 1 January 2005.

We addressed this problem, not by triggering a trade war with China but, on the contrary, through a period of restricted growth providing a short adjustment period for European producers leading to full liberalisation in 2008.

I acted with the Chinese to cushion the impact of a massive shift in global trading patterns in textiles. In two years that cushion will be gone.

In the case of leather footwear, the allegation is that goods are being traded in a way that is both unfair and unacceptable under World Trade Organization rules. The European Commission has a legal obligation to investigate such a claim and a legal right to protect European producers against such practice.

Even so, This case concerns about nine out of every 100 pairs of shoes bought by European consumers – a fraction of the product range. It should be seen in this perspective.

Let me add that I remain strongly committed to developing the two way trade and investment relationship between Europe and China, and with other Asian markets including Vietnam.

There is no greater prize for European trade policy in the coming years than the prize of getting these relationships right.

I believe Europe must respect and adjust to the natural advantages these economies have; shifting our own focus to sectors and products where our own skills and technologies give us the edge. This is how trade grows: and that is how Europe's economies have grown over centuries.

But China has a key role to play in her own successful integration into the world trading system. China has responsibilities fully to embrace the rules, to avoid breaches of intellectual property rights, and to open her markets to external produce. This way, China will flourish through free not unfair trade and I will continue to welcome this.

Inevitably frictions and disputes will arise in our relationship. I am committed wherever possible to try to reduce them through dialogue and cooperation. That is true in the case of shoes: but until a solution is reached, action is needed to make sure that the rules of fair trade are fully upheld.

IP/06/364

Brussels, 23 March 2006

Commission adopts provisional anti-dumping measures on Chinese and Vietnamese leather shoes

The European Commission has today adopted proposals by the European Trade Commissioner Peter Mandelson to impose a provisional anti-dumping duty on leather shoes from China and Vietnam. The measures follow a preliminary Commission investigation that has identified clear evidence of disguised subsidies and unfair state intervention to the leather footwear sector in China and Vietnam. The Trade Commissioner today firmly reiterated his willingness to work with the Vietnamese and Chinese governments to address the questions of competitive distortions raised by the Commission's investigation.

EU Trade Commissioner Peter Mandelson said: "These anti-dumping measures will correct the injury caused to European leather shoe producers. It is important that we act against unfair trade while encouraging legitimate and competitive from emerging economies. We do not target China and Vietnam's natural competitive advantages, only unfair distortions of trade."

In order to minimise any sudden impact on imports, the duties will be imposed progressively over a period of five months, beginning on April 7. They will rise to 16.8% for leather shoes from Vietnam and 19.4% for leather shoes from China - a duty sufficient to correct the injury caused to European producers by dumping. The provisional measures exclude children's leather shoes so as to ensure that even the small price rises are not passed on to poorer families. Special Technology Advanced Footwear will also be excluded from the measures because there is not sufficient production of these shoes in Europe for injury to have occurred. A monitoring mechanism will be created to ensure that importers do not use these excluded categories to circumvent the duties.

Four things you need to know about the Commission's provisional anti-dumping measures on leather shoes from China and Vietnam:

The confront unfair trade practice, not China and Vietnam's natural comparative advantage. Although the EU investigation was undertaken in factories jointly agreed with the Vietnamese and Chinese governments, EU investigators found clear evidence of serious state intervention in the leather footwear sector in China and Vietnam – cheap finance, tax holidays, non-market land rents, improper asset valuation and export incentives. There is dumping flowing from this state subsidisation. Legitimate low-cost comparative advantages common in developing countries are being topped up in this case with uncompetitive behaviour. The Commission will not act to protect European producers against tough but fair competition. It has a legal duty to act to limit the effects of unfair trade.

Because of our lesser duty principle, Europe's anti-dumping rules clearly ensure that anti-dumping measures cannot be used to make imports more expensive than the equivalent EU product. EU duties either close the margin of dumping, which is the difference between the export price of the dumped product and its true value or close the margin of injury, which is the difference between the export price of the dumped item and the sales price for the equivalent EU product, whichever is less. This means they can and often do leave the competing export much cheaper than the European equivalent. This is not true of the rules used by the United States, China and others – nor do these countries take account of the wider public interest through a 'Community interest-type' rule. We can't use anti-dumping procedures to stop tough but fair competition.

This case concerns just nine pairs of shoes from every 100 pairs bought by Europeans. A duty would add about 1.5 euro on average import prices of 8.5 euro for leather shoes that retail between 30-100 euros. Leather footwear import prices to the EU over the last five years have fallen by more than 20% but consumer prices have remained stable and even risen slightly. So the Commission believes that there is some margin within the supply chain to absorb a small duty on import costs by spreading it across product ranges and the distribution chain and the impact of measures on consumer prices will be minimal.

The shoes issue is not the textiles issue. The textile issue concerned fairly traded textile imports subject to a dramatic and sudden increase in volume. The European Commission never suggested that Chinese textile exports were unfair or traded illegally. It acted with the Chinese to cushion the impact of a massive shift in global trading patterns in textiles. By 2008 that cushion will be gone. Leather footwear is being state-subsidized and dumped. This is unacceptable under WTO rules and the European Union has a legal right to protect European producers against such practice.

For full details on the Commission's anti-dumping measures on leather shoes from China and Vietnam please visit:

http://europa.eu.int/comm/trade/issues/respectrules/anti_dumping/pr230206_en.htm




Important legal notice

English (en)

European Commission > United Kingdom > Press Room > Press releases > 2006

Contact | Search on EUROPA

Site map | Links | Subscribe | A-Z Index | Feedback

Search this site 

ISEC/06/05 - 23 February 2006

EU trade Commissioner Mandelson proposes import duties following evidence of dumping of Chinese and Vietnamese leather shoes

European trade Commissioner Peter Mandelson has today proposed provisional duties on imports of leather shoes from China and Vietnam after the European Commission's investigation into complaints of dumping of leather shoes from those countries found compelling evidence of state intervention, dumping and injury.

Mr Mandelson has recommended provisional duties of 19.4% for China and 16.8% for Vietnam to be phased in over a period of five months, beginning at about 4%, to ensure that retailers with goods in transit are not suddenly faced with an unexpected full tariff at the border.

It nevertheless means that after five months a full duty will be in place and the damaging effects of dumping will be counteracted. This balanced solution corrects injury, but allows maximum predictability for importers. There would be no quantitative limit on import of leather shoes from Vietnam and China.

The Commission will seek to work with the Chinese and Vietnamese to address the concerns raised by the EU investigation and welcomes signals from China and Vietnam that they are ready to engage to address the problem.

Retailer and consumer interests have been weighed carefully... This case concerns about nine pairs of shoes from every 100 pairs bought by Europeans. There is clear evidence that although leather footwear import prices to the EU over the last five years have fallen by more than 20% consumer prices have remained stable and even risen slightly. A duty would add just over £1 on average wholesale prices of £5.70 for leather shoes that retail between £25-£65. There is margin within the supply chain to absorb a small duty on import costs by spreading it across product ranges and the distribution chain.

On grounds of Community interest the trade Commissioner has also recommended that children's shoes be excluded from duties. High-tech sports shoes have been excluded from provisional measures because investigation suggests that there is not sufficient European production of these shoes for injury to have been caused.

Not a protectionist measure...

State intervention of this kind in a highly competitive industry is contrary to any notion of fair trade. The EU will not target low costs and comparative advantage – but it will target uncompetitive behaviour. Because of our lesser duty principle Europe's anti-dumping rules clearly ensure that anti-dumping measures cannot be used to make imports more expensive than the equivalent EU product – and they can and often

Home page

About us

Press Room

Front page news

Calendar

EU in the Media

Euromyths

European Agenda

Press releases

Press Watch

What the Papers Didn't Say

Information

How to work with the EU

Treaty of Lisbon

UN Climate Change Conference 2007
Ball - Indonesia

Europe and you in 2007

European Year of Intercultural Dialogue 2008

A Single European Market for All

Britain in the EU
The EU Reform Treaty
www.europe.gov.uk

**Reforming the Budget,
 Changing Europe**

EU2007 PT
 Portuguese Presidency

T. GEMIC
 SINCE 1957
 50th anniversary

**Margot
 Wallström's
 blog**

**Energy for a
 Changing World**

Britain in the EU
www.europe.gov.uk

 **EU information**
LOCAL SOURCES
 CLICK HERE

DebateEurope

do leave the competing export much cheaper than the European equivalent. This is not true of the rules used by India, the United States and China itself – nor do any of these countries apply a Community interest rule.

Compelling evidence of serious state intervention, dumping and injury...

Although the EU investigation was undertaken in factories jointly agreed with the Vietnamese and Chinese governments, there is compelling evidence of serious state intervention in the leather footwear sector in China and Vietnam – cheap finance, tax holidays, non-market land rents, improper asset valuation. This state intervention is leading to dumping unacceptable under WTO rules. Significant comparative advantage in China and Vietnam is being topped up with uncompetitive behaviour.

There is evidence of injury to EU producers. Since 2001, closely tracking the rise in dumped imports, European footwear production has contracted by about 30%. Some 40,000 jobs in the sector have been lost. This is not related solely to dumped goods, but state-intervention and dumping in China and Vietnam have exacerbated intense competition.

- ends -

Notes for editors

For more information, contact the European Commission's press office in London on 020 7973 1971.

Last update: 21 May 2007 | E-mail this page | Top