



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR TRADE
 Directorate G - Trade Defence

Brussels, 14 April 2021

2nd ADDITIONAL DISCLOSURE DOCUMENT
R720

**Expiry review of the anti-subsidy measures concerning imports of
 certain rainbow trout, originating in the Republic of Turkey**

OFFICIALS IN CHARGE	
SUBSIDY TEAM	INJURY/UNION INTEREST TEAM
Ms Cathy De Backer – Head of Sector Ms Lina Mazuraite – Case officer Ms Beatriz Berridi Blanco – Case officer E-mail: TRADE-R720-TROUT-SUBSIDY@ec.europa.eu	Mr Janusz Zielinski – Head of Sector Mr Alessandro Mattucci – Case officer Mr Philippe Metten – Case officer E-mail: TRADE-R720-TROUT-INJURY@ec.europa.eu

Comments after the disclosure

- (1) Following the disclosure, the GOT and the two sampled exporting producers commented that in relation to the indirect subsidy calculation, the methodology applied by the Commission in the current review was not in conformity with the methodology applied in the original investigation. Namely, in the original investigation the benefit for the purchased trout was calculated by dividing the total subsidies granted by the Turkish authorities by the amount of total trout production in Turkey and not by the amount of subsidised trout production in Turkey.
- (2) The Commission thus reviewed the calculation of the indirect subsidy amount calculated with regard to the purchased trout by the two sampled exporting producers from unrelated suppliers to align it with the methodology used in the original investigation.
- (3) Taking into account comments made by the interested parties, the direct and indirect subsidy amounts established during the RIP for the two sampled exporting producers were 2,4 % for Özpekler and 2,8 % for GMS.
- (4) The sampled exporting producers also claimed that some loans were not export contingent and thus not countervailable. After review, the Commission agreed, based on the supporting documentation provided, that some loans were neither related to export sales, nor falling under the subsidized agricultural loans, and thus were not covered by any subsidy scheme. The Commission therefore removed these loans from the benefit calculation.
- (5) The sampled exporting producer claimed that some export contingent loans were not only related with the product concerned, but also with other exported fish. The Commission reviewed these loans and, based on the information provided by the company, could confirm for some of the loans, that the claimed export contingent loans were related with the different type of fish exported, and adapted the calculations accordingly.
- (6) The two sampled exporting producers also highlighted a number of clerical errors in the calculation of the countervailable subsidies for the preferential loans in relation to capital repayments in the RIP, number of days to be taken for the interest calculation in the RIP and benchmark rates selected on the wrong dates. These clerical errors were corrected.
- (7) Taking into account comments made by the interested parties, the subsidy amounts in relation to the preferential financing schemes established during the RIP for the two sampled exporting producers were 0,8 % for Özpekler and 1 % for GMS.
- (8) Taking into account the comments made by the interested parties after the disclosure, the aggregated amount of countervailable subsidies in accordance with the provisions of the basic Regulation, expressed ad valorem, for the sampled exporting producers was 3,2 % for Özpekler and 4,5 % for GMS, thereby showing continuation of subsidisation during the review investigation period.