Question for written answer E-002727/2016
to the Commission
Rule 130
Ernest Maragall (Verts/ALE)

Subject: Anti-dumping measures in Ukraine

On 27 January 2016, the Commission agreed to reduce the anti-dumping measures applied to a Ukrainian company, Stalkanat-Silur, a producer of steel cables, which claimed that the ongoing conflict in the country had led to changes in the company's corporate structure and in the current situation of the Donetsk region.

The Commission, after examining the petition, lowered its anti-dumping duty from 50% to 10%, specifying that the reduction would apply only to Stalkanat-Silur. This came despite the fact that Stalkanat-Silur had itself acknowledged its monopoly over the market in the letter that it had sent to the Commission, in which it claimed to be the 'only company to produce steel cables in Ukraine'.

Given that Stalkanat-Silur is owned by the controversial Vladimir Nemirovskiy, the considerable reduction granted exclusively to this one company could be interpreted as being motivated by self-interest.

1. Why was this anti-dumping advantage not granted for one type of product and price, rather than for one specific company?

2. Does the Commission consider that this measure helps to support free competition in a free market in Ukraine?