QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE COUNTERVAILING DUTY LEGISLATION OF THE PHILIPPINES

EEC

The following additional question on the countervailing duty legislation of the Philippines has been received from the EEC.

Do the Philippine authorities assimilate the assessment of the admissibility of a complaint under Articles 2:1 and 2:3 of the Code with a preliminary finding that a subsidy exists and that there is sufficient evidence of injury as provided in Article 5:1 of the Code? If this is the case, how do the Philippine authorities reconcile such an approach with the different provisions of these Articles? If this interpretation is not correct, how do the Philippine authorities interpret the different provisions of Articles 2:1 and 5:1?