II. THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

A. Introduction

This chapter outlines the work of the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 2013, including the historic results of the 9th Ministerial Conference in Bali, Indonesia, and the work anticipated for 2014 to continue to find new, credible approaches to advancing negotiations in the WTO, including under the Doha Development Agenda (DDA). This chapter also details work of WTO Standing Committees and their subsidiary bodies, provides an overview of the implementation and enforcement of the WTO Agreement, and discusses accessions of new members to this rules-based organization.

The United States maintains an abiding commitment to the rules-based multilateral trading system, which advances the well-being of the people of the United States and of our trading partners. The WTO represents the multilateral bedrock of U.S. trade policy, playing a vital role in securing new economic opportunities for American workers, farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, and service providers and promoting global growth and development with widely shared benefits. The United States continues to take a leadership role at the WTO, working to ensure that trade makes a powerful contribution in expanding the global economy. The WTO provides a forum for enforcing U.S. rights under the various WTO agreements to ensure that the United States receives the full benefits of WTO membership. The WTO agreements also provide a foundation for high-standard U.S. bilateral and regional agreements that make a positive contribution to a dynamic and open global trading system based on the rule of law. On a day-to-day basis, the WTO provides opportunities for advancing U.S. interests through its more than 20 standing committees (not including numerous additional working groups, working parties, and negotiating bodies). These groups meet regularly to permit WTO Members to exchange views, work to resolve questions of Members’ compliance with commitments, and develop initiatives aimed at systemic improvements.

The DDA is the ninth round of multilateral trade negotiations to be carried out since the end of World War II. At the WTO’s Eighth Ministerial Conference in Geneva, Switzerland in December 2011, there was a consensus among Ministers that the DDA was at an impasse, with “significantly different perspectives on . . . possible results.” The agreed summary for the Ministerial Conference noted that “Members need to more fully explore different negotiating approaches,” and reiterated previous ministerial guidance that, where progress can be achieved on specific elements of the DDA, provisional or definitive agreements might be reached before all elements of the negotiating agenda are fully resolved. During the course of 2012 and 2013, Members took this guidance to heart in working collectively to complete a “Bali Package,” which included, in the form of the groundbreaking Trade Facilitation Agreement (TFA), the first new multilateral agreement in the nearly 20 year history of the WTO. The TFA, when fully implemented, will ensure that all WTO Members apply a variety of trade-facilitating customs and related measures that promise to substantially decrease the costs associated with trading and increase the value and volume of global trade. The Bali package also included important results on agriculture, such as decisions on food security, tariff-rate quota administration, export competition, and development, including a new Monitoring Mechanism to allow experience-based reviews of the implementation and operation of special and differential treatment provisions in WTO agreements.

In parallel, the United States and other WTO Members have generated renewed focus on the day-to-day work of the WTO’s standing committees and other bodies, which remained instrumental in promoting transparency of WTO Member trade policies and providing critical fora for monitoring and resisting protectionist pressures during a time of global economic challenges. Through discussions in these fora,
Members sought detailed information on individual Members’ trade policy actions and collectively considered them in light of WTO rules and their impact on individual Members and the trading system as a whole. The discussions enabled Members to assess their trade-related actions and policies in light of concerns that other Members raised and to consider and address those concerns in domestic policymaking. The United States also took advantage of opportunities in standing committees to consider how implementation of existing WTO provisions can be enhanced and to discuss areas that may hold potential for developing future rules.

B. The Doha Development Agenda under the Trade Negotiations Committee and Other Priority WTO Activities

The DDA was launched in Doha, Qatar, in November 2001, at the 4th WTO Ministerial Conference, where Ministers provided a mandate for negotiations on a range of subjects and work in WTO Committees. In addition, the mandate gives further direction on the WTO’s existing work program and implementation of the WTO Agreement. The goal of the DDA is to reduce trade barriers in order to expand global economic growth, development, and opportunity. The main focus of the negotiations under the DDA is in the following areas: agriculture; industrial goods market access; services; trade facilitation; WTO rules (i.e., trade remedies, fisheries subsidies, and regional trade agreements); and development.

The Trade Negotiations Committee (TNC), established at the WTO’s Fourth Ministerial Conference in Doha, oversees the agenda and negotiations under the DDA in cooperation with the WTO General Council. The WTO Director General serves as Chairman of the TNC (Annex II identifies the various negotiating groups and special bodies responsible for the negotiations, some of which are the responsibility of the WTO General Council).

In 2013, WTO Members worked collectively to follow through on the guidance from the 8th Ministerial Conference in order to make progress on discreet areas of the DDA with the possibility of early results. Broadly, the United States joined others in validating that the WTO had “turned the page” in the DDA negotiations and that only new, creative approaches could offer opportunities for delivering results. In this regard, the Membership focused on a select number of specific areas identified by Members for inclusion in the Bali Package, with the core result being the new TFA, supplemented by additional decisions on agriculture and development, particularly measures in favor of least developed countries. At the 9th Ministerial Conference in Bali in December 2013, Members hailed the completion of the Bali Package, which the new WTO Director General, Roberto Azevêdo, described as a much-needed vote of confidence in the WTO’s ability to complete multilateral trade negotiations. The Bali Package included a Ministerial Declaration directing Members to take up other parts of the Doha Agenda, including priority areas of the Round and those on which legally binding results were not included in the Package.

Beyond the DDA negotiations, Parties to the WTO Government Procurement Agreement (GPA), a plurilateral agreement within the WTO framework, announced in Bali their expectation that the revised GPA should enter into force by March of 2014, and the United States presented its instrument of acceptance in Bali.

The WTO is much more than a negotiating forum and venue for filing dispute settlement cases. The United States believes that the WTO demonstrates its value every day through the work of the standing committees and other WTO bodies. In 2013, the United States made effective use of the Council on Trade in Goods, the Committee on Import Licensing, and the Committee on Agriculture to raise the profile of trade protectionist actions by other Members. In the Committee on Technical Barriers to Trade,
the United States and other Members began follow up work to the Sixth Triennial Review of that WTO agreement, including substantial progress in completing recommendations on good regulatory practices.

Overall the United States noted the new energy in the operations of the WTO during the course of 2013, including areas outside the DDA, such as negotiations on a new Information Technology Agreement. This greater appreciation for the broad spectrum of WTO work, from the DDA to other areas, may be the critical factor in sustaining the relevance of the WTO in international trade in years to come.

Prospects for 2014

The United States will continue to play a leadership role across the range of WTO activities. It is particularly important to sustain and enhance the WTO’s critical work in monitoring and providing a forum for resisting protectionism. Accordingly, the United States will be devoting additional attention to making the best possible use of the WTO’s existing committees and other structures, using them both to advance specific U.S. trade policy objectives as well as to ensure the ongoing strength and credibility of the multilateral trading system. Additionally, the United States will take up a leadership role in the follow up to the Bali Ministerial, seeking to inject new direction and creative approaches in other areas of the DDA that have been dormant in recent years.

1. Committee on Agriculture, Special Session

Status

Negotiations in the Special Session of the Committee on Agriculture are conducted under the mandate agreed upon at the Fourth WTO Ministerial Conference in Doha, Qatar that calls for: “substantial improvements in market access; reductions of, with a view to phasing out, all forms of export subsidies; and substantial reductions in trade-distorting domestic support.” This mandate, calling for ambitious results in three areas (so called “pillars”), was augmented with specific provisions for agriculture in the framework agreed by the General Council on August 1, 2004, and at the Hong Kong Ministerial Conference in December 2005.

Major Issues in 2013

In 2013, the United States continued to lead the effort to approach the Doha negotiations with a focus on how countries might realistically work together to advance the negotiations.

Ambassador John Adank, the Chair of the Agriculture Negotiations, held negotiations in formal and informal settings to assess Members’ views on substantive issues. Members focused on proposals introduced in 2012, notably a proposal on tariff-rate quota (TRQ) administration from the G20 developing country group led by Brazil, and a proposal on public stockholding from the G33 developing country group, led by India. In addition, the G20 group introduced a new proposal in 2013 on export competition.

Deputy U.S. Trade Representative and U.S. Permanent Representative to the WTO Ambassador Michael Punke continued to urge Members to approach the overall Doha negotiations on the basis of a realistic assessment of possibilities for progress. Throughout 2013, U.S. negotiators undertook discussions at various levels (technical and political) and in various formats (bilateral and small group) to determine Members’ views and look for ways to move the negotiations forward, in line with U.S. interests and priorities.
At the WTO’s 9th Ministerial Conference, Members adopted results on several areas of agriculture. First, WTO Members reached a decision on the administration of tariff-rate quotas (TRQs), which will facilitate increased opportunities for U.S. farmers, ranchers, workers, and food processors to enhance exports to a number of WTO Member countries, including the European Union, Japan, Norway, and Switzerland. This decision provides American agricultural producers more market access by addressing the issue of chronically low fill rates in Members’ WTO bound TRQs. Further, the decision provides an increased level of transparency regarding how Members are filling their TRQs. Second, Members agreed to a new Ministerial declaration on export competition to help Members understand how their trading partners are proceeding toward their commitments. This also includes new transparency measures to ensure a balanced approach across all forms of export competition, including export subsidies, export credits, food aid, and notably state trading enterprises (STEs), where transparency is currently limited. Third, Members agreed to provide limited protection from legal challenge to developing country Members, who may be in danger of breaching their domestic support limits for public stockholding programs for food security purposes, to give them time to bring their policies in line with their WTO commitments. The United States worked to ensure that this protection from challenge is only available to Members if their programs do not distort trade, and if they meet certain transparency conditions to share the details of their support mechanisms. Lastly, Members agreed to transparency requirements on cotton trade.

Prospects for 2014

After the successful completion of the WTO’s 9th Ministerial Conference, Members in 2014 will resume negotiations and continue to look at fresh approaches to achieve results. A key to the negotiations will be securing meaningful market access commitments in agriculture. The advanced developing countries – which have been the fastest growing economies and are increasingly major exporters and importers – will play an important role. The challenge in 2014 will be to make continual progress towards fair, balanced results in agriculture.

2. Council for Trade in Services, Special Session

Status

The Special Session of the Council for Trade in Services (CTS-SS) was formed in 2000 pursuant to the Uruguay Round mandate of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) to undertake new multi-sectoral services negotiations. The Doha Declaration of November 2001 recognized the work already undertaken in the services negotiations and set deadlines for initial market access requests and offers. The services negotiations thus became one of the core market access pillars of the Doha Round, along with agriculture and nonagricultural goods.

The 2005 Hong Kong Ministerial Declaration called for the negotiations to proceed to conclusion with a view to promoting the economic growth of all trading partners, with due respect for the right of Members to regulate in their domestic markets. The Hong Kong Declaration provided a framework for intensifying the negotiations, with the goal of encouraging Members to improve their commitments by removing significant limitations and covering a broader range of service sectors and supply channels (i.e., cross border supply, consumption abroad, commercial presence, and presence of natural persons). To complement the existing bilateral request/offer process, the Hong Kong Declaration also encouraged negotiations to proceed on a plurilateral basis. Members subsequently developed a “plurilateral request process,” through which like-minded Members joined together to develop collective market access requests for more than 20 sectors and issues of interest.
II. The World Trade Organization

Major Issues in 2013

The CTS-SS did not meet during 2013, as the lack of general progress under the DDA affected negotiations on services.

Prospects for 2014

The United States continues to believe that a high level of ambition for services liberalization is a key to economic growth and prosperity. To that end, the United States will continue to pursue new ideas and approaches to create new trade and investment opportunities for service providers.

3. Negotiating Group on Non-Agricultural Market Access

Status

The U.S. Government’s longstanding objective in the Non-Agricultural Market Access (NAMA) negotiations – which cover manufactures, mining, fuels, and fish products – has been to obtain a balanced market access package that provides new export opportunities for U.S. businesses through liberalization of global tariffs and non-tariff barriers. Trade in industrial goods accounts for more than 90 percent of world merchandise trade\(^1\) and more than 95 percent of total U.S. goods exports. In developing countries, industrial goods comprise 94 percent of goods exports, more than 65 percent of which corresponds to manufactures – an increasing share of which is exported to other developing countries.\(^2\) Therefore, there is a substantial interest in improving market access conditions among developing countries. Yet, many emerging economies still charge very high tariffs on imported industrial goods, with ceiling tariff rates exceeding 150 percent in some cases. Thus, achieving a market-opening outcome is critical to stimulating trade and driving economic development in the wake of the global economic downturn.

The NAMA negotiations, however, remained at an impasse when they were last actively underway, prior to the 8th Ministerial Conference at the end of 2011. Without significant market opening commitments from advanced developing economies, there is little prospect for achieving robust trade liberalization for industrial goods on a multilateral basis. Given the changing global economic landscape, namely the emergence of certain new economic powers, securing broad-based liberalization that ensures that major industrial producers and traders compete on a level playing field is necessary and fundamental.

Major Issues in 2013

There were no substantive meetings or other activities related to either the tariff or non-tariff elements of the NAMA negotiations. Proposals that had been under negotiation remain on the table until such time as the Doha negotiations resume.

Prospects for 2014

In 2014, the United States intends to work with other WTO Members to pursue fresh and credible approaches to meaningful multilateral trade liberalization.

\(^1\) WTO, International Trade Statistics 2013.
\(^2\) WTO document WT/COMTD/W/143/Rev.5.
4. Negotiating Group on Rules

Status

At the Doha Ministerial Conference in 2001, Ministers agreed to negotiations aimed at clarifying and improving disciplines under the Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the GATT 1994 (the Antidumping Agreement) and the Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (the SCM Agreement), while preserving the basic concepts, principles, and effectiveness of these Agreements and their instruments and objectives. Ministers directed that the negotiations take into account the needs of developing and least-developed country Members. The Doha Round mandate also calls for clarified and improved WTO disciplines on fisheries subsidies.

The Negotiating Group on Rules (the Rules Group) has based its work primarily on written submissions from Members, organizing its work in the following categories: (1) the antidumping remedy, often including procedural and domestic industry injury issues potentially applicable to the countervailing duty remedy; (2) subsidies and the countervailing duty remedy, including fisheries subsidies; and (3) regional trade agreements. In November 2007, the Chairman of the Rules Group issued draft consolidated texts on the antidumping remedy, subsidies, the countervailing duty remedy, and fisheries subsidies.

In December 2008, the Chairman issued revised texts on antidumping, subsidies, and the countervailing duty remedy, as well as a roadmap for fisheries subsidies that identified key questions that need to be addressed in order to advance the negotiations towards a new fisheries text. In keeping with the Rules Chairman’s earlier pronouncements, the draft texts on antidumping and subsidies/countervailing duties reflected a “bottom up” approach, identifying the most contentious issues contained in brackets with no legal text provided. Following an intensification of work at the end of 2010 and beginning of 2011, the Chairman issued a report in April 2011 reflecting the work to date in the Rules Group on antidumping, subsidies and fisheries subsidies, and regional trade agreements. Included in this report was a slightly revised text on antidumping reflecting several technical changes. There were no changes made to the 2008 draft text on subsidies and countervailing measures or the 2007 draft text on fisheries subsidies.

The Doha Declaration also directed the Rules Group to clarify and improve disciplines and procedures governing Regional Trade Agreements (RTAs) under the existing WTO provisions. To that end, the General Council in December 2006 adopted a decision for the provisional application of the “Transparency Mechanism for Regional Trade Agreements” to improve the transparency of RTAs. A total of 139 RTAs have been considered under the Transparency Mechanism since then. Pursuant to its mandate, in the past, the Rules Group has explored the establishment of further standards governing the relationship of RTAs to the global trading system. However, such discussions have failed to produce common ground on how to clarify or improve existing RTA rules.

Major Issues in 2013

There were no meetings of the Rules Group in 2013. The United States, however, worked with other like-minded WTO Members to coordinate informal events on fisheries subsidies, including a launch event for the Food and Agriculture Organization’s biannual report on the State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture and a seminar on transparency in fisheries subsidies. During the 9th WTO Ministerial Conference in Bali, Indonesia, the United States and other Friends of Fish (FoF) Ministers released a Ministerial Statement that affirmed their commitment to ambitious disciplines on fisheries subsidies in the WTO and pledged to improve transparency and efforts to reform current fisheries subsidy programs.

Through this Statement, the FoF Members also pledged not to introduce new fisheries subsidies, or enhance or extend existing programs, which contribute to overfishing and overcapacity.

**Prospects for 2014**

In 2014, the United States will continue to focus on, *inter alia*, preserving the effectiveness of trade remedy rules, improving transparency and due process in trade remedy proceedings, and strengthening existing subsidies rules. Concerning fisheries subsidies, the United States will continue to press for an ambitious outcome in the WTO, and at the same time continue to pursue disciplines on fisheries subsidies through other fora such as the Trans-Pacific Partnership and Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership negotiations, which will assist our efforts to reach eventual agreement on fisheries subsidies in the WTO.

On RTAs, the United States will continue to advocate for increased transparency and strong substantive standards for RTAs that support and advance the multilateral trading system. The Transparency Mechanism<sup>4</sup> will continue to be applied in the consideration of additional RTAs.

**5. Negotiating Group on Trade Facilitation**

**Status**

WTO negotiations on Trade Facilitation were formally launched under the August 1, 2004 Decision by the General Council on the Doha Work Program. Opaque border procedures and unwarranted delays faced at the borders can add costs that are the equivalent of a significant tariff and are the non-tariff barriers that are most frequently cited by U.S. and other exporters. A major U.S. Doha Round priority was met when negotiations concluded on December 6, 2013, at the 9th WTO Ministerial Conference, with an agreement that will reduce these barriers through transparent and predictable multilateral trade rules under the WTO. The Negotiating Group on Trade Facilitation has now been subsumed by the Preparatory Committee established by the Ministerial Conference that will oversee the implementation of the Trade Facilitation Agreement (TFA).

**Major Issues in 2013**

The work of the Negotiating Group on Trade Facilitation (NGTF) continued to have as its hallmark in 2013 broad-based and constructive participation by Members at all levels of development – a positive negotiating environment that was seen as offering “win-win” opportunities for all. There continued to be

<sup>4</sup> At the end of 2006, the General Council established, on a provisional basis, a new transparency mechanism (TM) for all regional trade agreements (WT/L/671), which was agreed upon in the Negotiating Group on Rules and implemented in 2007. In December 2010, the Rules Group initiated a review of the operation of the RTA TM, and the Chair invited Members to submit any proposals to modify the TM in light of the experience gained under its operation. While the TM has on the whole significantly improved transparency with respect to RTAs, some of its operational aspects could be improved. Most notably, while there is no doubt that the TM applies to all RTAs – whether negotiated under GATT 1994, the GATS, or the GATT Enabling Clause – practical questions of the venue of consideration have arisen when parties to an agreement differ among themselves in their view of the relevant WTO provision for concluding a particular preferential agreement. While such underlying differences go beyond the scope of the review of the TM, the United States in January 2011 submitted a proposal to help ensure the consideration of RTAs that have been “dually notified” under such circumstances, so as to eliminate, or at least reduce, disagreement and procedural challenges in a way that is without prejudice to any underlying rights. The U.S. submission (TN/RL/W/248, dated January 24, 2011) proposes a specific solution, in the form of a proposed change to paragraph 18 of the TM, to consolidate the consideration of all RTAs in a single committee, the Committee on Regional Trade Agreements.
active leadership within the NGTF from individual developing country Members and from regional groupings including the landlocked developing countries (LLDCs), least developed countries (LDCs), the African Group (AG), and the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP). These groups worked with the United States and other Members to steer the negotiations toward conclusion in a practical, problem-solving manner. The United States also worked in various bilateral and plurilateral configurations of countries to advance work on specific textual proposals.

As recent U.S. Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) with other countries were implemented, positive synergy developed in the WTO negotiations with partners as diverse as Chile, Singapore, Australia, South Korea, Peru, Panama, Costa Rica, and Colombia. Each FTA negotiated by the United States has included a separate, stand-alone chapter that contains significant commitments on customs administration, most of which were reflected in proposals at the NGTF.

For many developing country Members, the TFA will bring improved transparency and an enhanced rules-based approach to border regimes, and will be an important element of broader ongoing domestic strategies to increase economic output and attract greater investment. There is also a growing understanding that the TFA will squarely address factors holding back increased regional integration and south-south trade. Most Members see the concluded TFA as a means to bring particular benefits to small and medium-sized businesses, enabling them to increase participation in the global trading system.

The modalities for the trade facilitation negotiations, set forth as part of the August 1, 2004 General Council decision launching the negotiations, included the following: “Negotiations shall aim to clarify and improve relevant aspects of Articles V, VIII, and X of the GATT 1994 with a view to further expediting the movement, release, and clearance of goods, including goods in transit. Negotiations shall also aim at enhancing technical assistance and support for capacity building in this area. The negotiations shall further aim at provisions for effective cooperation between customs or any other appropriate authorities on trade facilitation and customs compliance issues.” The modalities also included references that underscored the importance of addressing implementation issues such as costs, potential implications with regard to infrastructure, capacity building, the status of LDC Members, and the work of other international organizations.

The Member-driven proposals in the negotiating text covered each of the areas provided for in the NGTF modalities. This resulted in a final TFA that includes commitments that promote transparent rules and procedures, such as detailed publication requirements, a U.S.-driven provision on Internet publication, provisions to clarify appeal procedures and enquiry points, and provisions on advance administrative rulings. There are also several commitments to expedite release and clearance of goods, including through pre-arrival processing, separation of release and clearance, and expedited shipment procedures, and to simplify and reduce fees and formalities. Likewise, the final text includes provisions on transit procedures and customs cooperation. It also establishes disciplines on customs penalties, based on a proposal by the United States.

The work of the NGTF during 2013 was characterized by intensive, Member-driven, text-based negotiations. Significantly, the draft consolidated negotiating text was not a “Chair’s text,” based on the Chair’s perception of Members’ desired outcomes. Rather, the text reflected all proposals on the table and modifications to those proposals that Members suggested. Consistent with the Member driven, “bottom up” approach that characterized the NGTF from the outset, the NGTF’s work required continued engagement of Members with each other to resolve differences. During 2013, that engagement occurred in various formats, both formal and informal, as proponents and Chair-appointed facilitators for various sections of the text stepped forward to lead efforts to close gaps. The Ambassadors from Chile, Nigeria, Switzerland, and the Permanent Representative of Hong Kong, China, also played increased roles in the
negotiations, serving as “Friends of the Chair” (FOC) to facilitate informal meetings on specific sections of the text.

The NGTF met in plenary sessions in March, May, July, and October to capture progress achieved through the intervening small group and FOC-led work and to further refine the text. New revisions of the draft negotiating text that successively reduced the number of open issues were released following each meeting. Work intensified in the fall, with a Senior Officials meeting focused on all areas of a Ministerial package, including trade facilitation, taking place in September. At that time, the new WTO Director General, Roberto Azevêdo, began chairing informal meetings on trade facilitation and other issues. While the bottom-up Member-driven process continued, the Director General began to elevate work to Ambassadors and Senior Officials in areas where the text was ripe for such engagement. Following the October NGTF meeting, the Director General began holding more intensive meetings in various configurations, most commonly in open-ended sessions including all WTO Members. After a final session of negotiations in Geneva failed to produce a bracket-free text, the Director General presented a compromise text at the Ministerial Conference in Bali. Members agreed to the text without changes on the final day of the Ministerial Conference.

During 2013, while finalizing the commitments of the TFA, the NGTF continued its work on preparing for the challenge of implementing the results of the negotiations that will face many developing country Members. The TFA includes transition periods for developing and least developed country Members, intended to provide these Members with the flexibility necessary for them to fully implement all provisions of the Agreement, as well as the assurance that they will have the time and assistance to do so. The negotiating sessions in 2013 resulted in a final text that will focus appropriate discussion on these “special and differential treatment” provisions and allow for full implementation of the TFA by all Members.

As part of the substantial assistance already being provided for trade facilitation, the WTO and assistance organizations like the U.S. Agency for International Development have, over the course of the negotiations, provided training programs with developing country Members to help them undertake assessments of their individual situations regarding capacity and make progress in implementing the proposals under negotiation. The Member assessments, which are currently being updated, have made it apparent that many of the developing country Members have implemented – or are taking steps to do so – a number of the provisions contained in the TFA. At the same time, it is also clear that many developing country Members openly recognize that they have an “offensive” interest in seeking implementation by their neighbors of the TFA commitments. The WTO’s training efforts also included regional workshops for senior customs and trade officials of developing country Members to help them gain a deeper understanding of TFA measures and of issues relating to future implementation.

Prospects for 2014

In 2014, the newly-established Preparatory Committee on Trade Facilitation will work to fulfill the mandate established by the Ministerial Conference for this body to oversee the implementation of the TFA. This will include a legal review of the Agreement, acceptance of Category A notifications from developing country Members (that is, commitments that will be implemented without a transition period), and drafting a Protocol of Amendment to insert the Agreement into Annex 1A of the WTO Agreement. The 2013 Ministerial Decision on Trade Facilitation also calls for the General Council to meet no later than July 31, 2014 to annex the Category A notifications from developing countries to the Agreement and to adopt the Protocol drawn up by the Preparatory Committee. The Protocol will then be open for acceptance by a target date of July 31, 2015, and could then enter into force if ratified by two-thirds of the Membership by that date. If two-thirds of the Membership does not ratify the Agreement by this date, the General Council will need to review and take appropriate action. There will also be a focus on ensuring
that developing country Members seeking to obtain technical assistance to fully implement provisions contained in the TFA are matched with donors and that technical assistance projects are prioritized and funded.

6. Committee on Trade and Environment, Special Session

Status

Following the 2001 WTO Ministerial Conference at Doha, the TNC established a Special Session of the Committee on Trade and Environment (CTESS) to implement the mandate in paragraph 31 of the Doha Declaration. Paragraph 31 of the Doha Declaration includes a mandate to pursue negotiations, without prejudging their outcome, in three areas:

i. the relationship between existing WTO rules and specific trade obligations set out in Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) (with the negotiations limited to the applicability of existing WTO rules among parties to such MEAs and without prejudice to the WTO rights of Members that are not parties to the MEAs in question);

ii. procedures for regular information exchange between MEA secretariats and relevant WTO committees, and the criteria for granting observer status; and

iii. the reduction or, as appropriate, elimination of tariff and non-tariff barriers to trade in environmental goods and services.

Major Issues in 2013

The CTESS did not meet in 2013.

Prospects for 2014

The United States remains fully committed to a positive WTO trade and environment agenda; however, given the deep substantive divergences that have proven difficult to resolve in the CTESS, the United States will approach these negotiations with fresh thinking. This year, the United States is committed to exploring creative and innovative trade and environment solutions that can yield meaningful outcomes. In particular, the United States will consider ways to build on the results achieved in APEC on environmental goods liberalization (see Chapter III.B.3.).

7. Dispute Settlement Body, Special Session

Status

Following the Doha Ministerial Conference in 2001, the TNC established the Special Session of the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB-SS) to fulfill the Ministerial mandate found in paragraph 30 of the Doha Declaration which provides: “We agree to negotiations on improvements and clarifications of the Dispute Settlement Understanding. The negotiations should be based on the work done thus far, as well as any additional proposals by Members, and aim to agree on improvements and clarifications not later than May 2003, at which time we will take steps to ensure that the results enter into force as soon as possible thereafter.” In July 2003, the General Council decided that: (1) the timeframe for conclusion of the negotiations on clarifications and improvements of the Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes (DSU) be extended by one year (i.e., to aim to conclude the work
by May 2004 at the latest); (2) this continued work will build on the work done to date, and take into account proposals put forward by Members as well as the text put forward by the Chair of the DSB-SS; and (3) the first meeting of the DSB-SS when it resumed its work be devoted to a discussion of conceptual ideas. Due to complexities in negotiations, deadlines were not met. In August 2004, the General Council decided that Members should continue work toward clarification and improvement of the DSU, without establishing a deadline, and these negotiations have continued since.

**Major Issues in 2013**

The DSB-SS met two times during 2013. In previous phases of the review of the DSU, Members had engaged in a general discussion of the issues. Following that general discussion, Members tabled proposals to clarify or improve the DSU. Members then reviewed each proposal submitted and requested explanations and posed questions to the Member(s) making the proposal. Members also had an opportunity to discuss each issue raised by the various proposals. The Chair of the review issued a Chair’s text in July 2008 “to take stock of” the work to date and to provide a basis for its continuation. In 2013, delegations continued to engage on the basis of the comments received in the previous phase, seeking to advance the work on their proposals.

The United States has advocated two proposals, both of which are reflected in the Chair’s text. One would expand transparency and public access to dispute settlement proceedings. The proposal would open WTO dispute settlement proceedings to the public as the norm and give greater public access to submissions and panel reports. In addition to open hearings, public submissions and early public release of panel reports, the U.S. proposal calls on WTO Members to consider rules for “amicus curiae” submissions – submissions by nonparties to a dispute. WTO rules currently allow such submissions but do not provide guidelines on how they are to be considered. Guidelines would provide a clearer roadmap for handling such submissions.

In addition, the United States and Chile submitted a proposal to help improve the effectiveness of the WTO dispute settlement system in resolving trade disputes among Members. The joint proposal contained specifications aimed at giving parties to a dispute more control over the process and greater flexibility to settle disputes. Under the present dispute settlement system, parties are encouraged to resolve their disputes, but do not always have all the tools with which to do so. As part of this proposal, the United States has also proposed guidance for WTO Members to provide to WTO adjudicative bodies in three particular areas where important questions have arisen in the course of various disputes.

**Prospects for 2014**

In 2014, Members will continue to work to complete the review of the DSU. Members will be meeting a number of times over the course of 2014.

**8. Council for Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, Special Session**

**Status**

The Council for Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS Council), Special Session did not meet in 2013. In 2012, the work of the TRIPS Council Special Session was limited. With a view to completing the work started in the TRIPS Council on the implementation of Article 23.4 of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS Agreement), Ministers agreed at the 2001 Doha Ministerial Conference to negotiate the establishment of a multilateral system of
notification and registration of geographical indications (GIs) for wines and spirits. At the 2005 Hong Kong Ministerial Conference, Ministers agreed to intensify their work in order to complete these negotiations within the overall timeframe for the conclusion of the Doha negotiations. This matter is the only one before the Special Session of the TRIPS Council.

Major Issues in 2013

While the TRIPS Council Special Session did not meet in 2013, the United States and its allies continued to maintain their common position, i.e., the establishment of a multilateral system for notification and registration of geographical indications for wines and spirits must: be voluntary; have no legal effects for non-participating members; be simple and transparent; respect different systems of protection of GIs; respect the principle of territoriality; preserve the balance of the Uruguay Round; and, consistent with the mandate, be limited to the protection of wines and spirits. The Joint Proposal group continued to maintain that the mandate of the TRIPS Council Special Session is clearly limited to the establishment of a system of notification and registration of GIs for wines and spirits and that discussions cannot move forward on any other basis.

Members’ views continue to diverge sharply on several core issues. Key positions are reflected in a 2005 WTO Secretariat document (TN/IP/W/12), which contains a side-by-side presentation of the three proposals that are before the Special Session. The Secretariat expanded this document in May 2007, with an addendum that describes the various arguments and that presents questions raised by proponents of the proposals (TN/IP/W/12/Add. 1). In an April 2011 report to the TNC (TN/IP/21), the Chair of the TRIPS Council Special Session highlighted, in particular, ongoing divergences with respect to participation in the multilateral register system (i.e., whether the system would apply to all Members or only to those opting to participate in it), the nature of the legal obligations provided for in the system (i.e., the extent to which legal effects at the domestic level determine the effect of registration of a GI for a wine or spirit in the system), and to the mandate of the Special Session (i.e., whether the Special Session has the authority to address GIs for goods other than wines and spirits). In 2011, the Chair led meetings of a drafting group made up of representatives of the sponsors of the three competing proposals to negotiate a text covering six elements, namely: (1) notification; (2) registration; (3) legal effects/consequence of registration; (4) fees and costs; (5) Special and Differential (S&D) treatment; and (6) participation. The April 2011 report includes an annex with the Draft Composite Text (JOB/IP/3/Rev. 1), reflecting the current status of the discussions.

The United States, together with: Argentina; Australia; Canada; Chile; Costa Rica; the Dominican Republic; Ecuador; El Salvador; Guatemala; Honduras; Israel; Japan; Korea; Mexico; New Zealand; Nicaragua; Paraguay; the Separate Customs Territory of Taiwan, Penghu, Kinmen, and Matsu; and South Africa, support the Joint Proposal under which Members would voluntarily notify the WTO of their GIs for wines and spirits for incorporation into a registration system. During 2011, Israel formally became a cosponsor of the Joint Proposal. The Joint Proposal cosponsors submitted a revised Proposed Draft TRIPS Council Decision on the Establishment of a Multilateral System of Notification and Registration of Geographical Indications for Wines and Spirits to the Special Session to set out clearly in draft legal form, a means by which Members could implement the mandate from paragraph 18 of the Doha Ministerial Declaration and Article 23.4 of the TRIPS Agreement, and to reflect changes that Joint Proposal proponents had made during the informal drafting process. Members choosing to use the system would agree to consult the system when making any decisions under their domestic laws related to GIs, or in some cases, trademarks. Implementation of this proposal would not impose any additional obligations – with regard to GIs – on Members that chose not to participate, nor would it place undue burdens on the WTO Secretariat.
The EU, together with a number of other Members, continued to support their alternative proposal for a binding, multilateral system for the notification and registration of GIs for all products, not only wines and spirits, which all Members would be required to use. The current EU position on GIs combines two proposals: the multilateral GI register for wines and spirits and an amendment to the TRIPS Agreement to extend Article 23-level GI protection to products other than wines and spirits. The effect of this proposal would be to expand the scope of the negotiations to all GI products and to propose that any GI notified to the EU’s proposed register would benefit from a presumption of eligibility for protection as a GI in other WTO Members. In addition, the notified GI would be presumed valid against a competing rights holder, including a prior rights holder. Essentially, the system proposed by the EU could, as a practical matter, enable one Member to mandate GI protection in another Member simply by notifying that GI to the system. Such a proposal would negatively affect preexisting trademark rights, as well as investments in generic food terms, and would directly contradict the principle of territoriality with respect to intellectual property in favor of a system based upon the unilateral and extraterritorial application of domestic law and national intellectual property regimes. Although a third proposal, from Hong Kong, China remains on the table, this proposal has received little support.

In 2011, the proponents of the Joint Proposal made important gains, advancing support for substantive provisions of the Proposal. In addition, cosponsors were added to the Joint Proposal, and certain proponents of the EU proposal expressed support for key Joint Proposal provisions. The Draft Consolidated Text reflects these developments. For example, that text shows India and Brazil’s support for several key components of the Joint Proposal (e.g., participation). Sponsors of the Joint Proposal emphasized, repeatedly, that the Special Session’s mandate is limited to GIs for wines and spirits. There was limited discussion of the Joint Proposal in 2012 and no progress in resolving divergent views with Members instead continuing to adhere to entrenched positions.

**Prospects for 2014**

If discussions resume, WTO Members will continue to debate the Special Session’s mandate. In particular, Members will discuss whether negotiations are limited to GIs for wines and spirits (the position of the Joint Proposal proponents, based on the unambiguous text of Article 23.4 of the TRIPS Agreement) or whether these negotiations should be extended to cover GIs for goods other than wines and spirits (the position of the EU and certain other WTO members). The United States will continue to aggressively oppose extending the Special Session mandate, will continue to pursue additional support for the Joint Proposal in the coming year, and will seek a more flexible and pragmatic approach from supporters of the EU proposal.

**9. Committee on Trade and Development, Special Session**

**Status**

The Special Session of the Committee on Trade and Development (CTD-SS) was established by the TNC in February 2002, to fulfill the Doha Round mandate to review all S&D provisions “with a view to strengthening them and making them more precise, effective, and operational.” Under existing S&D provisions, Members provide developing country Members with technical assistance and transitional arrangements toward implementation of WTO agreements. S&D provisions also enable Members to provide developing country Members with better-than-MFN access to markets.

As part of the S&D review, developing country Members submitted a total of 88 Agreement-Specific Proposals (ASPs) in 2002 and 2003, to augment existing S&D provisions in the WTO Agreement. Thirty-eight of these proposals were referred to other negotiating groups and WTO bodies for consideration (Category II proposals). Of the proposals remaining for consideration in the CTD-SS,
Members reached an “in principle” agreement on draft decisions for 28 proposals at the 2003 Cancun Ministerial Conference (Cancun 28), following intensive negotiations in 2002 and 2003. Due to the breakdown of the DDA negotiations, these proposals were not adopted at Cancun.

At the 2005 Hong Kong Ministerial Conference, Members reached agreement on five ASPs: access to WTO waivers; coherence; duty-free and quota-free treatment (DFQF) for LDC Members; Trade-Related Investment Measures (TRIMS); and flexibility for LDC Members that have difficulty implementing their WTO obligations. The decisions on these proposals are contained in Annex F of the Hong Kong Ministerial Declaration.

Ministers at Hong Kong instructed the CTD-SS to expeditiously complete the review of all the outstanding ASPs and report to the General Council, with clear recommendations for a decision. With respect to the 38 Category II proposals, the CTD-SS was instructed to continue to coordinate its efforts with relevant bodies to ensure that work on those proposals was concluded and recommendations for a decision made to the General Council. Ministers at Hong Kong also mandated the CTD-SS to resume work on all outstanding issues, including a proposal submitted in 2002 by the African Group to negotiate a Monitoring Mechanism (“the Mechanism”) for effective monitoring of S&D provisions.

Following the Hong Kong Ministerial, the CTD-SS conducted a thorough “accounting” of the remaining ASPs. Though the number of proposals had been reduced considerably since their introduction, divergences among Members’ positions on the remaining proposals were quite wide. The Chair of the CTD-SS worked closely with the Chairs of the other negotiating groups and committees to which the proposals had been referred due to their technical complexity. The Chairs reported that there had been very little development on these proposals. However, some of the Chairs of the negotiating bodies indicated that a number of the issues raised in the proposals form an integral part of the ongoing negotiations. In addition, there are a number of bodies in which discussions on the proposals are continuing on the basis of revised language tabled by the proponents.

At the 8th Ministerial Conference in December 2011, Ministers agreed to expedite work to finalize the Mechanism and to take stock of the Cancun 28 proposals with a view to formal adoption of those agreed. With respect to the remaining proposals still under consideration in the CTD-SS, Members have focused their text-based discussions on six of the 16 remaining (non-Cancun 28) ASPs. These proposals cover issues relating to Articles 10.2 and 10.3 of the Agreement on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS) and Article 3.5 of the Agreement on Import Licensing Procedures.

**Major Issues in 2013**

The bulk of the CTD-SS work in 2013 was dedicated to informal, open-ended meetings to make progress on the Monitoring Mechanism and the Cancun 28 proposals. The Chair set up an ambitious schedule of informal meetings involving intensive negotiations on the Chair’s text for the Monitoring Mechanism, and discussions on the individual Cancun 28 proposals.

Following these negotiations, Members reached agreement on proposed text for the ministerial decision establishing the Monitoring Mechanism, which was adopted by a Ministerial Decision as part of the “Bali package” at the 9th Ministerial Conference, in Bali, Indonesia in December of 2013. The Mechanism will provide a regular opportunity for Members to engage in practical, evidence-based discussions that will highlight challenges and promote sharing of best practices with regard to S&D provisions, to make sure the provisions are properly encouraging trade and economic growth for developing country Members. The Decision (WT/MIN(13)/45, WT/L/920) indicates that the Mechanism shall act as a focal point within the WTO to analyze and review all aspects of implementation of existing S&D provisions, and where the review identifies a problem, recommendations may be made, including if necessary, for initiation of
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negotiations, to the relevant WTO body with purview over the provision at issue. It was also agreed that the recommendations emanating from reviews under the Mechanism will inform the work of the relevant WTO body, but not define or limit its final determination. The Monitoring Mechanism will convene twice a year pursuant to the Mechanism in dedicated sessions of the CTD (as opposed to meeting in a special session of the CTD), with the possibility of additional meetings as appropriate. The status of recommendations emerging from the Mechanism shall be included in the annual report of the CTD to the General Council.

During 2013, Members discussed the Cancun 28 in regular informal meetings of the CTD-SS. Members initially continued discussions on the six proposals that the Secretariat identified as having been affected by the passage of time since the 2003 Cancun Ministerial and expanded to discussions about all the remaining Cancun 28 proposals. Despite intensive engagement, convergence could not be reached on whether to harvest a subset of ASPs at the 9th Ministerial Conference, in line with the 8th Ministerial Conference guidance. While the Africa Group maintained that all of the Cancun 28 should be agreed and adopted, other Members expressed a contrary view, noting, in particular, that considerable time has passed since the Cancun Ministerial, such that certain proposals have been overtaken by events or require updates. As a result, the Cancun 28 proposals were not included in the Bali package.

Members also discussed, early in 2013, the ASP related to Article 10.3 of the SPS Agreement. Members were unable to agree on what constitutes “strengthening” this ASP. Considerable gaps remain, and while proponents indicated they would consult on how to move forward, there was no progress in 2013 on this or the other non-Cancun 28 ASPs (including the ASPs related to Article 10.2 of the SPS Agreement and Article 3.4 of the Agreement on Import Licensing Procedures).

Prospects for 2014

In 2014, the CTD-SS is likely to consider possible paths forward on the Cancun 28 proposals and other remaining ASPs, as part of the effort to define the post-Bali work program, as called for in the Bali Ministerial Declaration. In addition, Members will begin meeting under the Monitoring Mechanism in dedicated sessions of the CTD.

C. Work Programs Established in the Doha Development Agenda

1. Working Group on Trade, Debt, and Finance

Status

Ministers at the 2001 Doha Ministerial Conference established the mandate for the Working Group on Trade, Debt, and Finance (WGTDF). Ministers instructed the WGTDF to examine the relationship between trade, debt, and finance and to examine and make recommendations on possible steps, within the mandate and competence of the WTO, to enhance the capacity of the multilateral trading system to contribute to a durable solution to the problem of external indebtedness of developing and least-developed country Members. Ministers further instructed the WGTDF to consider possible steps to strengthen the coherence of international trade and financial policies, with a view to safeguarding the multilateral trading system from the effects of financial and monetary instability.
Major Issues in 2013

The WGTDF met twice in 2013, on May 7 and October 8. Both meetings were intended to follow up on the WGTDF’s work in 2012 regarding the direct and indirect economic relationships between exchange rates and trade.

At the May 7, 2013 meeting, Members reverted to a discussion of the substance of Brazil’s 2012 submission on exchange rate misalignment and trade remedies. The meeting also included a helpful presentation from the International Monetary Fund (IMF). In summarizing the discussion, the Chair noted that there was general interest among Members for continuing the analytical discussion on the relationship between exchange rates and trade. He further noted, however, that before Members could consider any specific WTO work in this area, including rule-making, more detailed discussions were needed, particularly with regard to the WTO’s role in this issue area. In this regard, he noted the need to build a stronger relationship between the IMF and the WTO on the topic, in the context of the existing WTO coherence mandate.

At the October 8 meeting, Members adopted the Working Group’s annual report for submission to the General Council.

Prospects for 2014

In 2014, the WGTDF will continue to discuss issues relating to the relationship between exchange rates and trade. The WGTDF will also continue to be a forum for discussing trade finance issues. Additionally, the WGTDF will continue its work under the 2001 mandate.

2. Working Group on Trade and Transfer of Technology

Status

During the 2001 Doha Ministerial Conference, WTO Ministers agreed to an “examination . . . of the relationship between trade and transfer of technology, and of any possible recommendations on steps that might be taken within the mandate of the WTO to increase flows of technology to developing countries.” To fulfill that mandate, the TNC established the Working Group on Trade and Transfer of Technology (WGTTT), under the auspices of the General Council, and tasked the WGTTT to report on its progress to the 2003 Ministerial Conference at Cancun. At that meeting, Ministers extended the time period for the WGTTT’s examination. WTO Ministers further continued this work during the 2005 Hong Kong Ministerial Conference. During the 2013 Ministerial Conference in Bali, WTO Ministers noted that the working group “has covered a number of issues and has helped to enhance Members' understanding of the complex issues that encompass the nexus between trade and transfer of technology.” However, they also observed that more work remains to be done, and directed “that the Working Group should continue its work in order to fully achieve the mandate of the Doha Ministerial Declaration.”

Major Issues in 2013

During 2013, WTO Members continued their consideration of the relationship between trade and transfer of technology on the basis of submissions by WTO Members and presentations by intergovernmental organizations. Members continued to discuss the work of the OECD and the WTO Secretariat on global value chains, first presented to the working group during 2012. The OECD highlighted its work in categorizing types of global value chains and its conclusion that the extent of knowledge depended on the choice of model. The WTO Secretariat highlighted its view that services and manufacturing firms
operated increasingly across regions and that Members’ engagement in global value chains through foreign direct investment resulted in technology transfer and increased exports. The working group also continued to discuss a 2012 UNCTAD report on the effects of non-equity relationships, such as closely integrated customer and supplier relationships, on technology transfer. UNCTAD reported that such integrated supplier relationships often involve a significant level of non-equity investment in local producers, and that such non-equity relationships played a crucial role in diffusion of technology and skills to local partners.

Concerning any possible recommendations on steps that might be taken within the mandate of the WTO to increase flows of technology to developing countries, the working group has focused on a 2008 submission by India, Pakistan, and the Philippines. Those Members reported that they intended to revise this submission in the near future. Consequently, discussion of this topic was limited in 2013.

Members also considered a revised proposal from Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico, and Peru, initially presented during 2012, for a workshop on developments in trade and transfer of technology. According to proponents, such a workshop would provide an opportunity to hear from outside speakers and to present the subject of the working group to a wider audience. Although Members continue to discuss the agenda, scope, and format of such a workshop, they agreed, in principle, to hold such a workshop during 2014.

**Prospects for 2014**

No WGGTT meetings have been scheduled yet for 2014. During 2014, Members will hold a workshop on trade and transfer of technology. The working group will also welcome presentations by Members on their national experience with technology transfer and additional presentations by intergovernmental organizations.

### 3. Work Program on Electronic Commerce

**Status**

Pursuant to the 2005 Hong Kong Ministerial Declaration, Members continue to work on ways to advance the Work Program on Electronic Commerce. At the 2013 9th Ministerial Conference in Bali, Ministers agreed to extend once again, until the next Ministerial Conference, the current practice of not imposing customs duties on electronic transmissions. In addition, they agreed to continue the Work Program, with a specific focus on addressing developmental issues, as well as a number of issues related to electronically delivered software and cloud computing.

**Major Issues in 2013**

Two workshops on electronic commerce were held at the WTO in 2013. The Committee on Trade in Development held a workshop focused on developing countries and small and medium sized enterprises. The Council for Trade in Services, at the initiation of the United States, held a second workshop focused on commercial, technological, and regulatory developments in global e-trade. Both workshops identified important policy objectives in expanding electronic commerce.

**Prospects for 2014**

The United States will continue to work with other Members to maintain a liberal trade environment for electronically traded goods and services, seeking to ensure that trade rules remain relevant to electronic commerce.
commerce. It is likely that the WTO will continue to build upon the two successful workshops held in 2013. As in the past, the General Council will assess the Work Program’s progress and consider any recommendations, including the status of the customs duties moratorium on electronic transmissions.

D. General Council Activities

Status

The WTO General Council is the highest level decision-making body in the WTO that meets on a regular basis during the year. It exercises all of the authority of the Ministerial Conference, which is required to meet no less than once every two years.

Only the Ministerial Conference and the General Council have the authority to adopt authoritative interpretations of the WTO Agreements, submit amendments to the WTO Agreement for consideration by Members, and grant waivers of obligations. The General Council or the Ministerial Conference must approve the terms for all accessions to the WTO. Technically, both the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) and the Trade Policy Review Body (TPRB) are General Council meetings that are convened for the purpose of discharging the responsibilities of the DSB and TPRB, respectively.

Four major bodies report directly to the General Council: the Council for Trade in Goods, the Council for Trade in Services, the Council for Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, and the Trade Negotiations Committee. In addition, the Committee on Trade and Environment, the Committee on Trade and Development, the Committee on Balance of Payments Restrictions, the Committee on Budget, Finance and Administration, and the Committee on Regional Trade Agreements report directly to the General Council. The Working Groups established at the First Ministerial Conference in Singapore in 1996 to examine investment, trade and competition policy, and transparency in government procurement also report directly to the General Council, although these groups have been inactive since the Cancun Ministerial Conference in 2003. A number of subsidiary bodies report to the General Council through the Council for Trade in Goods or the Council for Trade in Services. The Doha Ministerial Declaration approved a number of new work programs and working groups with mandates to report to the General Council, such as the Working Group on Trade, Debt, and Finance and the Working Group on Trade and Transfer of Technology. These mandates are part of the DDA set out in the Doha Ministerial Declaration, and this report reviews these groups’ work in subsections of Section C.

The General Council uses both formal and informal processes to conduct the business of the WTO. Informal groupings, which generally include the United States, play an important role in consensus-building. Throughout 2013, the Chairman of the General Council, together with the WTO Director General, conducted informal consultations with large groupings comprising the Heads of Delegation of the entire WTO Membership and as well as a wide variety of smaller groupings of WTO Members at various levels. The Chairman and Director General convened these consultations with a view to resolving outstanding issues on the General Council’s agenda.

Major Issues in 2013

Activities of the General Council in 2013 included:

*9th Ministerial Conference:* The General Council had detailed discussions throughout the year to plan for the 9th Ministerial Conference, held from December 3-7, 2013, in Bali, Indonesia. Details on the outcome of that Conference are set out elsewhere in this Report.
Appointed by the new WTO Director General: The General Council played a key role in appointing Roberto Azevêdo as the new Director General of the WTO. The term of office of the previous Director General, Pascal Lamy, ended on August 31, 2013.

Work under the Doha Work Program: Under the auspices of the DDA, the General Council continued its discussions related to small economies, LDCs, Aid for Trade, and the development assistance aspects of cotton and e-commerce.

WTO Accessions: Yemen, an LDC, was invited by the Membership to become the 160th Member of the WTO at the 9th Ministerial Conference in Bali in December 2013. The General Council also agreed in 2013 to new chairmen for the Working Parties for Belarus, Uzbekistan, and the Comoros.

Waivers of Obligations: The General Council adopted three draft decisions concerning the introduction of Harmonized System 2002, 2007, and 2012 nomenclature changes into WTO schedules of tariff concessions as well as a waiver for the European Union to extend additional autonomous trade preferences to Moldova. The General Council also reviewed a number of previously agreed waivers, including U.S. waivers related to the Former Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act, the African Growth and Opportunity Act, and the Andean Trade Preference Act. Annex II of this report contains a detailed list of Article IX waivers currently in force.

Ukraine’s request to renegotiate concessions under Article XXVIII of the GATT 1994: At both the February and July General Council meetings, a large group of WTO Members, including the United States, continued to press Ukraine to abandon its proposed action to renegotiate its tariff bindings on over 350 key agricultural and non-agricultural products.

Prospects for 2014

In addition to its management of the WTO and oversight of implementation of the WTO Agreement, the General Council will have detailed discussions throughout the year to implement the decisions taken at the 9th Ministerial Conference in December 2013.

E. Council for Trade in Goods

Status


The CTG is the central oversight body in the WTO for all agreements related to trade in goods and the forum for discussing issues and decisions which may ultimately require the attention of the General Council for resolution or a higher-level discussion, and for putting issues in a broader context of the rules and disciplines that apply to trade in goods. For example, the CTG considers the use of the GATT 1994 Article IX waiver provisions and has given initial approval to waivers for trade preferences that the United States and the EU granted to ACP countries and the Caribbean Basin Initiative countries, respectively.
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Major Issues in 2013

In 2013, the CTG held four formal meetings, in March, July, September, and October. The CTG devoted its attention primarily to providing formal approval of decisions and recommendations proposed by its subsidiary bodies. The CTG also served as a forum for raising concerns regarding actions that individual Members had taken with respect to the operation of goods-related WTO agreements. In addition, three major issues were discussed in the CTG in 2013:

Waivers: In light of the introduction of HS 2007 and HS 2012 changes to the Schedules of Tariff Concessions, the CTG approved two collective requests for extensions of waivers related to the implementation of the Harmonized Tariff System. The CTG forwarded these approvals to the General Council for adoption. The CTG also considered and approved an EU request for an extension of the Waiver for the Application of Autonomous Preferential Treatment to Moldova. In addition, the Philippines informed the Council of the results of further consultations and discussions it held with interested delegations, including the United States, relating to special treatment for rice. The CTG decided to revert to this issue at its next meeting in the spring of 2014.

EU Enlargement: In accordance with procedures under Article XXVIII:3 of GATT 1994, the CTG met on November 26, 2013 to consider the EU’s requests to extend the time period for the withdrawal of concessions regarding the EU’s 2007 and 2013 enlargements (i.e., the Republic of Bulgaria and Romania in 2007 and Croatia in 2013).

Market Access Complaints: The CTG also discussed concerns raised by individual Members, including concerns the United States raised, inter alia, regarding Indonesia’s import licensing regime, Ukraine’s notification under Article XXVIII of the GATT 1994, Ukraine’s Coking-Coal import quota, and the Russian Federation’s implementation of its WTO accession commitments. The United States also raised concerns with respect to Japan’s wood use points program and Nigeria’s local content measures in oil and gas.

Prospects for 2014

The CTG will continue to be the focal point for discussing agreements in the WTO dealing with trade in goods. Waiver requests and goods-specific market access concerns are likely to continue to be prominent issues on the CTG agenda.

1. Committee on Agriculture

Status

The WTO Committee on Agriculture oversees the implementation of the Agreement on Agriculture (the Agriculture Agreement) and provides a forum for Members to consult on matters related to provisions of the Agreement. In many cases, the Agriculture Committee resolves problems on implementation, permitting Members to avoid invoking lengthy dispute settlement procedures. The Agriculture Committee also has responsibility for monitoring the possible negative effects of agricultural reform on LDCs and net food importing developing country (NFIDC) Members.

Since its inception, the Agriculture Committee has proven to be a vital instrument for the United States to monitor and enforce the agricultural trade commitments undertaken by Members in the Uruguay Round. Under the Agriculture Agreement, Members agreed to provide annual notifications of progress in meeting
their commitments in agriculture, and the Agriculture Committee has met frequently to review the notifications and monitor activities of Members to ensure that trading partners honor their commitments.

Under the watchful eye of the Agriculture Committee, Members have, for the most part, complied with the agricultural commitments that they undertook as WTO Members. However, there have been important exceptions where certain Members’ agricultural policies have adversely affected U.S. agricultural trade interests. In these situations, the Agriculture Committee has frequently served as an indispensable tool for resolving conflicts before they became formal WTO disputes.

**Major Issues in 2013**

The Agriculture Committee held three formal meetings, in March, June, and September 2013, to review progress on the implementation of commitments negotiated in the Uruguay Round. At the meetings, Members undertook reviews based on notifications by Members in the areas of market access, domestic support, export subsidies, export prohibitions and restrictions, and general matters relevant to the implementation of commitments.

In total, 142 notifications were subject to review during 2013. The United States participated actively in the review process and raised specific issues concerning the operation of Members’ agricultural policies. For example, the United States regularly raised points with respect to domestic support in many countries, including Brazil, Chile, China, the EU, Indonesia, and Thailand. The United States continued to raise concerns regarding Costa Rica exceeding its bound Aggregate Measurement of Support (AMS) limits. The United States also encouraged countries, including China, India, and Vietnam to bring their domestic support notifications up to date. The United States used the review process to question Brazil’s Program for Product Flow (PEP – Prêmio para Escoamento do Produto) for rice, wheat, and corn, Thailand’s rice support program, and China’s cotton reserves purchasing program. In addition, the United States used the review process to seek information regarding St. Lucia’s domestic purchase requirements for poultry and pork; Indonesia’s revised Food Act; the Philippines’ use of reference prices applied to imports; and Turkey’s wheat export policy. The United States raised questions with respect to Japan’s notifications on special safeguards, and raised concerns regarding the administration of tariff-rate quotas with Brazil, Korea, and Thailand, and trade-distorting practices, such as Venezuela’s import licensing policies. The United States also asked about Indonesia’s and Brazil’s policies on public stockholding for food security.

During 2013, the Agriculture Committee addressed a number of other issues related to the implementation of the Agriculture Agreement, such as: (1) enhanced transparency in export subsidy notifications by “significant exporters;” (2) improving the implementation of notifications on export prohibitions/restrictions; (3) assessing transparency and consistency in domestic support notifications; (4) excessive inflation rates vis-à-vis domestic support; (5) annual monitoring of the follow up to the Marrakesh NFIDC Decision on food aid of April 15, 1994; and (6) annual consultations, under Article 18.5 of the Agriculture Agreement, concerning Members’ participation in the normal growth of world trade in agricultural products within the framework of commitments on export subsidies.

In 2013, the Agriculture Committee introduced an electronic archiving system for formal questions and responses raised in the Committee. The United States submitted a document with ideas to improve the transparency of export restrictions.

**Prospects for 2014**

The United States will continue to make full use of the Agriculture Committee to ensure transparency through timely notification by Members and to enhance enforcement of Uruguay Round commitments as
they relate to export subsidies, market access, domestic support, and trade distorting practices of WTO Members. The United States will also work with other Members as the Agriculture Committee begins implementation of the new transparency provisions that were agreed at the 9th WTO Ministerial Conference in December 2013. In addition, the United States will continue to work closely with the Agriculture Committee Chair and Secretariat to find ways to improve the timeliness and completeness of notifications and to increase the effectiveness of the Committee overall. In addition, the Agriculture Committee will continue to monitor and analyze the impact of the possible negative effects of the reform process on LDCs and NFIDCs in accordance with the Agriculture Agreement.

2. Committee on Market Access

Status

In January 1995, WTO Members established the Committee on Market Access (MA Committee), which is responsible for the implementation of concessions related to tariffs and non-tariff measures that are not explicitly covered by another WTO body, as well as for verification of new concessions on market access in the goods area.

Major Issues in 2013

The MA Committee held two formal meetings in May and October 2013, and four informal sessions or consultations, to discuss the following topics: (1) ongoing and future work on WTO Members’ tariff schedules to reflect changes to the HS tariff nomenclature and any other tariff modifications; (2) the WTO Integrated Data Base (IDB) and Consolidated Tariff Schedules (CTS) database; (3) Member notifications of quantitative restrictions; and (4) other market access issues as raised by Members.

Updates to the HS nomenclature: The MA Committee examines issues related to the transposition and renegotiation of the schedules of Members that adopted the HS in the years following its introduction on January 1, 1988. Since then, the World Customs Organization has amended the HS tariff classification system relating to tariff nomenclature in 1996, 2002, 2007, and 2012. Using agreed examination procedures, WTO Members have the right to object to modifications in another Member’s tariff schedule that result from changes in the HS nomenclature, if such modifications affect the Member’s bound tariff commitments. Members may pursue unresolved objections under Article XXVIII of GATT 1994.

The MA Committee continued its work concerning the introduction and verification of HS2002 changes to Members’ WTO tariff schedules. Throughout the year, the United States worked closely with other Members and the WTO Secretariat to ensure that all Members’ bound tariff commitments are properly reflected in their updated schedules. To date, the HS2002 files for 109 Members – including the United States – have been certified, with only 9 files outstanding.

In 2011, the MA Committee agreed to commence work on the introduction and verification of HS2007 changes to tariff schedules. Multilateral review of tariff schedules under the HS2007 procedures continued at informal Committee meetings throughout 2013. The multilateral verification process in the Committee will be ongoing through 2014.

Concerning the HS2012 nomenclature changes, the General Council approved procedures (WT/L/831) to introduce those changes to schedules of concessions using the CTS database. However, that work will not commence for some time, as the Committee is in the midst of updating Members’ bound commitments into HS2007 nomenclature. This lag can create difficulties in determining whether Members’ MFN duties – which were applied in HS2012 nomenclature beginning January 1, 2012 – are
consistent with their WTO bound commitments. The United States was the first WTO Member to submit its tariff schedule in HS2012 nomenclature to the WTO Secretariat in September 2012.

*Integrated Data Base (IDB):* Members are required to notify information on annual tariffs and trade data, linked at the level of tariff lines, to the IDB as a result of a General Council Decision adopted in July 1997. On the tariff side, the IDB contains MFN current bound duties and MFN current applied duties. Additional information covering preferential duties is also included if provided by Members. On the trade side, it contains value and quantity data on imports by country of origin by tariff line. The WTO Secretariat periodically reports on the status of Member submissions to the IDB, the most recent of which can be found in WTO document G/MA/IDB/2/Rev.37 and 38. The United States notifies this data in a timely fashion every year. However, several Members are not up to date in their submissions. The public can access tariff and trade data notified to the IDB through the WTO’s Tariff Online Analysis (TAO) facility at [https://tariffanalysis.wto.org](https://tariffanalysis.wto.org). The WTO Secretariat is also currently working to integrate into the IDB historical tariff and import information for 29 Members covering years 1988 to 1995.

*Consolidated Tariff Schedules (CTS) database:* The MA Committee continued work on implementing an electronic structure for tariff and trade data. The CTS database includes tariff bindings for each WTO Member that reflect its Uruguay Round tariff concessions, HS1996 and HS2002 amendments to tariff nomenclature and bindings, and any other Member rectifications/modifications to its WTO schedule (e.g., participation in the Information Technology Agreement). The database also includes agricultural support tables. The CTS database has been linked to the IDB and serves as the vehicle for conducting the DDA negotiations in agriculture and non-agricultural market access.

*Notification Procedures for Quantitative Restrictions (QRs):* On December 1, 1995, the Council for Trade in Goods adopted a Decision on Notification Procedures for Quantitative Restrictions, which provides that WTO Members should make complete notifications of the quantitative restrictions (QRs), which they maintain at two-year intervals thereafter, and shall notify changes to their QRs when these changes occur.

Under the revised notification procedures for QRs, the MA Committee continued to examine the QR notifications submitted by Members (G/MA/QR/1). Several Members have submitted notifications on QRs, including the United States, the Russian Federation, Hong Kong, Costa Rica, Turkey, Ukraine, Thailand, Korea, Australia, New Zealand, Macao China, and Canada.

*Other Market Access Issues:* The MA Committee also approved procedures for the de-restriction of negotiating material of the Dillon Round and some negotiating material of the four earlier GATT rounds. The procedures are almost identical to those used by the WTO General Council to derestrict GATT 1947 restricted documents.

**Prospects for 2014**

The ongoing work program of the MA Committee, while highly technical, aims to ensure that all WTO Members’ schedules of tariff commitments are up to date and available in electronic spreadsheet format. The Committee will continue to explore technical assistance needs related to data submissions, work to finalize Members’ amended schedules based on the HS2002 amendments, continue work on the transposition of Members’ tariff schedules to HS2007 nomenclature, and begin work on 2012 schedules.
3. Committee on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures

Status

The Committee on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (the SPS Committee) provides a forum for the implementation and administration of the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (the SPS Agreement), consultation on Members’ existing and proposed SPS measures, technical assistance, other informational exchanges, and the participation of the international standard setting bodies recognized in the SPS Agreement. These international standard setting bodies are: for food safety, the Codex Alimentarius Commission (Codex); for animal health, the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE); and for plant health, the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC).

The SPS Committee also discusses specific provisions of the SPS Agreement. These discussions provide an opportunity to develop procedures to assist Members in meeting specific SPS obligations. For example, the SPS Committee has issued procedures or guidelines regarding: notification of SPS measures; the “consistency” provisions under Article 5.5 of the SPS Agreement; equivalence; transparency regarding the provisions for S&D; and regionalization. Participation in the SPS Committee, which operates by consensus, is open to all WTO Members. Governments negotiating accession to the WTO may attend Committee meetings as observers. In addition, representatives from a number of international organizations attend Committee meetings as observers on an ad hoc meeting by meeting basis, including: the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO); the World Health Organization (WHO); Codex; the IPPC; the OIE; the International Trade Center; the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA); and the World Bank.

Major Issues in 2013

In 2013, the SPS Committee held meetings in March, June, and October. In these meetings, Members exchanged views regarding the implementation of SPS Agreement provisions with respect to transparency, equivalence, and regionalization, including their efforts to declare areas of their country free from specified pests and diseases.

The United States views these exchanges as positive developments, as they demonstrate a growing familiarity with the provisions of the SPS Agreement and increased recognition of the value of the SPS Committee as a forum for Members to discuss SPS-related trade issues. Many Members, including the United States, utilized these meetings to raise concerns regarding new and existing SPS measures of other Members. In 2013, the United States raised a number of concerns with measures imposed by other Members, including Vietnam's restriction on offals, France’s ban and labeling requirements on food packaging made with Bisphenol A, China's limits for methanol content in alcoholic beverages, Indonesia's restrictions on meat, and bans imposed by several Members on the use of a growth additive in cattle and swine. Further, the United States, with a view to transparency, informed the SPS Committee of U.S. measures, both new and proposed. A special information session was held on the margins of the June Committee meeting. The special information session allowed WTO Members an opportunity to informally discuss implementation of the Food Safety Modernization Act with senior officials from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration.

The Committee also continued work on the issuance of guidance regarding ad hoc consultations under Article 12.2 of the Agreement, as well as the use and development of international standards, guidelines, and recommendations by Codex, OIE, and IPPC. In October 2013, the WTO SPS Committee held a workshop on transparency for all Members.
Other important issues before the SPS Committee included private and commercial standards, along with various specific trade concerns and notifications.

*Private and Commercial Standards:* In 2013, the SPS Committee finalized a series of possible recommended actions related to the issue of private and commercial standards. The possible actions discussed include supporting the work of the three international standard-setting bodies referenced in the SPS Agreement (Codex, OIE, and IPPC), various avenues for promoting the exchange of information among Members and these bodies, and defining private and commercial standards. The Committee will only take action if all Members agree to do so. While work is currently underway in the Committee to prepare a working group definition of a SPS-related private standard, the United States remains quite concerned about whether defining private and commercial standards is an appropriate issue to which the SPS Committee should be devoting resources and continues to work with the Committee and other Members to address that concern.

*Notifications:* Because it is critical for trading partners to know and understand each other’s laws and regulations, the SPS notification process, with the Committee’s consistent encouragement, is becoming an increasingly important mechanism in the facilitation of international trade. The process also provides a means for Members to report on determinations of equivalence and S&D. The United States made 145 SPS notifications to the WTO Secretariat in 2013, and submitted comments on 78 SPS measures notified by other Members.

**Prospects for 2014**

The SPS Committee will hold three meetings in 2014 with informal sessions anticipated to be held in advance of each meeting. The Committee has a standing agenda for meetings that can be amended to accommodate new or special issues. The SPS Committee will continue to monitor Members’ implementation activities, and the discussion of specific trade concerns will continue to be an important part of the Committee’s activities, including exchanges on bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE), avian influenza, food safety measures, and technical assistance.

In 2014, the SPS Committee will work on priorities identified during its Fourth Review, as well as those identified during the Second and Third Reviews of the Operation and Implementation of the SPS Agreement. The United States anticipates that the SPS Committee will complete discussions and issue guidelines regarding *ad hoc* consultations under Article 12.2 of the Agreement, as well as on how to improve cooperation and coordination with Codex, OIE, and IPPC. In addition, the SPS Committee will continue to monitor the use and development of international standards, guidelines, and recommendations by those three bodies.

### 4. Committee on Trade-Related Investment Measures

**Status**

The Agreement on Trade-Related Investment Measures (the TRIMS Agreement), which entered into force with the establishment of the WTO in 1995, prohibits investment measures that are inconsistent with national treatment obligations under Article III:4 of the GATT 1994 and reinforces the prohibitions on quantitative restrictions set out in Article XI:1 of the GATT 1994. The TRIMS Agreement requires the elimination of certain measures imposing requirements on, or linking advantages to, certain actions of foreign investors, such as measures that require, or provide benefits for, the use of local inputs (“local content requirements”) or measures that restrict a firm’s imports to an amount related to the quantity of its
exports or of its foreign exchange earnings (“trade balancing requirements”). The Agreement includes an illustrative list of measures that are inconsistent with Articles III:4 and XI:1 of the GATT 1994.

Developments relating to the TRIMS Agreement are monitored and discussed both in the Council for Trade in Goods and in the Committee on Trade-Related Investment Measures (the “TRIMS Committee”). Since its establishment in 1995, the TRIMS Committee has been a forum for the United States and other Members to address concerns, gather information, and raise questions about the maintenance, introduction, or modification of trade-related investment measures by Members.

**Major Issues in 2013**

The TRIMS Committee held two formal meetings during 2013, in April and October, during which the United States and other Members continued to discuss particular local content measures of concern to the United States. The United States explored these concerns through written questions to certain countries to seek a better understanding of a variety of potentially trade-distortive local content requirements. The United States made progress on some of these measures. In 2012 and again in 2013, the United States raised the issue of preferences to domestically manufactured electronic goods in India, under a February 10, 2012, policy notice published by India’s Department of Information Technology (DIT). In October 2013, India announced that it intends to revise the measure, including by removing local manufacturing requirements.

This success notwithstanding, some local content measures before the Committee remain in place after several years. For example, the United States, joined by Japan and the European Union, continued to raise questions about possible local content requirements in Indonesia’s measures pertaining to mineral and coal mining and oil and gas exploration, noting that it had raised these concerns every year since 2009. The United States also asked Indonesia in this context about announced plans to ban the export of unprocessed and unrefined mining products by 2014. The United States, the European Union, Japan, and Canada also continued to press Nigeria to respond to questions from 2011 on possible local content requirements in measures pertaining to the oil and gas industry. The questions from the United States are contained in WTO document G/TRIMS/W/89. The United States also raised this issue at the Council for Trade in Goods, as discussed above, emphasizing in particular Nigeria’s failure to respond to written questions. In addition, the United States, the European Union, and Japan posed questions to Indonesia regarding potential TRIMS concerns in the telecommunications sector, an issue that was raised in the Committee in 2009, 2010, and 2012.

The Committee also addressed new local content requirements during 2013. In prior years, the United States and Japan pointed to certain local content measures imposed by Brazil in connection with a bidding process on rights to use specific radio frequencies to provide commercial mobile radio services. During 2013, the United States drew the Committee’s attention to indications that a newly announced proposal to auction off spectrum in the 700 MHz band might also contain such local content measures. The United States also joined the European Union and Australia in expressing concern about newly-introduced tax preferences in Brazil based upon fulfillment of local content requirements in a wide variety of sectors including automobiles and telecommunications equipment. The United States also joined the EU and Japan in asking Ukraine about a requirement that raw materials, supplies, fixed assets, workers, and services to be used in the development of energy power plants must be at least 50 percent locally sourced. Finally, the United States raised concerns about a 20 percent local content requirement for all energy uptake contracts entered into by the government of Uruguay in connection with construction of wind farm projects.

During 2013, the United States provided responses to questions from India concerning certain measures in the renewable energy sector taken by California, Michigan, and by public utilities in the cities of...
Having acceded to the WTO in August of 2012, the Russian Federation filed its required notification under Article 6.2 of the TRIMS Agreement identifying the names of publications in which TRIMs might be found, and a notification of measures inconsistent with the TRIMS agreement under Article 5.1 and pursuant to the "Timeline for Submission of Notifications" contained in Table 38 of the Report on the Working Party on the Accession of the Russian Federation. The United States informed the Committee that it remains keenly interested in how the Russian Federation will bring its automotive investment regimes into compliance with its WTO commitments, as required by its protocol of accession.

Prospects for 2014

The United States will continue to engage other Members in efforts to promote compliance with the TRIMS Agreement.

5. Committee on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures

Status

The Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (the SCM Agreement) provides rules and disciplines for the use of government subsidies and the application of remedies – through either WTO dispute settlement or countervailing duty (CVD) action taken by individual WTO Members – to address subsidized trade that causes harmful commercial effects. Subsidies contingent upon export performance or the use of domestic over imported goods are prohibited. All other subsidies are permitted but are actionable (through CVD or WTO dispute settlement actions) if they are (i) “specific”, i.e., limited to a firm, industry, or group thereof within the territory of a WTO Member, and (ii) found to cause adverse trade effects, such as material injury to a domestic industry or serious prejudice to the trade interests of another Member.

Major Issues in 2013

The Committee on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (the SCM Committee) held two regular meetings and two special meetings in 2013, in April and October. The SCM Committee continued to review the consistency of Members’ domestic laws, regulations, and actions with the SCM Agreement’s requirements, as well as Members’ notifications of their subsidy programs to the SCM Committee. Other items addressed in the course of the year included: the U.S. “counter notification” of unreported subsidy programs in China and India; submission by the United States of questions to China under Article 25.8 of the SCM Agreement; examination of ways to improve the timeliness and completeness of subsidy notifications; the “export competitiveness” of India’s textile and apparel sector; review of the export subsidy program extension mechanism for certain small economy developing country Members; filling the opening on the five-member Permanent Group of Experts; and updating the eligibility threshold for developing countries to provide export subsidies under Annex VII(b) of the SCM Agreement. Further information on these various activities is provided below.

Review and Discussion of Notifications: Throughout the year, Members submitted notifications of: (1) new or amended CVD legislation and regulations; (2) CVD investigations initiated and decisions taken; and (3) Members’ subsidy programs. Notifications of CVD legislation and actions, as well as subsidy notifications, were reviewed and discussed by the SCM Committee at its April and October meetings.
In reviewing notified CVD legislation and subsidies, SCM Committee procedures provide for the exchange in advance of written questions and answers in order to clarify the operation of the notified measures and their relationship to the obligations of the SCM Agreement. As of the end of 2013, 101 WTO Members (counting the European Union as a single Member) have notified their CVD legislation or lack thereof; 31 Members have so far failed to make a legislative notification. In 2013, the SCM Committee reviewed notifications of new or amended CVD laws and regulations from the United States, Australia, Cameroon, Chile, Mali, Morocco, New Zealand, the Russian Federation, and Ukraine.

As for CVD measures, nine Members notified CVD actions they took during the latter half of 2012, and eight Members notified actions they took in the first half of 2013. Specifically, the SCM Committee reviewed actions taken by: Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, the EU, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, South Africa, Turkey, and the United States.

In 2013, the SCM Committee examined 36 new and full subsidy notifications covering various time periods. Unfortunately, numerous Members have yet to make even an initial subsidy notification to the WTO, although many of them are least-developed country Members.

**Counter notifications:** Under Article 25.1 of the SCM Agreement, Members are obligated to regularly provide a subsidy notification to the SCM Committee. Prior to October 2011, China had only submitted a single subsidy notification in 2006 (covering the years 2001 – 2004). India submitted a subsidies notification in 2010 – that only included three programs – after not providing any notification for 10 years. The United States and other Members have repeatedly expressed deep concern about the notification record of China and India (among others). During the 2010 fall meeting of the SCM Committee, the United States foreshadowed potential resort to the counter notification mechanism under Article 25.10 of the SCM Agreement. This provision states that when a Member fails to notify a subsidy, any other Member may bring the matter to the attention of the Member failing to notify.

Pursuant to Article 25.10, the United States filed counter notifications in October 2011 with respect to over 200 unreported subsidy programs in China and 50 unreported subsidy programs in India – the first counter notifications ever filed by the United States. While China submitted its second subsidy notification (covering 2005 – 2008) shortly after the U.S. counter notification, it covered very few of the subsidy programs referenced in the U.S. counter notification. At the April 2012 meeting of the Committee, the United States brought these matters to the notice of the SCM Committee under the provisions of Article 25.10. In May 2012, India submitted a supplemental subsidy notification covering certain fishery programs, including programs at the sub-central level. However, none of the programs in the supplemental notification were those referenced by the U.S. counter notification of programs in India. At both meetings of the SCM Committee in 2013, the United States continued to press China and India to notify the outstanding programs identified in the U.S. counter notifications.

**Submission of Article 25.8 questions:** Article 25.8 of the Agreement provides: "Any Member may, at any time, make a written request for information on the nature and extent of any subsidy granted or maintained by another Member (including any subsidy referred to in Part IV), or for an explanation of the reasons for which a specific measure has been considered as not subject to the requirement of notification." Because China’s two notifications to date have been significantly incomplete (e.g., only central government-level programs have been notified) and late (e.g., the notification filed in 2011 only
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5 These 99 notifications do not include notifications submitted by Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, the Slovak Republic and Slovenia before these Members acceded to the European Communities.

6 In keeping with WTO practice, the review of legislative provisions which pertain or apply to both antidumping and CVD actions by a Member generally took place in the Antidumping Committee.
covered up through 2008), the United States submitted extensive, detailed questions to China in October 2012, covering a wide range of possible subsidy programs in numerous sectors that appear should have been notified. Under Article 25.9, China is obligated to provide a response “as quickly as possible and in a comprehensive manner.” To date, China has not responded to the United States’ questions submitted under Article 25.8; the United States continued to press China in both meetings of the SCM Committee in 2013 to provide answers.

Notification Improvements: In March 2009, the Chairman of the Trade Policy Review Body, acting through the Chairman of the General Council, requested that all committees discuss “ways to improve the timeliness and completeness of notifications and other information flows on trade measures.” The United States fully supported the continuation of this initiative in 2013 in light of Members’ poor record in meeting their subsidy notification obligations. In 2010, the United States took the initiative under this agenda item to review the subsidy notification record of several large exporters in failing to provide complete and timely subsidy notifications. Of primary concern in this regard was China. The United States continues to devote significant time and resources to researching, monitoring, and analyzing China’s subsidy practices. These efforts helped to identify the very significant omissions in the two subsidy notifications submitted by China to date and lay the groundwork for the further pursuit of these issues in the context of the SCM Committee’s work and other fora.

In 2011, the United States submitted a specific proposal under Article 25.8 of the SCM Agreement to strengthen and improve the notification procedures of the SCM Committee. As noted above, under Article 25.8, any Member may make a written request for information on the nature and extent of a subsidy subject to the requirement of notification. Unfortunately, many requests under Article 25.8 have not been answered or are only partially answered orally after significant delay. To address this problem, the United States proposed that the SCM Committee establish deadlines for the submission of written answers to Article 25.8 questions and include all unanswered Article 25.8 questions on the bi-annual agendas of the SCM Committee until the questions are answered. In 2013, the Committee continued to examine the U.S. proposal. Many countries supported the proposal; several other countries, such as China, India and South Africa, voiced concerns. Work will continue on the U.S. proposal in 2014.

The “export competitiveness” of India’s textile and apparel sector: Under the SCM Agreement, developing countries receive special and differential treatment with respect to certain subsidy disciplines under Article 27. For developing countries listed in Annex VII of the SCM Agreement, which includes India, the general prohibition on export subsidies does not apply until: (1) per capita GNP reaches a designated threshold of $1,000 per annum or (2) 8 years after the country achieves “export competitiveness” for a particular product. Article 27.6 of the SCM Agreement defines export competitiveness as the point when an exported product reaches a share of 3.25 percent of world trade for two consecutive calendar years. Export competitiveness is determined to exist either via notification by the Annex VII developing country having reached export competitiveness or on the basis of a computation undertaken by the WTO SCM Committee Secretariat at the request of any Member.

In February 2010, the United States formally requested the Secretariat, pursuant to Article 27.6 of the SCM Agreement, to compute the export competitiveness of India’s textile and apparel sector. The Secretariat submitted its results to the Committee in March 2010. The calculations appear to support the conclusion that India has reached export competitiveness in the textile and apparel sector. In light of the Secretariat’s calculations, the United States has pressed India to identify the current export subsidy programs that benefit the textile and apparel sector and commit to a phase-out schedule to end all such programs to the extent they benefit the textile and apparel sector. In response, India has raised certain
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7 G/SCM/W/555; 21 October 2011.
technical questions as to the appropriate definition of “product” and the precise starting point of the phase-out period under Articles 27.5 and 27.6. The United States will continue to pursue this issue.

**Extension of the transition period for the phase out of export subsidies:** Under the SCM Agreement, most developing country Members were obligated to eliminate their export subsidies by December 31, 2002. To address the concerns of certain small economies, a special procedure within the context of Article 27.4 of the SCM Agreement was adopted at the 2001 Doha Ministerial Conference to provide for facilitated annual extensions of the time available to eliminate certain notified export subsidies. In 2007, the General Council, acting on an SCM Committee recommendation, decided to extend the application of the special procedure. An important outcome of these negotiations, upon which the United States and other developed and developing countries insisted, was that the beneficiaries must eliminate all export subsidy programs no later than 2015 and that they will have no recourse to further extensions beyond 2015. The final two-year phase-out period (2014-2015) is provided for in Article 27.4 of the SCM Agreement and shall end no later than December 31, 2015.

**Permanent Group of Experts:** Article 24 of the SCM Agreement directs the SCM Committee to establish a Permanent Group of Experts (PGE), “composed of five independent persons, highly qualified in the fields of subsidies and trade relations” and that “[t]he experts will be elected by the Committee and one of them will be replaced every year.” The SCM Agreement articulates three possible roles for the PGE: (i) to provide, at the request of a dispute settlement panel, a binding ruling on whether a particular practice brought before that panel constitutes a prohibited subsidy within the meaning of Article 3 of the SCM Agreement; (ii) to provide, at the request of the SCM Committee, an advisory opinion on the existence and nature of any subsidy; and (iii) to provide, at the request of a Member, a “confidential” advisory opinion on the nature of any subsidy proposed to be introduced or currently maintained by that Member. To date, the PGE has not yet been called upon to perform any of the aforementioned duties.

At the beginning of 2013, the members of the Permanent Group of Experts were: Mr. Jeffrey A. May (United States); Mr. Gérard Depayre (EU); Mr. Akio Shimizu (Japan); Mr. Zhang Yuqing (China); and, Mr. Welber Barral (Brazil). Mr. Jeffrey A. May’s term expired in 2013. Two candidates were nominated to replace him – one from the United States and one from Chile. At the regular April 2013 meeting, Mr. Chris Parlin of the United States was elected to replace Mr. Jeffrey A. May. Therefore, at the end of 2013, the five members of the PGE were: Mr. Gérard Depayre (until Spring 2014); Mr. Akio Shimizu (until Spring 2015); Mr. Zhang Yuqing (until Spring 2016); Mr. Welber Barral (until Spring 2017); and Mr. Chris Parlin (until Spring 2018).

**The Methodology for Annex VII (b) of the SCM Agreement:** Annex VII of the SCM Agreement identifies certain lesser developed country Members that are eligible for particular special and differential treatment. Specifically, the export subsidies of these Members are not prohibited, and therefore, are not actionable as prohibited subsidies under the dispute settlement process. The Members identified in Annex VII include those WTO Members designated by the United Nations as “least-developed countries” (Annex VII(a)) as well as countries that had, at the time of the negotiation of the Agreement, a per capita GNP under $1,000 per annum and are specifically listed in Annex VII(b). A country automatically “graduates” from Annex VII (b) status when its per capita GNP rises above the $1,000 threshold. At the
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8 Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Belize, Costa Rica, Dominica, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Grenada, Guatemala, Jamaica, Jordan, Mauritius, Panama, Papua New Guinea, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, and Uruguay have made yearly requests since 2002 under these special procedures.

9 Members identified in Annex VII(b) are: Bolivia, Cameroon, Congo, Cote d’Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Morocco, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Senegal, Sri Lanka, and Zimbabwe. In recognition of the technical error made in the final compilation of this list and pursuant to a General Council decision, Honduras was formally added to Annex VII(b) on January 20, 2001.
Fourth Ministerial Conference, decisions were made, which, *inter alia*, led to the adoption of an approach to calculate the $1,000 threshold in constant 1990 dollars and to require that a Member be above this threshold for three consecutive years before graduation. The WTO Secretariat updated these calculations in 2013.\textsuperscript{10}

**Prospects for 2014**

In 2014, the United States expects to review China’s answers to the United States’ outstanding questions submitted under Article 25.8 and will focus on other possible subsidy programs in China not notified, particularly those that may be prohibited under the SCM Agreement and those administered at the provincial and local levels. The United States will press China and India to notify the outstanding programs included in the U.S. counter notifications. Furthermore, the United States will continue to seek to engage India bilaterally to commit to a phase out of its export subsidy programs to the extent that they benefit the textile and apparel sector. More generally, the SCM Committee will continue to work in 2014 to improve the timeliness and completeness of Members’ subsidy notifications and, in particular, will continue to discuss the proposal made by the United States to improve and strengthen the SCM Committee’s procedures under Article 25.8 of the SCM Agreement. Finally, the United States will likely submit its next subsidies notification to the SCM Committee in 2014, covering fiscal years 2011 and 2012.

**6. Committee on Customs Valuation**

**Status**

The purpose of the Agreement on the Implementation of GATT Article VII (known as the WTO Agreement on Customs Valuation, referred to herein as the “Valuation Agreement”) is to ensure that determinations of the customs value for the application of duty rates to imported goods are conducted in a neutral and uniform manner, precluding the use of arbitrary or fictitious customs values. Adherence to the Agreement is important for U.S. exporters, particularly to ensure that market access opportunities achieved through tariff reductions are not negated by unwarranted and unreasonable “uplifts” in the customs value of goods to which tariffs are applied. The use of arbitrary and inappropriate “uplifts” in the valuation of goods by importing countries when applying tariffs can result in an unwarranted doubling or tripling of effective duties.

**Major Issues in 2013**

The Valuation Agreement is administered by the Committee on Customs Valuation (the Customs Valuation Committee), which held two formal meetings in 2013. The Agreement established a Technical Committee on Customs Valuation under the auspices of the World Customs Organization (WCO), with a view to ensuring, at the technical level, uniformity in interpretation and application of the Valuation Agreement. The Technical Committee also held two meetings in 2013.

In accordance with a 1999 recommendation of the WTO Working Party on Preshipment Inspection that was adopted by the General Council, the Customs Valuation Committee continued to provide a forum for reviewing the operation of various Members’ preshipment inspection regimes and the implementation of the WTO Agreement on Preshipment Inspection.

\textsuperscript{10} See G/SCM/110/Add.10.
The use of minimum import prices, a practice inconsistent with the provisions of the Agreement, continues to diminish, and no Members currently maintain the S&D reservation concerning the use of minimum values. The United States has used the Customs Valuation Committee as an important forum for addressing concerns on behalf of U.S. exporters across all sectors – including agriculture, automotive, textile, steel, and information technology – that have experienced difficulties related to the conduct of customs valuation regimes, as well as preshipment inspection regimes, outside of the disciplines set forth under the Agreements.

Achieving universal adherence to the Valuation Agreement in the Uruguay Round was an important objective of the United States. The Agreement was initially negotiated in the Tokyo Round, but its acceptance was voluntary until mandated as part of membership in the WTO. A proper valuation methodology under the Agreement, avoiding arbitrary determinations or officially established minimum import prices, is essential for the realization of market access commitments. Just as important, the implementation of the Agreement also often represents the first concrete and meaningful steps taken by developing country Members toward reforming their customs administrations and diminishing corruption and ultimately moving to a rules-based trade facilitation environment.

An important part of the Customs Valuation Committee’s work is the examination of implementing customs valuation legislation. As of December 2013, 90 Members had notified their national legislation on customs valuation (these figures do not include the 27 individual EU Members). In addition, 60 Members have notified the checklist of issues. Some 39 Members have not yet made any notification of their national legislation on customs valuation. At the Committee’s May and September 2013 meetings, the Committee undertook its examination of the customs valuation legislation of Bahrain, Belize, Cambodia, Cape Verde, China, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Rwanda, Russian Federation, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Thailand, Tunisia, Uruguay, and Ukraine. The Committee also looked at first time notifications by Lao PDR, Macau (China), Mali, Nicaragua, and the Russian Federation. With the exception of Cambodia whose review the Committee agreed to conclude, the Committee’s examination of these Members’ customs valuation legislation will continue in 2014.

Working with information provided by U.S. exporters, the United States played a leading role in these examinations, submitting in some cases a series of detailed questions as well as suggestions toward improved implementation. In addition to raising questions for Members whose customs valuation legislation is under examination, the United States also submitted a detailed request for information to Indonesia requesting notification of its preshipment inspection program to the Committee.

The Customs Valuation Committee’s work throughout 2013 continued to reflect a cooperative focus among all Members to ensure appropriate implementation of the Valuation Agreement. The Committee took note of technical assistance activities carried out by the Secretariat of the WCO and its Members, related to customs valuation. The Committee also noted that technical assistance in the area of customs valuation is now incorporated into the WTO-wide technical assistance program, which encompasses regional activities on market access issues, including customs valuation.

**Prospects for 2014**

The Customs Valuation Committee’s work in 2014 will include reviewing the relevant implementing legislation and regulations notified by Members, along with addressing any further requests by other Members concerning implementation deadlines. The Committee will monitor progress by Members with regard to their respective work programs that were included in the decisions granting transitional reservations or extensions of time for implementation. In this regard, the Committee will continue to provide a forum for sustained focus on issues arising from practices of all Members that have implemented the Valuation Agreement, to ensure that such Members’ customs valuation regimes do not
utilize arbitrary or fictitious values, such as through the use of minimum import prices. In addition the United States, along with a number of co-sponsors, proposed that the Committee agree to sponsor an informal workshop inviting the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) to discuss the use of databases to set reference prices. In addition to the ICC other representatives from the WTO Secretariat, WCO, and Technical Committee on Customs Valuation will be invited to present their work on this issue. It is hoped that the presentations will encourage discussions between Members, and encourage the participation of capital-based experts about the use of reference price databases. Finally, the Committee will continue to address technical assistance issues as a matter of high priority.

7. Committee on Rules of Origin

Status

The objective of the Agreement on Rules of Origin (the ROO Agreement) is to increase transparency, predictability, and consistency in both the preparation and application of rules of origin. The ROO Agreement provides important disciplines for conducting preferential and nonpreferential origin regimes, such as the obligation to provide binding origin rulings upon request to traders within 150 days of that request. In addition to setting forth disciplines related to the administration of rules of origin, the ROO Agreement provides for a work program leading to the multilateral harmonization of rules of origin used for nonpreferential trade. The Harmonization Work Program (HWP) is more complex than initially envisioned under the Agreement, which provided for the work to be completed within three years after its commencement in July 1995. This HWP continued throughout 2013 and will continue into 2014.

The ROO Agreement is administered by the Committee on Rules of Origin (the ROO Committee), which held meetings in April and September of 2013. The Committee also serves as a forum to exchange views on notifications by Members concerning their national rules of origin along with relevant judicial decisions and administrative rulings of general application. The ROO Agreement also established a Technical Committee on Rules of Origin with the WCO to assist in the HWP.

Major Issues in 2013

As of December 2013, 85 Members have notified the WTO concerning nonpreferential rules of origin. In these notifications, 41 Members notified that they apply nonpreferential rules of origin, and 44 Members notified that they did not have a nonpreferential rule of origin regime. Forty-six Members have not notified nonpreferential rules of origin.

Virtually all WTO Members have notified the WTO, either through the ROO Committee or other WTO bodies, that they apply preferential rules of origin. Six Members have notified that they do not have preferential rules of origin.

The ROO Agreement has provided a means for addressing and resolving many problems facing U.S. exporters pertaining to origin regimes, and the ROO Committee has been active in its review of the Agreement’s implementation. Virtually all issues and concerns cited by U.S. exporters as arising under the origin regimes of U.S. trading partners arise from administrative practices that are not transparent, allow discrimination, and lack predictability. Substantial attention has been given to the implementation of the ROO Agreement’s important disciplines related to transparency, which constitute internationally-recognized “best customs practices.”

The ongoing HWP leading to the multilateral harmonization of nonpreferential product specific rules of origin has attracted a great deal of attention and resources. Progress has been made toward completion of
this effort, despite the large volume and magnitude of complex issues, which must be addressed for hundreds of specific products.

The ROO Committee continued to focus on the HWP to achieve multilateral harmonization of nonpreferential rules of origin. U.S. proposals for the HWP have been developed based on a Section 332 study, which was conducted by the U.S. International Trade Commission pursuant to a request by USTR. The U.S. proposals reflect input received from ongoing consultations with the private sector as the negotiations have progressed from the technical stage to deliberations at the ROO Committee. Representatives from several U.S. Government agencies continue to be involved in the HWP, including USTR, Customs and Border Protection (formerly the U.S. Customs Service), the U.S. Department of Commerce, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

In 2006, the General Council agreed that following resolution of the core policy issues, the Committee would complete its remaining work on the HWP by December 2007. Notwithstanding this deadline, the HWP has not been completed.

While the ROO Committee made some progress towards fulfilling the mandate of the ROO Agreement to establish harmonized nonpreferential rules of origin, a number of fundamental issues, including many product-specific rules for agricultural and industrial goods, and the scope of the prospective obligation to apply the harmonized nonpreferential rules of origin equally for all purposes, remained to be resolved.

Because of the impasse among Members on: (i) the product specific rules related to the 94 core policy issues; (ii) the absence of a common understanding of the scope of the prospective obligation to apply the harmonized nonpreferential rules of origin equally for all purposes; and (iii) the growing concern among Members that the final result of the HWP negotiations would not be consistent with the objectives of the HWP set forth in Article 9 of the ROO Agreement, the General Council recognized that its guidance was needed on how to resolve these issues. In 2007, the General Council endorsed the recommendation of the ROO Committee that substantive work on these issues be suspended until the ROO Committee receives the necessary guidance from the General Council on how to reconcile the differences among Members on the aforementioned issues. The General Council also agreed with the recommendation of the Chair of the ROO Committee that the Committee would continue its work with a view to resolving all technical issues and report periodically to the General Council on its efforts in this regard.

During the two ROO Committee meetings in 2013, the Members continued to work on technical issues, including the technical aspects of the overall architecture that would be used for applying the rules of origin, and the transposition of draft harmonized rules of origin (originally negotiated in the 1996 version of the Harmonized System or HS) into more recent versions of the HS nomenclature. In addition, Members discussed the future organization of the ROO Committee’s work. Some Members hold the view that the harmonization of nonpreferential rules of origin remains an important trade policy objective while other Members feel that conclusion of this work is no longer a priority since the WTO now covers virtually all major trading nations.

Prospects for 2014

Further progress in the HWP will remain contingent on achieving appropriate resolution of the “core policy issues,” reaching a consensus on the scope of the prospective obligation to the harmonized nonpreferential rules of origin apply equally for all purposes and achieving a result that is consistent with the objectives set forth in Article 9 of the ROO Agreement. The Committee will also continue to discuss the future organization of the Committee’s work and divergences in Members’ views of how to continue discussions of the HWP. In accordance with the decision taken by the General Council in July 2007, and subject to future guidance from the General Council, the ROO Committee will continue to focus on
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technical issues, including the technical aspects of the overall architecture of the HWP product specific
rules, through informal consultations. The Committee will also continue to review the work done by the
Secretariat on the transposition of the current HWP to more recent versions of the HS nomenclature. The
ROO Committee will continue to report periodically to the General Council on its progress in resolving
these issues.

8. Committee on Technical Barriers to Trade

Status

The Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (the TBT Agreement) establishes rules and procedures
regarding the development, adoption, and application of voluntary standards and mandatory technical
regulations for products and the procedures (such as testing or certification) used to determine whether a
particular product meets such voluntary standards or technical regulations. One of the main objectives of
the TBT Agreement is to prevent the use of regulations as unnecessary barriers to trade while ensuring
that Members retain the right to regulate, *inter alia*, for the protection of health, safety, or the
environment, at the levels they consider appropriate.

The TBT Agreement applies to industrial as well as agricultural products, although it does not apply to
SPS measures or specifications for government procurement, which are covered under separate
agreements. TBT Agreement rules help to distinguish legitimate standards, conformity assessment
procedures, and technical regulations from protectionist measures and other measures that act as
unnecessary obstacles to trade. For example, the TBT Agreement requires Members to apply standards,
technical regulations, and conformity assessment procedures in a nondiscriminatory fashion and, in
particular, requires that technical regulations be no more trade restrictive than necessary to meet a
legitimate objective and be based on relevant international standards, except where international standards
would be ineffective or inappropriate to meet a legitimate objective.

The Committee on Technical Barriers to Trade (the TBT Committee)\(^1\) serves as a forum for consultation
on issues associated with implementing and administering the TBT Agreement. The TBT Committee is
composed of representatives of each WTO Member and provides an opportunity for Members to discuss
concerns about specific standards, technical regulations, and conformity assessment procedures that a
Member proposes or maintains. The TBT Committee also allows Members to discuss systemic issues
affecting implementation of the TBT Agreement (*e.g.*, transparency, use of good regulatory practices,
regulatory cooperation), and to exchange information on Members’ practices related to implementing the
TBT Agreement and relevant international developments.

\(^1\) Participation in the Committee is open to all WTO Members. Certain non-WTO Member governments also
participate, in accordance with guidance agreed on by the General Council. Representatives of a number of
organizations were invited to attend meetings of the Committee as observers: the International Monetary Fund
(IMF); the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD); the International Trade Center
(ITC); the International Organization for Standardization (ISO); the International Electrotechnical Commission
(IEC); the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO); the World Health Organization (WHO); the FAO/WHO
Codex Alimentarius Commission; the International Office of Epizootics (OIE); the Organization for Economic
Cooperation and Development (OECD); the UN Economic Commission for Europe (UN/ECE); and the World
Bank. The International Organization of Legal Metrology (OIML), the *Bureau International des Poids et Mesures*
(BIPM), the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), the Latin American Integration
Association (ALADI), the European Free Trade Association (EFTA), the International Telecommunications Union
(ITU), the Southern African Development Community (SADC), and the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of
States (ACP) have been granted observer status on an *ad hoc* basis.
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Transparency and Availability of WTO/TBT Documents: The TBT Agreement requires each Member to establish a central contact point, known as an inquiry point, which is responsible for responding to requests for information on its standards, technical requirements, and conformity assessment procedures, or making the appropriate referral. The TBT Agreement also requires Members to notify proposed technical regulations and conformity assessment procedures and to take comments received from other Members into account. These obligations provide a key benefit to the public. Through the U.S. Government’s implementation of these obligations, the public is able to obtain information on proposed technical regulations and conformity assessment procedures of other WTO Members and to provide written comments for consideration on those proposals before they are finalized.

The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) serves as the U.S. inquiry point for purposes of the TBT Agreement (NIST can be contacted via email at: ncsci@nist.gov or notifyus@nist.gov or via the Internet at: http://www.nist.gov/ncsci or http://www.nist.gov/notifyus). NIST maintains a reference collection of standards, specifications, test methods, codes, and recommended practices. This reference material includes U.S. Government agencies’ technical regulations and conformity assessment procedures, and the standards of nongovernmental standardizing bodies. The inquiry point responds to requests for information concerning Federal and State standards, technical regulations, and conformity assessment procedures, as well as voluntary standards and conformity assessment procedures developed or adopted by nongovernmental bodies. Upon request, NIST will provide copies of notifications of proposed technical regulations and conformity assessment procedures that other Members have made under the TBT Agreement, as well as contact information for other Members’ TBT inquiry points. NIST maintains the “Notify U.S. Service” through which U.S. entities receive, via e-mail, notifications of drafts or changes to domestic and foreign technical regulations and conformity assessment procedures for manufactured products. U.S. entities can access the services through the website: https://tsapps.nist.gov/notifyus/data/index/index.cfm. NIST refers requests for information concerning SPS measures to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is the U.S. inquiry point pursuant to the WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures.

A number of documents relating to the work of the TBT Committee are available to the public directly from the WTO website: http://www.wto.org. TBT Committee documents are indicated by the symbols, “G/TBT/...”. Notifications by Members of proposed technical regulations and conformity assessment procedures that are available for comment are issued as: G/TBT/N (the “N” stands for “notification”) /USA (which in this case stands for the United States of America; three letter symbols will be used to designate the WTO Member originating the notification) /X (where “x” will indicate the numerical sequence for that Member). Parties in the United States interested in submitting comments to foreign governments on their proposals should contact the U.S. inquiry point, as discussed above. As a general rule, written information that the United States provides to the TBT Committee is submitted on an “unrestricted” basis and is available to the public on the WTO website. The WTO Secretariat has expanded the information it provides on its “technical barriers to trade” website that is available to the public, including summaries of meetings, agendas, workshops, technical assistance, and key documents.

The opportunity provided by the TBT Agreement for interested parties in the United States to influence the development of proposed technical regulations and conformity assessment procedures being developed by other Members by allowing them to provide written comments on drafts and submit them through the U.S. inquiry point helps to prevent the establishment of technical barriers to trade. The TBT Agreement has functioned well in this regard, although discussions on how to improve its operation occur as part of the triennial review process (see below). Disciplines and obligations, such as the prohibition on 12 Before 2000, the numbering of notifications of proposed technical regulations and conformity assessment procedures read: “G/TBT/Notif./...” (followed by a number).
discrimination and the requirement that technical regulations not be more trade restrictive than necessary to fulfill legitimate regulatory objectives, have been useful in evaluating potential trade barriers and in seeking ways to address them.

The TBT Committee also plays an important monitoring and oversight role. It has served as a constructive forum for discussing and resolving issues and avoiding disputes. Since its inception, an increasing number of Members, including developing countries, have used the Committee to highlight trade problems.

Article 15.4 of the TBT Agreement requires the Committee to review the operation and implementation of the TBT Agreement every three years. Six such reviews have now been completed (G/TBT/5, G/TBT/9, G/TBT/13, G/TBT/19, G/TBT/26, and G/TBT/32). From the U.S. perspective, a key benefit of these reviews is that they prompt WTO Members to review and discuss all of the provisions of the TBT Agreement, which facilitates a common understanding of Members’ rights and obligations. The reviews have also prompted the Committee to host workshops on various topics of interest, including technical assistance, conformity assessment, labeling, good regulatory practice, international standards, and regulatory cooperation.

Major Issues in 2013

The TBT Committee met three times in 2013, March (G/TBT/M/59), June (G/TBT/M/60), and October (G/TBT/M/61). At some of these meetings, Members made statements informing the Committee of measures they had taken to implement the TBT Agreement and to administer measures in compliance with the Agreement. Members also used Committee meetings to raise concerns about specific technical regulations, standards, or conformity assessment procedures that have been proposed or adopted by other Members. Measures garnering significant Committee attention included proposed labeling requirements for food from Chile, Peru, and Indonesia; tobacco-related measures from New Zealand, Ireland and the European Union; regulations on alcoholic beverages from Russia; and continued concern regarding regulations for EU REACH (Registration, Evaluation, Authorization, and Restriction of Chemicals); the development of China-specific standards in the information technology sphere; Korea’s cosmetics measures; and India’s testing and certification requirements for telecommunications products.

In 2013, the Committee continued its exchange of experiences on good regulatory practice, conformity assessment procedures, transparency, technical assistance, international standards, and S&D treatment. Pursuant to the recommendations agreed in November 2012 under the Sixth Triennial Review (G/TBT/32), the Committee expanded these exchanges to include informal thematic discussions at each of its meetings to provide the opportunity for TBT experts to consider, in a multilateral setting, how other Members have addressed challenges in their national efforts to strengthen implementation of the Agreement. Through these thematic discussions, the Committee is pressing for greater progress on these issues related to specific decisions and recommendations arising out of the triennial reviews (G/TBT/1/Rev.11), including on good regulatory practice and transparency. At its March 2013 meeting, the TBT Committee adopted the Eighteenth Annual Review of the Implementation and Operation of the TBT Agreement under Article 15.3 (G/TBT/33). The WTO Secretariat also updated the relevant lists of standardizing bodies that have accepted the Code of Good Practice for the Preparation, Adoption, and Application of Standards set out in Annex 3 of the Agreement (G/TBT/CS/1/Add.17 and G/TBT/CS/2/Rev.19).

During the 2013 meetings of the TBT Committee, representatives of observers to the Committee, including Codex, IEC, ISO, ITC, OECD, UNECE, and ITU, updated the Committee on their activities relevant to its work, including on technical assistance.
Prospects for 2014

The TBT Committee will continue to monitor Members’ implementation of the TBT Agreement. In 2014, U.S. priorities will continue to focus on resolving specific trade concerns, as well as furthering the outcomes generated by the Sixth Triennial Review of the Operation and Implementation of the TBT Agreement. In this regard, among the U.S. priorities for the Committee in 2014 will be to agree on a list of mechanisms and principles of good regulatory practices to guide Members in implementing the TBT Agreement more efficiently and effectively. In addition, the United States will focus on increasing transparency in standard setting through review of the implementation by Members of the Code of Good Practice (Annex 3 of the Agreement). Lastly, the United States will support the Committee’s work to inform Members on the choice and design of conformity assessment procedures.

9. Committee on Antidumping Practices

Status

The Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 (the Antidumping Agreement) sets forth detailed rules and disciplines prescribing the manner and basis on which Members may take action to offset the injurious dumping of products imported from another Member. Implementation of the Antidumping Agreement is overseen by the Committee on Antidumping Practices (the Antidumping Committee), which operates in conjunction with two subsidiary bodies, the Working Group on Implementation (formerly the Ad Hoc Group on Implementation) and the Informal Group on Anticircumvention.

The Antidumping Committee is an important venue for reviewing Members’ compliance with the detailed provisions in the Antidumping Agreement, improving mutual understanding of those provisions, and providing opportunities to exchange views and experiences with respect to Members’ application of antidumping remedies.

The Working Group on Implementation (the Working Group) is an active body, which focuses on practical issues and concerns relating to implementation. The activities of the Working Group permit Members to develop a better understanding of their respective policies and practices for implementing the provisions of the Antidumping Agreement based on papers submitted by Members on specific topics. Where possible, the Working Group endeavors to develop draft recommendations on the topics it discusses, which it forwards to the Antidumping Committee for consideration. To date, the Antidumping Committee has adopted Working Group recommendations on the following five antidumping topics: (1) the period of data collection for antidumping investigations; (2) the timing of notifications under Article 5.5; (3) the contents of preliminary determinations; (4) the time period to be considered in making a determination of negligible imports for purposes of Article 5.8; and (5) an indicative list of elements relevant to a decision on a request for extension of time to provide information pursuant to Articles 6.1 and 6.1.1.

The Working Group has drawn a high level of participation by Members, and in particular, by capital-based experts and officials of antidumping administering authorities. Since the inception of the Working Group, the United States has submitted papers on most topics and has been an active participant at all meetings. While not a negotiating forum in either a technical or formal sense, the Working Group serves an important role in promoting improved understanding of the Antidumping Agreement’s provisions and exploring options for improving practices among antidumping administrators.
At Marrakesh in 1994, Ministers adopted a Decision on Anticircumvention directing the Antidumping Committee to develop rules to address the problem of circumvention of antidumping measures. In 1997, the Antidumping Committee agreed upon a framework for discussing this important topic and established the Informal Group on Anticircumvention (the Informal Group). Many Members, including the United States, recognize the importance of using the Informal Group to pursue the 1994 decision by Ministers.

Major Issues in 2013

In 2013, the Antidumping Committee held meetings in April and October. At its meetings, the Antidumping Committee focused on implementation of the Antidumping Agreement, in particular, by continuing its review of Members’ antidumping legislation. The Antidumping Committee also reviewed reports required of Members that provide information as to preliminary and final antidumping measures and actions taken over the preceding six months.

The following is a list of the more significant activities that the Antidumping Committee, the Working Group, and the Informal Group undertook in 2013.

Notification and Review of Antidumping Legislation: To date, 76 Members have notified that they currently have antidumping legislation in place, and 36 Members have notified that they maintain no such legislation. In 2013, the Antidumping Committee reviewed new notifications of antidumping legislation and/or regulations submitted by Australia, Cameroon, Chile, the European Union, Lao PDR, Morocco, New Zealand, the Russian Federation, Ukraine, and the United States. In addition, Brazil and Montenegro have notified their respective antidumping legislation for review by Members and that review will be undertaken as part of the April 2014 Antidumping Committee meeting. Several Members, including the United States, were active in formulating written questions and in making follow up inquiries at the Antidumping Committee meetings.

Notification and Review of Antidumping Actions: In 2013, 30 Members notified that they had taken antidumping actions during the latter half of 2012, whereas 31 Members did so with respect to the first half of 2013. Members identified these actions, as well as outstanding antidumping measures currently maintained by Members, in semi-annual reports submitted for the Antidumping Committee’s review and discussion. The semi-annual reports for the second half of 2012 were issued in document series “G/ADP/N/223/…,” and the semi-annual reports for the first half of 2013 were issued in document series “G/ADP/N/230/…” At its April and October 2013 meetings, the Antidumping Committee reviewed Members’ notifications of preliminary and final actions pursuant to Article 16.4 of the Antidumping Agreement.

Working Group on Implementation: The Working Group held meetings in April and October 2013. Beginning in 2003, the Working Group has held discussions on several agreed topics, including: (1) export prices to third countries vs. constructed value under Article 2.2 of the Antidumping Agreement; (2) foreign exchange fluctuations under Article 2.4.1; (3) conduct of verifications under Article 6.7; (4) judicial, arbitral, or administrative reviews under Article 13; and (5) price undercutting by dumped imports. In 2009, the Working Group agreed to include the following additional topics for discussion: (1) constructed export prices; (2) other known causes of injury; (3) threat of material injury; (4) accuracy and adequacy of evidence to justify the initiation of an investigation; and (5) the determination of the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping and injury in sunset reviews. The discussions in the Working Group on all of these topics have focused on submissions by Members describing their own practices.
For the April 2013 meeting, two papers submitted by Jamaica were discussed: one on the accuracy and adequacy test and the other on export price to a third country or constructed normal value. Several Members, including the United States, posed questions on the papers discussed.

For the October 2013 meeting, two papers submitted by Brazil were discussed: one on significant price undercutting and the other on the accuracy and adequacy test. Several Members, including the United States, posed questions on the papers discussed.

Informal Group on Anticircumvention: In 2013, the Informal Group held meetings in April and October. There were no new papers submitted for discussion in 2013. Members did not actively engage in discussions on what constitutes circumvention, what is being done by Members confronted with what they consider to be circumvention, or to what extent circumvention can be dealt with under the relevant WTO rules. Nevertheless, it was agreed that the Informal Group should continue to meet in the future to provide a forum to discuss such topics, as Members deem appropriate.

Prospects for 2014

Work will proceed in 2014 on the areas that the Antidumping Committee and the Working Group addressed this past year, and the Informal Group will continue to meet on relevant topics as the Members deem appropriate. The Antidumping Committee will pursue its review of Members’ notifications of antidumping legislation, and Members will continue to have the opportunity to submit additional questions concerning previously reviewed notifications. This ongoing review process in the Antidumping Committee is important for ensuring that Members’ antidumping laws are properly drafted and implemented, thereby contributing to a well-functioning, rules-based trading system. Since notifications of antidumping legislation are not restricted documents, U.S. exporters will continue to enjoy access to information about the antidumping laws of other Members, which should assist them in better understanding the operation of such laws and in taking them into account in commercial planning.

The preparation by Members and review in the Antidumping Committee of semi-annual reports and reports of preliminary and final antidumping actions will also continue in 2014. The semi-annual reports are accessible to the general public on the WTO website. This transparency promotes improved public knowledge and appreciation of the trends and focus of all WTO Members’ antidumping actions.

Discussions in the Working Group on Implementation will continue to play an important role as more Members enact antidumping laws and begin to apply them. There has been a sharp and widespread interest in the technical issues related to understanding how Members implement these rules when administering their laws pursuant to the Antidumping Agreement. Tackling these issues in a serious manner will require the involvement of the Working Group, which is the forum that was established to discuss these technical and administrative issues. For these reasons, the United States will continue to use the Working Group to learn in greater detail about other Members’ administration of their antidumping laws, especially as that forum provides opportunities to discuss not only the laws as written, but also the operational practices that Members employ to implement them. In 2014, the Working Group will continue its discussion of topics that it has been discussing for several years and recently added topics, as described in the last section.

The work of the Informal Group on Anticircumvention will also continue in 2014 according to the framework for discussion on which Members have agreed.
10. Committee on Import Licensing

Status

The Committee on Import Licensing (the Import Licensing Committee) was established to administer the Agreement on Import Licensing Procedures (Import Licensing Agreement) and to monitor compliance with the mutually-agreed rules for the application of these widely used measures. The Import Licensing Committee normally meets twice a year to review information on import licensing requirements submitted by WTO Members in accordance with the obligations set out in the Import Licensing Agreement. The Committee also receives questions from Members on the licensing regimes of other Members, whether or not those regimes have been notified to the Committee. The Committee meetings also address specific observations and complaints concerning Members’ licensing systems. These reviews are not intended to substitute for dispute settlement procedures; rather, they offer Members an opportunity to focus multilateral attention on licensing measures and procedures that they find problematic, to receive information on specific issues and to clarify problems, and possibly to resolve issues before they become disputes.

Major Issues in 2013

In 2013, the Import Licensing Committee held its meetings in April and October. In accordance with Articles 1.4(a), 5.4, and 8.2(b) of the Import Licensing Agreement and procedures agreed to by the Committee, all Members, upon joining the WTO, must notify the sources of the information pertaining to their laws, regulations, and administrative procedures relevant to import licensing. Any subsequent changes to these laws, regulations, and administrative procedures must also be published and notified. Since the entry into force of the WTO Agreement, 101 Members have notified the Committee of their legislation and/or publications under these provisions (up to the last meeting of the year held on October 4, 2013). During 2013, the Committee received 22 notifications from the following 16 Members: Colombia; Ecuador; the European Union; Gabon; Malaysia; Moldova; Morocco; Peru; the Philippines; the Russian Federation; Saint Lucia; the Separate Customs Territory of Taiwan, Penghu, Kinmen and Matsu; Togo; Ukraine; the United States; and Vietnam (up to October 4, 2013).

With regard to notifications of new import licensing procedures or changes in such procedures (required by Articles 5.1-5.4 of the Agreement), the Committee received 18 notifications from eight Members (up to October 4, 2013): Argentina; Chad; Colombia; the European Union; Indonesia; New Zealand; Thailand; and Ukraine (Annex II). Since the entry into force of the WTO Agreement, 41 Members have submitted notifications under these provisions.

Article 7.3 of the Import Licensing Agreement requires all Members to provide prompt replies to the annual Questionnaire on Import Licensing Procedures; Committee procedures set a deadline of September 30 each year. While not all Members provide responses every year, since the entry into force of the WTO Agreement, 103 Members have made notifications under this provision (up to October 4, 2013). The number of Members submitting annual notifications has increased from 11 Members in 1995, when the WTO was established, to 35 Members in 2013. All of these notifications, including the U.S. responses to the Questionnaire on Import Licensing Procedures, may be found in document series G/LIC/N/3/- (http://www.wto.org/english/res_e/res_e.htm).

The United States remained one of the most active members of the Import Licensing Committee in 2013, using the forum to gather information and to discuss import licensing measures applied to its trade by

13 The European Union and its Member States counted as one Member for purposes of this notification.
other Members. U.S. submissions to the Committee in 2013 included the response to the annual Questionnaire (G/LIC/N/3/USA/10) and the notification of the final rule (see Federal Register, Vol. 78, No. 32, dated February 15, 2013) to extend the Steel Import Monitoring and Analysis System until March 21, 2017.

The United States also focused its presentations on continuing problems with Indonesia’s import licensing policies and procedures, including those regarding horticultural products and animals and animal products. On August 30, 2013, the United States requested consultations under the Dispute Settlement Understanding regarding Indonesia’s import licensing procedures with respect to these products.

The United States raised concerns about the Russian Federation’s import licensing procedures and posed questions on the import licensing practices of Vietnam, Saint Lucia, Ukraine, Bangladesh, Ecuador, India, Colombia, and Malaysia. Through its interventions, the United States continued to question India, Ukraine, the Russian Federation, and Vietnam concerning the basis for and operation of their licensing practices and to press them for adequate responses to requests for information that had not yet been provided. The United States and other Members submitted written questions on these issues. Written questions and replies to and from Members submitted to the Committee concerning notifications and import licensing procedures may be found in document series G/LIC/Q/- on the WTO website (http://www.wto.org/english/res_e/res_e.htm).

Notifications and Other Documentation: The United States continues to work within the Committee to seek to enhance Members’ efforts to comply with the Agreement’s notification requirements. In so doing, transparency remains the primary goal.

Prospects for 2014

The administration of import licensing procedures continues to be a significant topic of discussion in the day-to-day implementation of Members’ WTO obligations. The use of such measures to monitor and to regulate imports has increased, especially in light of global economic circumstances. The United States will continue to advocate for increased efforts to provide transparency, proper use of import licensing procedures, and insurance that licensing procedures do not, in themselves, restrict imports in a manner not consistent with WTO provisions. Licensing continues to be a factor in the administration of tariff-rate quotas and the application of safeguard measures, technical regulations, and sanitary and phytosanitary requirements applied to imports as well. The proliferation of import licensing requirements raises additional concerns, as many such requirements appear to be administered in a manner that restricts trade.

11. Committee on Safeguards

Status

The Committee on Safeguards (the Safeguards Committee) was established to administer the WTO Agreement on Safeguards (the Safeguards Agreement). The Safeguards Agreement establishes rules for the application of safeguard measures as provided in Article XIX of GATT 1994. Effective rules on safeguards are important to the viability and integrity of the multilateral trading system. The availability of a safeguard mechanism gives WTO Members the assurance that they can act quickly to help industries adjust to import surges, providing them with flexibility they would not otherwise have to open their markets to international competition. At the same time, WTO rules on safeguards ensure that such actions are of limited duration and are gradually less restrictive over time.
The Safeguards Agreement incorporates into WTO rules many of the concepts embodied in U.S. safeguards law (section 201 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended). Among its key provisions, the Safeguards Agreement: requires a transparent, public process for making injury determinations; sets out clearer definitions of the criteria for injury determinations; requires that safeguard measures be steadily liberalized over their duration; establishes maximum periods for safeguard actions; requires a review no later than the midterm of any measure with a duration exceeding three years; allows safeguard actions to be taken for three years, without the requirement of compensation or the possibility of retaliation; and prohibits so-called “grey area” measures, such as voluntary restraint agreements and orderly marketing agreements.

The Safeguards Agreement requires Members to notify the Safeguards Committee of their laws, regulations, and administrative procedures relating to safeguard measures. It also requires Members to notify the Safeguards Committee of various safeguards actions, such as: (1) the initiation of an investigatory process; (2) a finding by a Member’s investigating authority of serious injury or threat thereof caused by increased imports; (3) the taking of a decision to apply or extend a safeguard measure; and (4) the proposed application of a provisional safeguard measure.

**Major Issues in 2013**

During its two regular meetings in April and October 2013, the Safeguards Committee continued its review of Members’ laws, regulations, and administrative procedures based on notifications required under Article 12.6 of the Safeguards Agreement. The Committee reviewed the national legislation of Cameroon, Chile, India, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Macao China, Mali, Morocco, Russia, Togo, and Ukraine. In addition, Montenegro notified its safeguard legislation for review by Members, the review of which will be undertaken as part of the April 2014 Safeguards Committee meeting.

The Safeguards Committee reviewed Article 12.1(a) notifications regarding the initiation of a safeguard investigatory process relating to serious injury or threat thereof and the reasons for it, or the initiation of a review process relating to the extension of an existing measure, from the following Members: Australia on Canned Tomatoes and Certain Processed Fruit Products; Chile on Maize and Frozen Pork; Colombia on Steel Wire Rod, Steel Angles, Bars of Iron or Non-Alloy Steel (rebar) and Wire Rods of Iron or Non-Alloy Steel, and Sections of Iron or Non-Alloy and Rods of Iron or Steel; Egypt on Raw and White Sugar, and Steel Rebar; India on Seamless Pipes, Tubes and Hollow Profiles of Iron or Non-alloy Steel, Sodium Nitrite, Methyl Acetoacetate, Phthalic Anhydride, and PX-13; Indonesia on Kilowatt Hour Meters, Dextrose Monohydrate, Sheath Contraceptive, Flat-Rolled Product of Iron or Non-alloy Steel; and D-Glutosol (Sorbitol); Kyrgyz Republic on Wheat Flour; Philippines on Newsprint and Galvanized Iron and Pre-Painted Sheets and Coils; Russia on Woven Fabrics; South Africa on Frozen Potato Chips; Thailand on Glass Block, Hot-Rolled Steel Flat Products, and Woven Fabric; Turkey on Terephthalic Acid and Certain Electrical Appliances; Ukraine on Tableware and Kitchenware of Porcelain; and Vietnam on Vegetable Oil.

The Safeguards Committee reviewed Article 12.1(b) notifications, regarding a finding of serious injury or threat thereof caused by increased imports from the following Members: Australia on Canned Tomatoes and Certain Processed Fruit Products; Chile on Maize; Egypt on Raw and White Sugar, and Steel Rebar; India on Diocetyl Phthalate (DOP); Indonesia on Wheat Flour, and Seamless Pipe Casing and Tubing; Morocco on Bars and Rods; Russian Federation on Harvesters and Modules Thereof, and Tableware and Kitchenware of Porcelain; South African on Frozen Potato Chips; Thailand on Hot-Rolled Steel Flat Products and Glass Block; and Vietnam on Vegetable Oil.

The Safeguards Committee reviewed Article 12.1(c) notifications regarding a decision to apply or extend a safeguard measure from the following Members: the Dominican Republic on Certain Sports and Dress...
Socks; Indonesia on Articles of Iron or Steel Wire, and Seamless Pipe Casing and Tubing; Jordan on Bars and Rods of Iron or Steel; Philippines on Float Glass; Russian Federation on Harvesters and Modules Thereof, and Tableware and Kitchenware of Porcelain; Thailand on Glass Block, and Hot-Rolled Steel Products; Ukraine on Matches, Motor Cars, and Casing and Pump-Compressor Seamless Steel Pipes; and Vietnam on Vegetable Oil.

The Safeguards Committee reviewed Article 12.4 notifications regarding the application of a provisional safeguard measure from the following Members: Chile on Maize; Colombia on Steel Wire Rod, and Bars of Iron or Non-Alloy Steel (Rebar) and Wire Rods of Iron or Non-Alloy Steel; Egypt on Raw and White Sugar, and Steel Rebar; Indonesia on Wheat Flour, and Seamless Pipe Casing and Tubing; Jordan on Bars and Rods of Iron or Steel; Morocco on Bars and Rods; Russian Federation on Harvesters and Modules Thereof; South Africa on Frozen Potato Chips; Thailand on Hot-Rolled Steel Flat Products; and Vietnam on Vegetable Oil.

The Safeguards Committee received notifications of the termination of a safeguard investigation with no definitive safeguard measure imposed, or the expiration or termination of a definitive safeguard measure, from the following Members: Brazil on Fine or Table Wine; Chile on Maize and Frozen Pork; Egypt on polypropylene and Raw and White Sugar; India on Phthalic Anhydride; Indonesia on Dextrose Monohydrate and D-Glutisol (Sorbitol); South Africa on Frozen Potato Chips; Thailand on Woven Fabric; Turkey on Cotton Yarn; and Ukraine on Matches.

At the Committee meetings in April and October, the Friends of Safeguards Procedures (FSP) – a new 10 delegation group of WTO Members, including the United States – organized an informal discussion group at each of the Committee meetings. The informal discussion group consisted of presentations by various WTO Members on a specific topic for discussion. The April discussion focused on the initiation of safeguard investigations while the October discussion focused on the experience when evaluating whether to invoke critical circumstances and/or impose provisional measures and the role of consultations.

Prospects for 2014

The Safeguards Committee’s work in 2014 will continue to focus on the review of safeguard actions that have been notified to the Committee and on the review of notifications of any new or amended safeguards legislation. The United States will also work on its own, as well as with the FSP, to continue to address systemic issues of concern with safeguard proceedings as issues arise.

12. Working Party on State Trading Enterprises

Status

Article XVII of the GATT 1994 requires Members, *inter alia*, to ensure that state trading enterprises (STEs), as defined in that Article, act in a manner consistent with the general principle of nondiscriminatory treatment, make purchases or sales solely in accordance with commercial considerations, and abide by other GATT disciplines. The Understanding on the Interpretation of Article XVII of the GATT 1994 (the Article XVII Understanding) defines a state trading enterprise more narrowly for the purposes of providing a notification that is required under the Understanding. Members must notify the Working Party of enterprises in their respective territories that meet this definition, whether or not such enterprises have imported or exported goods. Members are required to submit new and full notifications to the Working Party for review every two years.
The Working Party on State Trading Enterprises (WP-STE) was established in 1995 to review, *inter alia*, Member notifications of STEs and the coverage of STEs that are notified, and to develop an illustrative list of relationships between Members and their STEs and the kinds of activities engaged in by these enterprises.

**Major Issues in 2013**

The WP-STE held one formal meeting on October 7, 2013. At the meeting, Members reviewed STE notifications from Armenia, Barbados, Ecuador, India, Lichtenstein, Malaysia, Mali, Moldova, Peru, Singapore, South Africa, Thailand, and Uruguay.

During the meeting, the European Union posed questions relating to the notification of India, and Pakistan posed two written questions – the first regarding the notification of India and the second regarding the notification of Malaysia.

**Prospects for 2014**

The WP-STE is scheduled to meet in October 2014. The WP-STE will continue its review of new notifications and its examination of how to improve Member compliance with STE notification obligations to enhance transparency of STEs.

**F. Council on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights**

**Status**

The WTO Council for Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (the TRIPS Council) monitors implementation of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (the TRIPS Agreement), provides a forum in which WTO Members can consult on intellectual property matters, and carries out the specific responsibilities assigned to the Council in the TRIPS Agreement. The TRIPS Agreement sets minimum standards of protection for copyrights and related rights, trademarks, geographical indications (GIs), industrial designs, patents, integrated circuit layout designs, and undisclosed information. The TRIPS Agreement also establishes minimum standards for the enforcement of intellectual property rights (IPR) through civil actions for infringement, actions at the border and, at least with respect to copyright piracy and trademark counterfeiting, in criminal actions.

The TRIPS Agreement is important to U.S. interests and has yielded significant benefits for U.S. industries and individuals, from those engaged in the pharmaceutical, agricultural, chemical, and biotechnology industries to those producing motion pictures, sound recordings, software, books, magazines, and consumer goods.

Developed Members were required to fully implement the obligations of the TRIPS Agreement by January 1, 1996, and developing country Members generally had to achieve full implementation by January 1, 2000. LDC Members have had their deadline for full implementation of the TRIPS Agreement extended to July 1, 2021. The extension of this deadline provides, as before, that “This Decision is without prejudice to the Decision of the Council for TRIPS of June 27, 2002, on ‘Extension of the Transition Period under Article 66.1 of the TRIPS Agreement for Least-Developed Country Members for Certain Obligations with respect to Pharmaceutical Products’ (IP/C/25), and to the right of least developed country Members to seek further extensions of the period provided for in paragraph 1 of Article 66 of the Agreement.”
Major Issues in 2013

In 2013, the TRIPS Council held three formal meetings. In addition to its continuing work on reviewing the implementation of the Agreement, the TRIPS Council’s activities in 2013 focused on the positive relationship between intellectual property (IP) and innovation and between IP and sports, under agenda items co-sponsored by the United States and other WTO Members. The TRIPS Council also discussed the contributions of IP to facilitate the transfer of environmentally-sound technology and continued its consideration of the relationship of the TRIPS Agreement to the Convention on Biological Diversity of issues addressed in the Doha Ministerial Declaration and the Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health, and of technology transfer and technical cooperation.

Intellectual Property and Innovation: At the March and June TRIPS Council meetings, the United States co-sponsored agenda items on IP and innovation. In March, the United States, Chile, Chinese Taipei and the Republic of Korea co-sponsored an agenda item specifically addressing the importance of IP for innovation by small and medium sized enterprises. Under this item, WTO Members’ delegations focused on the particular importance of IP for SMEs in terms of IP serving as the core of the business, a principal element of the venture’s value, and a source of its future success. Citing case studies, several delegations also noted the contributions of SMEs to innovation and job growth in their markets as well as the significant negative impact of IP infringement on SMEs. In June, the United States, Canada, Chile, Chinese Taipei, the European Union, the Republic of Korea, and Switzerland co-sponsored an item under the IP and innovation heading focused on low-cost innovation. Interventions under this item stressed the role of IP in facilitating high-impact solutions at a low price, particularly by social entrepreneurs seeking to address challenges in under-served communities, including with respect to medical devices for infants, clean drinking water, cook stoves, and lighting sources. The United States also co-sponsored a WTO side event featuring several NGO and other speakers that highlighted the positive role IP has played in their work to deliver critical services in low-income communities.

Intellectual Property and Sports: At the October TRIPS Council meeting, the United States, European Union, Jamaica, Mexico, and Trinidad and Tobago co-sponsored an agenda item on IP and sports. These and several other delegations discussed the contribution of IP to the significant economic and other contributions of sports, including trademarks for branding and sponsorships, and copyright for broadcasting. WTO Members also provided details regarding specific national IP policies geared toward promoting sports, such as hosting international competitions like the Olympics and the World Cup. The United States also co-sponsored a WTO side event including the International Olympic Committee, the Union of European Football Associations, Nike, and a Brazilian IP and sports expert, which spoke on the importance of IP for developing sports and holding major sporting events.

IP and Climate Change: At the June and October TRIPS Council meetings, Ecuador sponsored an agenda item on the Contributions of IP to Facilitate the Transfer of Environmentally-sound Technology. Relying on very limited data in support of its position, Ecuador contended that IP may not facilitate the transfer of such technologies and that innovation in these areas is focused in a limited number of countries. The United States and several other delegations countered, relying on a significant body of research, that IPR not only incentivizes green technology innovation, but also promotes technology transfer in these goods and services. The United States and other delegations cited a wealth of data demonstrating that green technology innovation is happening in a wide array of countries at different levels of development, that voluntary technology transfer is occurring, and that IPR plays a significant and positive role in promoting both activities. The United States and other Members also cited to numerous economic studies demonstrating that IPR does not increase costs and is not a barrier to technology transfer. Finally, the United States provided a detailed evaluation of the Technology Needs Assessments (TNAs) provided under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, in which developing countries did not cite IPR among the nearly 20 access barriers to green technologies identified in their respective TNAs.
Review of Developing Country Members’ TRIPS Agreement Implementation: During 2013, the TRIPS Council continued to conduct ongoing reviews of developing country Members’ and newly acceded Members’ implementation of the TRIPS Agreement, and to provide assistance to developing country Members in implementing the Agreement. The United States continued to press for full implementation of the TRIPS Agreement by developing country Members and participated actively during the reviews of legislation by highlighting specific concerns regarding individual Members’ implementation of the Agreement’s obligations.

Intellectual Property and Access to Medicines: The August 30, 2003 solution (the General Council Decision on “Implementation of Paragraph 6 of the Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health,” in light of the statement read out by the General Council Chairperson) continues to apply to each Member until the formal amendment to the TRIPS Agreement replacing its provisions takes effect for that Member. The amendment text adopted by the General Council in December 2005, and the statement by the Chairperson, preserve all substantive aspects of the August 30, 2003 solution and do not alter the substance of the previously agreed to solution. The United States was the first Member to submit its acceptance of the amendment to the WTO. As of January 9, 2014, a total of 49 Members had accepted the amendment, which will enter into force for those Members that have accepted it upon its acceptance by two thirds of the membership of the WTO.

TRIPS-related WTO Dispute Settlement Cases: In April 2007, the United States initiated WTO dispute settlement proceedings over deficiencies in China’s legal regime for the protection and enforcement of IPR by requesting consultations with China. On September 25, 2007, the WTO Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) established a panel to consider the dispute. The panel circulated its report on January 26, 2009. The panel found that China's denial of copyright protection to works that do not meet China’s content review standards is inconsistent with the TRIPS Agreement. The panel also found it inconsistent with the TRIPS Agreement for China to provide for simple removal of an infringing trademark as the only precondition for the sale at public auction of counterfeit goods seized by Chinese customs authorities.

With respect to the U.S. claim regarding thresholds in China’s law that must be met in order for certain acts of trademark counterfeiting and copyright piracy to be subject to criminal procedures and penalties, the panel clarified that China must provide for criminal procedures and penalties to be applied to willful trademark counterfeiting and copyright piracy on a commercial scale. The panel agreed with the United States that Article 61 of the TRIPS Agreement requires China not to set its thresholds for prosecution of piracy and counterfeiting so high as to ignore the realities of the commercial marketplace. The Panel did find, however, that it needed more evidence in order to decide whether the actual thresholds for prosecution in China’s criminal law are so high as to allow commercial-scale counterfeiting and piracy to occur without the possibility of criminal prosecution.

The DSB adopted the panel report on March 20, 2009. On April 15, 2009, China notified the DSB that China intends to implement the recommendations and rulings of the DSB in this dispute and stated it would need a reasonable period of time for implementation. On June 29, 2009, the United States and China notified the DSB that they had agreed on a one year period of time for implementation, which ended on March 20, 2010. In 2013, the United States monitored China’s compliance with the 2009 DSB recommendations and rulings.

During 2013, the United States continued to monitor EU compliance with a 2005 ruling of the DSB that the EU’s regulation on food-related GIs is inconsistent with the EU’s obligations under the TRIPS Agreement and the GATT 1994. The United States has raised certain questions and concerns with regard
to the revised EU regulation and its compliance with the DSB findings and recommendations, and continues to monitor implementation in this dispute.

The United States also continues to monitor WTO Members’ implementation of their TRIPS Agreement obligations and will consider the further use of the WTO dispute settlement mechanism as appropriate.

Geographical Indications: The Doha Declaration directed the TRIPS Council to discuss “issues related to extension” of the level of protection provided under Article 23 of the TRIPS Agreement to GIs for products other than wines and spirits, and to report to the TNC by the end of 2002 for appropriate action. Because no consensus could be reached in the TRIPS Council on how the Chairperson should report to the TNC on the issues related to the extension of Article 23 level protection to GIs for products other than wines and spirits, and in light of the strong divergence of positions on the way forward on GIs and other implementation issues, the TNC Chairperson closed the discussion by saying he would consult further with Members. At the December 2005 Hong Kong Ministerial Conference, the Ministers directed the Director General to continue his consultative process on all outstanding implementation issues, including an extension of Article 23-level protection to GIs for products other than wines and spirits.

In 2013, the Director General did not hold any consultations on the extension issue. While some WTO Members seek to conduct negotiations in the TRIPS Council Special Session on whether to include other non-wine or spirit GIs, the United States and its allies on this issue continue to oppose any expansion of the Article 24.3 mandate in the Special Session to include negotiations on extension.

Review of Article 27.3(b), Relationship Between the TRIPS Agreement and the Convention on Biological Diversity, and Protection of Traditional Knowledge and Folklore: As called for in the TRIPS Agreement, the TRIPS Council initiated a review of Article 27.3(b) of the TRIPS Agreement (permitting Members to exclude from patentability plants, animals, and biological processes used for the production of plants and animals). The Doha Declaration directs the TRIPS Council, in pursuing its work program under the review of Article 27.3(b), to examine, inter alia, the relationship between the TRIPS Agreement and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the protection of traditional knowledge and folklore. Consideration of this set of issues also continues to be guided by the direction of Ministers in the Hong Kong Declaration, that all implementation issues (including the relationship of the TRIPS Agreement and the CBD) should be the subject of consultations facilitated by the WTO Director General. Furthermore, Ministers agreed that work would continue in the TRIPS Council on this issue.

A number of developing country Members continue to advocate for amending the patent provisions of the TRIPS Agreement to require disclosure of the source of the genetic resource or traditional knowledge, as well as evidence of prior informed consent to obtain the genetic resource and adequate benefit sharing with the custodian community or country of the genetic resource in order to obtain a patent. In 2006, a group of developing country Members submitted draft text for such an amendment to the TRIPS Agreement. There is, however, no consensus in the TRIPS Council that an amendment should be pursued. In 2013, the Director General did not hold consultations with Members on this issue.

Technical Cooperation and Capacity Building: As in each past year, the United States and other Members provided reports on their activities in connection with technical cooperation and capacity building for consideration at the fall TRIPS Council meeting (October 2013) (see IP/C/W/596/Add.6). Priority needs reports submitted by LDCs were discussed in the TRIPS Council as well as in informal consultations.

Implementation of Article 66.2: Article 66.2 of the TRIPS Agreement requires developed country Members to provide incentives for enterprises and institutions in their territories to promote and encourage technology transfer to LDC Members in order to enable them to create a sound and viable
technological base. This provision was reaffirmed in the Doha Decision on Implementation related Issues and Concerns, and the TRIPS Council was directed to put in place a mechanism for ensuring monitoring and full implementation of the obligation. Developed country Members are required to provide detailed reports every third year, with annual updates, on these incentives. In October 2013, the United States provided an updated report on specific U.S. Government institutions and incentives, as required (see IP/C/W/594/Add.6).

Implementation of the TRIPS Agreement by LDCs: On June 11, 2013, the TRIPS Council reached consensus on a decision to extend the transition period under Article 66.1 of the TRIPS Agreement for least-developed WTO Members. Under this decision, LDCs are not required to apply the provisions of the TRIPS Agreement, other than Articles 3, 4, and 5, until July 1, 2021, or until such a date on which they cease to be a LDC Member, whichever date is earlier.

Non-Violation and Situation Complaints: On October 10, 2013, the TRIPS Council reached agreement to extend the moratorium on non-violation and situation complaints under the TRIPS Agreement until the next Ministerial. The TRIPS Council agreement became final on October 21, 2013. WTO Members confirmed their intention to intensify the examination of this issue in 2014. The moratorium was originally introduced in Article 64 of the TRIPS Agreement, for a period of five years following the entry into force of the WTO Agreement (i.e., until December 31, 1999). The moratorium has been referred to and extended in several WTO Ministerial documents, most recently in 2013.

New Zealand Plain Packaging Legislation: In March 2013, Members discussed New Zealand’s proposed legislation requiring plain packaging of tobacco products. Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Switzerland, Ukraine, Uruguay, Zambia, and Zimbabwe intervened under this agenda item.

Prospects for 2014

In 2014, the TRIPS Council will continue to focus on its built-in agenda and the additional mandates established in the Doha Declaration, including possibly issues related to the LDC transition period for implementing the TRIPS Agreement, the extension of Article 23-level protection for GIs for products other than wines and spirits, on the relationship between the TRIPS Agreement and the CBD, and on traditional knowledge and folklore, as well as enforcement and other relevant new developments.

U.S. objectives for 2014 continue to be to:

- resolve differences through consultations and use of dispute settlement procedures, where appropriate;
- continue efforts to ensure that developing country Members fully implement the TRIPS Agreement;
- engage in constructive dialogue regarding the technical assistance and capacity-related needs of developing countries, and especially LDCs, in connection with TRIPS Agreement implementation;
- continue to encourage a fact-based discussion within the TRIPS Council regarding TRIPS Agreement provisions;
- ensure that provisions of the TRIPS Agreement are not weakened; and
- intensify discussions within the TRIPS Council on the application of NVNI under the TRIPS Agreement.
G. Council for Trade in Services

Status

The General Agreement for Trade in Services (GATS) is the first multilateral, legally-enforceable agreement covering trade and investment in the services sector. The GATS is designed to reduce or eliminate governmental measures that prevent services from being freely supplied across borders or from within an economy through locally-established services firms with foreign ownership. The GATS includes specific commitments by WTO Members to restrict their use of restrictive measures and provides a forum for further negotiations to open services markets over time.

The Council for Trade in Services (CTS) oversees implementation of the GATS and reports to the General Council. This includes a technical review of GATS Article XX.2 provisions; review of waivers from specific commitments pursuant to paragraphs 3 and 4 of Article IX of the Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the WTO; a periodic review of developments in the air transport sector; the transitional review mechanism under Section 18 of the Protocol on the Accession of the People’s Republic of China; implementation of GATS Article VII; a review of Article II exemptions (to most-favored nation treatment); and notifications made to the General Council pursuant to GATS Articles III.3, V.5, V.7, and VII.4. Four subsidiary bodies report to the CTS: The Committee on Specific Commitments, the Committee on Trade in Financial Services, the Working Party on Domestic Regulation, and the Working Party on GATS Rules.

Major Issues in 2013

The CTS met in March, June, and October 2013.

The CTS received a number of notifications pursuant to GATS Article III:3 (transparency) and GATS Article V:7 (economic integration). Norway continued to raise concerns related to the telecommunications market in Thailand pursuant to Article III.5 of the GATS. There were also further discussions on possible ways to assist Members in notifying measures affecting trade in services as a means to improve transparency.

Under the Work Program on Electronic Commerce, the CTS held a workshop in June 2013. The workshop covered a wide array of issues related to e-commerce, many of which were based on submissions from the United States (information and communications technology (“ICT”) principles, cloud computing, and mobile applications). Further work under the Program is possible in 2014.

At the March and June meetings of the Council, the LDC Group added an item for discussion at the CTS on the operationalization of the LDC Services waiver. The CTS is expected to examine this issue in much greater detail in 2014.

Australia, and many other Members, continued to raise concerns related to the enlargement of the European Union, specifically the entry into force of the EC-25 schedule of commitments pursuant to GATS Article XXI and the procedures outlined in S/L/80 and S/L/84. Finally, the United States and other Members involved in the Trade in Services Agreement (TiSA) negotiations provided updates on the progress of those discussions for transparency purposes.
Prospects for 2014

The CTS will continue discussions related to its mandated reviews and various notifications related to GATS implementation, as well as other topics raised by Members. As noted above, work is likely to continue on Member-driven proposals in the area of e-commerce. In addition, further work is envisioned on the topic of the LDC services waiver.

1. Committee on Trade in Financial Services

Status

The Committee on Trade in Financial Services (CTFS) provides a forum for Members to explore financial services market access or regulatory issues, including implementation of existing trade commitments.

Major Issues in 2013

The CTFS met in March, June, and October 2013.

Members continued to urge Brazil to take the necessary steps to accept the Fifth Protocol to the GATS. In accepting the protocol, financial services commitments made in 1994 would be replaced by those agreed during the 1995-1997 extended negotiations on financial services. All other Members have accepted the protocol. The Chair invited Brazil to provide information on the status of its domestic ratification efforts. Brazil reported no progress.

At the March meeting, the CTFS held a dedicated discussion on Members’ experiences with macroprudential policies and regulations. This dedicated discussion was based on a proposal by Ecuador to learn from other Members’ experiences with macroprudential policies and regulations.

The topic of trade in financial services and development continues to receive attention by the CTFS. China made a brief presentation at the March meeting on the access of small- and medium-sized enterprises to financial services. At the June meeting, Pakistan and Norway made a joint presentation on the various issues surrounding mobile banking services, and raised the issue of access to financial services more generally.

Prospects for 2014

The CTFS will continue to use its broad and flexible mandate to discuss various issues, including ratification of existing commitments as well as market access and regulatory issues. Discussions will continue on trade in financial services and development, as well as on issues related to mobile banking.

2. Working Party on Domestic Regulation

Status

GATS Article VI:4 on Domestic Regulation provides for Members to develop any necessary disciplines relating to qualification requirements and procedures, technical standards, and licensing requirements and procedures. A Ministerial Decision assigned priority to the professional services sector, and Members subsequently established the Working Party on Professional Services (WPPS). In May 1997, the WPPS developed Guidelines for the Negotiation of Mutual Recognition Agreements in the Accountancy Sector,
adopted by the WTO. The WPPS completed Disciplines on Domestic Regulation in the Accountancy Sector in December 1998, although their full implementation is suspended pending completion of the ongoing round of services negotiations. The text of these disciplines is found in WTO document S/L/64 (December 17, 1998).

In May 1999, the CTS established the Working Party on Domestic Regulation (WPDR), which took on the mandate of the WPPS. The WPDR is charged with determining whether any new disciplines are deemed necessary beyond those negotiated for the accountancy sector. At the December 2005 Hong Kong Ministerial Conference, Ministers directed the WPDR to develop disciplines on domestic regulation pursuant to the mandate under Article VI:4 of the GATS before the end of the current round of negotiations.

**Major Issues in 2013**

The WPDR met in March, June, and October 2013. At the March 2013 meeting, the delegate from Hungary was elected to be the Chairperson.

Members continued to examine a set of questions raised in the “List of Potential Technical Issues Submitted for Discussion.” Questions examined during 2013 included those related to verification and assessment of qualifications; identification of deficiencies of qualifications; examinations; technical standards; general provisions; and development-related aspects of the disciplines. There was also some information sharing by some Members on the time-frame for processing applications, permission to supply services after fulfillment of requirements, and fees. After these discussions, some Members reflected on the implications of the information provided for possible horizontal disciplines, but there was no consensus on that approach to disciplines. The WPDR also started to examine regulatory issues in particular sectors and modes of supply. These regulatory issues were identified in the sector and modes of supply papers that the Secretariat had compiled over the past several years.

The United States continues to take the view that any horizontal disciplines must respect the right of WTO Members to regulate, as recognized by the GATS, in a manner which meets the legitimate policy objectives of national and subnational regulatory authorities. The United States’ focus remains on the development of horizontal disciplines for regulatory transparency in the procedures used for granting authorization to supply services.

**Prospects for 2014**

During 2014, the United States expects the WPDR will continue to focus on broad thematic questions submitted by Members, as well as discussion of the Note prepared by the WTO Secretariat on regulatory issues and development.

**3. Working Party on GATS Rules**

**Status**

The Working Party on GATS Rules (WPGR) provides a forum to discuss the possibility of new disciplines on emergency safeguard measures, government procurement, and subsidies in the context of the GATS in accordance with the Doha Work Program resulting from the Hong Kong Ministerial Conference in December 2005. That program called for Members to intensify their efforts to conclude the negotiations on rulemaking under GATS Articles X (emergency safeguard mechanism), Article XIII (government procurement), and Article XV (subsidies).
Major Issues in 2013

The WPGR met in March, June, and October 2013, and in March 2013 elected the delegate from Chile to be its Chairman.

Proponents of an emergency safeguard measure (ESM) sought to restart the discussion on this topic and proposed that the Committee hold a dedicated technical discussion to examine so-called emergency safeguard provisions in regional trade agreements (RTAs). At that discussion, those with such RTAs could share their experiences. Further consultations will take place to discuss the framework of such a discussion.

On government procurement of services, Members began planning to hold a discussion in 2014 based on a WTO Staff Working Paper on the scope of government procurement related commitments in RTAs. In addition, the Secretariat made a presentation on the main features of the revised Government Procurement Agreement and its significance for trade in services.

With respect to subsidies, the WPGR continued to face an impasse among Members on next steps for advancing this issue. The Secretariat produced a Background Note entitled, “Subsidies for Services Sectors – Information Contained in WTO Trade Policy Reviews.” This Note generated some discussion, but did not yield any further advancement on the issue. The United States continues to press for responses to a series of questions it put forward in 2010 (contained in document S/WPGR/W/59), designed to identify specific concerns that new subsidies disciplines would aim to address. To date, there has not been a single response. Absent any real evidence of a problem to solve, Members have no clear impetus to begin developing new disciplines.

Prospects for 2014

Future work in the WPGR will likely involve the development of a dedicated discussion on ESMs in RTAs; an examination in greater detail of government procurement and its impact on trade in services based on the WTO Staff Working Paper; and little movement in the area of subsidies in services.

4. Committee on Specific Commitments

Status

The Committee on Specific Commitments (CSC) examines ways to improve the technical accuracy of scheduling commitments, primarily in preparation for the GATS negotiations, and oversees the application of the procedures for the modification of schedules under GATS Article XXI. The CSC also oversees implementation of commitments in Members’ schedules in sectors for which there is no sectoral body, which is currently the case for all sectors except financial services. As a result of the impasse in the overall Doha Round negotiations, the CSC has focused its efforts on ways to improve the classification of services, so that scheduled commitments reflect the service activity, particularly with regard to new or evolving services.

Major Issues in 2013

The CSC held meetings in March, June, and October 2013.

The CSC resumed its ongoing discussion of classification issues in various sectors, including postal and courier, distribution, maritime transport, logistics, and legal services. The Secretariat prepared a compilation of these issues to facilitate Members’ discussions. In addition, the Secretariat prepared a
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Background Note examining services classification issues arising in WTO disputes. On scheduling issues, it was suggested that Members could share scheduling experiences based on trade agreements outside the WTO on an educational basis to ensure clarity and uniformity of services commitments in future negotiations. The Chair is consulting further on that idea.

Prospects for 2014

Work will continue on technical issues.

H. Dispute Settlement Understanding

Status

The Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes (Dispute Settlement Understanding or DSU), which is annexed to the WTO Agreement, provides a mechanism to settle disputes under the Uruguay Round Agreements. Thus, it is key to the enforcement of U.S. rights under these Agreements.

The DSU is administered by the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB), which consists of representatives of the entire membership of the WTO and is empowered to establish dispute settlement panels, adopt panel and Appellate Body reports, oversee the implementation of panel recommendations adopted by the DSB, and authorize retaliation. The DSB makes all its decisions by consensus unless the WTO Agreement provides otherwise.

Major Issues in 2013

The DSB met 13 times in 2013 to oversee disputes and to address responsibilities such as appointing members to the Appellate Body and approving additions to the roster of governmental and nongovernmental panelists.

Roster of Governmental and Non-Governmental Panelists: Article 8 of the DSU makes it clear that panelists may be drawn from either the public or private sector and must be “well-qualified,” such as persons who have served on or presented a case to a panel, represented a government in the WTO or the GATT, served with the Secretariat, taught or published in the international trade field, or served as a senior trade policy official. Since 1985, the Secretariat has maintained a roster of nongovernmental experts for GATT 1947 dispute settlement, which has been available for use by parties in selecting panelists. In 1995, the DSB agreed on procedures for renewing and maintaining the roster, and expanding it to include governmental experts. In response to a U.S. proposal, the DSB also adopted standards increasing and systematizing the information submitted by roster candidates. These modifications aid in evaluating candidates’ qualifications and encouraging the appointment of well qualified candidates who have expertise in the subject matters of the Uruguay Round Agreements. In 2013, the DSB approved by consensus a number of additional names for the roster. The United States scrutinized the credentials of these candidates to assure the quality of the roster.

Pursuant to the requirements of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA), the present WTO panel roster appears in the background information in Annex II. The list in the roster notes the areas of expertise of each roster member (goods, services, and/or TRIPS).

Rules of Conduct for the DSU: The DSB completed work on a code of ethical conduct for WTO dispute settlement and, on December 3, 1996, adopted the Rules of Conduct for the Understanding on Rules and
Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes. A copy of the Rules of Conduct was printed in the Annual Report for 1996 and is available on the WTO and USTR websites. There were no changes in these Rules in 2013.

The Rules of Conduct elaborate on the ethical standards built into the DSU to maintain the integrity, impartiality, and confidentiality of proceedings conducted under the DSU. The Rules of Conduct require all individuals called upon to participate in dispute settlement proceedings to disclose direct or indirect conflicts of interest prior to their involvement in the proceedings and to conduct themselves during their involvement in the proceedings so as to avoid such conflicts.

The Rules of Conduct also provide parties an opportunity to address potential material violations of these ethical standards. The coverage of the Rules of Conduct exceeds the goals established by the U.S. Congress in section 123(c) of the URRAA, which directed USTR to seek conflict of interest rules applicable to persons serving on panels and members of the Appellate Body. The Rules of Conduct cover not only panelists and Appellate Body members, but also: (1) arbitrators; (2) experts participating in the dispute settlement mechanism (e.g., the Permanent Group of Experts under the SCM Agreement); (3) members of the WTO Secretariat assisting a panel or assisting in a formal arbitration proceeding; (4) the Chair of the Textile Monitoring Body (TMB) and other members of the TMB Secretariat assisting the TMB in formulating recommendations, findings, or observations under the Agreement on Textiles and Clothing; and (5) the support staff of the Appellate Body.

As noted above, the Rules of Conduct established a disclosure based system. Examples of the types of information that covered persons must disclose are set forth in Annex II to the Rules, and include: (1) financial interests, business interests, and property interests relevant to the dispute in question; (2) professional interests; (3) other active interests; (4) considered statements of personal opinion on issues relevant to the dispute in question; and (5) employment or family interests.

**Appellate Body:** Pursuant to the DSU, the DSB appoints seven persons to serve on an Appellate Body, which is to be a standing body with members serving four year terms, except for three initial appointees determined by lot whose terms expired at the end of two years. At its first meeting on February 10, 1995, the DSB formally established the Appellate Body, and agreed to arrangements for selecting its members and staff. The DSB also agreed that Appellate Body members would serve on a part-time basis and sit periodically in Geneva. The original seven Appellate Body members were Mr. James Bacchus of the United States, Mr. Christopher Beeby of New Zealand, Mr. Claus-Dieter Ehlermann of Germany, Mr. Said El-Naggar of Egypt, Mr. Florentino Feliciano of the Philippines, Mr. Julio Lacarte-Muró of Uruguay, and Mr. Mitsuo Matsushita of Japan. On June 25, 1997, it was determined by lot that the terms of Messrs. Ehlermann, Feliciano, and Lacarte-Muró would expire in December 1997. The DSB agreed on the same date to reappoint them for a final term of four years commencing on December 11, 1997. At its meeting held on October 27, 1999 and November 3, 1999, the DSB agreed to renew the terms of Messrs. Bacchus and Beeby for a final term of four years, commencing on December 11, 1999, and to extend the terms of Mr. El-Naggar and Mr. Matsushita until the end of March 2000. On April 7, 2000, the DSB agreed to appoint Mr. Georges Michel Abi-Saab of Egypt and Mr. A.V. Ganesan of India to a term of four years commencing on June 1, 2000. On May 25, 2000, the DSB agreed to the appointment of Mr. Yasuhei Taniguchi of Japan to serve through December 10, 2003, the remainder of the term of Mr. Beeby, who passed away on March 19, 2000. On September 25, 2001, the DSB agreed to appoint Mr. Luiz Olavo Baptista of Brazil, Mr. John S. Lockhart of Australia, and Mr. Giorgio Sacerdoti of Italy to a term of four years commencing on December 11, 2001. On November 7, 2003, the DSB agreed to appoint Ms. Merit Janow of the United States to a term of four years commencing on December 11, 2003, to reappoint Mr. Taniguchi for a final term of four years commencing on December 11, 2003, and to reappoint Mr. Abi-Saab and Mr. Ganesan for a final term of four years commencing on June 1, 2004. On September 27, 2005, the DSB agreed to reappoint Mr. Baptista, Mr. Lockhart, and Mr. Sacerdoti for a
The Appellate Body has also adopted Working Procedures for Appellate Review. On February 28, 1997, the Appellate Body issued a revision of the Working Procedures, providing for a two year term for the first Chairperson, and one year terms for subsequent Chairpersons. In 2001, the Appellate Body amended its working procedures to provide for no more than two consecutive terms for a Chairperson. Mr. Lacarte-Muró, the first Chairperson, served until February 7, 1998; Mr. Beeby served as Chairperson from February 7, 1998 to February 6, 1999; Mr. El-Naggar served as Chairperson from February 7, 1999 to February 6, 2000; Mr. Feliciano served as Chairperson from February 7, 2000 to February 6, 2001; Mr. Ehlermann served as Chairperson from February 7, 2001 to December 10, 2001; Mr. Bacchus served as Chairperson from December 15, 2001 to December 10, 2003; Mr. Abi-Saab served as Chairperson from December 13, 2003 to December 12, 2004; Mr. Taniguchi served as Chairperson from December 17, 2004 to December 16, 2005; Mr. Ganesan served as Chairperson from December 17, 2005 to December 16, 2006; Mr. Sacerdoti served as Chairperson from December 17, 2006 to December 17, 2007; Mr. Baptista served as Chairperson from December 18, 2007, to December 17, 2008; Mr. Unterhalter served as Chairperson from December 18, 2008 to December 16, 2010; Ms. Bautista served as Chairperson from December 17, 2010 to June 14, 2011; Ms. Hillman served as Chairperson from June 15, 2011 until December 10, 2011; Ms. Zhang served as Chairperson from December 11, 2011 to December 31, 2012; and Mr. Ramirez served as Chairperson from January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2013.

In 2013, the Appellate Body issued two reports, on challenges by the EU and Japan to Canada’s measures relating to renewable energy generation. In both disputes, the United States participated as a third party.
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earlier years remained active in 2013. What follows is a description of those disputes in which the United States was a complainant, defendant, or third party during the past year.

Prospects for 2014

While there were improvements to the multilateral trading system’s dispute settlement system as a result of the Uruguay Round, there is still room for improvement. Accordingly, the United States has used the opportunity of the ongoing review to seek improvements in its operation, including greater transparency. In 2014, the United States expects the DSB to continue to focus on the administration of the dispute settlement process in the context of individual disputes. Experience gained with the DSU will be incorporated into the U.S. litigation and negotiation strategy for enforcing U.S. WTO rights, as well as the U.S. position on DSU reform. Participants will continue to consider reform proposals in 2014.

Disputes Brought by the United States

In 2013, the United States continued to be one of the most active participants in the WTO dispute settlement process. This section includes brief summaries of dispute settlement activity in 2013 where the United States was a complainant (listed alphabetically by responding party). As demonstrated by these summaries, the WTO dispute settlement process has proven to be an effective tool in combating barriers to U.S. exports. Indeed, in a number of cases the United States has been able to achieve satisfactory outcomes by invoking the consultation provisions of the dispute settlement procedures, without recourse to formal panel proceedings.

Argentina — Measures Affecting the Importation of Goods (DS444)

On August 21, 2012, the United States requested consultations with Argentina regarding certain measures affecting the importation of goods into Argentina. These measures include the broad use of non-transparent and discretionary import licensing requirements that have the effect of restricting U.S. exports as well as burdensome trade balancing commitments that Argentina requires as a condition for authorization to import goods.

Between 2008 and 2013, Argentina greatly expanded the list of products subject to non-automatic import licensing requirements, with import licenses required for approximately 600 eight-digit tariff lines in Argentina’s goods schedule. In February 2012, Argentina adopted an additional licensing requirement that applies to all imports of goods into the country. In conjunction with these licensing requirements, Argentina has adopted informal trade balancing requirements and other schemes, whereby companies seeking to obtain authorization to import products must agree to export goods of an equal or greater value, make investments in Argentina, lower prices of imported goods, and/or refrain from repatriating profits.

Through these measures, Argentina appears to have acted inconsistently with its WTO obligations. In particular, the measures appear to be inconsistent with Article XI:1 of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 (GATT 1994), which generally prohibits restrictions on imports of goods, including those made effective through import licenses. The measures also appear to breach various provisions of the Agreement on Import Licensing Procedures, which contains requirements related to the administrative procedures used to implement import licensing regimes.

The United States and Argentina held consultations on September 20-21, 2012, but these consultations failed to resolve the dispute. On December 17, 2012, the United States, together with the European Union and Japan, requested the WTO to establish a dispute settlement panel to examine Argentina’s import restrictions, and a panel was established on January 28, 2013. The Director General composed the
panel as follows: Ms. Leora Blumberg, Chair; and Ms. Claudia Orozco and Mr. Graham Sampson, Members.

Argentina repealed its product-specific non-automatic import licenses which had been the subject of consultations and the U.S. panel request on January 25, 2013. However, it continued to maintain a discretionary non-automatic import licensing requirement applicable to all goods imported into Argentina, as well as informal trade balancing and similar requirements.

The panel is expected to issue its report in 2014.

**China – Measures Affecting Trading Rights and Distribution Services for Certain Publications and Audiovisual Entertainment Products (DS363)**

On April 10, 2007, the United States requested consultations with China regarding certain measures related to the import and/or distribution of imported films for theatrical release, audiovisual home entertainment products (e.g., video cassettes and DVDs), sound recordings, and publications (e.g., books, magazines, newspapers, and electronic publications). On July 10, 2007, the United States requested supplemental consultations with China regarding certain measures pertaining to the distribution of imported films for theatrical release and sound recordings.

Specifically, the United States was concerned that certain Chinese measures: (1) restricted trading rights (such as the right to import goods into China) with respect to imported films for theatrical release, audiovisual home entertainment products, sound recordings, and publications; and (2) restricted market access for, or discriminated against, imported films for theatrical release and sound recordings in physical form, and foreign service providers seeking to engage in the distribution of certain publications, audiovisual home entertainment products, and sound recordings. The Chinese measures at issue appeared to be inconsistent with several WTO provisions, including provisions in the *General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994* (GATT 1994) and *General Agreement on Trade in Services* (GATS), as well as specific commitments made by China in its WTO accession agreement.

The United States and China held consultations on June 5-6, 2007 and July 31, 2007, but they did not resolve the dispute. On October 10, 2007, the United States requested the establishment of a panel, and on November 27, 2007, a panel was established. On March 27, 2008, the Director General composed the panel as follows: Mr. Florentino P. Feliciano, Chair; and Mr. Juan Antonio Dorantes and Mr. Christian Häberli, Members.

The report of the panel was circulated to WTO Members and made public on August 12, 2009. In the final report, the panel made three critical sets of findings. First, the panel found that China’s restrictions on foreign invested enterprises (and in some cases foreign individuals) from importing films for theatrical release, audiovisual home entertainment products, sound recordings, and publications are inconsistent with China’s trading rights commitments as set forth in China’s protocol of accession to the WTO. The panel also found that China’s restrictions on the right to import these products are not justified by Article XX(a) of the GATT 1994. Second, the panel found that China’s prohibitions and discriminatory restrictions on foreign owned or controlled enterprises seeking to distribute publications and audiovisual home entertainment products and sound recordings over the Internet are inconsistent with China’s obligations under the GATS. Third, the panel also found that China’s treatment of imported publications is inconsistent with the national treatment obligation in Article III:4 of the GATT 1994.

In September 2009, China filed a notice of appeal to the WTO Appellate Body, appealing certain of the panel’s findings. First, China contended that its restrictions on importation of the products at issue are justified by an exception related to the protection of public morals. Second, China claimed that while it
had made commitments to allow foreign enterprises to partner in joint ventures with Chinese enterprises to distribute music, those commitments did not cover the electronic distribution of music. Third, and finally, China claimed that its import restrictions on films for theatrical release and certain types of sound recordings and DVDs were not inconsistent with China’s commitments related to the right to import because those products were not goods and therefore were not subject to those commitments. The United States filed a cross appeal on one aspect of the panel’s analysis of China’s defense under GATT Article XX(a). On December 21, 2009, the Appellate Body issued its report. The Appellate Body rejected each of China’s claims on appeal. The Appellate Body also found that the Panel had erred in the aspect of the analysis that the United States had appealed. The DSB adopted the Appellate Body and panel reports on January 19, 2010. On July 12, 2010, the United States and China notified the DSB that they had agreed on a 14 month period of time for implementation, to end on March 19, 2011.

China subsequently issued several revised measures, and repealed other measures, relating to the market access restrictions on books, newspapers, journals, DVDs and music. As China acknowledged, however, it did not issue any measures addressing theatrical films. Instead, China proposed bilateral discussions with the United States in order to seek an alternative solution. The United States and China reached agreement in February 2012 on a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) providing for substantial increases in the number of foreign films imported and distributed in China each year and substantial additional revenue for foreign film producers. The MOU will be reviewed after five years in order to discuss additional compensation for the U.S. side.

*China – Measures Relating to the Exportation of Various Raw Materials (DS394)*

On June 23, 2009, the United States requested consultations with China regarding China’s export restraints on a number of important raw materials. The materials at issue are: bauxite, coke, fluorspar, magnesium, manganese, silicon metal, silicon carbide, yellow phosphorus, and zinc. These materials are inputs for numerous downstream products in the steel, aluminum, and chemical sectors.

The United States challenged China’s export restraints on these raw materials as inconsistent with several WTO provisions, including provisions in the *General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994*, as well as specific commitments made by China in its WTO accession agreement. Specifically, the United States challenged certain Chinese measures that impose: (1) QRs in the form of quotas on exports of bauxite, coke, fluorspar, silicon carbide, and zinc ores and concentrates, as well as certain intermediate products incorporating some of these inputs; and (2) export duties on several raw materials. The United States also challenged other related export restraints, including export licensing restrictions, minimum export price requirements, and requirements to pay certain charges before certain products can be exported, as well as China’s failure to publish relevant measures.

The United States and China held consultations on July 30 and September 1-2, 2009, but did not resolve the dispute. The European Union and Mexico also requested and held consultations with China on these measures.

On November 19, 2009, the European Union and Mexico joined the United States in requesting the establishment of a panel, and on December 21, 2009, the WTO Dispute Settlement Body established a single panel to examine all three complaints. On March 29, 2010, the Director General composed the panel as follows: Mr. Elbio Rosselli, Chair; Ms. Dell Higgie and Mr. Nugroho Wisnumurti, Members. The panel’s final report was circulated to Members on July 5, 2011. The panel found that the export duties and export quotas that China maintains on various forms of bauxite, coke, fluorspar, magnesium, manganese, silicon carbide, silicon metal, and zinc constitute a breach of WTO rules and that China failed to justify those measures as legitimate conservation measures, environmental protection measures, or short supply measures. The panel also found that China’s imposition of minimum export price, export
licensing, and export quota administration requirements on these materials, as well as China’s failure to publish certain measures related to these requirements, is inconsistent with WTO rules.

On January 30, 2012, the Appellate Body issued a report affirming the panel’s findings on all significant claims. In particular, the Appellate Body confirmed that: China may not seek to justify its imposition of export duties as environmental or conservation measures; China failed to demonstrate that certain of its export quotas were justified as measures for preventing or relieving a critical shortage; and the Panel correctly made recommendations for China to bring its measures into conformity with its WTO obligations. The Appellate Body also found that the Panel erred in making findings related to licensing and administration claims, declaring those findings moot and in its legal interpretation of one element of the exception set forth in Article XX(g) of the GATT 1994.

The DSB adopted the Appellate Body report, and the Panel report as modified by the Appellate Body report, on February 22, 2012. The United States, the European Union, Mexico, and China agreed that China would have until December 31, 2012, to comply with the rulings and recommendations.

At the conclusion of the reasonable period of time for China to comply, it appeared that China had eliminated the export duties and export quotas on the products at issue in this dispute, as of January 1, 2013. However, China maintains export licensing requirements for a number of the products. The United States continues to monitor actions by China that might operate to restrict exports of raw materials at issue in this dispute.

**China – Certain Measures Affecting Electronic Payment Services (DS413)**

On September 15, 2010, the United States requested consultations with China concerning issues relating to certain restrictions and requirements maintained by China pertaining to electronic payment services (EPS) for payment card transactions and the suppliers of those services. EPS enable transactions involving credit card, debit card, charge card, check card, automated teller machine (ATM) card, prepaid card, or other similar card or money transmission product, and manage and facilitate the transfers of funds between institutions participating in such card-based electronic payment transactions.

EPS provide the essential architecture for card-based electronic payment transactions, and EPS are supplied through complex electronic networks that streamline and process transactions and offer an efficient and reliable means to facilitate the movement of funds from the cardholders purchasing goods or services to the individuals or businesses that supply them. EPS consist of a network, rules and procedures, and operating system that allow cardholders’ banks to pay merchants’ banks the amounts they are owed. EPS suppliers receive, check and transmit the information that processors need to conduct the transactions. The rules and procedures established by the EPS supplier give the payment system stability and integrity, and enable net payment flows among the institutions involved in card-based electronic transactions. The best known EPS suppliers are credit and debit card companies based in the United States.

China instituted and maintains measures that operate to block foreign EPS suppliers, including U.S. suppliers, from supplying these services, and that discriminate against foreign suppliers at every stage of a card-based electronic payment transaction. The United States challenged China’s measures affecting EPS suppliers as inconsistent with China’s national treatment and market access commitments under the WTO’s General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS).

The United States and China held consultations on October 27 and 28, 2010, but these consultations did not resolve the dispute. The United States requested the establishment of a panel on February 11, 2011. On March 25, 2011, the DSB established a panel to consider the claims of the United States. On July 4, 2011, the Director General composed the panel as follows: Mr. Virachai Plasai, Chair; and Ms. Elaine

The United States prevailed on significant threshold issues, including:

- EPS is a single service (or EPS are integrated services) and each element of EPS is necessary for a payment card transaction to occur.

- EPS is properly classified under the same subsector, item (viii) of the GATS Annex on Financial Services, which appears as subsector (d) of China’s Schedule (“All payment and money transmission services, including credit, charge, and debit cards…”) as the United States argued, and no element of EPS is classified as falling in item xiv of the GATS Annex on Financial services (“settlement and clearing of financial assets, including securities, derivative products, and other negotiable instruments”), as China argued and for which China has no WTO commitments.

- In addition to the “four-party” model of EPS (e.g., Visa and MasterCard), the “three-party” model (e.g., American Express) and other variations, and third party issuer processor and merchant processors also are covered by subsector (d) of China’s Schedule.

With respect to the U.S. GATS national treatment claims, the Panel found the following violations:

- China imposes requirements on issuers of payment cards that payment cards issued in China bear the “Yin Lian/UnionPay logo,” and furthermore, through these, China requires issuers to become members of the CUP network, and that the cards they issue in China meet certain uniform business specifications and technical standards, and that these requirements fail to accord to services and service suppliers of any other Member treatment no less favorable than China accords to its own like services and service suppliers;

- China imposes requirements that all terminals (ATMs, merchant processing devices, and point of sale (POS) terminals) in China that are part of the national card inter-bank processing network be capable of accepting all payment cards bearing the Yin Lian/UnionPay logo, and that these requirements fail to accord to services and service suppliers of any other Member treatment no less favorable than China accords to its own like services and service suppliers;

- China imposes requirements on acquirers (those institutions that acquire payment card transactions and that maintain relationships with merchants) to post the Yin Lian/UnionPay logo, and furthermore, China imposes requirements that acquirers join the CUP network and comply with uniform business standards and technical specifications of inter-bank interoperability, and that terminal equipment operated or provided by acquirers be capable of accepting bank cards bearing the Yin Lian/UnionPay logo, and that these requirements fail to accord to services and service suppliers of any other Member treatment no less favorable than China accords to its own like services and service suppliers;

With respect to the U.S. GATS market access claims, the Panel found that China’s requirements related to certain Hong Kong and Macao transactions are inconsistent with Article XVI:2(a) of the GATS because,
contrary to China’s Sector 7.B(d) mode 3 market access commitments, China maintains a limitation on the number of service suppliers in the form of a monopoly.

The United States and China agreed that a reasonable period of time for China to implement the DSB recommendations and rulings would be 11 months from the date of adoption of the recommendations and rulings, that is, until July 31, 2013.

To date, China has taken some compliance steps by removing certain restrictive measures, but it has not yet issued the necessary affirmative regulations to establish a licensing process for foreign EPS suppliers to operate in China. The United States continues to engage China in discussions regarding further regulatory steps China intends to take in the EPS sector.

China – Countervailing and Anti-Dumping Duties on Grain Oriented Flat-rolled Electrical Steel from the United States (DS414)

On September 15, 2010, the United States filed a request for consultations regarding China’s imposition of antidumping duties (ADs) and countervailing duties (CVDs) on imports of grain oriented flat rolled electrical steel (GOES) from the United States.

In June 2009, China’s Ministry of Commerce (MOFCOM) initiated two investigations on GOES from the United States. On April 10, 2010, based on determinations that American steel had been dumped into their market and subsidized, MOFCOM imposed antidumping duties ranging from 7.8 percent to 64.8 percent and countervailing duties ranging from 11.7 percent and 44.6 percent.

China’s antidumping and subsidy determinations in the GOES investigations appeared to violate numerous WTO requirements. Specifically, the United States was concerned, inter alia, that China initiated the countervailing duty investigation without sufficient evidence; failed to objectively examine the evidence; failed to disclose “essential facts” underlying its conclusions; failed to provide an adequate explanation of its calculations and legal conclusions; improperly used investigative procedures; and failed to provide non-confidential summaries of Chinese submissions.

The United States and China held consultations on November 1, 2010, but did not resolve the dispute. In March 2011, the United States requested the establishment of a panel. In May 2011, the DSB established a panel. On May 10, 2011, the panel was composed by the agreement of the parties, as follows: Mr. John Adank, Chair; and Mr. Anthony Abad and Mr. Jan Heukelman, Members. Meetings with the Panel took place in September and December 2011.

In June 2012, the Panel issued its report, upholding U.S. claims that China had breached a number of substantive and procedural obligations under the WTO Agreement in imposing AD/CVDS on GOES from the United States. The Panel found that China initiated the countervailing duty investigation with respect to several alleged programs based on insufficient evidence, failed to provide non-confidential summaries of submissions containing confidential information, calculated the subsidy rates for U.S. companies in a manner unsupported by the facts, calculated the “all others” subsidy rate and dumping margin without a factual basis, failed to disclose essential facts and failed to explain the calculation of the “all others” subsidy rate and dumping margin, and made unsupported findings that U.S. exports caused injury to China’s domestic industry.

In July 2012, China filed a notice of appeal challenging certain aspects of the panel report. The Appellate Body held a hearing in August 2012. In October 2012, the Appellate Body issued its report, and rejected all of China’s claims on appeal.
In November 2012, the Dispute Settlement Body adopted the panel and Appellate Body reports. The same month, China announced its intention to implement the DSB recommendations and rulings in the dispute, and stated that it would need a reasonable period of time (RPT) in which to do so.

In early 2013, following unsuccessful bilateral discussions on the length of the RPT, the United States requested that an arbitrator determine the RPT pursuant to Article 21.3(c) of the DSU. The oral hearing was held on April 4, 2013, and the arbitrator issued the award of 8.5 months on May 3, 2013. The RPT expired on July 31, 2013. That same day, China issued a re-determination based on a review of the existing evidence and information in the primary AD/CVD investigations at issue. The re-determination continued the imposition of AD/CVDs on imports of GOES from the United States. The United States is evaluating China’s re-determination closely to assess its implications for China’s compliance in this dispute.

China — Measures Related to the Exportation of Rare Earths, Tungsten and Molybdenum (DS431)

On March 13, 2012, the United States requested consultations with China regarding China’s export restraints on rare earths, tungsten and molybdenum. These materials are vital inputs in the manufacture of electronics, automobiles, steel, petroleum products, and a variety of chemicals that are used to produce both everyday items and highly sophisticated, technologically advanced products, such as hybrid vehicle batteries, wind turbines, and energy efficient lighting.

Specifically, the United States is concerned that certain Chinese measures: (1) impose QRs in the form of quotas on exports of rare earth, tungsten and molybdenum ores and concentrates, as well as certain intermediate products incorporating some of these inputs; (2) impose export duties on rare earths, tungsten and molybdenum; and (3) impose other export restraints including prior export performance and minimum capital requirements. The measures at issue appear to be inconsistent with several WTO provisions, including provisions in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994, as well as specific commitments made by China in its WTO accession agreement.

The United States, together with the European Union and Japan, held consultations with China on April 25-26, 2012, but the consultations did not resolve the dispute.

On June 29, 2012, the European Union and Japan joined the United States in requesting the establishment of a panel, and on July 23, 2012, the WTO Dispute Settlement Body established a single panel to examine all three complaints. On September 24, 2012, the Director General composed the panel as follows: Mr. Nacer Benjelloun-Touimi, Chair; Mr. Hugo Cayrús and Mr. Darlington Mwaite, members. The panel held its meetings with the parties on February 26-28, 2013, and June 18-19, 2013. Circulation of the panel report is expected in 2014.

China — Anti-Dumping and Countervailing Duty Measures on Broiler Products from the United States (DS427)

On September 20, 2011, the United States filed a request for consultations regarding China’s imposition of antidumping (AD) duties and countervailing duties (CVD) on imports of chicken broiler products from the United States.

On September 27, 2009, China’s Ministry of Commerce (MOFCOM) initiated antidumping and countervailing duty investigations of imports of chicken broiler products from the United States. On September 26, 2010 and August 30, 2010, China imposed antidumping and countervailing duties, respectively. In levying the antidumping and countervailing duties, China appears to have acted inconsistently with numerous WTO obligations, such as abiding by applicable procedures and legal
standards, including by finding injury to China’s domestic industry without objectively examining the evidence, by improperly calculating dumping margins and subsidization rates, and by failing to adhere to various transparency and due process requirements.

The United States and China held consultations on October 28, 2011, but were unable to resolve the dispute. On December 8, 2011, the United States requested the establishment of a panel. The DSB established a panel on January 20, 2012. On May 24, 2012, the WTO Director General composed the panel as follows: Mr. Faizullah Khilji, Chair; and Mr. Serge Fréchette and Ms. Claudia Orozco, members. The Panel held its meetings with the parties on September 27-28, 2012, and December 4-5, 2012.

The Panel’s report, which upheld nearly all the claims brought by the United States, was circulated on August 2, 2013. In particular, the Panel found MOFCOM’s substantive determinations and procedural conduct in levying the duties was inconsistent with China’s WTO obligations. With respect to the substantive errors, the Panel’s report found China breached its obligations by:

- Levying countervailing duties on U.S. producers in excess of the amount of subsidization;
- Relying on flawed price comparisons for its determination that China’s domestic industry had suffered injury;
- Unjustifiably declining to use the books and records of two major U.S. producers in calculating their costs of production; failing to consider any of the alternative allocation methodologies presented by U.S. producers and instead using a weight-based methodology resulting in high dumping margins; improperly allocating distinct processing costs to other products inflating dumping margins; and allocating one producer’s costs in producing non-exported products to exported products creating an inflated dumping margin; and
- Improperly calculating the “all others” dumping margin and subsidy rates.

With respect to the procedural failings, the Panel found that China breached its WTO obligations by:

- Denying a hearing request during the investigation;
- Failing to require the Chinese industry to provide non-confidential summaries of information it provided to MOFCOM; and
- Failing to disclose essential facts to U.S. companies including how their dumping margins were calculated.

The DSB adopted the panel report on September 25, 2013. On December 19, 2013, the United States and China agreed that the reasonable period of time for China to implement the Panel’s findings would be 9 months and 14 days, i.e., July 9, 2014.

China — Anti-Dumping and Countervailing Duties on Certain Automobiles from the United States (DS440)

On July 5, 2012, the United States filed a request for consultations regarding China’s imposition of antidumping (AD) duties and countervailing duties (CVD) on imports of certain automobiles from the United States.

In November 2009, China’s Ministry of Commerce (MOFCOM) had initiated two investigations on certain automobiles from the United States. On December 14, 2011, based on affirmative determinations of injurious dumping and subsidization with respect to certain American-made automobiles, MOFCOM imposed antidumping duties ranging from 2.0 percent to 21.5 percent and countervailing duties ranging from 6.2 percent to 12.9 percent.
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China’s dumping and subsidy determinations in the autos investigations appear to breach numerous WTO obligations. Specifically, the United States is concerned that China failed to objectively examine the evidence, and made unsupported findings of injury to China’s domestic industry. In addition, China failed to disclose “essential facts” underlying its conclusions, failed to provide an adequate explanation of its conclusions, improperly used investigative procedures, and failed to provide non-confidential summaries of Chinese submissions.

The United States and China held consultations on August 23, 2012, but did not resolve the dispute. In September 2012, the United States requested the establishment of a panel, and in October 2012 the DSB established a panel. On February 11, 2013, the Director General composed the panel as follows: Mr. Pierre Pettigrew, Chair; and Ms. Andrea Marie Brown and Ms. Enie Nerie De Ross, members. The panel held meetings with the parties on June 25-26, 2013, and on October 15, 2013. The panel is expected to issue its report in 2014.

China — Certain Measures Affecting the Automobile and Automobile-Parts Industries (DS450)

On September 17, 2012, the United States requested consultations with China concerning China’s auto and auto parts “export base” program. Under this program, China appears to provide extensive subsidies to auto and auto-parts exporting enterprises located in designated regions known as “export bases.” It appears that China is providing these subsidies in contravention of its obligation under Article 3 of the Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (Subsidies Agreement), which prohibits the provision of subsidies contingent upon export performance. China also appears to have failed to comply with various transparency related obligations, including its obligation to notify the challenged subsidies as required by the Subsidies Agreement, and to publish the measures at issue in an official journal and to translate the measures into one or more of the official languages of the WTO as required by China’s Protocol of Accession.

The United States and China held consultations in November 2012 and continue to engage in discussions to explore ways for China to address the concerns raised by the United States in this dispute.

European Union – Measures concerning meat and meat products (hormones) (DS26, 48)

The United States and Canada challenged the EU ban on imports of meat from animals to which any of six hormones for growth promotional purposes had been administered. The panel found that the EU ban is inconsistent with the EU’s obligations under the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement), and that the ban is not based on science, a risk assessment, or relevant international standards.

Upon appeal, the Appellate Body affirmed the panel’s findings that the EU ban fails to satisfy the requirements of the SPS Agreement. The Appellate Body also found that, while a country has broad discretion in electing what level of protection it wishes to implement, in doing so it must fulfill the requirements of the SPS Agreement. In this case, the ban imposed is not rationally related to the conclusions of the risk assessments the EU had performed.

Because the EU did not comply with the recommendations and rulings of the DSB by May 13, 1999, the final date of its compliance period as set by arbitration, the United States sought WTO authorization to suspend concessions with respect to certain products of the EU. The value of the suspension of concessions represents an estimate of the annual harm to U.S. exports resulting from the EU’s failure to lift its ban on imports of U.S. meat. The EU exercised its right to request arbitration concerning the amount of the suspension. On July 12, 1999, the arbitrators determined the level of suspension to be
$116.8 million. On July 26, 1999, the DSB authorized the United States to suspend such concessions and the United States proceeded to impose 100 percent ad valorem duties on a list of EU products with an annual trade value of $116.8 million. On May 26, 2000, USTR announced that it was considering changes to that list of EU products, but did not make any changes.

On November 3, 2003, the EU notified the WTO that it had amended its hormones ban. As discussed below (DS320), on November 8, 2004, the EU requested consultations with respect to “the United States’ continued suspension of concessions and other obligations under the covered agreements” in the EU – Hormones dispute. The Appellate Body issued its report in the U.S. – Continued Suspension (WT/DS320) dispute on October 16, 2008.

On October 31, 2008, USTR again announced that it was considering changes to the list of EU products on which 100 percent ad valorem duties had been imposed in 1999. A modified list of EU products was announced by USTR on January 15, 2009.

On December 22, 2008, the EU requested consultations with the United States and Canada pursuant to Articles 4 and 21.5 of the DSU, regarding the EU’s implementation of the DSB’s recommendations and rulings in the EU–Hormones dispute. In its consultations request, the EU stated that it considered that it has brought into compliance the measures found inconsistent in EU–Hormones by, among other things, adopting its revised ban in 2003. Consultations took place in February 2009.

Pursuant to the MOU, further litigation in the EU–Hormones compliance proceeding has been suspended.

The initial phase outlined in the Beef MOU ran from August 2009 through August 2012. During phase 1, the EU provided increased, duty-free access to the EU market for U.S. beef produced without certain growth promoting hormones. The United States was permitted to maintain increased duties on a reduced list of EU products.

In August 2012 the United States and the EU, by mutual agreement, entered into phase 2 of the Beef MOU. In accordance with its phase 2 obligations, the EU increased the amount of duty free access to the EU market for U.S. beef produced without certain growth promoting hormones. Consistent with its phase 2 obligations, the United States is no longer applying increased duties on EU products.

European Union – Measures affecting the approval and marketing of biotechnology products (DS291)

Since the late 1990s, the EU has pursued policies that undermine agricultural biotechnology and trade in biotechnological foods. After approving a number of biotechnological products through October 1998, the EU adopted an across the board moratorium under which no further biotechnology applications were allowed to reach final approval. In addition, six Member States (Austria, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, and Luxembourg) adopted unjustified bans on certain biotechnological crops that had been approved by the EU prior to the adoption of the moratorium. These measures have caused a growing portion of U.S. agricultural exports to be excluded from EU markets, and unfairly cast concerns about biotechnology products around the world, particularly in developing countries.

On May 13, 2003, the United States filed a consultation request with respect to: (1) the EU’s moratorium on all new biotechnology approvals; (2) delays in the processing of specific biotech product applications; and (3) the product specific bans adopted by six EU Member States (Austria, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, and Luxembourg). The United States requested the establishment of a panel on August 7, 2003. Argentina and Canada submitted similar consultation and panel requests. On August 29, 2003, the DSB established a panel to consider the claims of the United States, Argentina, and Canada. On March 4,
2003, the Director General composed the panel as follows: Mr. Christian Häberli, Chair; and Mr. Mohan Kumar and Mr. Akio Shimizu, Members.

The panel issued its report on September 29, 2006. The panel agreed with the United States, Argentina, and Canada that the disputed measures of the EU, Austria, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, and Luxembourg are inconsistent with the obligations set out in the SPS Agreement. In particular:

- The panel found that the EU adopted a *de facto*, across the board moratorium on the final approval of biotechnological products, starting in 1999 up through the time the panel was established in August 2003.

- The panel found that the EU had presented no scientific or regulatory justification for the moratorium, and thus that the moratorium resulted in “undue delays” in violation of the EU’s obligations under the SPS Agreement.

- The panel identified specific, WTO inconsistent “undue delays” with regard to 24 of the 27 pending product applications that were listed in the U.S. panel request.

- The panel upheld the United States’ claims that, in light of positive safety assessments issued by the EU’s own scientists, the bans adopted by six EU Member States on products approved in the EU prior to the moratorium were not supported by scientific evidence, and were thus inconsistent with WTO rules.

The DSB adopted the panel report on November 21, 2006. At the meeting of the DSB held on December 19, 2006, the EU notified the DSB that the EU intended to implement the recommendations and rulings of the DSB in these disputes, and stated that it would need a reasonable period of time for implementation. On June 21, 2006, the United States, Argentina, and Canada notified the DSB that they had agreed with the EU on a one year period of time for implementation, to end on November 21, 2007. On November 21, 2007, the United States, Argentina, and Canada notified the DSB that they had agreed with the EU to extend the implementation period to January 11, 2008.

On January 17, 2008, the United States submitted a request for authorization to suspend concessions and other obligations with respect to the EU under the covered agreements at an annual level equivalent to the annual level of nullification or impairment of benefits accruing to the United States resulting from the EU’s failure to bring measures concerning the approval and marketing of biotechnology products into compliance with the recommendations and rulings of the DSB. On February 6, 2008, the European Union requested arbitration under Article 22.6 of the DSU, claiming that the level of suspension proposed by the United States was not equivalent to the level of nullification or impairment. The European Union and the United States mutually agreed to suspend the Article 22.6 arbitration proceedings as of February 18, 2008. The United States may request resumption of the proceedings following a finding by the DSB that the EU has not complied with the recommendations and rulings of the DSB.

Subsequent to the suspension of the Article 22.6 proceeding, the United States has been monitoring EU developments and has been engaged with the EU in discussions with the goal of normalizing trade in biotechnology products.

*European Union – Subsidies on large civil aircraft (DS316)*

On October 6, 2004, the United States requested consultations with the European Union, as well as with Germany, France, the United Kingdom, and Spain, with respect to subsidies provided to Airbus, a
The United States alleged that such subsidies violated various provisions of the Subsidies and Countervailing Measures Agreement, as well as Article XVI:1 of the GATT 1994. Consultations were held on November 4, 2004. On January 11, 2005, the United States and the EU agreed to a framework for the negotiation of a new agreement to end subsidies for large civil aircraft. The parties set a three month time frame for the negotiations and agreed that, during negotiations, they would not request panel proceedings.

The United States and the European Union were unable to reach an agreement within the 90 day time frame. Therefore, the United States filed a request for a panel on May 31, 2005. The panel was established on July 20, 2005. The U.S. request challenged several types of EU subsidies that appear to be prohibited, actionable, or both.

On October 17, 2005, the Deputy Director General composed the panel as follows: Mr. Carlos Pérez del Castillo, Chair; and Mr. John Adank and Mr. Thinus Jacobsz, Members. The panel met with the parties on March 20-21 and July 25-26, 2007, and met with the parties and third parties on July 24, 2007. The panel granted the parties’ request to hold part of its meetings with the parties in public session. This portion of the panel’s meetings was videotaped and reviewed by the parties to ensure that business confidential information had not been disclosed before being shown in public on March 22 and July 27, 2007.

The Panel issued its report on June 30, 2010. It agreed with the United States that the disputed measures of the European Union, France, Germany, Spain, and the United Kingdom were inconsistent with the SCM Agreement. In particular:

- Every instance of “launch aid” provided to Airbus was a subsidy because in each case, the terms charged for this unique low interest, success dependent financing were more favorable than were available in the market.

- Some of the launch aid provided for the A380, Airbus’s newest and largest aircraft, was contingent on exports and, therefore, a prohibited subsidy.

- Several instances in which German and French government entities created infrastructure for Airbus were subsidies because the infrastructure was not general, and the price charged to Airbus for use resulted in less than adequate remuneration to the government.

- Several government equity infusions into the Airbus companies were subsidies because they were on more favorable terms than available in the market.

- Several EU and Member State research programs provided grants to Airbus to develop technologies used in its aircraft.

- These subsidies caused adverse effects to the interests of the United States in the form of lost sales, displacement of U.S. imports into the EU market, and displacement of U.S. exports into the markets of Australia, Brazil, China, Chinese Taipei, Korea, Mexico, and Singapore.

The EU filed a notice of appeal on July 21, 2010. The WTO Appellate Body conducted an initial hearing on August 3, 2010 to discuss procedural issues related to the need to protect business confidential information and highly sensitive business information and issued additional working procedures to that end on August 10, 2010. The Appellate Body held two hearings on the issues raised in the EU’s appeal of the Panel’s findings of WTO inconsistent subsidization of Airbus. The first hearing, held November...
11-17, 2010, addressed issues associated with the main subsidy to Airbus, launch aid, and the other subsidies challenged by the United States. The second hearing held December 9-14, 2010, focused on the Panel’s findings that the European subsidies caused serious prejudice to the interests of the United States in the form of lost sales and declining market share in the European Union and other third country markets. On May 18, 2011, the Appellate Body issued its report. The Appellate Body affirmed the Panel’s central findings that European government launch aid had been used to support the creation of every model of large civil aircraft produced by Airbus. The Appellate Body also confirmed that launch aid and other challenged subsidies to Airbus have directly resulted in Boeing losing sales involving purchases of Airbus aircraft by easyJet, Air Berlin, Czech Airlines, Air Asia, Iberia, South African Airways, Thai Airways International, Singapore Airlines, Emirates Airlines, and Qantas – and lost market share, with Airbus gaining market share in the European Union and in third country markets, including China and South Korea, at the expense of Boeing. The Appellate Body also found that the Panel applied the wrong standard for evaluating whether subsidies are export subsidies, and that the Panel record did not have enough information to allow application of the correct standard.

On December 1, 2011, the EU provided a notification in which it claimed to have complied with the DSB recommendations and rulings. On December 9, 2011, the United States requested consultations regarding the notification and also requested authorization from the DSB to impose countermeasures. The United States and the EU held consultations on January 13, 2012. On December 22, 2011, the EU objected to the level of suspension of concessions requested by the United States, and the matter was referred to arbitration pursuant to Article 22.6 of the DSU. On January 19, 2012, the United States and the EU requested that the arbitration be suspended pending the conclusion of the compliance proceeding.

On March 30, 2012, in light of the parties’ disagreement over whether the EU had complied with the DSB’s recommendations and rulings, the United States requested that the DSB refer the matter to the original Panel pursuant to Article 21.5 of the DSU. The DSB did so at a meeting held on April 13, 2012. On April 25, 2012, the compliance Panel was composed with the members of the original Panel: Mr. Carlos Pérez del Castillo, Chair; Mr. John Adank and Mr. Thinus Jacobsz, Members.

The parties filed submissions in the compliance proceeding in late 2012, and the compliance Panel held a meeting with the parties on April 16-17, 2013. The Panel is expected to issue a report in 2014.

European Union – Regime for the importation, sale, and distribution of bananas – Recourse to Article 21.5 of the DSU by the United States (WT/DS27)

On June 29, 2007, the United States requested the establishment of a panel under Article 21.5 of the DSU to review whether the European Union had failed to bring its import regime for bananas into compliance with its WTO obligations and the DSB recommendations and rulings adopted on September 25, 1997. The request related to the EU’s apparent failure to implement the WTO rulings in a proceeding initiated by Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, and the United States. That proceeding had resulted in findings that the EU’s banana regime discriminated against bananas originating in Latin American countries and against distributors of such bananas, including a number of U.S. companies. The EU was under an obligation to bring its banana regime into compliance with its WTO obligations by January 1999. The EU committed to shift to a tariff only regime for bananas no later than January 1, 2006. Despite these commitments, the banana regime implemented by the EU on January 1, 2006 included a zero duty tariff-rate quota allocated exclusively to bananas from African, Caribbean, and Pacific countries. All other bananas did not have access to this duty-free tariff-rate quota and were subject to a 176 euro per ton duty. The United States brought challenges under GATT Articles I:1 and XIII.

Ecuador requested the establishment of a similar compliance panel on February 23, 2007, and a panel was composed in response to that request on June 15. In response to the United States request, the Panel was
established on July 12, 2007. On August 13, 2007, the Director General composed the Panel as follows: Mr. Christian Häberli, Chair; and Mr. Kym Anderson and Mr. Yuqing Zhang, members. Mr. Häberli and Mr. Anderson were members of the original Panel in this dispute.

The Panel granted the parties’ request to open the substantive meeting with the parties, as well as a portion of the third-party session, to the public. The public observed these meetings from a gallery in the room in which the meetings were conducted.

The Panel issued its report on May 19, 2008. The Panel agreed with the United States that the EU’s regime was inconsistent with the EU’s obligations under Articles I:1, XIII:1, and XIII:2 of the GATT 1994, and that the EU had failed to implement the recommendations and rulings of the DSB.

On August 28, 2008, the EU filed a notice of appeal. The Appellate Body granted a joint request by the parties to open its hearing to the public, and the public was able to observe the hearing via a closed circuit television broadcast. The Appellate Body issued its report on November 26, 2008. The Appellate Body found that the EU had failed to bring itself into compliance with the recommendations and rulings of the DSB. In particular, the Appellate Body rejected all of the EU’s procedural arguments alleging the United States was barred from bringing the compliance proceeding and agreed with the panel that the EU’s duty-free tariff-rate quota reserved only for some countries was inconsistent with Article XIII of the GATT 1994. The Panel in this dispute had also found that the EU’s banana import regime was in violation of GATT Article I. The EU did not appeal that finding. The DSB adopted the Appellate Body report on December 22, 2008.

On December 15, 2009, the United States and the EU initialed an agreement designed to lead to settlement of the dispute. In the agreement, the EU undertakes not to reintroduce measures that discriminate among bananas distributors based on the ownership or control of the distributor or the source of the bananas, and to maintain a nondiscriminatory, tariff only regime for the importation of bananas. The United States-European Union agreement complements an agreement initialed on the same date between the EU and several Latin American banana supplying countries (the GATB). That agreement provides for staged EU tariff cuts that will bring the EU into compliance with its obligations under the WTO Agreement. The GATB was signed on May 31, 2010, and the United States-European Union agreement was signed on June 8, 2010. The agreements will enter into force following completion of certain domestic procedures. Upon entry into force, the EU will need to request formal WTO certification of its new tariffs on bananas. The GATB provides that once the certification process is concluded, the EU and the Latin American signatories to the GATB will settle their disputes and claims. Once that has occurred, the United States will also settle its dispute with the European Union.

The GATB entered into force on May 1, 2012, following completion of certain domestic procedures. The EU’s revised tariff commitments on bananas were formally certified through the WTO certification process (document WT/Let/868 of October 30, 2012). Pursuant to the GATB, the EU, and the Latin American signatories to the GATB settled their disputes and claims on November 8, 2012. As the GATB has entered into force and both the European Union and the United States have completed necessary domestic procedures, the United States-European Union agreement entered into force on January 24, 2013. The United States will also settle its dispute with the European Union.

**European Communities – Tariff Treatment of Certain Information Technology Products (WT/DS375)**

On May 28, 2008, the United States requested consultations with the European Union and its Member States regarding the tariff treatment accorded to set top boxes with a communication function, flat panel displays, “input or output units,” and facsimile machines. The United States was concerned that certain EU measures appear to have resulted in the imposition of duties on these products. As a result of the
Information Technology Agreement, the EU and its Member States, in their Schedules of Concessions to the GATT 1994, committed to provide duty-free treatment for these products.

The measures in question appeared to be inconsistent with the obligations of the EU and its Member States under Articles II:1(a) and II:1(b) of the GATT 1994. In addition, certain of the actions taken by the EU with respect to set top boxes appeared to be inconsistent with the EU’s obligations under GATT 1994 Articles X:1 and X:2.

Japan and Chinese Taipei (on May 28, 2008, and June 12, 2008, respectively) also filed requests for consultations with the EU and its Member States on these measures. On August 18, the United States, Japan, and Chinese Taipei jointly requested the establishment of a panel. A panel was established at the meeting of the DSB on September 23, 2008. On January 22, 2009, the Director General composed the panel as follows: Mr. Wilhelm Meier, Chair; and Mr. David Evans and Ms. Valerie Hughes, Members.

The Panel met with the parties on May 12 and 14, 2009 and on July 9, 2009, and met with the parties and third parties on May 13, 2009. Pursuant to the parties’ request, the meetings with the parties, as well as a portion of the third party session, were open for public observation.

The Panel issued its report on August 16, 2010. The Panel agreed with the United States with respect to all three products at issue, finding that the EU measures result in the imposition of duties on products that are entitled to duty-free treatment under the EU’s schedule of concessions and are inconsistent with GATT Article II:1(a) and (b). In addition, the Panel agreed with the United States that the EU’s failure to promptly publish its Explanatory Note on set top boxes and its enforcement of an April 2007 set top box measure before its official publication were inconsistent with GATT Article X:1 and X:2, respectively.

The report was adopted at the meeting of the DSB on September 21, 2010. On October 13, 2010, the EU informed the Chairman of the DSB that it intended to implement the recommendations and rulings of the DSB and would need a reasonable period of time to do so. On December 20, 2010, the United States and the EU notified the DSB that they had agreed on a nine month and nine day period of time for implementation, to end on June 30, 2011. While the EU took some steps to bring its measures into compliance as of June 30, 2011, the United States remained concerned that certain products at issue would still be subject to duties. In 2013, the EU took additional steps to ensure that flat panel displays which were the subject of the dispute will be afforded duty-free treatment consistent with the findings of the Panel. The United States continues to monitor the EU’s implementation of the recommendations and rulings of the DSB.

*European Communities – Certain Measures Affecting Poultry Meat and Poultry Meat Products from the United States (DS389)*

On January 16, 2009, the United States requested consultations regarding certain EU measures that prohibit the import of poultry meat and poultry meat products that have been processed with chemical treatments designed to reduce the amount of microbes on poultry meat, unless such pathogen reduction treatments (PRTs) have been approved. The EU further prohibits the marketing of poultry meat and poultry meat products if they have been processed with PRTs. In December 2008, the EU formally rejected the approval of four PRTs whose approval had been requested by the United States, despite the fact that EU scientists have repeatedly concluded that poultry meat and poultry meat products treated with any of these four PRTs does not present a health risk to European consumers. The EU’s maintenance of its import ban and marketing regulation against PRT poultry appears to be inconsistent with its obligations under the SPS Agreement, the Agreement on Agriculture, the GATT 1994, and the Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) Agreement. Consultations were held on February 11, 2009, but those
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consultations failed to resolve the dispute. The United States requested the establishment of a panel on October 8, 2009, and the DSB established a panel on November 19, 2009.

India — Measures Concerning the Importation of Certain Agricultural Products from the United States (DS430)

On March 6, 2012, the United States requested consultations with India regarding its import prohibitions on various agricultural products from the United States. India asserts these import prohibitions are necessary to prevent the entry of avian influenza into India. However, the United States has not had an outbreak of highly pathogenic avian influenza (“HPAI”) since 2004. With respect to low pathogenic avian influenza (“LPAI”), the only kind of avian influenza found in the United States since 2004, international standards do not support the imposition of import prohibitions, including the type maintained by India. The United States considers that India’s restrictions are inconsistent with numerous provisions of the SPS Agreement, including Articles 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 5.1, 5.2, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 6.1, 6.2, 7, and Annex B, and Articles I and XI of GATT 1994.

The United States and India held consultations on April 16-17, 2012, but were unable to resolve the dispute. The United States requested the establishment of a WTO panel on May 24, 2012. At its meeting on June 25, 2012, the WTO Dispute Settlement Body established a panel.

India – Solar Local Content (DS456)

In February 2013, the United States requested WTO consultations with India concerning domestic-content requirement for participation in an Indian solar-power generation program known as the National Solar Mission (“NSM”). Under Phase I of the NSM, India provides guaranteed, long-term payments to solar power developers contingent on the purchase and use of solar cells and solar modules of domestic origin. Specifically, the NSM’s domestic-content requirements appear to be inconsistent with India’s WTO obligations under Article III:4 of the GATT 1994, Article 2 of the Agreement on Trade-Related Investment Measures, and Article 3.1(b) of the Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures.

The United States and India held consultations on March 20, 2013. The consultations failed to resolve U.S. concerns, and the United States continues to engage with India on this matter.

Indonesia – Import Restrictions on Horticultural Products, Animals, and Animal Products (DS455 and DS465)

In January 2013, the United States requested consultations with Indonesia concerning its non-automatic import licensing requirements and quotas that serve as serious impediments to trade in horticultural products, animals, and animal products.

In late 2011, Indonesia passed regulations establishing non-automatic import licensing requirements for horticultural products. Those regulations were revised in September 2012 to include additional requirements. The affected products include, but are not limited to, fruits, vegetables, flowers, dried fruits and vegetables, and juices. In addition, Indonesia maintains a similar non-automatic import licensing and quota regime for beef and other animal product imports.

Through these measures, Indonesia appears to have acted inconsistently with its WTO obligations. In particular, the measures appear to be inconsistent with Article XI:1 of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 (GATT 1994) and Article 4.2 of the Agreement on Agriculture. The measures also appear to breach various provisions of the Agreement on Import Licensing Procedures.
Subsequent to the filing of the first U.S. consultations request in January, Indonesia has revised its import licensing and quota measures. Indonesia’s revised measures include new laws on food, beef, and other agricultural products that contain further import-restrictive provisions.

In August 2013, the United States and New Zealand each requested consultations with Indonesia concerning its revised measures. Consultations were held on September 23, 2013, but failed to resolve the concerns raised. The United States and New Zealand continue to work to ensure that Indonesia adheres to its WTO obligations.

**Philippines – Taxes on Distilled Spirits (DS403)**

On January 14, 2010, the United States requested consultations regarding Philippine excise taxes on distilled spirits. The Philippines has taxed distilled spirits at rates that differ depending on the product from which the spirit is distilled. The Philippines taxed distilled spirits made from certain materials that are typically produced in the Philippines, such as sugar and palm, at a low rate (e.g., 13.59 pesos per proof liter in 2009). Other distilled spirits were taxed at significantly higher rates (from approximately 10 to 40 times higher) than the low rate applied to domestic products. The Philippine taxes on distilled spirits appeared not to tax similarly those distilled spirits that are imported compared to directly competitive or substitutable domestic distilled spirits, and the taxes appeared to be applied in a way that affords protection to the domestic products. In addition, the taxes appeared to subject imported distilled spirits to internal taxes in excess of those applied to like domestic products. Accordingly, the tax treatment of distilled spirits appeared inconsistent with Article III:2 of the GATT 1994. After consultations failed to resolve the dispute, the United States, on March 26, 2010, requested the establishment of a panel. At its meeting on April 20, 2010, the DSB established a panel and agreed that, as provided in Article 9.1 of the DSU in respect of multiple complainants, the panel established on January 19, 2010 to examine the complaint by the European Union (DS396) on the same measures, would also examine the U.S. complaint. The Director General composed the panel on July 5, 2010.

The United States and the European Union filed their respective first written submissions on September 2, 2010. The first meeting of the Panel took place on November 17-18, 2010. The second meeting of the Panel took place on February 9, 2011. The Panel circulated its final report on August 15, 2011. The Panel found that the Philippine excise taxes were inconsistent with the first and second sentences of Article III:2 of the GATT 1994.

The Philippines filed a notice of appeal on September 23, 2011. The Appellate Body hearing was held on October 25-26, 2011. The Appellate Body report was issued December 21, 2011. It confirmed the Panel’s findings that the Philippine taxes were inconsistent with the first and second sentences of Article III:2 of GATT 1994.

On April 20, 2012, the United States, the European Union, and the Philippines agreed on a reasonable period of time for implementation of the recommendations and rulings in the dispute, ending on March 8, 2013.

During 2012, the Philippine Congress considered proposals to change the tax system on distilled spirits. On June 5, the Philippine House of Representatives passed a bill that included reform of the taxation system for distilled spirits, and the Senate followed suit with its own bill on November 20, 2012. The proposals were reconciled through a bicameral process, and approved by the full Philippine Congress. The reforms were signed into law on December 20, 2012.

Under the new system, which went into effect January 1, 2013, the raw materials requirement that was the basis for discrimination was removed. All distilled spirits are now subject to a two part tax: a 20 peso tax by proof, and an additional ad valorem tax of 15 percent by value in the first two years, rising to 20
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percent on January 1, 2015. The specific tax of 20 pesos will increase 4 percent every year after 2015. The United States will continue to review the implementation of the new tax system.

**Disputes Brought Against the United States**

Section 124 of the URRA requires, *inter alia*, that the Annual Report on the WTO describe, for the preceding fiscal year of the WTO: each proceeding before a panel or the Appellate Body that was initiated during that fiscal year regarding Federal or State law, the status of the proceeding, and the matter at issue; and each report issued by a panel or the Appellate Body in a dispute settlement proceeding regarding Federal or State law. This section includes summaries of dispute settlement activity in 2013 for disputes in which the United States was a responding party (listed by DS number).

**United States – Section 110(5) of the Copyright Act (DS160)**

As amended in 1998 by the Fairness in Music Licensing Act, section 110(5) of the U.S. Copyright Act exempts certain retail and restaurant establishments that play radio or television music from paying royalties to songwriters and music publishers. The European Union claimed that, as a result of this exception, the United States was in violation of its TRIPS obligations. Consultations with the EU took place on March 2, 1999. A panel on this matter was established on May 26, 1999. On August 6, 1999, the Director General composed the panel as follows: Ms. Carmen Luz Guarda, Chair; and Mr. Arumugamangalam V. Ganesan and Mr. Ian F. Sheppard, Members. The Panel issued its final report on June 15, 2000 and found that one of the two exemptions provided by section 110(5) is inconsistent with the U.S. WTO obligations. The Panel report was adopted by the DSB on July 27, 2000, and the United States has informed the DSB of its intention to respect its WTO obligations. On October 23, 2000, the European Union requested arbitration to determine the period of time to be given the United States to implement the Panel’s recommendation. By mutual agreement of the parties, Mr. J. Lacarte-Muró was appointed to serve as arbitrator. He determined that the deadline for implementation should be July 27, 2001. On July 24, 2001, the DSB approved a U.S. proposal to extend the deadline until the earlier of the end of the then current session of the U.S. Congress or December 31, 2001.

On July 23, 2001, the United States and the European Union requested arbitration to determine the level of nullification or impairment of benefits to the EU as a result of section 110(5)(B). In a decision circulated to WTO Members on November 9, 2001, the arbitrators determined that the value of the benefits lost to the EU in this case was $1.1 million per year. On January 7, 2002, the European Union sought authorization from the DSB to suspend its obligations vis-à-vis the United States. The United States objected to the details of the European Union request, thereby causing the matter to be referred to arbitration.

However, because the United States and the European Union had been engaged in discussions to find a mutually acceptable resolution of the dispute, the arbitrators suspended the proceeding pursuant to a joint request by the parties filed on February 26, 2002.

On June 23, 2003, the United States and the European Union notified the WTO of a mutually satisfactory temporary arrangement regarding the dispute. Pursuant to this arrangement, the United States made a lump sum payment of $3.3 million to the European Union, to a fund established to finance activities of general interest to music copyright holders, in particular awareness raising campaigns at the national and international level and activities to combat piracy in the digital network. The arrangement covered a three year period, which ended on December 21, 2004.
Section 211 addresses the ability to register or enforce, without the consent of previous owners, trademarks or trade names associated with businesses confiscated without compensation by the Cuban government. The EU questioned the consistency of Section 211 with the TRIPS Agreement and requested consultations on July 7, 1999. Consultations were held September 13 and December 13, 1999. On June 30, 2000, the EU requested a panel. A panel was established on September 26, 2000, and at the request of the EU, the WTO Director General composed the panel on October 26, 2000. The Director General composed the panel as follows: Mr. Wade Armstrong, Chair; and Mr. François Dessemontet and Mr. Armand de Mestral, Members. The Panel report was circulated on August 6, 2001, rejecting 13 of the EU’s 14 claims and finding that, in most respects, section 211 is not inconsistent with the obligations of the United States under the TRIPS Agreement. The EU appealed the decision on October 4, 2001. The Appellate Body issued its report on January 2, 2002.

The Appellate Body reversed the Panel’s one finding against the United States and upheld the Panel’s favorable findings that WTO Members are entitled to determine trademark and trade name ownership criteria. The Appellate Body found certain instances, however, in which section 211 might breach the national treatment and most favored nation obligations of the TRIPS Agreement. The Panel and Appellate Body reports were adopted on February 1, 2002, and the United States informed the DSB of its intention to implement the recommendations and rulings. The reasonable period of time for implementation ended on June 30, 2005. On June 30, 2005, the United States and the European Union agreed that the European Union would not request authorization to suspend concessions at that time and that the United States would not object to a future request on grounds of lack of timeliness.

Japan alleged that the preliminary and final determinations of the U.S. Department of Commerce (Commerce) and the U.S. International Trade Commission (USITC) in their antidumping investigations of certain hot rolled steel products from Japan, issued on November 25 and 30, 1998, February 12, 1999, April 28, 1999, and June 23, 1999, were erroneous and based on deficient procedures under the U.S. Tariff Act of 1930 and related regulations. Japan claimed that these procedures and regulations violate the GATT 1994, as well as the Antidumping Agreement and the Agreement Establishing the WTO. Consultations were held on January 13, 2000, and a panel was established on March 20, 2000. In May 2000, the Director General composed the panel as follows: Mr. Harsha V. Singh, Chair; and Mr. Yanyong Phuangrach and Ms. Lidia di Vico, Members. On February 28, 2001, the Panel circulated its report, in which it rejected most of Japan’s claims, but found that, inter alia, particular aspects of the antidumping duty calculation, as well as one aspect of the U.S. antidumping duty law, were inconsistent with the WTO Antidumping Agreement. On April 25, 2001, the United States filed a notice of appeal on certain issues in the Panel report.

The Appellate Body report was issued on July 24, 2001, reversing in part and affirming in part. The reports were adopted on August 23, 2001. Pursuant to a February 19, 2002 arbitral award, the United States was given 15 months, or until November 23, 2002, to implement the DSB’s recommendations and rulings. On November 22, 2002, the U.S. Department of Commerce issued a new final determination in the hot rolled steel antidumping duty investigation, which implemented the recommendations and rulings of the DSB with respect to the calculation of antidumping margins in that investigation. The reasonable period of time ended on July 31, 2005. With respect to the outstanding implementation issue, on July 7, 2005, the United States and Japan agreed that Japan would not request authorization to suspend concessions at that time and that the United States would not object to a future request on grounds of lack of timeliness.
United States – Continued Dumping and Subsidy Offset Act of 2000 (CDSOA) (DS217/234)

On December 21, 2000, Australia, Brazil, Chile, the EU, India, Indonesia, Japan, South Korea, and Thailand requested consultations with the United States regarding the Continued Dumping and Subsidy Offset Act of 2000 (19 U.S.C. § 754), which amended Title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 to transfer import duties collected under U.S. antidumping and countervailing duty orders from the U.S. Treasury to the companies that filed the antidumping and countervailing duty petitions. Consultations were held on February 6, 2001. On May 21, 2001, Canada and Mexico also requested consultations on the same matter, which were held on June 29, 2001. On July 12, 2001, the original nine complaining parties requested the establishment of a panel, which was established on August 23, 2001. On September 10, 2001, a panel was established at the request of Canada and Mexico, and all complaints were consolidated into one panel. The panel was composed of: Mr. Luzius Wasescha, Chair; and Mr. Maamoun Abdel-Fattah and Mr. William Falconer, Members.

The Panel issued its report on September 2, 2002, finding against the United States on three of the five principal claims brought by the complaining parties. Specifically, the Panel found that the CDSOA constitutes a specific action against dumping and subsidies and, therefore, is inconsistent with the WTO Antidumping and SCM Agreements as well as Article VI of the GATT 1994. The Panel also found that the CDSOA distorts the standing determination conducted by Commerce and, therefore, is inconsistent with the standing provisions in the Antidumping and SCM Agreements. The United States prevailed against the complainants’ claims under the Antidumping and SCM Agreements that the CDSOA distorts Commerce’s consideration of price undertakings (agreements to settle antidumping and countervailing duty investigations). The Panel also rejected Mexico’s actionable subsidy claim brought under the SCM Agreement. Finally, the Panel rejected the complainants’ claims under Article X:3 of the GATT, Article 15 of the Antidumping Agreement, and Articles 4.10 and 7.9 of the SCM Agreement. The United States appealed the Panel’s adverse findings on October 1, 2002.

The Appellate Body issued its report on January 16, 2003, upholding the Panel’s finding that the CDSOA is an impermissible action against dumping and subsidies, but reversing the Panel’s finding on standing. The DSB adopted the Panel and Appellate Body reports on January 27, 2003. At the meeting, the United States stated its intention to implement the DSB recommendations and rulings. On March 14, 2003, the complaining parties requested arbitration to determine a reasonable period of time for U.S. implementation. On June 13, 2003, the arbitrator determined that this period would end on December 27, 2003. On June 19, 2003, legislation to bring the Continued Dumping and Subsidy Offset Act into conformity with U.S. obligations under the Antidumping Agreement, the SCM Agreement, and the GATT of 1994 was introduced in the U.S. Senate (S. 1299).

On January 15, 2004, eight complaining parties (Brazil, Canada, Chile, the EU, India, Japan, South Korea, and Mexico) requested WTO authorization to retaliate. The remaining three complaining parties (Australia, Indonesia, and Thailand) agreed to extend to December 27, 2004 the period of time in which the United States had to comply with the WTO rulings and recommendations in this dispute. On January 23, 2004, the United States objected to the requests from the eight complaining parties to retaliate, thereby referring the matter to arbitration. On August 31, 2004, the Arbitrators issued their awards in each of the eight arbitrations. They determined that each complaining party could retaliate, on a yearly basis, covering the total value of trade not exceeding, in U.S. dollars, the amount resulting from the following equation: amount of disbursements under CDSOA for the most recent year for which data are available relating to antidumping or countervailing duties paid on imports from each party at that time, as published by the U.S. authorities, multiplied by 0.72.
Based on requests from Brazil, the EU, India, Japan, South Korea, Canada, and Mexico, on November 26, 2004, the DSB granted these Members authorization to suspend concessions or other obligations, as provided in DSU Article 22.7 and in the Decisions of the Arbitrators. The DSB granted Chile authorization to suspend concessions or other obligations on December 17, 2004. On December 23, 2004, January 7, 2005 and January 11, 2005, the United States reached agreements with Australia, Thailand, and Indonesia that these three complaining parties would not request authorization to suspend concessions at that time, and that the United States would not object to a future request on grounds of lack of timeliness.

On May 1, 2005, Canada and the European Union began imposing additional duties of 15 percent on a list of products from the United States. On August 18, 2005, Mexico began imposing additional duties ranging from 9 to 30 percent on a list of U.S. products. On September 1, 2005, Japan began imposing additional duties of 15 percent on a list of U.S. products.

On February 8, 2006, U.S. President George W. Bush signed the Deficit Reduction Act into law. That Act included a provision repealing the CDSOA. Certain of the complaining parties nevertheless continued to impose retaliatory measures because they considered that the Deficit Reduction Act failed to bring the United States into immediate compliance. Thus, on May 1, 2006, the EU renewed its retaliatory measure and added eight products to the list of targeted imports. Japan renewed its retaliatory measure on September 1, 2006, retaining the same list of targeted imports. Mexico adopted a new retaliatory measure on September 14, 2006, imposing duties of 110 percent on certain dairy products through October 31, 2006. Since that date, Mexico has taken no further retaliatory measures. Canada did not renew its retaliatory measures once they expired on April 30, 2006.

Since 2007, only the EU and Japan have maintained retaliatory measures against the United States in connection with this dispute. On May 27, 2013, the EU announced that it would renew its retaliatory measure on sweet corn, frames and mountings for spectacles, crane lorries, and women’s denim trousers, effective May 1, 2013, at a rate of 26 percent covering, over one year, a total value of trade not exceeding $60.77 million. On August 23, 2013, Japan announced it would renew its retaliatory measure on various ball bearings, bars and rods, tubes and pipes, parts of ball or roller ball bearings, and bearing housings, effective September 1, 2013, at a rate of 17.4 percent covering, over one year, a total value of trade not exceeding $74.47 million.

United States – Subsidies on upland cotton (DS267)

On September 27, 2002, Brazil requested WTO consultations pursuant to Articles 4.1, 7.1, and 30 of the SCM Agreement, Article 19 of the Antidumping Agreement, and Article 4 of the DSU. The Brazilian consultation request on U.S. support measures that benefit upland cotton claimed that these alleged subsidies and measures are inconsistent with U.S. commitments and obligations under the SCM Agreement, the Agreement on Agriculture, and the GATT 1994. Consultations were held on December 3, 4, and 19, 2002, and January 17, 2003.

On February 6, 2003, Brazil requested the establishment of a panel. Brazil’s panel request pertained to “prohibited and actionable subsidies provided to U.S. producers, users and/or exporters of upland cotton, as well as legislation, regulations and statutory instruments and amendments thereto providing such subsidies (including export credit guarantees), grants, and any other assistance to the U.S. producers, users and exporters of upland cotton.” The DSB established the panel on March 18, 2003. On May 19, 2003, the Director General appointed as panelists: Mr. Dariusz Rosati, Chair; and Mr. Daniel Moulis and Mr. Mario Matus, Members.
On September 8, 2004, the Panel circulated its report to all WTO Members and the public. The Panel made some findings in favor of Brazil on certain claims and other findings in favor of the United States:

- The Panel found that the “Peace Clause” in the WTO Agreement on Agriculture did not apply to a number of U.S. measures, including: (1) domestic support measures; and (2) export credit guarantees for “unscheduled commodities” and rice (a “scheduled commodity”). Therefore, Brazil could proceed with certain of its challenges.

- The Panel found that the GSM 102, GSM 103, and SCGP export credit guarantees for “unscheduled commodities” (such as cotton and soybeans) and for rice are prohibited export subsidies. However, the Panel also found that Brazil had not demonstrated that the guarantees for other “scheduled commodities” exceeded U.S. WTO reduction commitments and therefore breached the Peace Clause. Further, Brazil had not demonstrated that the programs threaten to lead to circumvention of U.S. WTO reduction commitments for other “scheduled commodities” and for “unscheduled commodities” not currently receiving guarantees.

- Some U.S. domestic support programs (i.e., marketing loan, countercyclical, market loss assistance, and so called “Step 2 payments,”) were found to cause significant suppression of cotton prices in the world market in marketing years 1999-2002, causing serious prejudice to Brazil’s interests. However, the Panel found that other U.S. domestic support programs (i.e., production flexibility contract payments, direct payments, and crop insurance payments) did not cause serious prejudice to Brazil’s interests because Brazil failed to show that these programs caused significant price suppression. The Panel also found that Brazil failed to show that any U.S. program caused an increase in U.S. world market share for upland cotton constituting serious prejudice.

- The Panel did not reach Brazil’s claim that U.S. domestic support programs threatened to cause serious prejudice to Brazil’s interests in marketing years 2003-2007. The Panel also did not reach Brazil’s claim that U.S. domestic support programs per se cause serious prejudice in those years.

- The Panel also found that Brazil had failed to establish that FSC/ETI tax benefits for cotton exporters were prohibited export subsidies.

- Finally, the Panel found that Step 2 payments to exporters of cotton are prohibited export subsidies not protected by the Peace Clause, and Step 2 payments to domestic users are prohibited import substitution subsidies because they were only made for U.S. cotton.

On October 18, 2004, the United States filed a notice of appeal with the Appellate Body; Brazil then cross appealed. The Appellate Body circulated its report on March 3, 2005. The Appellate Body upheld the Panel’s findings appealed by the United States.

The Appellate Body also rejected or declined to rule on most of Brazil’s appeal issues. On March 21, 2005, the DSB adopted the Panel and Appellate Body reports, and on April 20, 2005, the United States advised the DSB that it intends to bring its measures into compliance.

On June 30, 2005, the United States announced that it would cease to issue GSM 103 export credit guarantees and that it was instituting a new fee structure for the GSM 102 export credit guarantee program. Further, on July 5, the United States proposed legislation relating to the export credit guarantee and Step 2 programs. On July 5, 2005, Brazil requested authorization to impose countermeasures and suspend concessions in connection with the prohibited export subsidies findings. On July 14, 2005, the
United States objected to the request, thereby referring the matter to arbitration. On August 17, 2005, the United States and Brazil agreed to suspend the arbitration. On October 1, 2005, the United States ceased to issue export credit guarantees under the SCGP. On October 6, 2005, Brazil made a separate request for authorization to impose countermeasures and suspend concessions in connection with the “serious prejudice” findings. The United States objected to Brazil’s request on October 17, 2005, thereby also referring that matter to arbitration. On November 21, 2005, the United States and Brazil agreed to suspend the arbitration.

On February 8, 2006, the President signed into law the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005. That Act includes a provision repealing the Step 2 program as of August 2006.

On August 18, 2006, Brazil requested the establishment of an Article 21.5 panel. On September 28, 2006, the DSB established a panel to consider Brazil’s claims. On October 25, 2006, the Director General composed the panel as follows: Mr. Eduardo Pérez Motta, Chair; and Mr. Mario Matus and Mr. Ho-Young Ahn, Members. On December 18, 2007, the Article 21.5 panel circulated its report. The panel found, inter alia, that: (1) U.S. export credit guarantees issued under the modified GSM 102 program with respect to unscheduled and certain scheduled (rice, pig and poultry meat) commodities constituted prohibited export subsidies; and (2) U.S. marketing loan and countercyclical payments for upland cotton were continuing to cause serious prejudice to Brazil by significantly suppressing world upland cotton prices. The Panel rejected Brazil’s claim that payments under the marketing loan and countercyclical payment programs were responsible for an increase in U.S. market share in market year 2005 and thereby caused serious prejudice to Brazil’s interests. The Panel also found that the United States was not required to have refused to perform on export credit guarantees that were issued prior to the deadline for the implementation of the DSB’s recommendations and rulings as to such guarantees (July 1, 2005) and that were still outstanding as of that date.

The United States appealed the compliance Panel’s adverse findings on February 12, 2008. Brazil filed its notice of other appeal on February 25, 2008.

The Appellate Body issued its report on June 2, 2008, in which it:

- upheld the compliance Panel’s finding that U.S. marketing loan and countercyclical payments cause significant price suppression in the market for upland cotton, thereby constituting present serious prejudice to Brazil;

- while agreeing with the United States that the compliance Panel erred in dismissing U.S. Government budgetary data showing that U.S. export credit guarantee programs operate at a profit, nonetheless upheld the compliance Panel’s ultimate finding that GSM 102 export credit guarantees with respect to unscheduled products and certain scheduled products (rice, pig meat, and poultry meat) were prohibited export subsidies; and,

- upheld the compliance Panel’s finding that Brazil’s claims as to marketing loan and countercyclical payments made after September 21, 2005, and Brazil’s claims as to GSM 102 guarantees for exports of pig meat and poultry meat, were within the scope of the compliance proceeding.

The DSB adopted the Appellate Body report and the Panel report, as modified by the Appellate Body report, on June 20, 2008.

Brazil requested resumption of the arbitration process on August 25, 2008. On October 1, 2008, the United States and Brazil agreed that the arbitration would be carried out by the following individuals:
Mr. Eduardo Pérez-Motta, Chair; and Mr. Alan Matthews and Mr. Daniel Moulis, Members. The meetings with the Arbitrators were held March 2-4, 2009.

The Arbitrators issued their awards on August 31, 2009. They issued one award concerning U.S. subsidies found to cause serious prejudice to Brazil's interests (marketing loan and countercyclical payments for cotton) and another award concerning U.S. subsidies found to be prohibited export subsidies (export credit guarantees under the GSM 102 program for a range of agricultural products, plus the repealed “Step 2” program for cotton).

The Arbitrators found that Brazil may impose countermeasures against U.S. trade:

- for marketing loan and countercyclical payments for cotton, in an annual fixed amount of $147.3 million; and,
- for export credit guarantees under the GSM 102 program, in an annual amount that may change each year based on a formula.

The Arbitrators rejected Brazil’s request for countermeasures for the Step 2 program.

The Arbitrators also found that, in the event that the total level of countermeasures that Brazil would be entitled to in a given year should increase to a level that would exceed a threshold based on a subset of Brazil’s consumer goods imports from the United States, then Brazil would also be entitled to suspend certain obligations under the TRIPS Agreement and/or the GATS with respect to any amount of permissible countermeasures applied in excess of that figure.

On November 19, 2009, the DSB granted Brazil authorization to suspend the application to the United States of concessions or other obligations consistent with the Arbitrators’ awards.

On April 6, 2010, the United States and Brazil reached agreement on certain steps to help make progress in the dispute. Pursuant to this agreement, on April 20, 2010, the United States and Brazil signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) establishing a fund of approximately $147.3 million per year on a pro rata basis to provide technical assistance and capacity building. The fund is scheduled to continue until the next Farm Bill or a mutually agreed solution to the Cotton dispute is reached. The MOU also provides that the United States may end the fund if Brazil imposes countermeasures.

With the conclusion of the MOU, Brazil announced that countermeasures would not be imposed for at least 60 days from signature of the MOU. During this period, the United States and Brazil negotiated a framework regarding the Cotton dispute. On June 17, 2010, Brazil approved the framework that the governments had negotiated, and on June 21, it announced that it would not impose countermeasures as long as the framework remained in effect. The framework includes elements on cotton support, the GSM-102 program, and further discussion between the United States and Brazil.

Brazil and the United States met for the first discussions under the framework on October 20, 2010. They held discussions under the framework at least quarterly in 2011, 2012, and 2013. During the meetings, the United States and Brazil discussed issues identified in the June 2010 Framework as part of the ongoing bilateral work program, including the GSM-102 export credit guarantee program and domestic support programs for upland cotton. They also discussed the technical assistance and capacity building fund the parties established in the Memorandum of Understanding in April 2010.
On March 13, 2003, Antigua and Barbuda (“Antigua”) requested consultations regarding its claim that U.S. Federal, State, and territorial laws on gambling violate U.S. specific commitments under the GATS, as well as Articles VI, XI, XVI, and XVII of the GATS, to the extent that such laws prevent or can prevent operators from Antigua from lawfully offering gambling and betting services in the United States. Consultations were held on April 30, 2003.

Antigua requested the establishment of a panel on June 12, 2003. The DSB established a panel on July 21, 2003. At the request of Antigua, the WTO Director General composed the panel on August 25, 2003, as follows: Mr. B. K. Zutshi, Chair; and Mr. Virachai Plasai and Mr. Richard Plender, Members. The Panel’s final report, circulated on November 10, 2004, found that the United States breached Article XVI (Market Access) of the GATS by maintaining three U.S. Federal laws (18 U.S.C. §§ 1084, 1952, and 1955) and certain statutes of Louisiana, Massachusetts, South Dakota, and Utah. It also found that these measures were not justified under exceptions in Article XIV of the GATS.

The United States filed a notice of appeal on January 7, 2005. The Appellate Body issued its report on April 7, 2005, in which it reversed and/or modified several Panel findings. The Appellate Body overturned the Panel’s findings regarding the state statutes, and found that the three U.S. Federal gambling laws at issue “fall within the scope of ‘public morals’ and/or ‘public order’” under Article XIV. To meet the requirements of the Article XIV chapeau, the Appellate Body found that the United States needed to clarify an issue concerning Internet gambling on horse racing.

The DSB adopted the Panel and Appellate Body reports on April 20, 2005. On May 19, 2005, the United States stated its intention to implement the DSB recommendations and rulings. On August 19, 2005, an Article 21.3(c) arbitrator determined that the reasonable period of time for implementation would expire on April 3, 2006.

At the DSB meeting of April 21, 2006, the United States informed the DSB that the United States was in compliance with the recommendations and rulings of the DSB in the dispute. On June 8, 2006, Antigua requested consultations with the United States regarding U.S. compliance with the DSB recommendations and rulings. The parties held consultations on June 26, 2006. On July 5, 2006, Antigua requested the DSB to establish a panel pursuant to Article 21.5 of the DSU, and a panel was established on July 19, 2006. The chair of the original panel and one of the panelists were unavailable to serve. The parties agreed on their replacements, and the panel was composed as follows: Mr. Lars Anell, Chair; and Mr. Mathias Francke and Mr. Virachai Plasai, Members. The report of the Article 21.5 Panel, which was circulated on March 30, 2007, found that the United States had not complied with the recommendations and rulings of the DSB in this dispute.

On May 4, 2007, the United States initiated the procedure provided for under Article XXI of the GATS to modify the schedule of U.S. commitments so as to reflect the original U.S. intent of excluding gambling and betting services.

The DSB adopted the report of the Article 21.5 panel on May 22, 2007. On June 21, 2007, Antigua submitted a request, pursuant to Article 22.2 of the DSU, for authorization from the DSB to suspend the application to the United States of concessions and related obligations of Antigua under the GATS and the TRIPS. On July 23, 2007, the United States referred this matter to arbitration under Article 22.6 of the DSU. The arbitration was carried out by the three panelists who served on the Article 21.5 Panel.
On December 21, 2007, the Article 22.6 arbitration award was circulated. The arbitrator concluded that Antigua’s annual level of nullification or impairment of benefits is $21 million, and that Antigua may request authorization from the DSB to suspend its obligations under the TRIPS Agreement in this amount. On December 6, 2012, Antigua submitted a request under Article 22.7 of the DSU for authorization to suspend concessions or other obligations under the TRIPS Agreement consistent with the award of the Arbitrator. At the DSB meeting of January 28, 2013, the DSB authorized Antigua to suspend concessions or other obligations under the TRIPS Agreement consistent with the Award of the Arbitrator.

During 2007 and early 2008, the United States reached agreement with every WTO Member, aside from Antigua, that had pursued a claim of interest in the GATS Article XXI process of modifying the U.S. schedule of GATS commitments so as to exclude gambling and betting services. Antigua and the United States have continued in their efforts to achieve a mutually agreeable resolution to this matter.

**United States – Subsidies on large civil aircraft (DS317)**

On October 6, 2004, the EU requested consultations with respect to “prohibited and actionable subsidies provided to U.S. producers of large civil aircraft.” The EU alleged that such subsidies violated several provisions of the SCM Agreement, as well as Article III:4 of the GATT. Consultations were held on November 5, 2004. On January 11, 2005, the United States and the European Union agreed to a framework for the negotiation of a new agreement to end subsidies for large civil aircraft. The parties set a three month timeframe for the negotiations and agreed that, during negotiations, they would not request panel proceedings. These discussions did not produce an agreement. On May 31, 2005, the EU requested the establishment of a panel to consider its claims. The EU filed a second request for consultations regarding large civil aircraft subsidies on June 27, 2005. This request covered many of the measures covered in the initial consultations, as well as many additional measures that were not covered.

A panel was established with regard to the October claims on July 20, 2005. On October 17, 2005, the Deputy Director General established the panel as follows: Ms. Marta Lucía Ramírez de Rincón, Chair; and Ms. Gloria Peña and Mr. David Unterhalter, Members. Since that time, Ms. Ramirez and Mr. Unterhalter have resigned from the Panel. They have not been replaced.

The EU requested establishment of a panel with regard to its second panel request on January 20, 2006. That panel was established on February 17, 2006. On December 8, 2006, the WTO issued notices changing the designation of this panel to DS353. The summary below of United States – Subsidies on large civil aircraft (Second Complaint) (DS353) discusses developments with regard to this panel.

**United States – Final Antidumping Measures on Stainless Steel from Mexico (DS344)**

On May 26, 2006, Mexico requested consultations with respect to the U.S. Department of Commerce’s alleged use of “zeroing” in an antidumping investigation and three administrative reviews involving certain stainless steel products from Mexico. Mexico claims these alleged measures breach several provisions of the Antidumping Agreement, the GATT 1994, and the WTO Agreement. Consultations were held on June 15, 2006. On October 12, 2006, Mexico filed a request for the establishment of a panel and a panel was established on October 26, 2006. On December 20, 2006, the Director General composed the panel as follows: Mr. Albert Dumont, Chair; and Mr. Bruce Cullen and Ms. Leora Blumberg, Members.

On December 20, 2007, the Panel circulated its report. The Panel found that the use by the United States of “model zeroing” in investigations, including in the particular investigation at issue in this dispute, was inconsistent with U.S. obligations under the Antidumping Agreement. The Panel also found, however,
that the use by the United States of “simple zeroing” in administrative reviews (including in the administrative reviews at issue in this dispute) was not inconsistent with U.S. obligations under the Antidumping Agreement.

On January 31, 2008 Mexico appealed the Panel report with respect to the “as such” and “as applied” claims related to zeroing in administrative review. The Appellate Body issued its report on April 30, 2008. The Appellate Body reversed the Panel’s findings with respect to administrative reviews, finding that zeroing in administrative reviews is “as such” and “as applied” to the subject administrative reviews, inconsistent with Article VI:2 of the GATT 1994 and Article 9.3 of the Antidumping Agreement.

The DSB adopted the Appellate Body report and the Panel report, as modified by the Appellate Body report, on May 20, 2008. At the DSB meeting held on June 2, 2008, the United States notified its intention to comply with its WTO obligations and indicated it would need a reasonable period of time to do so.

On August 11, 2008, Mexico requested that the reasonable period of time be determined through arbitration pursuant to Article 21.3(c) of the DSU. On August 29, 2008, the Director General appointed Mr. Florentino P. Feliciano as the arbitrator. On October 31, 2008, the arbitrator issued his award, in which he decided that the reasonable period of time would be 11 months and 10 days, ending on April 30, 2009.

On May 18, 2009, the United States and Mexico entered into a sequencing agreement regarding any further proceedings in this dispute. On September 2, 2009, the United States held consultations with Mexico with respect to U.S. compliance with the recommendations and rulings of the DSB in this dispute.

On September 7, 2010, Mexico requested the establishment of a compliance panel, and a panel was established on September 21, 2010. On May 13, 2011, the panel was composed by agreement of the parties as follows: Mr. Alberto Juan Dumont, Chair; and Mr. Greg Weppner and Ms. Leora Blumberg, Members.

Mexico submitted its first and second written submissions on July 1, 2011 and August 12, 2011, respectively, and the United States submitted its first and second written submission on July 22, 2011 and September 2, 2011, respectively. The Panel met with the Parties on October 4-5, 2011, and with the third parties on October 4, 2011. The proceeding is currently suspended based on a request from Mexico (and supported by the United States).

United States – Subsidies on large civil aircraft (Second Complaint) (DS353)

On June 27, 2005, the European Union filed a second request for consultations regarding large civil aircraft subsidies allegedly applied by the United States. The section above on United States – Subsidies on Large Civil Aircraft (DS317) discusses developments with regard to the dispute arising from the initial request for consultations. The June 2005 request covered many of the measures in the initial consultations, as well as many additional measures that were not covered. The EU requested establishment of a panel with regard to its second panel request on January 20, 2006. That panel was established on February 17, 2006. On November 22, 2006, the Deputy Director General composed the panel as follows: Mr. Crawford Falconer, Chair; and Mr. Francisco Orrego Vicuña and Mr. Virachai Plasai, Members.

The Panel granted the parties’ request to open the substantive meetings with the parties to the public via a screening of a videotape of the public session. The sessions of the Panel meeting that involve business confidential information and the Panel’s meeting with third parties were closed to the public.
On March 31, 2011, the Panel circulated its report with the following findings:

Findings against the EU
- Most of the NASA research spending challenged by the EU did not go to Boeing.
- Most of the U.S. Department of Defense research payments to Boeing were not subsidies or did not cause adverse effects to Airbus.
- Treatment of patent rights under U.S. Government contracts is not a subsidy specific to the aircraft industry.
- Treatment of certain overhead expenses in U.S. Government contracts is not a subsidy.
- Washington State infrastructure and plant location incentives were not a subsidy or did not cause adverse effects.
- U.S. Department of Commerce research programs were not a subsidy specific to the aircraft industry.
- The U.S. Department of Labor payments to Edmonds Community College in Snohomish County, Washington, were not specific subsidies.
- Kansas and Illinois tax programs were not subsidies or did not cause adverse effects.
- The Foreign Sales Corporation/Extraterritorial Income tax measures were a WTO inconsistent subsidy, but as the United States removed the subsidy in 2006, there was no need for any further recommendation.

Findings against the United States
- NASA research programs conferred a subsidy to Boeing of $2.6 billion that caused adverse effects to Airbus.
- Tax programs and other incentives offered by the State of Washington and some of its municipalities conferred a subsidy of $16 million that caused adverse effects to Airbus.
- Certain types of research projects funded under the U.S. Department of Defense’s Manufacturing Technology and Dual Use Science and Technology programs were a subsidy to Boeing of approximately $112 million that caused adverse effects to Airbus.

On April 1, 2011, the EU filed a notice of appeal on certain findings, and on April 28, 2011, the United States filed a notice of other appeal. The Appellate Body held hearings on August 16-19, 2011, and October 11-14, 2011. On March 12, 2012, the Appellate Body circulated its report with the following findings:

- The Panel erred in its analysis of whether NASA and DoD research funding was a subsidy. However, the Appellate Body affirmed the Panel’s subsidy finding with regard to NASA research funding and DoD research funding through assistance instruments on other grounds. The Appellate Body declared the Panel’s findings with regard to DoD procurement contracts moot, but made no further findings.
II. The World Trade Organization

The Panel correctly found that NASA and DoD rules regarding the allocation of patent rights were not, on their face, specific subsidies. The Appellate Body found that Panel should have addressed the EU allegations of de facto specificity, but was unable to complete the Panel’s analysis of this issue.

The Panel correctly found that Washington state tax measures and industrial revenue bonds issued by the city of Wichita were subsidies.

The Panel erred in concluding that the WTO Dispute Settlement Body was not obligated to initiate information-gathering procedures requested by the EU, but this error did not require any modification in the panel’s ultimate findings.

The Panel correctly concluded that NASA research funding and DoD funding of research through assistance instruments caused adverse effects to Airbus.

The Panel erred in analyzing the effects of the Wichita industrial revenue bonds separately from other tax measures. The Appellate Body grouped the Wichita measure with the other tax benefits.

The Panel erred in concluding that Washington state tax benefits, in tandem with FSC/ETI tax benefits, caused lost sales, lost market share, and price depression of the Airbus A320 and A340 product lines. The Appellate Body found that the evidence before it justified a finding of lost sales only in two instances, involving 50 A320 airplanes.

On March 23, 2012, the DSB adopted its recommendations and rulings in this dispute. At the following DSB meeting, on April 13, 2012, the United States informed the DSB of its intention to implement the recommendations and rulings of the DSB in connection with this matter. On September 23, 2012, the United States notified the DSB that it has brought the challenged measures into compliance with the recommendations and rulings of the DSB.

On September 25, 2012, the EU requested consultations regarding the U.S. notification. The United States and the EU held consultations on October 10, 2012. On October 11, 2012, the EU requested that the DSB refer the matter to the original Panel pursuant to Article 21.5 of the DSU. The DSB did so at a meeting held on October 23, 2012. On October 30, 2012, the compliance Panel was composed with the members of the original Panel: Mr. Crawford Falconer, Chair; and Mr. Francisco Orrego Vicuña and Mr. Virachai Plasai, Members. The compliance Panel held a meeting with the parties on October 29-31, 2013. The Panel is expected to issue a report in 2014.

On September 27, 2012, the EU requested authorization from the DSB to impose countermeasures. On October 22, 2012, the United States objected to the level of suspension of concessions requested by the EU, and the matter was referred to arbitration pursuant to Article 22.6 of the DSU. On November 27, 2012, the United States and the EU each requested that the arbitration be suspended pending the conclusion of the compliance proceeding.

United States – Measures Concerning the Importation, Marketing, and Sale of Tuna and Tuna Products (WT/DS381)

On October 24, 2008, Mexico requested consultations regarding U.S. dolphin-safe labeling provisions for tuna and tuna products. These provisions prohibit labeling tuna and tuna products as dolphin-safe if the
tuna was caught by using purse-seine nets intentionally set on dolphins, a technique Mexico uses to catch tuna in the Eastern Tropical Pacific Ocean. Mexico challenged three U.S. measures: (1) the Dolphin Protection Consumer Information Act (19 U.S.C. § 1385); (2) certain dolphin-safe labeling regulations (50 C.F.R. §§ 216.91-92); and (3) the Ninth Circuit decision in Earth Island v. Hogarth, 494 F.3d. 757 (9th Cir. 2007). On April 20, 2009, at Mexico’s request, the DSB established a WTO panel to examine these measures. Mexico alleged that these measures accord imports of tuna and tuna products from Mexico less favorable treatment than like products of national origin and like products originating in other countries and fail to immediately and unconditionally accord imports of tuna and tuna products from Mexico any advantage, favor, privilege, or immunity granted to like products in other countries. Mexico further alleged that the U.S. measures create unnecessary obstacles to trade and are not based on relevant international standards. Mexico alleges that the U.S. measures are inconsistent with Articles I and III of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 and Article 2 of the Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade.

On December 14, 2009, the Panel was composed by the Director-General. The Panel issued its interim report on May 5, 2011, and its final report to the parties on July 8, 2011. The final report was circulated to Members and the public on September 15, 2011. The Panel found the U.S. dolphin safe provisions are technical regulations within the meaning of Annex 1.1 of the TBT Agreement; not inconsistent with Article 2.1 of the TBT Agreement because they do not afford less favorable treatment to Mexican tuna products; inconsistent with Article 2.2. of the TBT Agreement because they are more trade restrictive than necessary to achieve their objectives; and not inconsistent with Article 2.4 of the TBT Agreement because the alternative measure put forth by Mexico would not be an effective means of achieving the objective of the U.S. measures. The Panel exercised judicial economy with respect to the GATT 1994 claims in light of its findings under Article 2.1 of the TBT Agreement.

The United States appealed aspects of the report on January 20, 2012, and Mexico appealed aspects of the report on January 25, 2012. The Appellate Body circulated its report on May 16, 2012. In its key findings, the Appellate Body rejected the U.S. appeal and upheld the Panel’s finding that the measure at issue is a technical regulation; agreed with Mexico’s appeal and overturned the Panel’s finding that the U.S. measure is consistent with the national treatment provisions of Article 2.1 of the TBT Agreement; agreed with the U.S. appeal and overturned the Panel’s finding that the measure at issue is more trade restrictive than necessary under Article 2.2 of the TBT Agreement; and agreed with the U.S. appeal and overturned the Panel’s finding that the AIDCP is a relevant international standard within the meaning of Article 2.4 of the TBT Agreement.

On June 13, 2012, the DSB adopted the Appellate Body report, and the Panel report as modified by the Appellate Body report. On September 17, 2012, the United States and Mexico notified the DSB that they agreed on a reasonable period of time for the United States to implement the recommendations and rulings of the DSB, ending on July 13, 2013.

On July 23, 2013, the United States announced that it had fully complied with the DSB’s recommendations and rulings through a final rule of the Department of Commerce’s National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) that came into effect on July 13, 2013. The final rule enhances the documentary requirements for certifying that no dolphins were killed or seriously injured in the sets or other gear deployments in which the tuna were caught outside the Eastern Tropical Pacific.

On November 25, 2013, Mexico requested that the DSB establish a panel to determine whether the U.S. dolphin-safe labeling provisions, as amended by the new final rule, are consistent with U.S. WTO obligations. Mexico’s request makes claims under Articles 2.1 and 2.2 of the TBT Agreement and Articles III:4 and XXIII:1(b) of the GATT 1994.
United States – Antidumping Administrative Reviews and Other Measures Related to Imports of Certain Orange Juice from Brazil (DS382)

On November 27, 2008, the United States received from Brazil a request for consultations pertaining to definitive antidumping duties imposed by the United States pursuant to the final results issued by the U.S. Department of Commerce in the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on imports of certain orange juice from Brazil. Brazil complained that Commerce used “zeroing” in the first administrative review of the antidumping duty order on imports of orange juice. On May 22, 2009, the United States received a request for consultations from Brazil pertaining to the antidumping duty investigation on certain orange juice from Brazil, the second antidumping duty administrative review on certain orange juice from Brazil, and the “continued use of the US zeroing procedures (‘model’ or ‘simple’ zeroing) in successive antidumping proceedings.”

Brazil claimed that the alleged use of “zeroing” in the investigation and first and second administrative reviews and “continued use of the U.S. ‘zeroing procedures’ in successive antidumping proceedings, in relation to the anti-dumping duty order issued in respect of imports of certain orange juice from Brazil” are inconsistent with Articles II:1(a), II:1(b), VI:1, and VI:2 of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 (GATT 1994), Articles 2.1, 2.4, 2.4.2, and 9.3 of the Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the GATT 1994, and Article XVI:4 of the Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization.

On August 20, 2009, Brazil requested the establishment of a panel. The DSB established the panel on September 25, 2009. On May 10, 2010, the Deputy Director General composed the panel as follows: Mr. Miguel Rodriguez Mendoza, Chair; and Mr. Pierre Pettigrew and Mr. Reuben Pessah, Members. The Panel met with the parties on July 15-16, 2010, and October 12, 2010, and met with the parties and third parties on July 16, 2010.

The Panel circulated its report on March 25, 2011. The Panel found that the United States acted inconsistently with the Antidumping Agreement by using “zeroing” in calculating certain margins of dumping in the first and second administrative reviews of the antidumping duty order on imports of certain orange juice from Brazil. The Panel also found that the “continued use” of “zeroing” in proceedings under the orange juice antidumping duty order is inconsistent with the Antidumping Agreement.

On June 17, 2011, the DSB adopted its recommendations and rulings in this dispute. At that DSB meeting, the United States informed the DSB of its intention to implement the recommendations and rulings of the DSB in connection with this matter. The United States and Brazil agreed that the reasonable period of time for the United States to implement the recommendations and rulings of the DSB would end on March 17, 2012.

On February 14, 2012, the U.S. Department of Commerce published in the Federal Register, 77 FR 8101, a modification to its procedures in order to implement DSB recommendations and rulings regarding the use of “zeroing” in antidumping reviews. This modification addresses the findings in this dispute.

The U.S. Department of Commerce issued a notice on April 20, 2012, revoking the antidumping duty order on the products covered in this dispute, effective as of March 9, 2011.

On February 18, 2013, the United States and Brazil informed the DSB that, on February 14, they had reached a mutually satisfactory solution in this dispute.
On December 1, 2008, Canada requested consultations with the United States regarding U.S. mandatory country of origin labeling (COOL) provisions. Canada requested supplemental consultations with the United States regarding this matter on May 7, 2009. Canada challenges the COOL provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, as amended by the Farm, Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (2002 Farm Bill), and Food, Conservation, and Energy Act, 2008 (2008 Farm Bill), the U.S. Department of Agriculture Interim Final Rule on COOL published on August 1, 2008 and on August 28, 2008, respectively, the U.S. Department of Agriculture Final Rule on COOL published on January 15, 2009, and a February 20, 2009 letter issued by the Secretary of Agriculture. These provisions relate to an obligation to inform consumers at the retail level of the country of origin of covered commodities, including beef and pork.

Canada alleges that the COOL requirements are inconsistent with Articles III:4, IX:2, IX:4, and X:3(a) of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 (GATT 1994), Articles 2.1, 2.2, and 2.4 of the Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT Agreement), or in the alternative, Articles 2, 5, and 7 of the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures, and Articles 2(b), 2(c), 2(e), and 2(j) of the Agreement on Rules of Origin. Canada asserts that these violations nullify or impair the benefits accruing to Canada under those Agreements and further appear to nullify or impair the benefits accruing to Canada within the meaning of GATT 1994 Article XXIII:1(b).

Consultations were held on December 16, 2008, and supplemental consultations were held on June 5, 2009. On October 7, 2009, Canada requested the establishment of a panel, and on November 19, 2009, the DSB established a single panel to examine both this dispute and Mexico’s dispute regarding COOL (see WT/DS386). On May 10, 2010, the Director General composed the panel as follows: Mr. Christian Häberli, Chair; and Mr. Manzoor Ahmad and Mr. Joao Magalhaes, Members.

The Panel circulated its final report on November 18, 2011. The final report found that the COOL measure (the COOL statute and USDA’s Final Rule together, in respect of muscle cut meat labels, breaches TBT Article 2.1 because it affords Canadian livestock less favorable treatment than it affords U.S. livestock. With respect to Article 2.2 of the TBT Agreement, the Panel found that the objective of the COOL measure was to provide consumers with information about the origin of the meat products that they buy at the retail level, and that consumer information on origin is a legitimate objective that WTO Members, including the United States, are permitted to pursue with their measures. However, the Panel found that the COOL measure breaches TBT Article 2.2 because it fails to fulfill its legitimate objective of providing consumer information on origin with respect to meat products. The Panel also found that the Vilsack Letter breaches GATT Article X:3 because it does not constitute a reasonable administration of the COOL measure. On April 5, 2012, USDA withdrew the Vilsack Letter.

On March 23, 2012, the United States appealed the Panel’s findings on Article 2.1 and 2.2. On March 28, 2012, Canada appealed certain aspects of the Panel’s Article 2.2 analysis, the Panel’s failure to make a finding on its claim under Articles III:4 of the GATT 1994, and made a conditional appeal on its claim under Article XXIII:1(b) of the GATT 1994. The Appellate Body agreed with the United States that the Panel’s Article 2.2 analysis was insufficient. Moreover, the Appellate Body found that, due to the absence of relevant factual findings by the Panel and the lack of sufficient undisputed facts on the record, the Appellate Body was unable to complete the analysis under Article 2.2, and Canada’s claim must fail. With regard to Article 2.1, the Appellate Body upheld the Panel’s finding that the COOL measure was inconsistent with the national treatment obligation, albeit with different reasoning. The Appellate Body first upheld the Panel’s finding that COOL measure has a disparate impact on Canadian livestock. However, the Appellate Body reasoned that the analysis could not end there but that the Panel should have analyzed whether the detrimental impact stemmed exclusively from a legitimate regulatory
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distinction. The Appellate Body found that the COOL measure did not as it imposes costs that are disproportionate to the information conveyed by the labels. Having upheld the Panel's Article 2.1 finding, the Appellate body found it unnecessary to make findings on Canada’s appeals under Articles III:4 and XXIII:1(b) of the GATT 1994.

On December 4, 2012, a WTO arbitrator determined that the reasonable period of time (RPT) for the United States to comply with the DSB recommendations and rulings is 10 months, meaning that the RPT ends on May 23, 2013.

On May 24, 2013, the United States announced that it had fully implemented the DSB’s recommendations and rulings through a new final rule issued by USDA on May 23, 2013. The final rule modifies the labeling provisions for muscle cut covered commodities to require the origin designations to include information about where each of the production steps (i.e., born, raised, slaughtered) occurred and removes the allowance for commingling.

On September 25, 2013, at the request of Canada, the DSB referred the matter raised by Canada in its panel request to a compliance panel to determine whether the COOL program, as amended by the May 23 final rule, is consistent with U.S. WTO obligations. Canada makes claims under Articles 2.1 and 2.2 of the TBT Agreement and Articles III:4 and XXIII:1(b) of the GATT 1994.

**United States – Certain Country of Origin Labeling (COOL) Requirements (Mexico) (DS386)**

On December 17, 2008, Mexico requested consultations regarding U.S. mandatory country of origin labeling (COOL) provisions. Mexico requested supplemental consultations with the United States regarding this matter on May 7, 2009. Mexico challenges the COOL provisions of the *Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946*, as amended by the *Farm, Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002* (2002 Farm Bill), and the *Food, Conservation, and Energy Act, 2008* (2008 Farm Bill), the U.S. Department of Agriculture (“USDA”) Interim Final Rule on COOL published on August 1, 2008 and on August 28, 2008, respectively, the USDA Final Rule on COOL published on January 15, 2009, and a February 20, 2009 letter issued by the Secretary of Agriculture. These provisions relate to an obligation to inform consumers at the retail level of the country of origin of covered commodities, including beef and pork.

Mexico alleges that the COOL requirements are inconsistent with Articles III:4, IX:2, IX:4, and X.3(a) of the *General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994* (GATT 1994), Articles 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 12.1, and 12.3 of the *Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade* (TBT Agreement), or in the alternative, Articles 2, 5, and 7 of the *Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures*, and Articles 2(b), 2(c), and 2(e), of the *Agreement on Rules of Origin*. Mexico asserts that these violations nullify or impair the benefits accruing to Mexico under those Agreements and further appear to nullify or impair the benefits accruing to Mexico within the meaning of GATT 1994 Article XXIII:1(b).

Consultations were held on February 27, 2009, and supplemental consultations were held on June 5, 2009. On October 9, 2009, Mexico requested the establishment of a panel in this dispute, and November 19, 2009, the DSB established a single panel to examine both this dispute and Canada’s dispute regarding COOL (see WT/DS384). On May 10, 2010, the Director General composed the panel as follows: Mr. Christian Häberli, Chair; and Mr. Manzoor Ahmad and Mr. Joao Magalhaes, Members.

The Panel circulated its final report on November 18, 2011. The final report found that the COOL measure (the COOL statute and USDA’s Final Rule together), in respect of muscle cut meat labels, breaches TBT Article 2.1 because it affords Mexican livestock less favorable treatment than it affords U.S. livestock. Under TBT Article 2.2, the Panel found that the objective of the COOL measure was to provide consumers with information about the origin of the meat products that they buy at the retail level,
and that consumer information on origin is a legitimate objective that WTO Members, including the United States, are permitted to pursue with their measures. However, the Panel found that the COOL measure breaches TBT Article 2.2 because it fails to fulfill its legitimate objective of providing consumer information on origin with respect to meat products.

The Panel rejected Mexico’s claim under TBT Article 2.4 that the United States was required to base origin under the COOL measure on the principle of substantial transformation, concluding that using this principle would be an ineffective and inappropriate means to fulfill the U.S. legitimate objective of providing consumers with information about the origin of the meat products they buy. The panel also rejected Mexico’s claims under TBT Articles 12.1 and 12.3, concluding that the United States did not fail to take account of Mexico’s needs as a developing country Member.

Finally, the Panel found that the Vilsack Letter breaches GATT Article X:3 because it does not constitute a reasonable administration of the COOL measure. On April 5, 2012, USDA withdrew the Vilsack Letter.

On March 23, 2012, the United States appealed the Panel’s findings on Article 2.1 and 2.2. On March 28, 2012, Mexico appealed certain aspects of the panel’s Article 2.2 analysis, and made a conditional appeal on its claims under Articles III:4 and XXIII:1(b) of the GATT 1994. The Appellate Body agreed with the United States that the Panel’s Article 2.2 analysis was insufficient. Moreover, the Appellate Body found that, due to the absence of relevant factual findings by the Panel and the lack of sufficient undisputed facts on the record, the Appellate Body was unable to complete the analysis under Article 2.2, and Canada’s claim must fail. With regard to Article 2.1, the Appellate Body upheld the Panel’s finding that the COOL measure was inconsistent with the national treatment obligation, albeit with different reasoning. The Appellate Body first upheld the Panel’s finding that the COOL measure has a disparate impact on Mexican livestock. However, the Appellate Body reasoned that the analysis could not end there but that the Panel should have analyzed whether the detrimental impact stemmed exclusively from a legitimate regulatory distinction. The Appellate Body found that the COOL measure did not as it imposes costs that are disproportionate to the information conveyed by the labels. Having upheld the Panel's Article 2.1 finding, the Appellate body found it unnecessary to make findings on Mexico’s appeals under Articles III:4 and XXIII:1(b) of the GATT 1994.

On December 4, 2012, a WTO arbitrator determined that the reasonable period of time (RPT) for the United States to comply with the DSB recommendations and rulings is 10 months, meaning that the RPT ends on May 23, 2013.

On May 24, 2013, the United States announced that it had fully implemented the DSB’s recommendations and rulings through a new final rule issued by USDA on May 23, 2013. The final rule modifies the labeling provisions for muscle cut covered commodities to require the origin designations to include information about where each of the production steps (i.e., born, raised, slaughtered) occurred and removes the allowance for commingling.

On September 25, 2013, at the request of Mexico, the DSB referred the matter raised by Mexico in its panel request to a compliance panel to determine whether the COOL program, as amended by the May 23 final rule, is consistent with U.S. WTO obligations. Mexico makes claims under Articles 2.1 and 2.2 of the TBT Agreement and Articles III:4 and XXIII:1(b) of the GATT 1994.

United States – Anti-dumping Measures on Certain Shrimp from Vietnam (DS404)

On February 1, 2010, the United States received from Vietnam a request for consultations pertaining to antidumping duties imposed by the United States pursuant to the final results issued by the U.S.
Department of Commerce (Commerce) in several administrative reviews of the antidumping duty order on imports of certain frozen and canned warm water shrimp from Vietnam. Vietnam claimed that certain actions by Commerce and U.S. Customs and Border Protection with respect to several administrative reviews and with respect to any ongoing or future administrative review or sunset review concerning this antidumping duty order, as well as various U.S. laws, regulations, administrative procedures, practices, and policies, both as such and as applied, are inconsistent with U.S. commitments and obligations under Articles I, II, VI:1 and VI:2 of the GATT 1994, Articles 1, 2.1, 2.4, 2.4.2, 6.8, 6.10, 9.1, 9.3, 9.4, 11.2, 11.3, 18.1, and 18.4 and Annex II of the Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the GATT 1994 (the Antidumping Agreement); Article XVI:4 of the Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization; and Vietnam’s Protocol of Accession.

The United States and Vietnam held consultations on March 23, 2010. On April 19, 2010, Vietnam requested that the DSB establish a panel. The DSB did so at its meeting on May 18, 2010. On July 26, 2010, the Director General composed the panel as follows: Mr. Mohammad Saeed, Chair; and Ms. Deborah Milstein and Mr. Iain Sanford, Members.

The Panel circulated its report on July 11, 2011. The Panel found that the use of “zeroing” in the second and third administrative reviews of the shrimp antidumping order was inconsistent with Article 2.4 of the Antidumping Agreement, and the use of “zeroing” in administrative reviews is inconsistent “as such” with Article 9.3 of the Antidumping Agreement and Article VI:2 of the GATT 1994. The Panel also found that the use of antidumping margins determined using “zeroing” to calculate the “all others” rate in the second and third administrative reviews was inconsistent with Article 9.4 of the Antidumping Agreement. The Panel found that the application to the Vietnam-wide entity of an antidumping margin different from the “all others” rate was also inconsistent with Article 9.4 of the Antidumping Agreement. The Panel rejected Vietnam’s claim that Commerce’s determination to limit the number of individually examined respondents was inconsistent with various provisions of the Antidumping Agreement, and the Panel rejected Vietnam’s claims relating to “continued use,” finding those claims to be outside the Panel’s terms of reference.

On September 2, 2011, the DSB adopted its recommendations and rulings as set out in the Panel’s report. The United States and Vietnam agreed that the reasonable period of time for the United States to implement the recommendations and rulings of the DSB would end on July 2, 2012.

United States – Measures Affecting the Production and Sale of Clove Cigarettes (DS406)

On April 7, 2010, the United States received a request for consultations from Indonesia regarding Section 907 of the 2009 Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended by the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act, which prohibits the production or sale in the United States of cigarettes with a characterizing flavour other than tobacco or menthol. Indonesia contends that the measure is inconsistent with the United States’ WTO obligations in that it bans clove cigarettes. Specifically, Indonesia contends that the measure is inconsistent with Article III:4 of the GATT 1994, as well as Articles 2.1, 2.2, 2.5, 2.8, 2.9, 2.10, 2.12, and 12.3 of the TBT Agreement.

Indonesia and the United States held consultations on May 13, 2010. On June 9, 2010, Indonesia requested the establishment of a panel. The DSB established the panel on July 20, 2010 and the Parties agreed to the composition of the panel on September 9, 2010, as follows: Mr. Ronald Saborio Soto, Chair; and Mr. Ichiro Araki and Mr. Hugo Cayrús, Members.

The Panel met with the parties on December 13-14, 2010, met with the parties and third parties on December 14, 2010, and with the parties on February 15-16, 2011.
The Panel circulated its report on June 24, 2011. The Panel found the measure consistent with Articles 2.2, 2.5, 2.8, 2.9.3, and 12.3 of the TBT Agreement, and inconsistent with Articles 2.1, 2.9.2, and 2.12 of the TBT Agreement. The Panel declined to make findings on Indonesia’s claim that the measure was inconsistent with Article III:4 of the GATT 1994 and the related U.S. defense that the measure is justified under Article XX(b) of the GATT 1994.

The United States appealed the Panel Report’s finding with respect to Article 2.1 of the TBT Agreement in January 2012, and a hearing was held in February. The WTO Appellate Body report affirmed the Panel Report’s finding that the U.S. measure is inconsistent with Article 2.1 of the TBT Agreement.

With respect to Indonesia’s claims concerning the U.S. process for adopting the ban, the Panel found in favor of the United States on all of these claims, with two exceptions. The Panel found that the United States should have notified the ban to the WTO prior to it becoming U.S. law and should have waited six months until enforcing the ban instead of the three months the law provided for. The United States appealed the latter finding, and the Appellate Body affirmed the Panel’s finding.

The DSB adopted the Appellate Body and Panel Reports on April 24, 2012. At the following DSB meeting on May 24, 2012, the United States notified the DSB of its intention to implement the recommendations and rulings of the DSB. The United States and Indonesia agreed that the reasonable period of time for the United States to implement the recommendations and rulings of the DSB would end on July 24, 2013.

At the DSB meeting on July 23, 2013, the United States stated that it had fully implemented the DSB’s recommendations and rulings of the DSB, but Indonesia did not agree. On August 12, 2013, Indonesia filed a request for authorization to suspend concessions or other obligations under Article 22.2 of the DSU. In a communication dated August 22, 2013, the United States objected to Indonesia’s request, thereby referring the matter to arbitration. The Arbitrator is composed of the members of the original Panel: Mr. Ronald Saborío, Chair; and Mr. Ichiro Araki and Mr. Hugo Cayrús (Uruguay), members. The Arbitrator is expected to issue its award in 2014.

United States – Anti-dumping measures on corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Korea (DS420)

On January 31, 2011, the Republic of Korea (Korea) requested consultations regarding various anti-dumping determinations made by the U.S. Department of Commerce (Commerce), including those made in administrative reviews and sunset determinations, regarding corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Korea. Korea’s request concerned Commerce’s use of its “zeroing” methodology in these determinations. Korea’s request for consultations described “zeroing” as the practice “by which transactions with negative dumping margins are treated as having margins equal to zero in determining dumping margins....”

On September 15, 2011, Korea requested the establishment of a panel. At the September 24, 2011 meeting of the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB), Korea withdrew the request for a panel from the agenda. On February 9, 2012, Korea again requested a panel. The request asserted that Commerce’s use of “zeroing” in the referenced determinations was inconsistent with the obligations of the United States under Articles 9.3 and 11.3 of the Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994. The DSB established a panel on February 22, 2012. On June 12, 2012, prior to the composition of the panel, Korea requested that panel proceedings be suspended in accordance with Article 12.12 of the Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes.
United States – Anti-Dumping Measures on Certain Shrimp and Diamond Sawblades from China (DS422)

On February 28, 2011, China requested consultations regarding the antidumping duty investigation, a number of antidumping administrative reviews, and the sunset review conducted by the U.S. Department of Commerce on certain frozen warmwater shrimp from China. China challenges what it describes as the use by Commerce of the “zeroing practice” whereby “negative margins or amounts of dumping . . . were put at zero” in those proceedings. On July 22, 2011, China requested additional consultations regarding the antidumping duty investigation conducted by Commerce on diamond sawblades and parts thereof from China, referring in particular to the use of what it calls “zeroing” in that proceeding. The United States and China held consultations on May 11, 2011 and September 8, 2011.

On October 13, 2011, China requested the establishment of a panel. In its panel request, China alleges that the use of zeroing by Commerce in the final less than fair value determinations and the antidumping duty orders on certain frozen warmwater shrimp from China and diamond sawblades and parts thereof from China are inconsistent with the obligations of the United States under the first sentence of Article 2.4.2 of the Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 ("Antidumping Agreement"). The DSB established a panel on October 25, 2011 and the parties agreed to the composition of the panel on December 21, 2011, as follows: Mr. Alberto Juan Dumont, Chair; and Mr. Ernesto Fernández and Ms. Stephanie Sin Far Lee, Members.

The Panel circulated its report on June 8, 2012. The Panel found the use of zeroing in the two final less than fair value determinations and the antidumping duty orders was inconsistent with Article 2.4.2 of the Antidumping Agreement.

Neither party appealed the Panel’s findings. On July 23, 2012, the DSB adopted its recommendations and rulings in this dispute. At that DSB meeting, the United States informed the DSB of its intention to implement the recommendations and rulings of the DSB in connection with this matter. The United States and China agreed that the reasonable period of time for the United States to implement the recommendations and rulings of the DSB would end on March 23, 2013.

On March 4, 2013, Commerce issued to interested parties final determinations pursuant to section 129(b)(2) of the URRA with respect to issues in this dispute. On March 22, 2013, USTR directed Commerce to implement its final determinations. On March 28, 2013, a notice was published in the Federal Register announcing the implementation of Commerce’s final determinations, effective March 22, 2013 (78 FR 18958). On March 26, 2013, the United States reported to the DSB that it has brought the measures at issue in this dispute into full compliance with the DSB recommendations and rulings.

United States — Anti-Dumping Measures on Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from Vietnam (DS429)

On February 21, 2012, the United States received from Vietnam a request for consultations pertaining to antidumping duties imposed by the United States pursuant to the final results issued by the U.S. Department of Commerce (Commerce) in a number of administrative reviews and the sunset review of the antidumping duty order on imports of certain frozen and canned warm water shrimp from Vietnam. Vietnam claimed that certain actions by Commerce with respect to the administrative reviews identified, and with respect to any ongoing or future administrative review, as well as the sunset review concerning this antidumping duty order, as well as various U.S. laws, regulations, administrative procedures, practices, and policies, both as such and as applied, are inconsistent with U.S. commitments and obligations under Articles 1:1, VI:1, VI:2, and X:3(a) of the GATT 1994; Articles 1, 2.1, 2.4, 2.4.2, 6, 9, 11, 17.6(i), and Annex II of the Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the GATT 1994 (the
Antidumping Agreement); Article XVI:4 of the Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization; Articles 3.7, 19.1, 21.1, 21.3, and 21.5 of the DSU; and Vietnam’s Protocol of Accession. Specifically, Vietnam complained that Commerce used “zeroing” in the administrative reviews of the antidumping duty order on imports of shrimp. Commerce failed to provide most Vietnamese respondents seeking a review an opportunity to demonstrate the absence of dumping by being permitted to participate in a review, the treatment of the Vietnam-wide entity as a “single entity” and the application of adverse facts available to the entity, the use of dumping margins determined using a “zeroing” methodology in the final determination of the sunset review, and the use of WTO-inconsistent antidumping duty assessment rates applied to unliquidated entries that are assessed following a section 129 determination that implements an adverse DSB ruling.

The United States and Vietnam held consultations on March 28, 2012. On December 17, 2012, Vietnam requested the establishment of a panel. Vietnam filed a revised panel request on January 17, 2013. The DSB established a panel on February 27, 2013 and the Parties agreed to the composition of the panel on July 12, 2013, as follows: Mr. Simon Farbenbloom, Chair; and Mr. Adrian Makuc and Mr. Abd El Rahman Ezz El Din Fawzy, Members.

The Panel held the first meeting with the parties on December 10-11, 2013.

**United States — Countervailing Measures on Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from India (DS436)**

On April 24, 2012, India requested consultations concerning countervailing measures regarding certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat products from India. India challenges the Tariff Act of 1930, in particular sections 771(7)(G) and 776(b), as well as Title 19 of the Code of Federal Regulations, sections 351.308 and 351.511(a)(2)(i)-(iv). In addition, India challenges certain actions of the United States with respect to U.S. Department of Commerce countervailing duty determinations and the countervailing duty order related to certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat products from India, including determinations related to the original investigation, certain administrative reviews, and the five-year sunset review. India alleges inconsistencies with Articles I and IV of the GATT 1994 and Articles 1, 2, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 21, 22 and 32 of the SCM Agreement. The DSB established a panel to examine the matter on August 31, 2012. The panel was composed by the Director General on February 18, 2013, as follows: Mr. Hugh McPhail, Chair; Mr. Anthony Abad and Mr. Hanspeter Tschaeni, members.

The Panel met with the parties on July 9-10, 2013, and on October 8-9, 2013. The Panel is expected to circulate its report in 2014.

**United States — Countervailing Duty Measures on Certain Products from China (DS437)**

On May 25, 2012, China requested consultations concerning countervailing measures regarding numerous U.S. CVD determinations in which the U.S. Department of Commerce had determined that various Chinese state owned enterprises were “public bodies” under Article 1.1(a)(1) of the SCM Agreement, with a view towards extending the Appellate Body’s analysis in DS379 (discussed above) to those determinations. Various other aspects of these investigations are being challenged as well, including but not limited to Commerce’s calculation of benchmarks, determination of specificity of the subsidies, and use of facts available. Consultations were held in July 2012, and a panel was established in September 2012. The panel was composed by the Director-General on November 26, 2012, as follows: Mr. Mario Matus, Chair; Mr. Scott Gallacher and Mr. Hugo Perezcano Diaz, members. The Panel met with the parties on April 30-May 1, 2013, and on June 18-19, 2013. The Panel is expected to circulate its report in 2014.
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**United States — Measures Affecting the Importation of Animals, Meat and Other Animal Products from Argentina (DS447)**

On August 30, 2012, Argentina requested consultations regarding inaction by the United States to authorize importation of fresh bovine meat from Argentina. Currently, U.S. law prohibits the importation of fresh meat from Argentina, pending a determination by the U.S. Department of Agriculture as to whether, and under what import conditions, if any, such products can be safely imported without introducing foot-and-mouth disease into the United States. At issue in this matter is the status of three applications by Argentina to the U.S. Department of Agriculture to revise its prohibition and permit the importation of fresh bovine meat. Specifically, Argentina contends that U.S. measures are inconsistent with Articles 1.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.4, 5.6, 6.1, 6.2, 8, and 10.1 of the Agreement on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures, and Article I:1 and Article XI:1 of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT 1994).

Consultations were held on October 18 and 19, 2012. Argentina requested the establishment of a panel on December 6, 2012, and the DSB established a panel on January 28, 2013. On August 8, 2013, the Director General composed the panel as follows: Mr. Eirik Glenne, Chair; and Mr. Jaime Coghi and Mr. David Evans, members.

**United States — Measures Affecting the Importation of Fresh Lemons (DS448)**

On September 3, 2012, Argentina requested consultations regarding the U.S. failure thus far to grant import authorization for fresh lemons from Northwest Argentina. Consultations were held on October 17-18, 2012, in Geneva, Switzerland. Argentina submitted its request for establishment of a dispute settlement panel on December 6, 2012.

**United States — Countervailing and Anti-dumping Measures on Certain Products from China (DS449)**

On September 17, 2012, the United States received a request for consultations from China regarding Public Law 112-99 (“P.L. 112-99”) and determinations and actions made by the U.S. Department of Commerce, the U.S. International Trade Commission, and the U.S. Customs and Border Protection in connection with 31 joint antidumping (AD) and countervailing duty (CVD) proceedings. China alleges in its consultation request that the retroactive nature of Section 1 of P.L. 112-99 and the difference in effective dates between Sections 1 and 2 of P.L. 112-99 are violations of GATT Article X. China further alleges that the 31 AD and CVD proceedings initiated between November 20, 2006 and March 13, 2012 violate the United States’ WTO obligations because the United States had no basis under domestic law to identify and avoid “double remedies” and U.S. authorities failed to “investigate and avoid double remedies.”

China and the United States held consultations on November 5, 2012. On November 30, China requested the establishment of a panel. China and the United States held consultations on November 5, 2012. On November 30, China requested the establishment of a panel, and on December 17, 2012 a panel was established. On March 4, 2013, the Director General composed the panel as follows: Mr. José Graça Lima, Chair; and Mr. Donald Greenfield and Mr. Arie Reich, members. The panel met with the parties on July 2-3, 2013, and August 27-28, 2013. The Panel is expected to circulate its report in 2014.

**United States – Anti-Dumping and Countervailing Measures on Large Residential Washers from Korea (DS464)**

On August 29, 2013, the United States received from Korea a request for consultations pertaining to antidumping and countervailing duty measures imposed by the United States pursuant to final
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determinations issued by the U.S. Department of Commerce (Commerce) following antidumping and countervailing duty investigations regarding large residential washers (“washers”) from Korea. Korea claimed that Commerce’s determinations, as well as certain methodologies used by Commerce, are inconsistent with U.S. commitments and obligations under Articles 1, 2, 2.1, 2.4, 2.4.2, 5.8, 9.3, 9.4, 9.5, 11, and 18.4 of the AD Agreement, Articles 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 10, 14, and 19.4 of the SCM Agreement, Articles VI, VI:1, VI:2, and VI:3 of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994, and Article XVI:4 of the WTO Agreement. Specifically, Korea challenges Commerce’s alleged use of “zeroing” and application of the second sentence of Article 2.4.2 of the AD Agreement, as applied in the washers antidumping investigation and “as such.” Korea also challenges Commerce’s determinations in the washers countervailing duty investigation that Article 10(1)(3) of Korea’s Restriction of Special Taxation Act (“RSTA”) is a subsidy that is specific within the meaning of Article 2.1 of the SCM Agreement, Commerce’s determination of the amount of subsidy benefit received by a respondent under Article 10(1)(3) of the RSTA, Commerce’s determination that Article 26 of the RSTA is a regionally specific subsidy, and Commerce’s imposition of countervailing duties on one respondent that were attributable to tax credits that the respondent received for investments that it made under Article 26 of the RSTA.

The United States and Korea held consultations on October 3, 2013. On December 5, 2013, Korea requested that the DSB establish a panel. The DSB considered Korea’s request for the first time at a meeting on December 18, 2013, but a panel was not established.

United States – Certain Methodologies and their Application to Anti-Dumping Proceedings Involving China (DS471)

On December 3, 2013, the United States received from China a request for consultations pertaining to antidumping measures imposed by the United States pursuant to final determinations issued by the U.S. Department of Commerce (Commerce) following antidumping investigations regarding a number of products from China, including certain coated paper suitable for high-quality print graphics using sheet-fed presses, certain oil country tubular goods, high pressure steel cylinders, polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet, and strip; aluminum extrusions; certain frozen and canned warmwater shrimp; certain new pneumatic off-the-road tires; crystalline silicon photovoltaic cells, whether or not assembled into modules; diamond sawblades and parts thereof; multilayered wood flooring; narrow woven ribbons with woven selvedge; polyethylene retail carrier bags; and wooden bedroom furniture. China claimed that Commerce’s determinations, as well as certain methodologies used by Commerce, are inconsistent with U.S. obligations under Articles 2.4.2, 6.1, 6.8, 6.10, 9.2, 9.3, 9.4, and Annex II of the AD Agreement and Article VI:2 of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994. Specifically, China challenges Commerce’s application in certain investigations and administrative reviews of a “targeted dumping methodology,” “zeroing” in connection with such methodology, a “single rate presumption for non-market economies,” an “NME-wide methodology” including certain “features”. China also challenges a “single rate presumption” and the use of “adverse facts available” “as such.”

I. Trade Policy Review Body

Status

The Trade Policy Review Body (TPRB) is the subsidiary body of the General Council, created by the Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the WTO, to administer the Trade Policy Review Mechanism (TPRM). The TPRM examines domestic trade policies of each Member on a schedule designed to review the policies of the full WTO Membership on a timetable determined by trade volume. The express purpose of the review process is to strengthen Members’ adherence to WTO provisions and to contribute to the smoother functioning of the multilateral trading system. Moreover, the review mechanism serves as a valuable resource for improving the transparency of Members’ trade and investment regimes.
Members continue to value the review process, because it informs each government’s own trade policy formulation and coordination.

The Member under review works closely with the WTO Secretariat to provide pertinent information for the process. The Secretariat produces an independent report on the trade policies and practices of the Member under review. Accompanying the Secretariat’s report is the Member’s own report. In a TPRB session, the WTO Membership discusses these reports together, and the Member under review addresses issues raised in the reports and answers questions about its trade policies and practices. Reports cover the range of WTO agreements – including those relating to goods, services, and intellectual property – and are available to the public on the WTO’s website at http://www.wto.org. Documents are filed on the website’s “Documents Online” database under the document symbol “WT/TPR.”

TPRs of least developed country (LDC) Members often perform a technical assistance function, helping them improve their understanding of their trade policy structure’s relationship with the WTO Agreements. The reviews have also enhanced these countries’ understanding of the WTO Agreements, thereby better enabling them to comply and integrate into the multilateral trading system. In some cases, the reviews have spurred better interaction among government agencies. The reports’ wide coverage of Members’ policies also enables Members to identify any shortcomings in policy and specific areas where further technical assistance may be appropriate.

The TPRM requires Members, in between their reviews, to provide information on significant trade policy changes. The WTO Secretariat uses this and other information to prepare reports by the Director General on a regular basis on the trade and trade-related developments of Members and Observer Governments. The reports are discussed at informal meetings of the TPRB. The Secretariat consolidates the information it collects and presents it in the Director General’s Annual Report on Developments in the International Trading Environment.

**Major Issues in 2013**

During 2013, the TPRB reviewed the trade regimes of 20 Members (counting the EU as one Member). Members reviewed were Argentina, Brazil, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Costa Rica, European Union, Gabon, Indonesia, Japan, Liechtenstein, Kyrgyz Republic, Macao China, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Mexico, Peru, Suriname, Switzerland and Vietnam. The trade policies of two members were reviewed for the first time in 2013, including the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Vietnam.

Since its formation in 1998 to the end of 2013, the TPRB has conducted 384 reviews. The reviews have covered 147 of 159 Members, representing some 92 percent of world trade and 95 percent of the trade of WTO Members. Of the 34 LDC Members of the WTO, the TPRB had reviewed 30 by the end of 2013.

While each review highlights the specific issues and measures concerning the individual Member, certain common themes emerged during the course of the reviews conducted in 2013. These included:

- transparency in policy making and implementation;
- economic environment and trade liberalization;
- implementation of the WTO Agreements;
- regional trade agreements and their relationship with the multilateral trading system;
- tariff issues, including the differences between applied and bound rates;
- customs valuation and customs clearance procedures;
- the use of trade remedy measures such as antidumping and countervailing duties;
- technical regulations, and standards and their equivalence with international norms;
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- sanitary and phytosanitary measures;
- intellectual property rights legislation and enforcement;
- government procurement policies and practices;
- trade-related investment policy issues;
- sectoral trade policy issues, particularly liberalization in agriculture and certain services sectors; and,
- technical assistance in implementing the WTO Agreements and experience with Aid for Trade, and the Enhanced Integrated Framework.

Prospects for 2014

The TPRM continues to meet its transparency goals. It will continue to be an important tool for monitoring Members’ compliance with WTO commitments and an effective forum in which to encourage Members to meet their obligations and to adopt further trade liberalizing measures. For 2014, the proposed program of reviews is the United States, Antigua & Barbuda, Bahrain, China, Chinese Taipei, Djibouti, Dominica, Ghana, Grenada, Hong Kong China, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mongolia, Myanmar, Oman, Panama, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Sierra Leone, St. Kitts & Nevis, St. Vincent & the Grenadines, Tonga, Tunisia, and Ukraine.

J. Other General Council Bodies/Activities

1. Committee on Trade and Environment

Status

The WTO General Council created the Committee on Trade and Environment (CTE) on January 31, 1995, pursuant to the Marrakesh Ministerial Decision on Trade and Environment. Since then, the CTE has discussed many important issues, with a focus on those identified in the Doha Declaration. These issues include: market access associated with environmental measures (Doha paragraph 32(i)); the TRIPS Agreement and the environment (Doha paragraph 32(ii)); labeling for environmental purposes (Doha paragraph 32(iii)); capacity-building and environmental reviews (Doha paragraph 33); and discussion of the environmental aspects of the Doha negotiations (Doha paragraph 51). These issues identified in the Doha Declaration are separate from the issues contained in Doha paragraph 31 that are subject to specific negotiating mandates taken up by the Committee on Trade and Environment Special Session (CTESS) (for additional information, see Chapter II.B.6.).

Major Issues in 2013

In 2013, the CTE met twice under the Chairmanship of Ambassador Esteban Conejos of the Philippines.

As noted above, the CTE’s work was organized under the mandate established in the Doha Ministerial Declaration, Paragraphs 32, 33 and 51. Under Paragraph 32, the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) provided an update on ISO technical specifications related to requirements and guidelines for quantifying and communicating the greenhouse gas footprint of products. Additionally, the European Union shared information on its Single Market for Green Products (SMGP) initiative, adopted in April 2013. The SMGP initiative is an environmental assessment methodology scheme that addresses the proliferation of green labels and criteria to prove green credentials. Nigeria provided a presentation on its carbon footprint and management project. Chinese Taipei and Korea provided presentations on their voluntary carbon footprint labeling schemes. Australia shared information on its Clean Energy Future Package, which is a carbon pricing mechanism designed to reduce carbon emissions by
establishing a carbon price that would later be replaced by an emissions trading scheme. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations briefed the CTE on their 2001 International Plan of Action on Illegal Unreported and Unregulated Fishing as well as on aspects related to traceability concerning food safety, quality assurance and market access. The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) reported on the COP16 which resulted in the inclusion of new marine and timber species. Additionally, CITES informed the CTE on recent developments, including the accession of Angola as the 179th Party. No discussion took place under Paragraph 32(ii) (relevant provisions of the TRIPS Agreement); Paragraph 33 (technical assistance, capacity building, and environmental reviews); and Paragraph 51 (developmental and environmental aspects of the negotiations).

Prospects for 2014

The United States is committed to using the CTE as the premier global forum for discussing trade and environment issues and will explore fresh and innovative approaches to the most challenging issues, including those related to trade and climate change.

2. Committee on Trade and Development

Status

The Committee on Trade and Development (CTD) was established in 1965 to strengthen the GATT 1947’s role in the economic development of less developed GATT Contracting Parties. In the WTO, the CTD is a subsidiary body of the General Council. Since the Doha Development Round was launched, Members have established three additional subgroups of the CTD: a Subcommittee on LDCs; a Dedicated Session on Small Economies; and a Dedicated Session on Regional Trade Agreements (RTAs).

The CTD addresses trade issues of interest to Members with particular emphasis on issues related to the operation of the “Enabling Clause” (the 1979 Decision on Differential and More Favorable Treatment, Reciprocity, and Fuller Participation of Developing Countries). In this context, the CTD focuses on the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) programs, the Global System of Trade Preferences among developing country Members, and regional integration efforts among developing country Members. In addition, the CTD focuses on issues related to the fuller integration of all developing country Members into the international trading system, technical cooperation and training, trade in commodities, market access in products of interest to developing countries, and the special concerns of LDCs, small, and landlocked economies.

The CTD has been the primary forum for discussion of broad issues related to the nexus between trade and development, rather than the implementation or operation of a specific agreement. Since the initiation of the Doha Development Agenda (DDA), the CTD has intensified its work on issues related to trade and development. The CTD has focused on issues such as transparency in preferential trade agreements, expanding trade in products of interest to developing country Members, trade in commodities, the WTO’s technical assistance and capacity building activities, and an overall assessment of the development aspects of the DDA and sustainable development goals. As directed in the 2005 Hong Kong Ministerial Declaration, the CTD also conducts annual reviews of steps taken by WTO Members to implement the decision on providing duty free, quota free (DFQF) market access to the LDC Members.

Work in the Subcommittee on LDCs and the Dedicated Sessions on Small Economies and RTAs has included review of market access challenges related to exports of LDC Members, LDC accessions to the WTO, trade-related needs of small, vulnerable economies, including island and landlocked states, and review of Member RTAs notified under the Enabling Clause.
Major Issues in 2013

The CTD in Regular Session held three formal sessions in March, July, and October 2013. Activities of the CTD and its subsidiary bodies in 2013 included:

- **Focused Work on Trade and Development:** At the Eighth Ministerial Conference of the WTO, “Ministers reaffirm[ed] that development is a core element of the WTO's work. They also reaffirm[ed] the positive link between trade and development and call[ed] for focused work in the Committee on Trade and Development” (WT/MIN(11)/11). Throughout 2013, Members worked to identify areas of focused work in line with this mandate, and several submissions were considered. Discussions continued on a proposal submitted in late 2012 by Australia and other Members whereby Members would make “presentations in the CTD on individual Members' participation in the multilateral trading system and its effect on that Member's economic development” (WT/COMTD/W/191). Some Members expressed reservations about this proposal going forward, and it is unlikely that the proposal will continue to be discussed. The CTD agreed to one of the proposals contained in a submission from late 2012 (WT/COMTD/W/192) by a group of Members, including China, Ecuador, Africa Group, India, which directs the Secretariat to prepare an update to its document on the implementation of special and differential treatment provisions in the WTO Agreements and Decisions. Members have expressed reservations about the other proposals in that same submission, as well as a proposal by Barbados, Belize, Benin, Botswana, Kenya, Lesotho and Mauritius (WT/COMTD/W/202), and all these proposals, therefore, remain under discussion.

- **Technical Cooperation and Training:** In 2013, the CTD was briefed on the operationalization of the results-based management monitoring and evaluation system, which is intended to function as the Secretariat’s tool for achieving targeted results and outcomes relating to technical assistance. The CTD also took note of the 2012 Annual Report on Technical Assistance and Training (WT/COMTD/W/197) and of the Annual Report on Monitoring and Evaluation of Technical Assistance and Training for 2012, (WT/COMTD/W/199) and adopted the Biennial Technical Assistance and Training plan for 2014 and 2015 (WT/COMTD/W/200). In the course of 2013, the CTD was kept updated on the implementation of technical-assistance activities.

- **Notifications Regarding Market Access for Developing and LDCs:** In 2013, notifications under the Enabling Clause concerning Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) schemes were made by the European Union (WT/COMTD/N/4/Add.6), Norway, (WT/COMTD/N/6/Add.5), and the Russian Federation (WT/COMTD/N/42). In addition, the European Union notified the trade preferences granted to Pakistan (WT/COMTD/N/41). The CTD also considered issues relating to the notification status of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) Customs Union, the India-ASEAN RTA, and the India-Korea RTA.

- **Dedicated Session on Regional Trade Agreements:** A formal session of the CTD in Dedicated Session on RTAs was held in September 2013 to consider the Free Trade Agreement between India and Malaysia (WT/COMTD/RTA/5/1, WT/COMTD/RTA/5/2, WT/COMTD/RTA/5/3).

- **Electronic Commerce:** The CTD’s discussion on electronic commerce (e-commerce) in 2013 continued to take place in the context of the December 2011 Decision on the Work Program on E-Commerce (WT/L/843). A workshop on “E-commerce, Development and SMEs” was held at the WTO in April under the auspices of the CTD. The major themes that emerged from the
workshop discussions included concerns regarding infrastructure, and lack of reliable access to broadband, high speed cables.

- **Duty Free, Quota Free Market Access for LDCs Members:** The Decision taken at the Hong Kong Ministerial Conference on DFQF market access for LDCs remains a standing item on the CTD's agenda. A number of Members shared information on the steps they are taking to provide DFQF market access to LDCs' products, including in respect of preferential rules of origin. At each of the formal meetings of the CTD, the LDCs called for an expeditious and faithful implementation of the Decision, noting that DFQF market access was being considered in the context of deliverables for the 9th Ministerial Conference (MC9) which occurred in Bali, Indonesia, in December 2013. Additionally, at the July meeting, the Secretariat and the International Trade Center (ITC) made presentations on the existing market information and analysis tools available in the WTO’s Database on Preferential Trade Arrangements (http://ptadb.wto.org) and the Market Access Map tool (http://www.macmap.org).

- **Dedicated Session on Small Economies:** The Dedicated Session on Small Economies held two formal meetings, in April and October-November 2013. At the April meeting, Members discussed a proposal by Barbados on behalf of the small economies, requesting that the Secretariat undertake more analysis on the effects of Non-Tariff Measures (NTMs) on the exports of small economies. The proposal was revised and agreement reached for the Secretariat to conduct further research on the effects of NTMs on the exports of small economies and to hold a workshop during which this topic would be discussed in greater detail. The workshop was held in conjunction with the October-November CTD meeting, during which Members heard presentations on recent research conducted on NTMs by representatives from the ITC and UNCTAD.

- **Aid for Trade:** The CTD held three sessions on Aid for Trade in 2013, in March, June, and October. Work during these sessions focused on the five headings of the 2012-2013 Aid for Trade Work Program, namely resource mobilization, mainstreaming, regional integration, the private sector, and monitoring and evaluation. In addition, the Fourth Global Review of Aid for Trade was held in July 2013. It provided an opportunity to examine Aid for Trade in the context of a global trading system increasingly characterized by national, regional, and global supply chains and to discuss the challenges that developing countries and, in particular, LDCs face in integrating and moving up value chains. The 24 plenary sessions were structured around three broad themes: trade, development goals, and value chains; understanding value chains and development; and future perspectives on Aid for Trade. A total of 30 side events were also organized by WTO Members, intergovernmental organizations, and non-governmental organizations, including a side event sponsored by the United States on how the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), through its catalyzing role in the creation of both the African Cashew Alliance (ACA) and the Global Shea Alliance (GSA), helped to connect these two value chains to global end markets and helped the private sector add value in developing countries.

- **LDC Subcommittee:** The LDC Subcommittee also held three meetings in 2013. During those meetings, Members considered market access for LDCs and trends in LDC trade, as well as trade-related technical assistance and capacity-building initiatives for LDCs. Members also considered updates to the 2002 WTO Work Program for LDCs and adopted the revised work program in June (WT/COMTD/LDC/11/Rev.1).
Prospects for 2014

The CTD is expected to continue to monitor developments as they relate to issues of concern to developing country Members. Interest in issues related to technical assistance and market access is expected to continue. The CTD will undertake discussions to prepare the new Aid for Trade Work Program to replace the 2012-2013 Work Program. It is anticipated that efforts to identify “focused work” will continue, taking into consideration the Bali Ministerial Declaration. In this vein, the CTD will review steps taken by Members to provide DFQF market access to the LDC Members in line with the Hong Kong Declaration and the Bali Ministerial Declaration and review the participation of developing country Members in the multilateral trading system. Also in line with the Bali Ministerial Declaration in 2014, Members will work with the Secretariat in dedicated session to identify the challenges and opportunities experienced by small economies when linking into global value chains. In addition, the CTD’s examination of RTAs between developing country Members will resume as new RTAs are notified to the WTO. Work will continue on implementing the transparency mechanism for preferential trade agreements. Work will also begin on implementing the Monitoring Mechanism, agreed to at the Bali Ministerial (WT/MIN(13)/W/17), which will be done in dedicated sessions of the CTD.

3. Committee on Balance-of-Payments Restrictions

Status

The Uruguay Round Understanding on Balance-of-Payments substantially strengthened GATT disciplines on balance-of-payments-related trade measures. Under the WTO Agreement, any Member imposing restrictions for balance-of-payments purposes must consult regularly with the Committee on Balance-of-Payments Restrictions to determine whether the use of such restrictions is necessary or desirable to address a Member’s balance-of-payments difficulties. The Committee on Balance-of-Payments Restrictions works closely with the International Monetary Fund in conducting consultations. Full consultations involve examining a Member’s trade restrictions and balance-of-payments situation, while simplified consultations provide for more general reviews. Full consultations are held when restrictive measures are introduced or modified, or at the request of a Member in view of improvements in its balance-of-payments.

Major Issues in 2013

The Committee on Balance-of-Payments Restrictions met on October 17, 2013 to elect its Chairperson and to adopt its annual report to the General Council (WT/BOP/R/107). The Committee held no other meetings in 2013.

Prospects for 2014

Should a Member resort to new balance-of-payments measures, WTO rules require a thorough program of consultation with the Committee on Balance-of-Payments Restrictions. The United States expects the Committee to continue to ensure that balance-of-payments provisions are used as intended to address legitimate problems through the imposition of temporary, price-based measures.
4. Committee on Budget, Finance and Administration

Status

The Committee on Budget, Finance and Administration (the Budget Committee) is responsible for establishing and presenting the budget for the WTO Secretariat to the General Council for Members’ approval. The Budget Committee meets throughout the year to address the financial requirements of the organization. The budget process in the WTO operates on a biennial basis. As is the practice in the WTO, decisions on budgetary issues are taken by consensus. The United States is an active participant in the Budget Committee.

In the WTO, the assessed contribution of each Member is based on the share of that Member’s trade in goods, services, and intellectual property. The United States, as the Member with the largest share of world trade, makes the largest contribution to the WTO budget. For the 2014 budget, the U.S. assessed contribution is 11.406 percent of the total budget assessment, or Swiss Francs (CHF) 22,298,730 (about $24.6 million) (details required by Section 124 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act on the WTO’s consolidated budget for 2013 are provided in Annex II).

Major Issues in 2013

Activities of the Committee in 2013 included:

WTO Budget: The adoption of the Biennium Budget for 2014/2015 resulted in zero nominal growth for the 2014 budget and zero real growth for the 2015 budget. The budget adopted for 2014 amounted to CHF 197,203,900, including CHF 190,899,300 for the WTO Secretariat and CHF 6,304,600 for the Appellate Body and its Secretariat.

WTO Facilities: The work at the main entrance gate of the building and the security perimeter began this year and is expected to be completed in 2014. The new parking for staff in an off-site facility was completed in October. The interpretation equipment in the Council room was modernized in August.

Members’ Transition Operating Fund: The Members’ Transition Operating Fund was established in 2008 to finance additional operating costs during the Building Project as well as final installation costs once the construction is completed. The Committee approved two projects to be funded for a total amount of CHF 900,000. These projects were: (1) to complete the building work on the Accreditation Facility started in March 2013, and (2) to complete the landscaping of areas surrounding the security perimeter.

Human Resource Matters: In accordance with the WTO salary adjustment methodology, the Director General applied a 2.4 percent negative adjustment to the WTO salary scale, to freeze salaries for WTO staff and apply the revised scale to new staff. The main factor behind this negative movement was the drop in the value of the Euro against the Swiss franc in the benchmark comparator. The promotion of staff diversity remained a key issue for the Secretariat and the Committee.

Prospects for 2014

The Budget Committee will continue to monitor the financial and budgetary situation of the WTO on an ongoing basis and prepare the biennial budget for 2016-2017. It will also be regularly consulted and kept informed of all aspects concerning the finalization and implementation of security enhancements.
5. Committee on Regional Trade Agreements

Status

The Committee on Regional Trade Agreements (CRTA), a subsidiary body of the General Council, was established in early 1996 as a central body to oversee all regional agreements to which Members are party.

The CRTA is charged with conducting reviews of individual agreements, seeking ways to facilitate and improve the review process, implementing the biennial reporting requirements established in the Uruguay Round Agreements, and considering the systemic implications of such agreements and regional initiatives for the multilateral trading system. Prior to 1996, these reviews were typically conducted by a “working party” formed to review a specific agreement.

GATT Article XXIV is the principal provision governing Free Trade Areas (FTAs), Customs Unions (CUs), and interim agreements leading to an FTA or CU concerning goods. Additionally, the 1979 Decision on Differential and More Favorable Treatment, Reciprocity and Fuller Participation of Developing Countries, commonly known as the “Enabling Clause,” provides a basis for certain agreements between or among developing country Members, also concerning trade in goods. The Uruguay Round added three more provisions: the Understanding on the Interpretation of Article XXIV, which clarifies and enhances the requirements of Article XXIV of GATT 1994; and Articles V and Vbis of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), which govern services and labor markets economic integration agreements.

FTAs and CUs are authorized departures from the principle of MFN treatment, if certain requirements are met. With respect to goods, tariffs and other restrictions on trade must be eliminated on substantially all trade between the parties. In addition, duties and commercial measures applied to third countries upon the formation of an FTA or CU must not be higher or more restrictive than was the case before the agreement. If, in forming a CU, a Member exceeds its WTO bound rates, it must so notify the WTO in order to negotiate, with other Members, compensation in the form of market access concessions. Finally, while interim agreements leading to FTAs or CUs are permissible, transition periods to full FTAs or CUs should exceed 10 years only in exceptional cases.

With respect to trade in services, the CU or FTA must have “substantial sectoral coverage” and prohibit or eliminate substantially all discrimination. In addition, the FTA or CU may not exclude a priori any mode of supply from the agreement. As with agreements on goods, barriers or restrictions to trade in services, applicable to third parties upon formation of the FTA or CU, may not be higher than was the case previously. Finally, a compensation requirement analogous to that in goods agreements exists for services agreements.

Major Issues in 2013

As of November 15, 2013, 432 RTAs have been notified to the GATT or WTO, of which 250 are in force (135 covering goods only, 1 covering services only, and 114 covering both goods and services).

At the end of 2006, the General Council established, on a provisional basis, a new transparency mechanism for all RTAs. The main features of the mechanism, agreed upon in the Negotiating Group on Rules, include: the early announcement of any RTA; guidelines regarding the notification of RTAs; the preparation by the WTO Secretariat, on its own responsibility and in full consultation with the parties, of a factual presentation on each notified RTA to assist Members in their consideration of a notified RTA; timeframes associated with the consideration of RTAs; provisions regarding subsequent notification and
reporting with respect to notified RTAs; technical support for developing countries; and a division of work between the CRTA – entrusted to implement the mechanism vis-à-vis RTAs falling under Article XXIV of GATT 1994 and Articles V and Vbis of the GATS – and the Committee on Trade and Development (CTD), entrusted to do the same for RTAs falling under the Enabling Clause.

Since the implementation of the transparency mechanism in 2007, 155 agreements, counting goods and services notifications separately, have been considered (23 in 2013). Of these agreements, 150 have been reviewed in the CRTA and five in the CTD.

Under the transparency mechanism, the WTO Secretariat was tasked to establish and maintain an updated electronic database on individual RTAs. The database was launched in January 2009 and includes extensive information, all of which is available to the public. The RTAs database may be accessed at: http://rtais.wto.org.

In 2013, the Committee continued to discuss proposals regarding possible work on the systemic implications of RTAs and their effect on the multilateral system.

**Prospects for 2014**

Four sessions of the Committee on Regional Trade Agreements are foreseen in 2014.

### 6. Accessions to the World Trade Organization

**Status**

While several applicants intensified efforts to complete their accession negotiations during 2013, only Yemen was able to conclude all aspects of the accession process. The Ministerial Conference adopted Yemen’s terms of accession and invited it to become a WTO Member at the 9th Ministerial Meeting in Bali. This reduced to twenty-three the number of countries still negotiating for WTO accession.14 Laos and Tajikistan accepted their accession packages, which WTO Members approved in 2012, and became WTO Members during 2013. This brought to 159 the total number of WTO Members at the end of the year.

During 2013, the pace of work on accessions slowed, with only 13 formal or informal Working Party (WP) meetings convened as follows: for Afghanistan (1), Algeria (1), Belarus (1 informal WP consultation), Bosnia and Herzegovina (2), Kazakhstan (4), Serbia (1), Seychelles (2), and Yemen (1 final formal WP). Additionally, 11 plurilateral meetings to address specific technical issues in the various accession negotiations (e.g., in agricultural supports, SPS, TBT, or TRIMs issues) were convened for interested WTO Members. Market access negotiations and bilateral consultations on other issues also took place at the time of these meetings and consultations.

Kazakhstan, Afghanistan, and Seychelles made considerable progress in market access negotiations or in negotiations on other terms of accession. Work on these accessions, as well as on the accessions of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia, is well advanced. Algeria and Belarus resumed previously-dormant accession negotiations, and Comoros activated its process with the circulation of its Memorandum on the

---

14 Accession Working Parties have been established for Afghanistan*, Algeria, Andorra, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Belarus, Bhutan*, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Comoros*, Equatorial Guinea*, Ethiopia*, Iran, Iraq, Kazakhstan, Lebanon, Liberia*, Libya, Sao Tome and Principe*, Serbia, Seychelles, Sudan*, Syria, and Uzbekistan (the 8 countries marked with an asterisk are LDCs).
Foreign Trade Regime (MFTR). Azerbaijan advanced its accession with bilateral contacts, both on WTO rules and on goods and services market access.

Four of the 23 current applicants for WTO accession (Equatorial Guinea, Libya, Sao Tome and Principe, and Syria) have not yet submitted their MFTRs describing their respective foreign trade regimes, the action necessary to actually begin accession negotiations. Working Parties and bilateral negotiations with six other applicants — Andorra, Bhutan, Iraq, Lebanon, Sudan and Uzbekistan — remained dormant in 2013. While not officially dormant, there was no action with respect to Iran’s accession process.

Palestine requested and received observer status at the 9th Ministerial Meeting in Bali. Palestine also requested permanent observer status in the General Council; but, to date, there has been no action on the application. There were no other requests for accession or observer status in 2013.

**Background**

Countries and separate customs territories seeking to join the WTO must negotiate the terms of their accession with current Members, as Article XII of the WTO Agreement provides. The accession process, with its emphasis on the implementation of WTO provisions and the establishment of stable and predictable market access for goods and services, provides a proven framework for the adoption of policies and practices that encourage trade and investment and promote growth and development.

In a typical accession negotiation, a government submits an application to the WTO General Council, which establishes a WP composed of all interested WTO Members to review the applicant’s trade regime and to conduct the negotiations. The applicant must then provide its MFTR and respond to questions and comments on that document. When there is sufficient new documentation or the applicant makes progress in implementing WTO rules to justify further discussion, the WTO Secretariat schedules a meeting of the WP. The number of WP meetings, as well as the length of the negotiations, largely depends on the speed with which the applicant prepares itself to address the identified issues and to complete the negotiations. Accession applicants also negotiate trade liberalizing specific commitments on market access for industrial and agricultural goods, as well as for services, based on requests from WP Members. In addition, applicants are expected to make necessary legislative changes to implement WTO institutional and regulatory requirements and to eliminate existing WTO-inconsistent measures. Almost all “developed country” accession applicants, and many “developing country” accession applicants, take all of these actions on WTO rules prior to accession.

At the conclusion of its work, the WP adopts the agreed results of the negotiations (the recommended “terms of accession” developed with WP Members in bilateral and multilateral negotiations) and transmits them with its recommendation for approval to the General Council or Ministerial Conference. These terms, i.e., the accession “package,” consist of the “Report of the Working Party” and “Protocol of Accession,” consolidated schedules of specific commitments on market access for goods and services, and agriculture schedules that include commitments on export subsidies and domestic supports. After General Council or Ministerial Conference approval, accession applicants submit the package to their domestic authorities for acceptance (ratification). Thirty days after the WTO receives the applicant’s instrument accepting the terms of accession, the applicant becomes a WTO Member.

---

15 As outlined below, negotiations with applicants designated as “least developed” by the United Nations are subject to special procedures and guidelines, and do not, as a rule, fully implement WTO provisions prior to accession. Transitional periods may also be negotiated, if necessary, with developing or other applicants that request them and can justify their necessity.

16 The WP decision to adopt the accession package is by “consensus,” i.e., without objection by any WP Member. While there are provisions in the WTO Agreement for the Ministerial Conference or General Council to approve
The accession process requires attention and active engagement from both applicants and WTO Members. Undertaking accession negotiations is a serious decision for any country. Applicants already committed to economic reform, or that demonstrate a strong interest in using WTO provisions as the basis for their trade regimes, are usually the most successful in moving their accession towards completion (e.g., by submitting usable documentation, market access offers, and legislation for WP review on a timely basis). Thus, the pace of the accession process generally depends on the applicant.

The accession process strengthens the international trading system by ensuring that new Members understand and implement WTO rules from the outset. The process also offers current Members the opportunity to secure market access opportunities from acceding countries, to work with accession applicants towards full implementation of WTO obligations, and to address outstanding trade issues covered by the WTO in a multilateral context.

**U.S. Leadership and Technical Assistance:** As a matter of longstanding policy, the United States takes a leadership role in all aspects of the accession negotiations, including in the bilateral, plurilateral, and multilateral aspects of the negotiations. The objectives are to ensure that the applicant fully implements WTO provisions when it becomes a Member, to encourage trade liberalization in developing and transforming economies, and to use the opportunities provided in these negotiations to expand market access for U.S. exports. The United States also provides a broad range of technical assistance to countries seeking accession to the WTO to help them meet the requirements and challenges presented, both by the negotiations and the process of implementing WTO provisions in their trade regimes. USAID, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the Commercial Law Development Program (CLDP) of the U.S. Department of Commerce provide this assistance.

This assistance can include providing short term technical expertise focused on specific issues (e.g., customs procedures, intellectual property rights protection, or sanitary/phytosanitary and technical barriers to trade), and/or a WTO expert in residence in the acceding country or customs territory. A number of the WTO Members that have acceded since 1995 received technical assistance in their accession process from the United States, e.g., Albania, Armenia, Bulgaria, Cape Verde, Croatia, Estonia, Georgia, Jordan, Kyrgyz Republic, Latvia, Laos, Lithuania, Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro, Nepal, Russia, Tajikistan, Ukraine, Vietnam, and Yemen. Most of these countries had U.S.-provided resident experts for some portion of the accession process.

Accession applicants for which the United States provided a resident expert or other technical assistance for the accession process during 2013 include: Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iraq, Kazakhstan, Laos, and Liberia. Among current accession applicants, Algeria, Belarus, Ethiopia, Lebanon, Serbia, and Uzbekistan also received U.S. technical assistance earlier in their accession processes. All but Belarus had dedicated WTO advisors coordinating shorter term assistance at some point in the negotiations. At the Turkmenistan government’s request, USAID organized seminars on WTO accession for officials and other economic stakeholders (a form of short-term assistance) in March and again in July of 2013.

**Major Issues in 2013**

During 2013, WTO Members approved the terms of accession for only one country, Yemen, on December 4 at the 9th Ministerial Conference in Bali. Yemen intends to complete its domestic procedures to accept the terms of accession and become a WTO Member before the end of 2014.

| Accessions by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of all Members, in practice, the Ministerial Conference or General Council also approve the terms of accession by consensus. | 107 |
Kazakhstan

During 2013, Kazakhstan made further progress towards completion of its WTO accession process, making a strong effort to complete the negotiations and submit its accession package for final approval by the 9th Ministerial Meeting in Bali. During four meetings, WP Members further developed the text of the revised and updated draft WP report, resolving a few outstanding multilateral issues, and making progress towards commitment text for the others. Remaining issues include the need to reach agreement on the level of trade-distorting agricultural supports and export subsidies that can be granted; rules for applying safeguards; application of sanitary and phytosanitary measures; availability of trading rights of foreign individuals; application of import licensing procedures for goods with encryption; and the removal of local content requirements in investment contracts and in purchases by state owned enterprises engaged in commercial activity. Each of these issues saw progress; but, at the end of the year, the text of the draft WP report remained incomplete. Discussions continued for adjustments to the tariffs of the Common External Tariff intended to compensate for tariff commitments negotiated by Kazakhstan that would not be implemented in light of Kazakhstan’s membership in the Customs Union with Russia and Belarus. The consolidated schedule of commitments and concessions has not been circulated for verification.

Serbia

Serbia’s 13th WP meeting convened in June 2013. While bilateral negotiations on goods and services with the United States are well advanced, Serbia has adopted legislation banning importation of goods containing genetically modified organisms (GMOs). This nontariff measure blocks U.S. exports and is not consistent with WTO rules, which require that technical regulations on imports have a scientific basis. The WP review of Serbia’s trade regime is nearing completion based on U.S. and other WTO Members’ comprehensive comments and drafting suggestions which they submitted after the WP meeting in March 2012. Given the advanced state of the negotiations, it is critical for Serbia to enact the necessary legislation to bring its trade regime into line with WTO rules, including repeal or amendment of the law banning trade in GMOs.

Bosnia and Herzegovina

Two WP meetings, in March and in June 2013, continued discussion of remaining issues in Bosnia and Herzegovina’s WTO accession. Bilateral market access negotiations are well advanced. The review of Bosnia and Herzegovina’s trade regime in the Working Party is nearing completion, based on U.S. and other WTO Members’ comprehensive comments and drafting suggestions that they submitted during 2012. Working Party deliberations in 2013 focused on review and discussion of Bosnia and Herzegovina’s draft legislation that, when enacted, will implement WTO rules in that country’s trade regime. To complete its accession negotiations, Bosnia and Herzegovina must bridge the last gaps in market access and dedicate itself to solving the few systemic issues that remain, including on trading rights.

Azerbaijan

After two Working Party meetings in 2012, Azerbaijan spent 2013 focusing on market access negotiations, legislation, and providing the WTO Secretariat with information to refine its draft WP report. While much work remains, it is clear that 2014 could be a decisive year in efforts to complete the accession. Further progress in 2014 will depend on Azerbaijan’s successful bridging of the last gaps in market access and movement towards resolution of the outstanding systemic issues (e.g., in agricultural supports, taxes and fees on imports, local content requirements in state enterprise procurement, and removal of QRs), as well as progress towards full legislative implementation of WTO provisions.
Seychelles

Seychelles took a leap forward in its WTO accession in 2013, convening two WP meetings, in June and November. The comprehensive questions and comments provided by the United States and other WTO Members have helped identify the issues that Seychelles must resolve to complete the accession. These include taxes, quantitative restrictions, activity licensing and trading rights, and the establishment of WTO-consistent SPS, TBT, and intellectual property protection regimes. The WTO will hold the next WP meeting in early 2014. Bilateral market access negotiations are underway.

Algeria

After convening informal consultations in 2012 with WTO Members, Algeria’s WP Chairman sought a 2013 meeting and requested that Algeria provide updated documentation, including a revised draft WP report and updated legislation to implement WTO rules. Based on these inputs, Algeria resumed negotiations in its Working Party in April 2013. The WP identified the following issues for further discussion: trading rights, tariff exemptions, taxes, quantitative restrictions and import licensing, customs valuation, prohibited subsidies, and the implementation of the WTO Agreements on TBT, SPS, and TRIPS. Algeria also circulated revised goods and services offers, and engaged Members in bilateral negotiations on the margins of its WP meeting.

Belarus

In 2005, the WTO suspended regular WP meetings on Belarus’ WTO accession. After considering the situation in informal consultations in 2010 and 2012, WTO Members agreed to resume discussions, determining that Belarus had provided sufficient documentation in the intervening period to continue. Informal Working Party consultations were convened in May 2013. At that time, WP Members agreed that informal consultations with Belarus in the Working Party should continue, based on updated documentation and improved market access offers. Belarus stated that its economic regime was in transition with respect to private ownership of production, rule of law in economic and investment matters, and price controls. Members noted that giving Belarus the opportunity to clarify the status and next steps in its economic reforms justified further work.

Other Accessions

The WPs of Ethiopia, The Bahamas, Iraq, and Liberia did not meet during 2013, and there was little bilateral work with the United States on market access in these accessions. Achieving renewed WP discussions and further bilateral contacts will require efforts to update documentation, indicate an active legislative reform process, and revised offers on goods and services market access.

LDC Accessions

WTO Members are committed to facilitating the accession processes of LDCs and in making WTO accession more accessible to these applicants. The accession negotiations for all LDC accession applicants are guided by the simplified and streamlined procedures developed for these countries in response to the WTO General Council Decision on Accessions of Least Developed Countries (WT/L/508) established at the end of 2002, and in its addendum, adopted in July 2012 by the General Council. The expanded Guidelines include provisions under the following pillars: (i) Benchmarks on Goods; (ii) Benchmarks on Services; (iii) Transparency in Accession Negotiations; (iv) Special and Differential

17 WT/L/508 and WT/L/508/Add.1
(S&D) Treatment and Transition Periods; and, (v) Technical Assistance. Points (i) and (ii) establish that market access negotiations for the WTO accession of LDCs would be guided by special principles and benchmarks more appropriate to the development level of LDC applicants. The transparency provisions confirm evolving practice in LDC accessions for the use of the good offices of the Chairperson of the Sub-Committee on LDCs, as well as the Chairpersons of the LDCs’ Accession Working Parties to assist the conclusion of the accession process of LDCs. S&D treatment and technical assistance provisions of the additional recommendations also confirm the need for restraint and the broad use of transitional provisions when constructing market access commitments, Action Plans for transitional implementation of WTO provisions, and the need for enhanced technical assistance and capacity building in LDC accessions.

The United States and other developed country WTO Members support both the 2002 and the 2012 Decisions on LDC Accessions, adhering to the guidelines in formulating more flexible negotiating positions on market access and WTO implementation commitments for LDCs. The purpose of the guidelines is to ensure that LDCs are prepared for the responsibilities of WTO Membership by promoting use of technical assistance and structuring transitional periods with action plans, and, in general, facilitating LDC integration into the multilateral trading system. The 2012 additional provisions will continue to establish the WTO accession process for LDCs as a tool for economic development, incorporating the applicant’s own development program and schedule for receiving technical assistance in an action plan for progressive implementation of WTO rules.

Developments in 2013: With the approval of Yemen’s accession terms, the number of LDCs seeking WTO accession shrank to eight. Of those, only two actively negotiated with WTO Members during 2013: Afghanistan during its July 2013 WP meeting and Comoros when it submitted its MFTR. Liberia and Ethiopia did not convene WP meetings in 2013, but are continuing their accession efforts and are likely to convene WP meetings in 2014. Sao Tome and Principe and Equatorial Guinea have not yet provided documentation to begin negotiations, and the accession processes of Bhutan and Sudan have been dormant for some time.

Afghanistan

Afghanistan worked hard in 2013 to complete its accession process, in WP deliberations, in bilateral goods and services negotiations, and through accelerated development of implementing legislation for WTO rules. While unable to wrap up its accession process, Afghanistan made good progress in all these areas. In its single WP meeting in July 2013, Afghanistan continued the discussion initiated in the 2011 and 2012 WP meetings to identify measures in its trade regime that need improvement. At the same time, the WTO circulated to WP Members draft legislation that would change current practices. Revised Market Access Offers on Goods and Services were negotiated in bilateral meetings with delegations on the margins of the July WP meeting and, with the United States, in bilateral in Washington in February and in DVCs in July, August, and November. As 2014 began, the United States and Afghanistan were preparing to sign their bilateral agreement for goods. Afghanistan has declared that it will be a WTO Member by the end of 2014, a goal supported by the United States.

Prospects for 2014

Kazakhstan and Afghanistan made substantial progress towards completion of negotiations on their respective terms of accession. These applicants are now potential candidates for approval in 2014 based

---

18 Afghanistan, Bhutan, Comoros, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Liberia, Sao Tome and Principe and Sudan.
19 LDCs that have not yet applied for WTO accession include Eritrea, Timor-L’Este, Somalia, South Sudan, Kiribati, and Tuvalu.
on their active efforts to resolve outstanding issues, a fact recognized by the WTO Secretariat in its annual report on accessions. Serbia, and Bosnia and Herzegovina also are close to completion, but domestic political conflicts have blocked progress on market access and enacting the implementing legislation necessary for the WP to conclude work on their accessions. Azerbaijan, Algeria, Belarus, and Seychelles are actively engaged in accession negotiations, both on rules and market access. These applicants will continue negotiations bilaterally and in their Working Parties during 2014, depending on the timing and the quality of market access offers and on tangible progress on legislation. Other active accessions, but at an early stage of progress, include The Bahamas, Ethiopia, Comoros, and Liberia. Uzbekistan continues to suggest that it might resume its accession process, and Turkmenistan has signaled interest in possibly applying for accession. With the exception of Comoros, however, the divide between active accessions described in this section and the remaining ten applicant countries has only deepened, as these ten applicants are not, at this time, in a viable accession process, and have not been for over four years.

K. Plurilateral Agreements

1. Committee on Trade in Civil Aircraft

Status

The Agreement on Trade in Civil Aircraft (Aircraft Agreement) entered into force on January 1, 1980, and is one of two WTO plurilateral agreements (along with the Agreement on Government Procurement) that are in force only for those WTO Members that have accepted it.

The Aircraft Agreement requires Signatories to eliminate tariffs on civil aircraft, engines, flight simulators, and related parts and components, and to provide these benefits on a nondiscriminatory basis to other signatories. In addition, the Signatories have agreed provisionally to provide duty free treatment for ground maintenance simulators, although this item is not covered under the current agreement. The Aircraft Agreement also establishes various obligations aimed at fostering free market forces. For example, signatory governments pledge that they will base their purchasing decisions strictly on technical and commercial factors.

There are currently 32 Signatories to the Aircraft Agreement: Albania, Canada, the EU (the following 20 EU Member States are also Signatories to the Aircraft Agreement in their own right: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom), Egypt, Georgia, Japan, Macao China, Montenegro, Norway, Switzerland, Chinese Taipei, and the United States. WTO Members with observer status in the Committee are: Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Brazil, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Gabon, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Israel, South Korea, Mauritius, Nigeria, Oman, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, and Ukraine. The IMF and UNCTAD are also observers.

---

20 WT/ACC/21
21 Andorra, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Libya, Syria, Equatorial Guinea, Sao Tome and Principe, Bhutan, and Sudan.
22 Additional information on this agreement can be found on the WTO’s website at: http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/civair_e/civair_e.htm.
23 Currently comprising 27 Member States: Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Germany, Estonia, Ireland, Greece, Spain, France, Italy, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Hungary, Malta, the Netherlands, Austria, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Slovakia, Finland, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.
The Committee on Trade in Civil Aircraft (Aircraft Committee), permanently established under the Aircraft Agreement, provides the Signatories an opportunity to consult on the operation of the Aircraft Agreement, to propose amendments to the Agreement, and to resolve any disputes.

Major Issues in 2013

The Aircraft Committee held one regular meeting on November 7, 2013. At this meeting, the Committee elected Janet Chakarian-Renouf of Canada as its new Chair and continued to discuss its work on the revision of the Product Coverage Annex to the Trade in Civil Aircraft Agreement in order to bring it into conformity with the 2007 Harmonized Commodity and Description System.

Prospects for 2014

The Aircraft Committee agreed to hold its next regular meeting on November 4, 2014. The Chair of the Committee proposed an additional formal meeting of the Committee to finalize the revisions to the Product Coverage Annex in the first half of 2014. The United States will continue to encourage recently-acceded WTO Members to become Signatories pursuant to their respective protocols of accession, and will continue to encourage current Committee observers and other WTO Members to become Signatories to the Aircraft Agreement.

2. Committee on Government Procurement

Status

The WTO Agreement on Government Procurement (GPA) is a “plurilateral” agreement included in Annex 4 to the WTO Agreement. As such, it is not part of the WTO’s single undertaking and its membership is limited to WTO Members that specifically signed the GPA in Marrakesh or that have subsequently acceded to it. WTO Members are not required to join the GPA, but the United States strongly encourages all WTO Members to participate in this important agreement.

Forty-three WTO Members are parties to the GPA: Armenia; Canada; the EU and its 28 Member States (Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom); Hong Kong China; Iceland; Israel; Japan; South Korea; Liechtenstein; the Netherlands with respect to Aruba; Norway; Singapore; Switzerland; Chinese Taipei; and the United States (collectively the GPA Parties).

As of the end of 2012, 10 Members were in the process of acceding to the GPA: Albania; China; Georgia; Jordan; Kyrgyz Republic; Moldova; Montenegro; New Zealand; Oman; and Ukraine. Four additional Members have provisions in their respective Protocols of Accession to the WTO regarding accession to the GPA: the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; Mongolia; the Russian Federation; and Saudi Arabia. Panama’s withdrew its application for accession to the Agreement in a communication circulated on August 9, 2013. When Croatia joined the EU on July 1, 2013, it also became the 43rd Member of the GPA through EU’s coverage of the GPA.

When China joined the WTO in 2001, it committed to commence negotiations to join the GPA “as soon as possible.” In April 2006, China agreed in the Joint Committee on Commerce and Trade (JCCT) to submit its initial offer of coverage by the end of 2007. Based on these commitments, China submitted its application for accession to the GPA and its Initial Appendix I Offer on December 28, 2007. The United States submitted its Initial Request for improvements in China’s Initial Offer in May 2008. In accordance

Jordan submitted its initial offer of coverage in 2002. It has submitted several revised offers, in response to requests by the United States and other GPA Parties for improvements. Negotiations on Jordan’s accession did not make any progress in 2013.

The Kyrgyz Republic’s accession to the GPA, which had been inactive since 2003, moved forward in 2009 when it submitted updated responses to the Checklist of Issues, but it did not make further progress in 2013.


In October 2012, New Zealand commenced negotiations on its accession to the GPA with the submission of its application for accession, initial market access offer, and its replies to the Checklist of Issues. In September 2013, New Zealand circulated its revised coverage offer.

Ukraine commenced its accession to the GPA in 2011 with the submission of its application for accession, and in August 2011, submitted its replies to the Checklist of Issues. In 2012, Ukraine updated the committee on its progress in bringing its domestic legislation into compliance with the GPA’s requirements and its preparations of an initial offer. No further progress was made in 2013.

With the addition of Russia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in 2013, the following 27 WTO Members, including those in the process of acceding to the GPA, have observer status in the GPA Committee: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Georgia, India, Indonesia, Jordan, the Kyrgyz Republic, Malaysia, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, New Zealand, Oman, Panama, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine and Viet Nam. Four intergovernmental organizations (IMF, International Trade Centre, OECD, and UNCTAD) also have observer status.

On December 15, 2011, the GPA Parties reached agreement on the conclusion of negotiations, which had been conducted over more than a decade, to revise the GPA. The outcome included a revision of the text of the GPA to streamline and clarify its obligations, to incorporate flexibilities that reflect modern procurement practices, and to facilitate its implementation. The revision also significantly expanded the

---

procurement covered under the GPA. As part of the GPA package, the GPA Parties adopted a set of Future Work Programs to be undertaken by the GPA Committee following the entry into force of the revised Agreement. These include programs related to: (i) the treatment of small and medium sized enterprises; (ii) sustainable procurement; (iii) the collection and dissemination of statistical data; (iv) exclusions and restrictions in GPA Parties’ Annexes; and (v) safety standards in international procurement. The GPA Committee has also approved a decision relating to the use of electronic means to fulfill notification requirements under Articles XIX and XXII of the revised Agreement.

In March 2012, the GPA Parties formally adopted the results of the revision of the GPA. The GPA Parties also agreed to undertake the necessary domestic approval procedures so that the revised Agreement could enter into force as soon as possible.

On December 2, 2013, the United States deposited its instrument of acceptance. On December 3, 2013 GPA Parties committed to bring the revised GPA into force by March 31, 2014.

**Major Issues in 2013**

As noted, in March 2012, the GPA Committee adopted the results of the revision of the GPA. The revision will expand procurement opportunities for U.S. goods, services, and suppliers. The revised GPA will also facilitate understanding and implementation of the GPA text. In order for the revised agreement to enter into force, two-thirds of the 15 Parties must deposit their instruments of acceptance. In 2013, seven parties, including the United States, deposited their instruments of acceptance of the revised GPA. In December 2013 at the 9th WTO Ministerial Conference, GPA Parties committed to bringing the revised GPA into force by March 31, 2014.

During 2013, the GPA Committee held four formal meetings (in February, May, October and November) and four informal meetings, focused primarily on the entry into force of the revised GPA. The GPA Committee also worked on completing the decisions on arbitration procedures and indicative criteria that are intended to facilitate the modification of GPA Parties’ Annexes at the informal meetings. In addition, the GPA Committee held further discussions at the informal meetings on the accessions to the GPA of China, Croatia, Montenegro, New Zealand, and Ukraine.

In July, Croatia joined the GPA and became the 43rd member country. New Zealand submitted its revised offer in September. China submitted its fourth revised offer in December. Montenegro submitted an initial offer in October and a revised offer in November.

**Prospects for 2014**

The GPA Committee will continue work to advance GPA accessions, in particular, of China, Montenegro, and New Zealand. The GPA Committee will also focus on completion of decisions on arbitration procedures and indicative criteria. As noted, GPA parties are committed to bring the revised GPA into force by March 31, 2014. When the revised GPA enters into force, the GPA Committee will commence work on the five Work Programs that were adopted as part of the overall package.
3. Committee of Participants on the Expansion of Trade in Information Technology Products

Status

The Committee of Participants on the Expansion of Trade in Information Technology Products (“the ITA Committee”) was established to carry out the provisions of the Information Technology Agreement (ITA), among which are to review the current product coverage with a view to incorporate additional products, and to consider any divergence among ITA Participants in classifying ITA products. The ITA Committee thus serves as the forum for meetings required under its procedures and collective consultations among the participants.

The ITA covers a wide range of information and communications technology (ICT) products including computers and computer peripheral equipment, electronic components including semiconductors, computer software, telecommunications equipment, semiconductor manufacturing equipment, and computer-based analytical instruments. In March 2013, Tajikistan joined the ITA based on its WTO accession commitment. In July 2013, Qatar also joined the agreement, meaning that now all member countries of the Gulf Cooperation Council are ITA Participants. In September 2013, just over a year after its accession to the WTO, the Russian Federation became the 78th Participant in the ITA. Among these 78 ITA Participants, however, Morocco has yet to submit the formal documentation to implement its ITA Commitments, and El Salvador has indicated that implementation would begin after the completion of domestic legal procedural requirements.

Major Issues in 2013

In 2013, the United States and 26 other ITA Participants continued negotiations – started in May 2012 – to expand the product coverage of the ITA. Nine negotiating rounds were held in Geneva over the course of 2013 to negotiate on the basis of a “consolidated list” of products proposed for inclusion in the ITA. However, collective efforts to conclude a balanced and commercially significant ITA expansion deal prior to the 9th WTO Ministerial Conference in December 2013 failed when China refused to accept the inclusion of key technology goods in the scope of a final agreement.

In addition to discussion on ITA product expansion, the ITA Committee held two formal meetings in 2013, on March 22 and October 14. In those meetings, the ITA Committee continued its deliberations on the Non-Tariff Measures (NTMs) Work Program. With regard to its work on the Electro-Magnetic Compatibility/Electro-Magnetic Interference (EMC/EMI) Pilot Project, the ITA Committee took note that 28 ITA Members (including the EU as one Member) have provided survey responses to the ITA Committee and encouraged those that had not provided the information to do so without any further delay. In considering ways to advance and expand its work on NTMs other than EMC/EMI, the ITA Committee also heard reports and updates by participants on their contributions to work on NTMs, including a proposal requesting the ITA Committee to organize a workshop on non-tariff barriers in 2014.

The ITA Committee also continued a discussion of classification divergences on certain ITA products. These discussions are aimed at eliminating differences in the way Participants classify ITA products in their national tariff schedules. The ITA Committee adopted a decision to endorse the classification of 18

---

25 More formally known as the “WTO Ministerial Declaration on Trade in Information Technology Products” (WT/MIN(96)/16).
26 The minutes of these Committee meetings are contained in WTO documents G/IT/M/57 and G/IT/M/58 (not yet released).
ITA Attachment B items in the Harmonized System (HS) 1996 nomenclature. ITA Participants are to submit the relevant documentation to make any necessary modifications to their ITA schedules pursuant to the decision no later than April 30, 2014.

Prospects for 2014

Since the ITA entered into effect in 1997, the global ICT sector has experienced an innovation revolution, with countless new ICT and electronics products entering the market. It is estimated that eliminating duties on additional technology products through an ITA expansion initiative could liberalize roughly $1 trillion in global ICT trade, supporting an estimated 60,000 new U.S. jobs, and increase annual global GDP by $190 billion. In 2014, the United States will continue to urge China to increase its ambition on ITA expansion and to support a balanced and commercially-significant package that can be accepted by all Members and concluded as soon as possible.

The next meeting of the ITA Committee will be held in the first quarter of 2014.