



























































































110. The Panel would consider Canada and Mexico’s non-violation claims if it were to conclude that the U.S. measures were not inconsistent with the cited provisions of USMCA. In that case, one might well ask whether the United States reasonably could have expected that Complainants would adopt and promote measures *consistent* with the autos provisions of USMCA, rather than promoting actions and interpretations inconsistent with the Agreement. The Panel may resolve the non-violation claims on either basis suggested previously – no reasonable expectation or no nullification or impairment. It would be fully consistent with the Panel’s terms of reference<sup>176</sup> and function – as well as good judgment – for the Panel to approach such an exceptional claim with due caution as it considers appropriate findings and determinations.

## **VI. Conclusion**

111. For the reasons set out above, and in the U.S. initial written submission, Complainants have failed to establish that any U.S. measure is inconsistent with the USMCA in this dispute and have failed to establish any non-violation nullification or impairment of benefits.

---

<sup>176</sup> USMCA Art. 31.7.1 (terms of reference “to examine, in the light of the relevant provisions of this Agreement, the matter referred to in the request for the establishment of a panel under Article 31.6 (Establishment of a Panel)” and “make findings and determinations, and any jointly requested recommendations, together with its reasons therefor, as provided for in Article 31.17 (Panel Report)”).