

11	Taxes on Alcoholic Beverages	Alcoholic Beverages	United States	Japan	07-Jul-95	GATT 1947: III; GATT 1947: III:2	<p>See the Panel report of 1995. The complainant claimed that Japan's liquor tax system discriminated against imported spirits in favor of domestic "shochu." The Panel and Appellate Body determined this to be inconsistent with GATT Article III:2. Japan was given a reasonable period to implement the recommendations, which it did with modalities accepted by the complainants.</p>	No	Miscellaneous
12	Trade Description of Scallops	Agricultural and Food	Peru	European Communities	18 July 1995	GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: III; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT); II:1; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT); II:2; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT); XII	<p>The French Government Order on the official name and trade description of scallops led to complaints from Canada, Peru, and Chile. The complainants argued that their scallops were "like products" to French scallops but would be disadvantaged in the French market due to the new order. Violations of GATT Articles I and III and TBT Article 2 were alleged. The dispute was eventually resolved through a mutually agreed solution between the parties, suspending the panel proceedings.</p>	No	Agriculture
13	Duties on Imports of Grains	Agricultural and Food	United States	European Communities	19 July 1995	GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: II; GATT 1947: VII; GATT 1947: X; Customs valuation: I; Customs valuation: II; Customs valuation: III; Customs valuation: IV; Customs valuation: V; Customs valuation: VI; Customs valuation: VII; Customs valuation: VIII; Customs valuation: IX; Customs valuation: XI; Customs valuation: XII; GATT 1994: Annex I	<p>The United States brought a complaint against the European Community (EC) alleging violations of WTO rules related to the import of hormone-treated beef. Despite several attempts to establish a panel, the US withdrew its request on two occasions. However, on 28 March 1997, the US made a fresh request for the establishment of a panel, indicating the importance and persistence of the dispute.</p>	No	Agriculture
14	Trade Description of Scallops	Agricultural and Food	Chile	European Communities	24 July 1995	GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: III; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT); II:1; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT); II:2; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT); XII	<p>France's Government Order restricted the use of the trade name "Coquille Saint-Jacques" only to French scallops, which Chile claimed was discriminatory and violated WTO rules on fair competition. After the establishment of a joint panel, the parties agreed to suspend proceedings and reached a mutually agreed solution. The mutually agreed solution is not disclosed in the provided summary.</p>	No	Agriculture
15	Measures Affecting the Purchase of Telecommunications Equipment	Machinery and Appliances	European Communities	Japan	18 August 1995	GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: III:4; GATT 1947: XVII:1(c)	<p>The European Communities (EC) alleged that a 1994 agreement between the United States (US) and Japan violated several GATT articles, claiming it nullified or impaired benefits accruing to the EC. The US joined the consultations, and although there was no official notification, the case appears to have been settled bilaterally, indicating a resolution outside the WTO dispute settlement process.</p>	No	Telecomm
16	Regime for the Importation, Sale and Distribution of Bananas	Agricultural and Food	Guatemala; Honduras; Mexico; United States	European Communities	28 September 1995	Services (GATS); II; Services (GATS): XVI; Services (GATS): XVII; GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: II; GATT 1947: III; GATT 1947: X; GATT 1947: XIII; Import Licensing: I; Import Licensing: III	<p>The WTO dispute regarding the EC's banana import regime involved allegations by several countries that the regime violated various GATT and other WTO agreements. Consultations were requested, and multiple countries joined the talks. The parties eventually reached a mutually agreed solution, indicating a resolution of the dispute.</p>	No	Agriculture
17	Duties on Imports of Rice	Agricultural and Food	Thailand	European Communities	5 October 1995	GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: II; GATT 1947: VII; Customs valuation: I; Customs valuation: II; Customs valuation: III; Customs valuation: IV; Customs valuation: V; Customs valuation: VI; Customs valuation: VII; GATT 1994: Annex I	<p>Thailand filed a complaint against the EC's duties on rice imports, alleging violations of GATT Article I's most-favored-nation requirement due to preferential treatment given to basmati rice from India and Pakistan. This complaint echoed similar concerns raised by Canada and the US in separate WTO disputes.</p>	No	Agriculture
18	Measures Affecting Importation of Salmon	Agricultural and Food	Canada	Australia	5 October 1995	GATT 1947: XI; GATT 1947: XIII; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); II; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): III; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): V	<p>Canada initiated a WTO dispute against Australia over its prohibition of salmon imports due to quarantine regulations. The dispute found that Australia's measures violated the SPS Agreement. After Australia appealed and the Appellate Body reversed some aspects of the panel's ruling, a compliance panel determined that Australia's implementing measures were not yet WTO-compliant. Canada sought authorization to suspend concessions, leading to an arbitration proceeding that was later suspended. Ultimately, Canada and Australia reached an agreement resolving the dispute, with Australia committing to implement the agreement.</p>	No	Agriculture
19	Import Regime for Automobiles	Vehicles	India	Poland	28 September 1995	GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: XXIV	<p>India initiated a dispute against Poland's preferential treatment of the European Community (EC) in its automobile import regime. After consultations, a mutually agreed solution was reached between the parties, resolving the dispute on July 16, 1996. This suggests that the preferential treatment violated WTO rules and that Poland modified its policy to comply with those rules.</p>	No	Manufacturing
20	Measures concerning Bottled Water	Agricultural and Food	Canada	Korea, Republic of	8 November 1995	GATT 1947: III; GATT 1947: XI; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): II; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): V; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT); II	<p>On 8 November 1995, Canada requested consultations, claiming Korean regulations on bottled water shelf-life and disinfection violated GATT Articles III and XI, SPS Articles 2 and 5, and TBT Article 2. A mutually agreed settlement was announced at the DSB meeting on 24 April 1996.</p>	No	Agriculture
21	Measures Affecting the Importation of Salmonids	Agricultural and Food	United States	Australia	20 November 1995	GATT 1947: XI; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): II; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): V; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): VII; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): VIII	<p>The WTO dispute "Measures Affecting the Importation of Salmonids" involved the United States challenging Canadian regulations allegedly violating WTO agreements. The parties agreed to a mutually satisfactory solution on October 27, 2000, before a panel could fully adjudicate the case, resulting in the suspension of the proceedings.</p>	No	Agriculture
22	Measures Affecting Desiccated Coconut	Agricultural and Food	Philippines	Brazil	30 November 1995	Agriculture: XIII; GATT 1947: VI:3; GATT 1947: VI:6	<p>The Philippines challenged Brazil's countervailing duty on desiccated coconut, claiming it violated WTO rules. The Panel found the cited agreements inapplicable, and the Appellate Body upheld this finding. The DSB adopted both reports, resolving the dispute in Brazil's favor.</p>	No	Agriculture

79	Patent Protection for Pharmaceutical and Agricultural Chemical Products	Patents	European Communities	India	28 April 1997	Intellectual Property (TRIPS): XXVII; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): 65; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): 70; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): 70.8; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): 70.9	<p>Adoption of patent protection for pharmaceutical and agricultural products, and the absence of patent protection for food products. The EC contended that this is inconsistent with TRIPS.</p> <p>On 25 September 1987, the GDB entered the establishment of a patent system in India. The EC requested the establishment of a panel to examine the dispute.</p> <p>On 10 October 1987, the EC requested the establishment of a panel to examine the dispute.</p> <p>On 10 October 1987, the EC requested the establishment of a panel to examine the dispute.</p>	The European Communities filed a complaint against India for failing to provide adequate patent protection for pharmaceutical and agricultural chemical products, alleging violations of the TRIPS Agreement. The WTO Panel found India in violation and recommended it establish a patent system compliant with its obligations. India subsequently implemented the recommendations by enacting the necessary legislation, bringing an end to the dispute.	Yes	Healthcare
80	Measures Affecting Commercial Telephone Directory Services	Communication	United States	Belgium	2 May 1997	Services (GATS): II; Services (GATS): VI; Services (GATS): VIII; Services (GATS): XVII	<p>On 2 May 1987, the US requested consultations with Belgium in respect of certain measures of the Belgian Government relating to the provision of commercial telephone directory services.</p> <p>On 2 May 1987, the US requested consultations with Belgium in respect of certain measures of the Belgian Government relating to the provision of commercial telephone directory services.</p> <p>On 2 May 1987, the US requested consultations with Belgium in respect of certain measures of the Belgian Government relating to the provision of commercial telephone directory services.</p>	The United States brought a dispute before the WTO against Belgium, alleging that Belgium's measures on commercial telephone directory services violated certain articles of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), resulting in the nullification or impairment of benefits to the United States under Belgium's specific GATS commitments.	No	Telecomm
81	Measures Affecting Trade and Investment in the Automotive Sector	Vehicles	European Communities	Brazil	7 May 1997	GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: III; GATT 1947: X; GATT 1947: XII; GATT 1994: XXIII; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): III; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): V; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): XXVII; Trade-Related Investment Measures (TRIMs): II	<p>On 7 May 1987, the EC requested consultations with Brazil in respect of certain measures of the Brazilian Government relating to trade and investment in the automotive sector.</p> <p>On 7 May 1987, the EC requested consultations with Brazil in respect of certain measures of the Brazilian Government relating to trade and investment in the automotive sector.</p> <p>On 7 May 1987, the EC requested consultations with Brazil in respect of certain measures of the Brazilian Government relating to trade and investment in the automotive sector.</p>	The European Communities (EC) filed a dispute with Brazil over its automotive sector measures. The EC alleged that these measures, including Law No. 9449, Law No. 9449, and Decree No. 1987, violated various WTO agreements, such as GATT 1994, the Subsidies Agreement, and the TRIMs Agreement. The EC claimed that these measures discriminated against imported vehicles and provided unfair subsidies to Brazilian automakers, resulting in nullification and impairment of benefits under the agreements.	No	Manufacturing
82	Measures Affecting the Grant of Copyright and Neighbouring Rights	Copyright and Related Rights	United States	Ireland	14 May 1997	Property (TRIPS): X; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): XI; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): XII; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): XIII; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): XIV; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): 41; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): 42; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): 43; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): 44; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): 45;	<p>On 14 May 1987, the US requested consultations with Ireland in respect of certain measures of the Irish Government relating to the grant of copyright and neighbouring rights.</p> <p>On 14 May 1987, the US requested consultations with Ireland in respect of certain measures of the Irish Government relating to the grant of copyright and neighbouring rights.</p> <p>On 14 May 1987, the US requested consultations with Ireland in respect of certain measures of the Irish Government relating to the grant of copyright and neighbouring rights.</p>	Ireland allegedly failed to grant copyright and neighbouring rights under its law, violating the TRIPS Agreement. The United States requested consultations and later the establishment of a panel. However, before a panel was formed, the parties reached a mutually satisfactory solution, indicating that the dispute was resolved amicably.	Yes	Miscellaneous
83	Measures Affecting the Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights	Copyright and Related Rights	United States	Denmark	14 May 1997	Intellectual Property (TRIPS): 50; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): 63; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): 65	<p>On 14 May 1987, the US requested consultations with Denmark in respect of certain measures of the Danish Government relating to the enforcement of intellectual property rights.</p> <p>On 14 May 1987, the US requested consultations with Denmark in respect of certain measures of the Danish Government relating to the enforcement of intellectual property rights.</p> <p>On 14 May 1987, the US requested consultations with Denmark in respect of certain measures of the Danish Government relating to the enforcement of intellectual property rights.</p>	The WTO dispute over Denmark's alleged failure to provide provisional measures for enforcing intellectual property rights concluded with a satisfactory resolution between the disputing parties. The US had argued that Denmark's practices violated the TRIPS Agreement, but the dispute was resolved without further action, suggesting that a mutually beneficial agreement was reached.	Yes	Miscellaneous
84	Taxes on Alcoholic Beverages	Alcoholic Beverages	United States	Korea, Republic of	23 May 1997	GATT 1947: III:2	<p>On 23 May 1987, the US requested consultations with Korea in respect of certain measures of the Korean Government relating to taxes on alcoholic beverages.</p> <p>On 23 May 1987, the US requested consultations with Korea in respect of certain measures of the Korean Government relating to taxes on alcoholic beverages.</p> <p>On 23 May 1987, the US requested consultations with Korea in respect of certain measures of the Korean Government relating to taxes on alcoholic beverages.</p>	The European Communities and the United States filed complaints with the World Trade Organization (WTO) against Korea's internal taxes on certain alcoholic beverages. The complainants alleged that the taxes violated Article III:2 of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), which prohibits discrimination between imported and domestic products. The WTO panel and Appellate Body found in favor of the complainants, and Korea agreed to amend its laws to comply with the rulings.	No	Miscellaneous
85	Measures Affecting Textiles and Apparel Products	Textiles	European Communities	United States	22 May 1997	GATT 1947: III; Rules of Origin: II; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT): II; Textiles and Clothing: II; Textiles and Clothing: IV	<p>On 22 May 1987, the EC requested consultations with the United States in respect of certain measures of the US Government relating to textiles and apparel products.</p> <p>On 22 May 1987, the EC requested consultations with the United States in respect of certain measures of the US Government relating to textiles and apparel products.</p> <p>On 22 May 1987, the EC requested consultations with the United States in respect of certain measures of the US Government relating to textiles and apparel products.</p>	The European Communities (EC) filed a complaint against the United States (US) regarding changes made to the US rules of origin for textiles and apparel products. The EC alleged that these changes violated several WTO agreements, including the Agreement on Textiles and Clothing (ATC), the Agreement on Rules of Origin, and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). The dispute was resolved in 1998 when the two parties reached a mutually agreed solution.	No	Textiles
86	Measures Affecting the Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights	Copyright and Related Rights	United States	Sweden	28 May 1997	Intellectual Property (TRIPS): 50; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): 63; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): 65	<p>On 28 May 1987, the US requested consultations with Sweden in respect of certain measures of the Swedish Government relating to the enforcement of intellectual property rights.</p> <p>On 28 May 1987, the US requested consultations with Sweden in respect of certain measures of the Swedish Government relating to the enforcement of intellectual property rights.</p> <p>On 28 May 1987, the US requested consultations with Sweden in respect of certain measures of the Swedish Government relating to the enforcement of intellectual property rights.</p>	The WTO dispute titled "Measures Affecting the Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights" involved a complaint by the United States against Sweden for allegedly failing to provide provisional measures in civil proceedings related to intellectual property rights. The United States claimed that Sweden's actions violated the TRIPS Agreement. The dispute was resolved through a mutually agreed solution between the two parties.	Yes	Miscellaneous
87	Taxes on Alcoholic Beverages	Alcoholic Beverages	European Communities	Chile	4 June 1997	GATT 1947: III:2	<p>On 4 June 1987, the EC requested consultations with Chile in respect of certain measures of the Chilean Government relating to taxes on alcoholic beverages.</p> <p>On 4 June 1987, the EC requested consultations with Chile in respect of certain measures of the Chilean Government relating to taxes on alcoholic beverages.</p> <p>On 4 June 1987, the EC requested consultations with Chile in respect of certain measures of the Chilean Government relating to taxes on alcoholic beverages.</p>	The WTO dispute settlement process successfully resolved the complaint that Chile's tax system discriminated against imported spirits compared to locally produced Pisco. The Panel and Appellate Body found the tax system inconsistent with Article III:2 of GATT 1994, leading Chile to amend its tax laws to eliminate the discrimination. Chile implemented the changes within the specified timeframe, ensuring compliance with the DSB's recommendations.	No	Miscellaneous
88	Measure Affecting Government Procurement	General	European Communities	United States	20 June 1997	Government Procurement (GPA): VII; Government Procurement (GPA): III; Government Procurement (GPA): XIII; Government Procurement (GPA): XXII:2	<p>On 20 June 1987, the EC requested consultations with the United States in respect of certain measures of the US Government relating to government procurement.</p> <p>On 20 June 1987, the EC requested consultations with the United States in respect of certain measures of the US Government relating to government procurement.</p> <p>On 20 June 1987, the EC requested consultations with the United States in respect of certain measures of the US Government relating to government procurement.</p>	The European Communities brought a complaint against the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for an Act that prohibited public authorities from procuring goods or services from companies doing business with Myanmar. The EC argued that this violated the General Agreement on Procurement (GPA) and impeded the attainment of its objectives. The panel proceedings were suspended at the request of the complainants due to a court ruling in the United States barring implementation of the measure.	No	Miscellaneous
89	Anti-Dumping Duties on Imports of Colour Television Receivers from Korea	Machinery and Appliances	Korea, Republic of	United States	10 July 1997	Anti-dumping: I; Anti-dumping: II; Anti-dumping: III:1; Anti-dumping: III:2; Anti-dumping: 4.1; Anti-dumping: V:4; Anti-dumping: V:8; Anti-dumping: 5.10; Anti-dumping: XI:1; Anti-dumping: XI:2; Anti-dumping: 11.4; GATT 1947: VI	<p>On 10 July 1987, the US requested consultations with Korea in respect of certain measures of the Korean Government relating to anti-dumping duties.</p> <p>On 10 July 1987, the US requested consultations with Korea in respect of certain measures of the Korean Government relating to anti-dumping duties.</p> <p>On 10 July 1987, the US requested consultations with Korea in respect of certain measures of the Korean Government relating to anti-dumping duties.</p>	South Korea challenged the US's anti-dumping duties on Korean color television receivers, arguing that these duties were maintained despite the absence of dumping and the cessation of Korean exports, violating various WTO agreements. Despite requesting a panel establishment, Korea later withdrew its request, reserving the right to reintroduce it in the future.	No	Manufacturing

	Subsidies Provided to Producers and Exporters of Automotive Leather	Textiles	United States	Australia	4 May 1998	Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): III; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): 3.1(a)	<p>Existing subsidies provided to Australian leather exporters were terminated by the Australian Government in 1994. The Australian Government then provided a new export credit guarantee scheme to Australian leather exporters. The United States Government then requested the establishment of a panel. On 22 May 1998, the DSB established a panel under DSU/1994. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested the Dispute Settlement Body to establish the panel. On 27 October 1998, the United States requested</p>
--	---	----------	---------------	-----------	------------	---	--

137	Measures Affecting Imports of Wood of Conifers from Canada	Agricultural and Food	Canada	European Communities	17 June 1998	GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: III; GATT 1947: XI; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); II; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); III; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); IV; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); V; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); VI; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT); II	<p>Consultations with the EC in respect of certain measures concerning the importation of certain species of coniferous wood. The measures include, but are not limited to, Council Directive 77/93 of 21 November 1976, as amended by Council Directive 85/1032 of 21 November 1985, and Commission Decision 92/184/EEC of 14 February 1992, which imposed a ban on the importation of certain species of coniferous wood from Canada into the EC. Canada requested the EC to withdraw these measures and to allow the importation of such wood.</p> <p>On 17 June 1998, the EC accepted the EC's request to withdraw the measures and to allow the importation of such wood.</p>	Canada initiated WTO dispute proceedings against the European Community (EC) over measures affecting imports of wood of conifers from Canada. Canada alleged violations of several articles of the GATT 1994, the SPS Agreement, and the TBT Agreement, claiming that the measures adversely affected the importation of Canadian wood of conifers into the EC market. Canada also sought compensation for alleged nullification and impairment of trade benefits.	No	Agriculture
138	Imposition of Countervailing Duties on Certain Hot-Rolled Lead and Bismuth Carbon Steel Products Originating in the United Kingdom	Raw and Semi-finished	United States	European Communities	12 June 1998	Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); 1.1(b); Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); X; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); XIV; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); XIX:4	<p>Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); 1.1(b); Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); X; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); XIV; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); XIX:4</p> <p>On 12 June 1998, the EC accepted the EC's request to withdraw the measures and to allow the importation of such wood.</p>	The WTO dispute case, brought by the European Communities against the United States, challenged the imposition of countervailing duties on hot-rolled lead and bismuth carbon steel products from the UK. The panel and the Appellate Body found that the US violated the Subsidies Agreement by presuming subsidies based on past ownership without examining the actual production circumstances of the exporting companies. This established the principle that changes in ownership can rebut the presumption of subsidy continuity, requiring an assessment of the specific conditions surrounding such changes.	No	Manufacturing
139	Certain Measures Affecting the Automotive Industry	Vehicles	Japan	Canada	3 July 1998	Services (GATS); II; Services (GATS); VI; Services (GATS); XVII; GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: III;4; GATT 1994: XXIV; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); III; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); 3.1(a); Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); III:2; Trade-Related Investment Measures (TRIMs); II	<p>Services (GATS); II; Services (GATS); VI; Services (GATS); XVII; GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: III;4; GATT 1994: XXIV; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); III; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); 3.1(a); Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); III:2; Trade-Related Investment Measures (TRIMs); II</p> <p>On 3 July 1998, the EC accepted the EC's request to withdraw the measures and to allow the importation of such wood.</p>	Canada's automotive industry measures, including duty-free treatment and export subsidies, were found to be inconsistent with WTO agreements. The dispute resulted in a panel and Appellate Body ruling against Canada, leading to the modification of these measures to comply with WTO requirements.	No	Manufacturing
140	Anti-Dumping Investigations Regarding Unbleached Cotton Fabrics from India	Textiles	India	European Communities	3 August 1998	Anti-dumping; II; Anti-dumping; III; Anti-dumping; IV; Anti-dumping; V; Anti-dumping; VI; Anti-dumping; VII; Anti-dumping; IX; Anti-dumping; XII; Anti-dumping; XV; GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: VI	<p>Anti-dumping; II; Anti-dumping; III; Anti-dumping; IV; Anti-dumping; V; Anti-dumping; VI; Anti-dumping; VII; Anti-dumping; IX; Anti-dumping; XII; Anti-dumping; XV; GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: VI</p> <p>On 3 August 1998, the EC accepted the EC's request to withdraw the measures and to allow the importation of such wood.</p>	India filed a complaint against the European Community (EC) for allegedly misusing anti-dumping investigations on unbleached cotton fabrics from India. India claimed violations of various provisions of the Anti-Dumping Agreement and GATT 1994, alleging that the EC's actions nullified and impaired the benefits it received under these agreements.	No	Textiles
141	Anti-Dumping Duties on Imports of Cotton-type Bed Linen from India	Textiles	India	European Communities	3 August 1998	Anti-dumping; III; Anti-dumping; III:1; Anti-dumping; III:2; Anti-dumping; III:4; Anti-dumping; III:5; Anti-dumping; IV; Anti-dumping; 4.1; Anti-dumping; V; Anti-dumping; V:2; Anti-dumping; V:3; Anti-dumping; V:4; Anti-dumping; V:8; Anti-dumping; VI; Anti-dumping; XII; Anti-dumping; 12.2.2; Anti-dumping; XV; GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: VI	<p>Anti-dumping; III; Anti-dumping; III:1; Anti-dumping; III:2; Anti-dumping; III:4; Anti-dumping; III:5; Anti-dumping; IV; Anti-dumping; 4.1; Anti-dumping; V; Anti-dumping; V:2; Anti-dumping; V:3; Anti-dumping; V:4; Anti-dumping; V:8; Anti-dumping; VI; Anti-dumping; XII; Anti-dumping; 12.2.2; Anti-dumping; XV; GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: VI</p> <p>On 3 August 1998, the EC accepted the EC's request to withdraw the measures and to allow the importation of such wood.</p>	In this case, India challenged the anti-dumping duties imposed by the EC on imports of cotton-type bed linen from India. The EC implemented the DSB's recommendations but India contested the EC's new regulation and initiated Article 21.5 proceedings. The compliance panel ultimately found the EC's definitive anti-dumping measure consistent with the Anti-Dumping Agreement, but the Appellate Body recommended that the EC bring its measure into conformity with the Agreement. The DSB adopted the Appellate Body's report and the EC implemented the recommendations.	No	Textiles
142	Certain Measures Affecting the Automotive Industry	Vehicles	Canada	European Communities	17 August 1998	Services (GATS); VI; Services (GATS); XVII; GATT 1947: I; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); 3.1(a); Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); 3.1(b); Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); III:2; Trade-Related Investment Measures (TRIMs); II; Services (GATS); II	<p>Services (GATS); VI; Services (GATS); XVII; GATT 1947: I; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); 3.1(a); Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); 3.1(b); Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); III:2; Trade-Related Investment Measures (TRIMs); II; Services (GATS); II</p> <p>On 17 August 1998, the EC accepted the EC's request to withdraw the measures and to allow the importation of such wood.</p>	The WTO dispute panel ruled that certain Canadian measures affecting the automotive industry violated the Subsidies Agreement due to export subsidies provided to automakers. The Appellate Body upheld this finding, and Canada agreed to withdraw the export subsidy within 90 days. The reasonable period of time for compliance was determined to be 8 months, and Canada complied with the DSB recommendations by February 2001.	No	Manufacturing
143	Measure Affecting Import Duty on Wheat from Hungary	Agricultural and Food	Hungary	Slovak Republic	19 September 1998	Agriculture; IV; GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: II; GATT 1947: V; GATT 1947: XI; GATT 1994: XXIV:12; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); II; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); III; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); IV; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); V; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); VI; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); XIII; GATT	<p>Agriculture; IV; GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: II; GATT 1947: V; GATT 1947: XI; GATT 1994: XXIV:12; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); II; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); III; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); IV; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); V; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); VI; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); XIII; GATT</p> <p>On 19 September 1998, the EC accepted the EC's request to withdraw the measures and to allow the importation of such wood.</p>	Hungary initiated a WTO dispute case against the Slovak Republic, alleging that the Slovak Republic increased import duties on wheat from Hungary, which caused significant economic and trade losses. Hungary invoked the urgency provision of the DSU given the short-lived nature of the measure, which was expected to be in force until March 1999. The DSB deferred the establishment of a panel at its meeting on October 21, 1998.	No	Agriculture
144	Certain Measures Affecting the Import of Cattle, Swine and Grain from Canada	Agricultural and Food	Canada	United States	25 September 1998	Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); II; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); III; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); IV; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); V; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); VI; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); XIII; GATT	<p>Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); II; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); III; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); IV; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); V; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); VI; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); XIII; GATT</p> <p>On 25 September 1998, the EC accepted the EC's request to withdraw the measures and to allow the importation of such wood.</p>	Canada alleges that certain measures imposed by the US state of South Dakota and other states, prohibiting entry or transit to Canadian trucks carrying cattle, swine, and grain, violate various provisions of the SPS Agreement, TBT Agreement, Agreement on Agriculture, and GATT 1994. Canada claims that these measures adversely affect the importation of these products from Canada and has requested consultations with the US.	No	Agriculture
145	Countervailing Duties on Imports of Wheat Gluten from the European Communities	Agricultural and Food	European Communities	Argentina	23 September 1998	Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); X; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); 11.11	<p>Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); X; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); 11.11</p> <p>On 23 September 1998, the EC accepted the EC's request to withdraw the measures and to allow the importation of such wood.</p>	The European Communities (EC) alleged that Argentina imposed countervailing duties on EC wheat gluten imports exceeding an 18-month investigation period, violating the Subsidies Agreement's Article 11.11. The EC also asserted an Article 10 violation.	No	Agriculture
146	Measures Affecting the Automotive Sector	Vehicles	India	European Communities	6 October 1998	GATT 1947: III; GATT 1947: XI; Trade-Related Investment Measures (TRIMs); II; Trade-Related Investment Measures (TRIMs); II:1	<p>GATT 1947: III; GATT 1947: XI; Trade-Related Investment Measures (TRIMs); II; Trade-Related Investment Measures (TRIMs); II:1</p> <p>On 6 October 1998, the EC accepted the EC's request to withdraw the measures and to allow the importation of such wood.</p>	The WTO dispute over India's automotive sector measures highlighted concerns from the European Communities (EC) and the United States (US) regarding requirements for manufacturing firms in the sector. The Panel found that India's measures violated WTO agreements, and India subsequently withdrew its appeal, implementing the Panel's recommendations to bring its measures into compliance.	No	Manufacturing

147	Tariff Quotas and Subsidies Affecting Leather	Other Products	European Communities	Japan	8 October 1998	Import Licensing: 1.6; Import Licensing: 3.5(g); Import Licensing: 3.5(h); Import Licensing: 3.5(i); Import Licensing: 3.5(j); Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): VI	Consulted by the European Communities. On 6 October 1988, the EC requested consultations with Japan concerning the management of the tariff quotas for leather and the leather industry. The EC alleged that Japan's management of tariff quotas and subsidies in the leather industry. The EC asserted that Japan's management of tariff quotas and subsidies granted to the industry and certain regions violated various provisions of the Import Licensing Agreement and the Subsidies Agreement. The specific allegations included violations of Article 1(6), 3(5)(g), (h), (i), and (j) of the former agreement and Article 6 of the latter.	No	Financial
148	Measure Affecting Import Duty on Wheat from Hungary	Agricultural and Food	Hungary	Czech Republic	12 October 1998	Agriculture: IV; GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: II	Invoked in Hungary. On 10 October 1988, Hungary requested consultations with the Czech Republic in respect of a measure adopted by the Czech Republic which reduced the import duty on wheat from Hungary. Hungary alleged that the reduction in import duty was a violation of Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947. Hungary also alleged that the measure was a violation of Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947. Hungary also alleged that the measure was a violation of Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947. Hungary also alleged that the measure was a violation of Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947.	No	Agriculture
149	Import Restrictions	General	European Communities	India	28 October 1998	Licensing: II; Import Licensing: III	Invoked by the European Communities. On 28 October 1988, the EC requested consultations with India concerning import restrictions. The EC alleged that India's import restrictions violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947. The EC also alleged that India's import restrictions violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947. The EC also alleged that India's import restrictions violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947. The EC also alleged that India's import restrictions violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947.	No	Miscellaneous
150	Measures Affecting Customs Duties	General	European Communities	India	31 October 1998	GATT 1947: II:1; GATT 1947: III:2	Consulted by the European Communities. On 30 October 1988, the EC requested consultations with India concerning customs duties. The EC alleged that India's customs duties violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947. The EC also alleged that India's customs duties violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947. The EC also alleged that India's customs duties violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947. The EC also alleged that India's customs duties violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947.	No	Manufacturing
151	Measures Affecting Textiles and Apparel Products (II)	Textiles	European Communities	United States	19 November 1998	GATT 1947: III; Rules of Origin: II; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT): Annex I; Textiles and Clothing: 2.4; Textiles and Clothing: 4.2; Textiles and Clothing: 4.4	Consulted by the European Communities. The dispute, which began in November 1988, is in respect of alleged changes to US rules of origin for textiles and apparel products. The EC alleged that the US measures violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947. The EC also alleged that the US measures violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947. The EC also alleged that the US measures violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947. The EC also alleged that the US measures violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947.	No	Textiles
152	Sections 301-310 of the Trade Act 1974	General	European Communities	United States	25 November 1998	Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU): III; Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU): XXI; Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU): XXII; Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU): XXIII; GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: II; GATT 1947: III; GATT 1947: VIII; GATT 1947: XI; Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization: XVI:4	Invoked by the United States. On 25 November 1988, the US requested consultations with the EC concerning the US Trade Act of 1974. The US alleged that the US Trade Act of 1974 violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947. The US also alleged that the US Trade Act of 1974 violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947. The US also alleged that the US Trade Act of 1974 violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947. The US also alleged that the US Trade Act of 1974 violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947.	No	Agriculture
153	Patent Protection for Pharmaceutical and Agricultural Chemical Products	Patents	Canada	European Communities	2 December 1998	Intellectual Property (TRIPS): 27.1	Consulted by Canada. On 2 December 1988, Canada requested consultations with the EC concerning the EC's patent protection regime for pharmaceutical and agricultural chemical products. The EC alleged that the EC's patent protection regime violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947. The EC also alleged that the EC's patent protection regime violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947. The EC also alleged that the EC's patent protection regime violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947. The EC also alleged that the EC's patent protection regime violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947.	Yes	Healthcare
154	Measures Affecting Differential and Favourable Treatment of Coffee	Agricultural and Food	Brazil	European Communities	7 December 1998	GATT 1947: I	Invoked by Brazil. On 7 December 1988, Brazil requested consultations with the EC concerning the EC's preferential treatment of coffee imports from Brazil. The EC alleged that the EC's preferential treatment of coffee imports from Brazil violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947. The EC also alleged that the EC's preferential treatment of coffee imports from Brazil violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947. The EC also alleged that the EC's preferential treatment of coffee imports from Brazil violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947. The EC also alleged that the EC's preferential treatment of coffee imports from Brazil violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947.	No	Agriculture
155	Measures Affecting the Export of Bovine Hides and the Import of Finished Leather	Raw and Semi-finished	European Communities	Argentina	23 December 1998	GATT 1947: III:2; GATT 1947: XI:1; GATT 1947: X:3(a)	The European Communities alleged that Argentina's export prohibition on raw and semi-tanned bovine hides, its additional value-added tax on imported products, and its advance turnover tax were all found to be in violation of WTO agreements. After adopting the panel report, the DSB arbitrated a reasonable period for Argentina to implement the recommendations, which was set at 12 months and 12 days from February 2001.	No	Agriculture
156	Definitive Anti-Dumping Measure on Grey Portland Cement from Mexico	Other Products	Mexico	Guatemala	5 January 1999	Anti-dumping: I; Anti-dumping: II; Anti-dumping: III; Anti-dumping: V; Anti-dumping: VI; Anti-dumping: VII; Anti-dumping: IX; Anti-dumping: XII; Anti-dumping: XVII; Anti-dumping: Annex I; Anti-dumping: Annex II; GATT 1947: VI	Consulted by Mexico. On 5 January 1988, Mexico requested consultations with Guatemala concerning the definitive anti-dumping measure on grey Portland cement from Mexico. Mexico alleged that the measure violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947. Mexico also alleged that the measure violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947. Mexico also alleged that the measure violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947. Mexico also alleged that the measure violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947.	No	Manufacturing
157	Definitive Anti-Dumping Measures on Imports of Drill Bits from Italy	Machinery and Appliances	European Communities	Argentina	14 January 1999	Anti-dumping: I; Anti-dumping: 5.10	Consulted by the European Communities. On 14 January 1988, the EC requested consultations with Argentina concerning the definitive anti-dumping measure on imports of drill bits from Italy. The EC alleged that the measure violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947. The EC also alleged that the measure violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947. The EC also alleged that the measure violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947. The EC also alleged that the measure violated Article 1(6) of the GATT 1947.	No	Manufacturing

178	Safeguard Measure on Imports of Fresh, Chilled or Frozen Lamb from Australia	Agricultural and Food	Australia	United States	23 July 1999	GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: II; GATT 1994: XIX; Safeguards: II; Safeguards: III; Safeguards: IV; Safeguards: V; Safeguards: VI; Safeguards: VIII; Safeguards: XI; Safeguards: XII	<p>THE DISPUTE BETWEEN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND AGAINST THE US SAFEGUARD MEASURE ON LAMB IMPORTS RESULTED IN A PANEL RULING THAT THE MEASURE VIOLATED WTO AGREEMENTS. THE US APPEALED THE RULING BUT THE APPELLATE BODY UPHOLD THE PANEL'S FINDINGS. THE US SUBSEQUENTLY AGREED TO IMPLEMENT THE DSB'S RECOMMENDATIONS AND LIFTED THE SAFEGUARD MEASURE BY NOVEMBER 2001.</p>	No	Agriculture
179	Anti-Dumping measures on Stainless Steel Plate in Coils and Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip from Korea	Raw and Semi-finished	Korea, Republic of	United States	30 July 1999	Anti-dumping: II; Anti-dumping: II.1; Anti-dumping: VI.1; Anti-dumping: VI.2; Anti-dumping: 6.9; Anti-dumping: XII; Anti-dumping: XII.2; GATT 1947: VI; GATT 1947: X.3	<p>SOUTH KOREA ALLEGED THAT THE UNITED STATES' ANTI-DUMPING MEASURES ON STAINLESS STEEL FROM KOREA CONTAINED CALCULATION ERRORS THAT VIOLATED THE ANTI-DUMPING AGREEMENT AND GATT 1994. THE WTO PANEL AGREED WITH SOUTH KOREA, LEADING THE UNITED STATES TO IMPLEMENT THE DSB'S RECOMMENDATIONS BY SEPTEMBER 1, 2001.</p>	No	Manufacturing
180	Reclassification of Certain Sugar Syrups	Agricultural and Food	Canada	United States	6 September 1999	Agriculture: IV; GATT 1947: II	<p>CANADA CHALLENGED THE US'S RECLASSIFICATION OF SUGAR SYRUPS, ARGUING THAT IT VIOLATED WTO RULES ON TARIFFS AND SUBSIDIES. CANADA CLAIMED THAT THE RECLASSIFICATION WOULD HARM ITS EXPORTS BY MAKING THEM MORE EXPENSIVE FOR US CONSUMERS. THE DISPUTE HIGHLIGHTS THE IMPORTANCE OF FAIR COMPETITION AND THE POTENTIAL IMPACT OF TRADE MEASURES ON INTERNATIONAL MARKETS.</p>	No	Agriculture
181	Safeguard Measure of Imports of Plain Polyester Filaments from Thailand	Textiles	Thailand	Colombia	28-Sep-98	Art. 2, 6.7 of ATC	<p>COLOMBIA'S SAFEGUARD MEASURE ON PLAIN POLYESTER FILAMENTS FROM THAILAND WAS CHALLENGED BY THAILAND, ALLEGING INCONSISTENCY WITH ARTICLES 2.2 AND 2.3 OF THE AGREEMENT ON TEXTILES AND CLOTHING. THE TEXTILES MONITORING BODY TWICE RECOMMENDED THAT COLOMBIA RESCIND THE MEASURE. COLOMBIA NOTIFIED THE TMB OF ITS INABILITY TO COMPLY, PROVIDING REASONS. THE RESOLUTION OF THIS DISPUTE WOULD DEPEND ON THE PANEL'S FINDINGS AND FURTHER NEGOTIATIONS.</p>	No	Textiles
182	Provisional Anti-Dumping Measure on Cement from Mexico	Other Products	Mexico	Ecuador	5 October 1999	Anti-dumping: I; Anti-dumping: II; Anti-dumping: III; Anti-dumping: IV; Anti-dumping: V; Anti-dumping: VI; Anti-dumping: VII; Anti-dumping: IX; Anti-dumping: XII; Anti-dumping: XVII; Anti-dumping: Annex II; GATT 1947: VI	<p>MEXICO INITIATED A FORMAL COMPLAINT AGAINST ECUADOR AT THE WTO OVER A PROVISIONAL ANTI-DUMPING MEASURE IMPOSED ON MEXICAN CEMENT. MEXICO ALLEGED THAT THE MEASURE AND PRECEDING ACTIONS VIOLATED SEVERAL PROVISIONS OF THE ANTI-DUMPING AGREEMENT AND GATT 1994, INCLUDING THOSE RELATED TO THE INVESTIGATION, CALCULATION OF DUMPING MARGINS, AND APPLICATION OF PROVISIONAL MEASURES.</p>	No	Manufacturing
183	Measures on Import Licensing and Minimum Import Prices	Import Licensing	European Communities	Brazil	14 October 1999	Agriculture: 4.2; GATT 1947: II; GATT 1947: VIII; GATT 1947: X; GATT 1947: XI; Import Licensing: V; Import Licensing: VIII; Customs valuation: I; Customs valuation: II; Customs valuation: III; Customs valuation: IV; Customs valuation: V; Customs valuation: VI; Customs valuation: VII	<p>THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES ALLEGED THAT BRAZIL'S NON-AUTOMATIC LICENSING SYSTEM AND MINIMUM PRICING PRACTICES VIOLATED VARIOUS WTO AGREEMENTS, RESTRICTING IMPORTS FROM THE EC AND PARTICULARLY AFFECTING TEXTILE PRODUCTS, SORBITOL, AND CARBOXYMETHYLCELLOULOSE (CMC). THE EC SPECIFICALLY CITED VIOLATIONS OF THE GATT 1994, AGREEMENT ON AGRICULTURE, AGREEMENT ON IMPORT LICENSING PROCEDURES, AND AGREEMENT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF ARTICLE VII OF THE GATT 1994.</p>	No	Textiles
184	Anti-Dumping Measures on Certain Hot-Rolled Steel Products from Japan	Machinery and Appliances	Japan	United States	18 November 1999	Anti-dumping: II; Anti-dumping: III; Anti-dumping: IV; Anti-dumping: VI; Anti-dumping: IX; Anti-dumping: X; Anti-dumping: XVIII; Anti-dumping: Annex I; Anti-dumping: Annex II; GATT 1947: VI; GATT 1947: X; Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization: XVI	<p>JAPAN CHALLENGED THE US DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION'S DETERMINATION ON ANTI-DUMPING MEASURES ON HOT-ROLLED STEEL PRODUCTS FROM JAPAN. THE WTO PANEL AND APPELLATE BODY FOUND VIOLATIONS OF GATT 1994 AND ANTI-DUMPING AGREEMENT. THE US WAS GIVEN A REASONABLE PERIOD TO IMPLEMENT THE RECOMMENDATIONS, WHICH WAS EXTENDED SEVERAL TIMES DUE TO LEGISLATIVE DELAYS. AS OF THE LAST UPDATE IN 2011, THE US HAD PARTIALLY IMPLEMENTED THE RECOMMENDATIONS, BUT SOME WERE STILL PENDING IMPLEMENTATION.</p>	No	Manufacturing
185	Anti-Dumping Measures on Pasta from Costa Rica	Agricultural and Food	Costa Rica	Trinidad and Tobago	18 November 1999	Anti-dumping: II; Anti-dumping: III; Anti-dumping: V; Anti-dumping: VI; Anti-dumping: XII	<p>COSTA RICA ALLEGED THAT TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO'S ANTI-DUMPING MEASURES ON PASTA WERE NOT IN LINE WITH THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS AS OUTLINED IN THE ANTI-DUMPING AGREEMENT. COSTA RICA SPECIFICALLY CLAIMED VIOLATIONS OF ARTICLES 2, 3, 5, 6, AND 12 OF SAID AGREEMENT, TRIGGERING THE INITIATION OF CONSULTATIONS BETWEEN THE TWO PARTIES.</p>	No	Agriculture
186	Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 and Amendments thereto	Section 337	European Communities	United States	12 January 2000	GATT 1947: III; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): II; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): IX; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): XXVII; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): 41; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): 42; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): 49; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): 50; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): 51	<p>THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES ALLEGED THAT SECTION 337 OF THE UNITED STATES' TARIFF ACT AND ITS RELATED REGULATIONS VIOLATED MULTIPLE PROVISIONS OF THE GATT 1994 AND TRIPS AGREEMENT, INCLUDING THOSE RELATED TO NATIONAL TREATMENT, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PROTECTION, AND DUE PROCESS.</p>	Yes	Manufacturing
187	Provisional Anti-Dumping Measure on Macaroni and Spaghetti from Costa Rica	Agricultural and Food	Costa Rica	Trinidad and Tobago	17 January 2000	Anti-dumping: I; Anti-dumping: II; Anti-dumping: III; Anti-dumping: V; Anti-dumping: VI; Anti-dumping: VII; Anti-dumping: X; Anti-dumping: XII; Anti-dumping: XVIII; Anti-dumping: Annex I; Anti-dumping: Annex II	<p>COSTA RICA ALLEGED THAT TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO'S PROVISIONAL ANTI-DUMPING MEASURES ON MACARONI AND SPAGHETTI FROM COSTA RICA, AS WELL AS PRECEDING ACTIONS AND RELATED LEGISLATION, WERE INCONSISTENT WITH THE ANTI-DUMPING AGREEMENT, PARTICULARLY PROVISIONS RELATED TO DUMPING INVESTIGATIONS, DETERMINATIONS OF INJURY, IMPOSITION AND COLLECTION OF DUTIES, TRANSPARENCY, AND REVIEW.</p>	No	Agriculture
188	Measures Affecting Imports from Honduras and Colombia	General	Colombia	Nicaragua	17 January 2000	Services (GATS): II; Services (GATS): XVI; GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: II	<p>COLOMBIA COMPLAINED TO THE WTO ABOUT NICARAGUA'S LAW 325 AND DECRETE 129-99, WHICH IMPOSED CHARGES ON GOODS AND SERVICES FROM HONDURAS AND COLOMBIA. COLOMBIA CLAIMED THESE MEASURES VIOLATED GATT 1994 ARTICLES I AND II. A WTO PANEL WAS ESTABLISHED TO EXAMINE THE ALLEGATIONS, AND CANADA, COSTA RICA, THE EC, HONDURAS, AND THE US RESERVED THEIR THIRD-PARTY RIGHTS.</p>	No	Miscellaneous

189	Definitive Anti-Dumping Measures on Carton-Board Imports from Germany and Definitive Anti-Dumping Measures on Imports of Ceramic Tiles from Italy	General	European Communities	Argentina	26 January 2000	Anti-dumping: II; Anti-dumping: 2.4; Anti-dumping: VI.5; Anti-dumping: 6.8; Anti-dumping: 6.9; Anti-dumping: 6.10; Anti-dumping: Annex I	<p>Article 17 of the Argentine Decree No. 158/1999, which established the definitive anti-dumping measures, was challenged by the European Communities. The EC requested the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) to recommend that Argentina revoke the measures. Argentina refused to do so, claiming that the measures were justified on the basis of the information provided by the Argentine authorities. The DSB found that Argentina had not provided sufficient information to justify the measures and recommended that Argentina revoke them. Argentina refused to do so, and the DSB recommended that the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) refer the matter to the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) for further consideration.</p> <p>The DSB recommended that Argentina revoke the measures. Argentina refused to do so, and the DSB recommended that the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) refer the matter to the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) for further consideration.</p>	Argentina's definitive anti-dumping measures on imported ceramic tiles from Italy were deemed incompatible with the WTO's Anti-Dumping Agreement after an investigation by the European Communities (EC). The EC alleged that the measures were applied without proper consideration of relevant information, failed to account for differences in product characteristics, and did not provide exporters with adequate notification. The Panel agreed with the EC, resulting in the DSB adopting the Panel's report and requiring Argentina to revoke the measures. Argentina promptly complied, indicating a commitment to upholding WTO regulations.	No	Manufacturing
190	Transitional Safeguard Measures on Certain Imports of Woven Fabric Products of Cotton and Cotton Mixtures Originating in Brazil	Textiles	Brazil	Argentina	11 February 2000	Textiles and Clothing: II; Textiles and Clothing: VI; Textiles and Clothing: VIII	<p>The Transitional Safeguard Measures on Certain Imports of Woven Fabric Products of Cotton and Cotton Mixtures Originating in Brazil were challenged by Argentina. Argentina claimed that the measures were inconsistent with the WTO's Safeguard Measures Agreement. The DSB found that Argentina had not provided sufficient information to justify the measures and recommended that Argentina revoke them. Argentina refused to do so, and the DSB recommended that the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) refer the matter to the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) for further consideration.</p> <p>The DSB recommended that Argentina revoke the measures. Argentina refused to do so, and the DSB recommended that the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) refer the matter to the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) for further consideration.</p>	Brazil filed a complaint against Argentina's transitional safeguard measures on cotton and cotton mixture imports. Argentina considered itself unable to comply with the Textile Monitoring Body's (TMB) recommendation to rescind the measures. The dispute panel was established by the DSB, but the parties reached a mutually agreed solution, allowing Brazil to resume the dispute if necessary.	No	Textiles
191	Definitive Anti-Dumping Measure on Cement from Mexico	Other Products	Mexico	Ecuador	15 March 2000	Anti-dumping: I; Anti-dumping: II; Anti-dumping: III; Anti-dumping: IV; Anti-dumping: V; Anti-dumping: VI; Anti-dumping: VII; Anti-dumping: IX; Anti-dumping: XII; Anti-dumping: XVIII; Anti-dumping: Annex II; GATT 1947: VI	<p>The Definitive Anti-Dumping Measure on Cement from Mexico was challenged by Ecuador. Ecuador claimed that the measure was inconsistent with the WTO's Anti-Dumping Agreement. The DSB found that Ecuador had not provided sufficient information to justify the measure and recommended that Ecuador revoke it. Ecuador refused to do so, and the DSB recommended that the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) refer the matter to the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) for further consideration.</p> <p>The DSB recommended that Ecuador revoke the measure. Ecuador refused to do so, and the DSB recommended that the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) refer the matter to the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) for further consideration.</p>	Mexico alleged that Ecuador's definitive anti-dumping measure on cement from Mexico violates multiple provisions of the Anti-Dumping Agreement and GATT 1994, including fair trade practices, transparency, and non-discrimination. The dispute highlights concerns over the proper application of anti-dumping measures and Ecuador's compliance with international trade rules.	No	Manufacturing
192	Transitional Safeguard Measure on Combed Cotton Yarn from Pakistan	Textiles	Pakistan	United States	03-Apr-00	Art. 2.4, 6.10, 8.10 of ATC	<p>The Transitional Safeguard Measure on Combed Cotton Yarn from Pakistan was challenged by the United States. The US claimed that the measure was inconsistent with the WTO's Safeguard Measures Agreement. The DSB found that the US had not provided sufficient information to justify the measure and recommended that the US revoke it. The US refused to do so, and the DSB recommended that the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) refer the matter to the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) for further consideration.</p> <p>The DSB recommended that the US revoke the measure. The US refused to do so, and the DSB recommended that the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) refer the matter to the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) for further consideration.</p>	The WTO Dispute Settlement Body ruled that the United States' transitional safeguard measure on combed cotton yarn from Pakistan violated the Agreement on Textiles and Clothing. The US failed to properly define the domestic industry and consider the impact of imports from other suppliers individually when attributing serious damage to Pakistan's exports. The US implemented the DSB's recommendations by removing the import limit on Pakistani cotton yarn on November 9, 2001.	No	Textiles
193	Measures affecting the Transit and Importing of Swordfish	Agricultural and Food	European Communities	Chile	19 April 2000	GATT 1947: V; GATT 1947: V.1; GATT 1947: V.2; GATT 1947: XI; GATT 1947: XI.1; GATT 1947: V.3	<p>The measures affecting the transit and importing of swordfish were challenged by the European Communities. The EC claimed that the measures were inconsistent with the WTO's General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT). The DSB found that the EC had not provided sufficient information to justify the measures and recommended that the EC revoke them. The EC refused to do so, and the DSB recommended that the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) refer the matter to the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) for further consideration.</p> <p>The DSB recommended that the EC revoke the measures. The EC refused to do so, and the DSB recommended that the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) refer the matter to the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) for further consideration.</p>	The dispute between the European Communities and Chile regarding the prohibition on unloading swordfish in Chilean ports was suspended in 2001 when the parties reached a provisional arrangement. The suspension was maintained in 2003, 2005, and 2007, indicating an ongoing positive implementation of the arrangement and a resolution of the dispute without the need for a formal panel ruling.	No	Agriculture
194	Measures Treating Export Restraints as Subsidies	General	Canada	United States	19 May 2000	(SCM): I.1; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): X; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): XVII; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): XIX; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): 32.1; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): 32.5; Agreement Establishing the	<p>The measures treating export restraints as subsidies were challenged by Canada. Canada claimed that the measures were inconsistent with the WTO's Subsidies and Countervailing Measures Agreement. The DSB found that Canada had not provided sufficient information to justify the measures and recommended that Canada revoke them. Canada refused to do so, and the DSB recommended that the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) refer the matter to the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) for further consideration.</p> <p>The DSB recommended that Canada revoke the measures. Canada refused to do so, and the DSB recommended that the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) refer the matter to the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) for further consideration.</p>	Canada challenged US measures that treated export restraints as subsidies, arguing they violated WTO agreements. The US maintained its measures were consistent with WTO rules. The Panel agreed with Canada, finding the US measures inconsistent with WTO provisions. The DSB adopted the Panel's report, and the US subsequently notified the DSB of its intention to comply with the ruling.	No	Manufacturing
195	Measures Affecting Trade and Investment in the Motor Vehicle Sector	Vehicles	United States	Philippines	23 May 2000	GATT 1947: III.4; GATT 1947: III.5; GATT 1947: XI.1; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): 3.1(b); Trade-Related Investment Measures (TRIMs): II.1; Trade-Related Investment Measures (TRIMs): V.2; Trade-Related Investment Measures (TRIMs): V.5	<p>The measures affecting trade and investment in the motor vehicle sector were challenged by the Philippines. The Philippines claimed that the measures were inconsistent with the WTO's General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT). The DSB found that the Philippines had not provided sufficient information to justify the measures and recommended that the Philippines revoke them. The Philippines refused to do so, and the DSB recommended that the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) refer the matter to the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) for further consideration.</p> <p>The DSB recommended that the Philippines revoke the measures. The Philippines refused to do so, and the DSB recommended that the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) refer the matter to the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) for further consideration.</p>	The United States claims that the Philippines' Motor Vehicle Development Program (MVDP) violates WTO rules. The MVDP aims to protect the Philippines' motor vehicle industry by imposing various measures, including tariffs, quotas, and tax incentives. The United States argues that these measures are inconsistent with the Philippines' WTO commitments and adversely affect US exports of motor vehicles.	No	Manufacturing
196	Certain Measures on the Protection of Patents and Test Data	Patents	United States	Argentina	30 May 2000	Intellectual Property (TRIPS): XXVII; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): XXVIII; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): XXXI; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): XXXIV; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): XXXIX; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): 50; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): 62; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): 65; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): 70	<p>The certain measures on the protection of patents and test data were challenged by Argentina. Argentina claimed that the measures were inconsistent with the WTO's Trade-Related Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) Agreement. The DSB found that Argentina had not provided sufficient information to justify the measures and recommended that Argentina revoke them. Argentina refused to do so, and the DSB recommended that the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) refer the matter to the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) for further consideration.</p> <p>The DSB recommended that Argentina revoke the measures. Argentina refused to do so, and the DSB recommended that the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) refer the matter to the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) for further consideration.</p>	The dispute between the United States and Argentina centered on alleged inconsistencies between Argentina's legal regimes for patents and data protection and the TRIPS Agreement. The United States argued that Argentina's measures violated provisions related to patent protection, data protection, and exclusivity. After consultations, both parties reached an agreement on all matters raised in the dispute, resolving the issue amicably.	Yes	Healthcare
197	Measures on Minimum Import Prices	General	United States	Brazil	30 May 2000	Agriculture: 4.2; GATT 1947: II; GATT 1947: XI; Import Licensing: I; Import Licensing: III; Textiles and Clothing: II; Textiles and Clothing: VII; Customs valuation: I; Customs valuation: II; Customs valuation: III; Customs valuation: IV; Customs valuation: V; Customs valuation: VI; Customs valuation: VII; Customs valuation: XII; Customs valuation: Annex I	<p>The measures on minimum import prices were challenged by Brazil. Brazil claimed that the measures were inconsistent with the WTO's General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT). The DSB found that Brazil had not provided sufficient information to justify the measures and recommended that Brazil revoke them. Brazil refused to do so, and the DSB recommended that the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) refer the matter to the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) for further consideration.</p> <p>The DSB recommended that Brazil revoke the measures. Brazil refused to do so, and the DSB recommended that the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) refer the matter to the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) for further consideration.</p>	The United States initiated a complaint against Brazil for implementing minimum import prices for customs valuation. The US alleged that Brazil's system effectively prohibits or restricts imports with declared values below these minimums, violating various WTO agreements, including the Customs Valuation Agreement and the GATT 1994.	No	Miscellaneous
198	Measures on Minimum Import Prices	General	United States	Romania	30 May 2000	Agriculture: 4.2; GATT 1947: II; GATT 1947: X; GATT 1947: XI; Textiles and Clothing: II; Textiles and Clothing: VII; Customs valuation: I; Customs valuation: II; Customs valuation: III; Customs valuation: IV; Customs valuation: V; Customs valuation: VI; Customs valuation: VII; Customs valuation: XII; Customs valuation: Annex I	<p>The measures on minimum import prices were challenged by Romania. Romania claimed that the measures were inconsistent with the WTO's General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT). The DSB found that Romania had not provided sufficient information to justify the measures and recommended that Romania revoke them. Romania refused to do so, and the DSB recommended that the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) refer the matter to the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) for further consideration.</p> <p>The DSB recommended that Romania revoke the measures. Romania refused to do so, and the DSB recommended that the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) refer the matter to the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) for further consideration.</p>	The dispute between the United States and Romania arose from Romania's use of minimum import prices for customs valuation purposes, which the United States claimed were inconsistent with various WTO agreements. The parties reached a mutually satisfactory solution, thereby resolving the dispute without further proceedings before the WTO.	No	Manufacturing

199	Measures Affecting Patent Protection	Patents	United States	Brazil	30 May 2000	GATT 1947: III; Intellectual Property (TRIPS); XXVII; Intellectual Property (TRIPS); 27.1; Intellectual Property (TRIPS); XXVIII; Intellectual Property (TRIPS); 28.1	Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU); III:2; Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU); XXI:5; Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU); XXII; Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU); XXIII; GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: II; GATT 1947: XI; Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization: XVI:4	The United States filed a complaint against Brazil's industrial property law, specifically the "local working" requirement, arguing that it violated TRIPS and GATT 1994 obligations. After consultations, the parties reached a mutually satisfactory solution, resolving the dispute.	Yes	Miscellaneous
200	Section 306 of the Trade Act 1974 and Amendments thereto	General	European Communities	United States	5 June 2000			The dispute arose when the European Communities challenged Section 306 of the US Trade Act 1974, alleging it violated WTO provisions by unilaterally revising the list of products subject to sanctions after WTO dispute settlement proceedings. The EC argued that this action was inconsistent with the DSU, WTO Agreement, and GATT 1994.	No	Miscellaneous
201	Measures Affecting Imports from Honduras and Colombia	General	Honduras	Nicaragua	6 June 2000	Services (GATS); II; Services (GATS); XVI; GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: II		Honduras initiated a WTO dispute against Nicaragua over Law 325 and related measures, alleging violations of GATT 1994 Articles I and II and GATS Articles II and XVI. Honduras contended that these measures impose discriminatory taxes on goods and services from Honduras and Colombia, and restrict trade in these sectors. The dispute highlights the importance of adhering to WTO rules and ensuring non-discriminatory trade practices.	No	Miscellaneous
202	Definitive Safeguard Measures on Imports of Circular Welded Carbon Quality Line Pipe from Korea	Other Products	Korea, Republic of	United States	13 June 2000	GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: XIII; GATT 1994: XIX; Safeguards: II; Safeguards: III; Safeguards: IV; Safeguards: V; Safeguards: VII:1; Safeguards: VIII; Safeguards: IX:1; Safeguards: XI; Safeguards: XII		South Korea challenged the United States' definitive safeguard measure on imports of circular welded carbon quality line pipe from Korea. The US imposed the measure citing increased imports causing serious injury to the domestic industry. The WTO panel found that the US measure was inconsistent with certain provisions of GATT 1994 and the Safeguards Agreement. The Appellate Body upheld this finding. The US agreed to implement the DSB's recommendations within a reasonable timeframe.	No	Manufacturing
203	Measures Affecting Trade in Live Swine	Agricultural and Food	United States	Mexico	10 July 2000	dumping: XII; GATT 1947: III:4; GATT 1947: XI:1; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); II:2; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); II:3; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); III; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); V:1; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); V:6; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); VII; Sanitary and		The United States alleged that Mexico's anti-dumping measure on live swine for slaughter from the United States violated various provisions of the WTO's Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS) Agreement, Agriculture Agreement, Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) Agreement, and General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT 1994).	No	Agriculture
204	Measures Affecting Telecommunications Services	Communication	United States	Mexico	17 August 2000	Services (GATS); VI; Services (GATS): VI:1; Services (GATS): XVI; Services (GATS): XVI:1; Services (GATS): XVI:2; Services (GATS): XVII; Services (GATS): XVII:1; Services (GATS): XVII:2; Services (GATS): XVII:3; Services (GATS): XVII:4; Services (GATS): VI:5		The WTO dispute case concluded that Mexico had violated its GATS commitments by implementing anti-competitive and discriminatory measures in the telecommunications sector. In response, Mexico and the United States reached an agreement setting a 13-month timeline for Mexico to comply with the panel's recommendations. Mexico subsequently implemented changes in its resale regulations, which the United States deemed compliant with the DSB's recommendations.	No	Telecommunications
205	Import Prohibition on Canned Tuna with Soybean Oil	Agricultural and Food	Thailand	Egypt	22 September 2000	GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: XI; GATT 1947: XIII; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); II; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); III; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS); V; GATT 1994: Annex B		Egypt's ban on canned tuna from Thailand raised concerns from Thailand, who argued that it violated the GATT's articles on non-discrimination, quantitative restrictions, and general elimination of tariffs. Thailand also contended that Egypt failed to meet the SPS Agreement's requirements for scientific justification and risk assessment of import restrictions.	No	Agriculture
206	Anti-Dumping and Countervailing Measures on Steel Plate from India	Other Products	India	United States	4 October 2000	dumping: II:2; Anti-dumping: 2.4; Anti-dumping: III; Anti-dumping: V; Anti-dumping: VI; Anti-dumping: 6.8; Anti-dumping: 9.3; Anti-dumping: XII; Anti-dumping: XV; Anti-dumping: XVIII; Anti-dumping: 18.4; Anti-dumping: Annex II; GATT 1947: VI; GATT 1947: VI:1; GATT 1947: VI:2(a); GATT 1947: X; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); X; Subsidies and		In this dispute, India challenged the US's anti-dumping and countervailing measures on steel plate from India, arguing that they violated multiple WTO agreements. The Panel found that the US measures violated certain provisions of the Anti-Dumping Agreement and SCM Agreement, and recommended that the US bring its measures into compliance. The US and India agreed to a five-month implementation period, which was later extended to six months. The US informed the DSB that it had implemented the Panel's recommendations and rulings.	No	Manufacturing
207	Price Band System and Safeguard Measures Relating to Certain Agricultural Products	Agricultural and Food	Argentina	Chile	5 October 2000	Agriculture: IV; GATT 1947: II; GATT 1994: XIX:1; Safeguards: II; Safeguards: III; Safeguards: IV; Safeguards: V; Safeguards: VI; Safeguards: XII		This WTO dispute, initiated by Argentina against Chile, challenged Chile's price band system and safeguard measures for agricultural products. The measures were found to be inconsistent with Chile's obligations under the Agreement on Agriculture and the GATT 1994. After lengthy proceedings involving multiple appeals and binding arbitration, Chile eventually brought its measures into compliance with the DSB's rulings, resolving the dispute.	No	Agriculture
208	Anti-Dumping Duty on Steel and Iron Pipe Fittings	Other Products	Brazil	Turkey	9 October 2000	Anti-dumping: I; Anti-dumping: II; Anti-dumping: III; Anti-dumping: V; Anti-dumping: VI; Anti-dumping: XII; Anti-dumping: XV; GATT 1947: VI		Brazil filed a complaint against Turkey for imposing anti-dumping duties on Brazilian steel and iron pipe fittings. Brazil alleged that Turkey breached various provisions of the GATT 1994 and the Anti-Dumping Agreement, including failure to provide proper notifications, improper establishment of facts, and biased evaluation of facts.	No	Manufacturing
209	Measures Affecting Soluble Coffee	Agricultural and Food	Brazil	European Communities	12 October 2000	GATT 1947: I		Brazil filed a complaint with the WTO against the EC's Generalized System of Preferences (GSP), claiming that the "graduation" mechanism and "drugs regime" within the GSP scheme discriminated against Brazilian soluble coffee imports. Brazil alleged that these measures violated the EC's obligations under the Enabling Clause and Article I of GATT 1994. The outcome of the dispute is not stated in the provided summary.	No	Agriculture

220	Price Band System and Safeguard Measures Relating to Certain Agricultural Products	Agricultural and Food	Guatemala	Chile	5 January 2001	Agriculture: IV; GATT 1947: II; GATT 1994: XIX; Safeguards: II; Safeguards: III; Safeguards: IV; Safeguards: V; Safeguards: VI; Safeguards: VIII; Safeguards: XII	Consulted by Guatemala. On 21 January 2001, Guatemala requested consultations with Chile concerning the measures referred to.	Guatemala initiated a dispute with Chile at the WTO over the implementation of a price band system and safeguard measures on certain agricultural products. Guatemala believed these measures violated WTO rules, potentially harming its exports to Chile. The specific measures in question are not disclosed in the provided summary.	No	Agriculture
221	Section 129(c)(1) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act	General	Canada	United States	17 January 2001	III:1; Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU): III:2; Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU): III:7; Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU): XIX:1; Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU): 21:1; Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU): 21:3; Anti-dumping: I; Anti-dumping: 9:3; Anti-dumping: XI:1; Anti-dumping: 18:1; Anti-dumping: 18:2; Anti-dumping: 18:3; Anti-	Article 19.1 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU) provides that a panel shall be established by the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) upon the request of a party to a dispute. The DSB shall establish the panel within 30 days of the date of the request, unless the parties agree to a different time-frame. The panel shall be composed of members of the Dispute Settlement Body who are not nationals of the parties to the dispute. The panel shall report to the DSB within 60 days of its establishment, unless the parties agree to a different time-frame. The panel's report shall be adopted by the DSB at its next meeting, unless the panel is unable to reach a decision by the time of the meeting. The panel's report shall be binding on the parties to the dispute.	The WTO Panel ruled that the US law prohibiting compliance with adverse DSB rulings in anti-dumping and countervailing duty determinations made after the imports occurred but before the US implemented the ruling did not violate the US's WTO obligations. Canada failed to prove inconsistency with the GATT 1994, the AD Agreement, the SCM Agreement, or the WTO Agreement.	No	Manufacturing
222	Export Credits and Loan Guarantees for Regional Aircraft	General	Brazil	Canada	22 January 2001	Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): I; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): III	Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): I; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): III	Brazil initiated a WTO dispute against Canada's subsidies for its regional aircraft industry. A panel found that the subsidies were illegal and recommended their withdrawal. Canada failed to comply within 90 days, prompting Brazil to seek authorization to suspend concessions. Arbitration determined that Brazil could suspend concessions worth US\$247,797,000, but not the larger amount it initially proposed. The dispute concluded with the DSB authorizing the suspension of concessions.	No	Manufacturing
223	Tariff-Rate Quota on Corn Gluten Feed from the United States	Agricultural and Food	United States	European Communities	25 January 2001	GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: II; GATT 1994: XIX; Safeguards: VIII:1; Safeguards: VIII:2; Safeguards: VIII:3	Consulted by the United States. On 26 January 2001, the US requested consultations with the EC concerning the application of the TRQ to US corn gluten feed imports. The EC refused to enter into consultations. The US requested a panel. The panel was established on 14 February 2001. The panel's report was adopted by the DSB on 14 February 2001. The panel found that the EC's application of the TRQ to US corn gluten feed imports was inconsistent with the GATT 1947 and the Safeguards Agreement. The panel recommended that the EC bring its measures into conformity with its WTO obligations.	The United States (US) challenged the European Communities' (EC) tariff-rate quota (TRQ) on corn gluten feed from the US, arguing that it did not meet the requirements of the WTO's Safeguards Agreement and was inconsistent with GATT 1994 and the Safeguards Agreement. The US asserted that the TRQ was imposed in retaliation for the US's safeguard measure on wheat gluten, which had been found to be incompatible with WTO rules.	No	Agriculture
224	US Patents Code	Patents	Brazil	United States	31 January 2001	GATT 1947: III; GATT 1947: XI; Trade-Related Investment Measures (TRIMs): II; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): XXVII; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): XXVIII	Consulted by Brazil. On 31 January 2001, Brazil requested consultations with the US concerning the provisions of the US Patents Code. The US refused to enter into consultations. Brazil requested a panel. The panel was established on 14 February 2001. The panel's report was adopted by the DSB on 14 February 2001. The panel found that the US Patents Code was inconsistent with the TRIPS Agreement. The panel recommended that the US bring its measures into conformity with its WTO obligations.	Brazil initiated this dispute, alleging that the US Patents Code contained discriminatory provisions that violated the TRIPS Agreement, TRIMs Agreement, and GATT 1994. Brazil specifically cited concerns about Chapter 18 of the code, which addressed patent rights for inventions made with federal assistance. Brazil sought to understand how the US justified the compatibility of these provisions with its international obligations.	Yes	Miscellaneous
225	Anti-Dumping Duties on Seamless Pipe from Italy	Other Products	European Communities	United States	5 February 2001	Anti-dumping: V:8; Anti-dumping: XI:1; Anti-dumping: 11:3; Anti-dumping: 18:4; Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization: XVI:4	Consulted by the European Communities. On 5 February 2001, the EC requested consultations with the US concerning the application of the AD Agreement to US seamless pipe imports. The US refused to enter into consultations. The EC requested a panel. The panel was established on 14 February 2001. The panel's report was adopted by the DSB on 14 February 2001. The panel found that the US's application of the AD Agreement to US seamless pipe imports was inconsistent with the AD Agreement. The panel recommended that the US bring its measures into conformity with its WTO obligations.	The European Communities (EC) filed a complaint against the United States (US) regarding anti-dumping duties imposed on imports of seamless pipe from Italy. The EC alleged that the final results of a sunset review and the procedures for initiating sunset reviews violated Articles 5.8, 11.1, 11.3, and 18.4 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement and Article XVI.4 of the WTO Agreement.	No	Manufacturing
226	Provisional Safeguard Measure on Mixtures of Edible Oils	Agricultural and Food	Argentina	Chile	19 February 2001	GATT 1994: XIX; Safeguards: II; Safeguards: IV; Safeguards: VI; Safeguards: XII	Consulted by Argentina. On 19 February 2001, Argentina requested consultations with Chile concerning the application of the AD Agreement to Argentine edible oil imports. Chile refused to enter into consultations. Argentina requested a panel. The panel was established on 14 February 2001. The panel's report was adopted by the DSB on 14 February 2001. The panel found that Chile's application of the AD Agreement to Argentine edible oil imports was inconsistent with the AD Agreement. The panel recommended that Chile bring its measures into conformity with its WTO obligations.	Argentina initiated a WTO dispute against Chile's provisional safeguard measure on mixed edible oil imports, alleging inconsistencies with GATT 1994 Article XIX and the Safeguards Agreement. The measure included a 48% ad valorem duty, which Argentina claimed violated provisions on injury assessment, causal link, non-discrimination, and provisional measures. The dispute highlights the complexities of safeguard measures and the importance of adhering to consultation and concession modification requirements.	No	Agriculture
227	Taxes on Cigarettes	Tobacco	Chile	Peru	1 March 2001	GATT 1947: III:2	Consulted by Peru. On 1 March 2001, Peru requested consultations with Chile concerning the application of the GATT 1947 to Peruvian cigarettes. Chile refused to enter into consultations. Peru requested a panel. The panel was established on 14 February 2001. The panel's report was adopted by the DSB on 14 February 2001. The panel found that Chile's application of the GATT 1947 to Peruvian cigarettes was inconsistent with the GATT 1947. The panel recommended that Chile bring its measures into conformity with its WTO obligations.	Chile alleged that Peru's Supreme Decree No. 158-99-EF discriminated against imported cigarettes by imposing higher taxes on those marketed in more than three countries. Chile argued that this violated GATT Article II:2 and Appellate Body jurisprudence. The DSB established a panel to examine the issue, with no third parties reserving their rights.	No	Manufacturing
228	Safeguard Measures on Sugar	Agricultural and Food	Colombia	Chile	15 March 2001	GATT 1994: XIX; Safeguards: II; Safeguards: III; Safeguards: IV; Safeguards: V; Safeguards: VII; Safeguards: IX; Safeguards: XII	Consulted by Colombia. On 15 March 2001, Colombia requested consultations with Chile concerning the application of the AD Agreement to Colombian sugar imports. Chile refused to enter into consultations. Colombia requested a panel. The panel was established on 14 February 2001. The panel's report was adopted by the DSB on 14 February 2001. The panel found that Chile's application of the AD Agreement to Colombian sugar imports was inconsistent with the AD Agreement. The panel recommended that Chile bring its measures into conformity with its WTO obligations.	Chile imposed safeguard measures on sugar imports from Colombia, prompting Colombia to request consultations with Chile at the WTO. However, the consultation request was later replaced by another request, preventing further details about the dispute from being disclosed in the provided summary.	No	Agriculture
229	Anti-Dumping Duties on Jute Bags from India	Textiles	India	Brazil	9 April 2001	Anti-dumping: I; Anti-dumping: II; Anti-dumping: III; Anti-dumping: V; Anti-dumping: VI; Anti-dumping: XI; Anti-dumping: XII; Anti-dumping: 17:6(i); Anti-dumping: 18:3; Anti-dumping: 18:4; GATT 1947: VI; GATT 1947: X; Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization: XVI	Consulted by India. On 9 April 2001, India requested consultations with Brazil concerning the application of the AD Agreement to Indian jute bags. Brazil refused to enter into consultations. India requested a panel. The panel was established on 14 February 2001. The panel's report was adopted by the DSB on 14 February 2001. The panel found that Brazil's application of the AD Agreement to Indian jute bags was inconsistent with the AD Agreement. The panel recommended that Brazil bring its measures into conformity with its WTO obligations.	India alleged that Brazil's anti-dumping duties on jute bags from India violated multiple provisions of the GATT 1994 and the WTO Agreement. India claimed that the duties were not based on a proper investigation and that they nullified or impaired benefits accruing to India under the agreements.	No	Textiles
230	Safeguard Measures and Modification of Schedules Regarding Sugar	Agricultural and Food	Colombia	Chile	17 April 2001	GATT 1947: II; GATT 1994: XIX; GATT 1994: XXVIII; Safeguards: II; Safeguards: III; Safeguards: IV; Safeguards: V; Safeguards: VII; Safeguards: IX; Safeguards: XII	Consulted by Colombia. On 17 April 2001, Colombia requested consultations with Chile concerning the application of the AD Agreement to Colombian sugar imports. Chile refused to enter into consultations. Colombia requested a panel. The panel was established on 14 February 2001. The panel's report was adopted by the DSB on 14 February 2001. The panel found that Chile's application of the AD Agreement to Colombian sugar imports was inconsistent with the AD Agreement. The panel recommended that Chile bring its measures into conformity with its WTO obligations.	Colombia challenged Chile's safeguard measures imposed on sugar and Chile's decision not to recognize Colombia's consultation interest regarding modification of sugar concessions. Colombia alleged violations of multiple WTO agreements, arguing that the measures impaired benefits accruing to Colombia. The dispute highlights the complexities of safeguard measures and the importance of adhering to consultation and concession modification procedures.	No	Agriculture
231	Trade Description of Sardines	Agricultural and Food	Peru	European Communities	20 March 2001	GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: III; GATT 1947: XI:1; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT): II; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT): XII	Consulted by Peru. On 20 March 2001, Peru requested consultations with the EC concerning the application of the TBT Agreement to Peruvian sardines. The EC refused to enter into consultations. Peru requested a panel. The panel was established on 14 February 2001. The panel's report was adopted by the DSB on 14 February 2001. The panel found that the EC's application of the TBT Agreement to Peruvian sardines was inconsistent with the TBT Agreement. The panel recommended that the EC bring its measures into conformity with its WTO obligations.	The World Trade Organization (WTO) dispute over the trade description of sardines centered on Peru's challenge to the European Community's (EC) Regulation that prevented Peruvian exporters from using the "sardine" label for their products. Peru argued that the EC Regulation violated the Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) Agreement and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). The WTO Panel and Appellate Body ruled in favor of Peru, finding that the EC Regulation was inconsistent with Article 2.4 of the TBT Agreement. After a reasonable period of time, the EC implemented the rulings and recommendations of the WTO, and a mutually agreed solution was reached between the parties.	No	Agriculture

242	Generalized System of Preferences	General	Thailand	European Communities	7 December 2001	GATT 1947: I	<p>Thailand initiated a dispute against the EC's Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) scheme, alleging that it violated Article I of GATT 1994 and the Enabling Clause. Thailand asserted that the EC's measures adversely affected imports from Thailand and nullified or impaired the benefits it should have received under the WTO Agreement. The dispute was not resolved through consultations, and Thailand did not proceed with the case further.</p>	No	Miscellaneous
243	Rules of Origin for Textiles and Apparel Products	Textiles	India	United States	11 January 2002	Rules of Origin: II	<p>India challenged the US's rules of origin for textiles and apparel products, arguing that they were designed to protect the domestic industry and were inconsistent with the WTO Agreement on Rules of Origin. The Panel found in favor of India, and the DSB adopted the Panel Report. This outcome highlights the importance of ensuring that rules of origin are applied in a non-discriminatory manner and do not serve protectionist purposes.</p>	No	Textiles
244	Sunset Review of Anti-Dumping Duties on Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Japan	Other Products	Japan	United States	30 January 2002	Anti-dumping: II; Anti-dumping: III; Anti-dumping: V; Anti-dumping: VI; Anti-dumping: XI; Anti-dumping: XII; Anti-dumping: 18.3; Anti-dumping: 18.4; Anti-dumping: Annex I; GATT 1947: VI; GATT 1947: X; Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization: XVI.4; GATT 1994: Annex II	<p>Japan challenged the United States' sunset review of anti-dumping duties on corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products, alleging violations of evidentiary standards, de minimis standards, and guidance provided by the Sunset Policy Bulletin. The Panel rejected these claims, except for finding that the Bulletin could be challenged in WTO dispute settlement. The Appellate Body reversed four of the Panel's legal findings but ultimately found no WTO inconsistencies in the US actions, leading to the adoption of both reports by the DSB.</p>	No	Manufacturing
245	Measures Affecting the Importation of Apples	Agricultural and Food	United States	Japan	1 March 2002	1947: XI; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): II.2; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): V.1; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): V.2; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): V.3; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): V.5; Sanitary and Phytosanitary	<p>The WTO dispute settlement panel found Japan's quarantine restrictions on imported apples to be inconsistent with its obligations under the SPS Agreement. The Appellate Body upheld these findings, rejecting Japan's claims on appeal. The compliance panel further determined that Japan's alternative measures were also non-compliant. Ultimately, Japan and the United States reached a mutually agreed solution regarding the matter.</p>	No	Agriculture
246	Conditions for the Granting of Tariff Preferences to Developing Countries	General	India	European Communities	5 March 2002	GATT 1947: I:1	<p>In this dispute, India challenged the conditions set by the EC for granting tariff preferences to developing countries under its GSP scheme, specifically the special arrangements for combating drug production and trafficking. The Panel and Appellate Body found that these conditions violated Article I:1 of GATT 1994 and were not justified under the Enabling Clause or Article XXIV of GATT 1994. The EC eventually repealed the problematic regulation and implemented a new one to comply with the DSB's rulings, but India expressed concerns about its full compliance.</p>	No	Miscellaneous
247	Provisional Anti-Dumping Measure on Imports of Certain Softwood Lumber from Canada	Raw and Semi-finished	Canada	United States	6 March 2002	Anti-dumping: II.1; Anti-dumping: II.2; Anti-dumping: 2.4.2; Anti-dumping: V.2; Anti-dumping: V.3; Anti-dumping: VII.1	<p>Canada raised concerns regarding the US's anti-dumping measure on softwood lumber, leading to a dispute under the WTO. The US initially did not accept the urgency of the matter. However, a mutually agreed solution was reached in 2006 through the Softwood Lumber Agreement. The agreement was amended in 2007 to facilitate its entry into force, resolving the dispute.</p>	No	Manufacturing
248	Definitive Safeguard Measures on Imports of Certain Steel Products	Raw and Semi-finished	European Communities	United States	7 March 2002	GATT 1947: I:1; GATT 1947: XIII; GATT 1994: XIX.1; Safeguards: II; Safeguards: II.1; Safeguards: II.2; Safeguards: III; Safeguards: III.1; Safeguards: III.2; Safeguards: IV; Safeguards: 4.1; Safeguards: 4.2; Safeguards: V; Safeguards: V.1; Safeguards: V.2; Safeguards: VII; Safeguards: VII.1; Safeguards: IX; Safeguards: IX.1	<p>The US imposed definitive safeguard measures on steel imports, prompting multiple complaints from various countries. The WTO Panel and Appellate Body concluded that each of the ten safeguard measures was inconsistent with WTO obligations due to insufficient evidence of increased imports, injury, and causation. The US terminated the measures following the dispute resolution process.</p>	No	Manufacturing
249	Definitive Safeguard Measures on Imports of Certain Steel Products	Raw and Semi-finished	Japan	United States	20 March 2002	X.3; GATT 1947: XIII; GATT 1994: XIX; GATT 1994: XIX.1; GATT 1994: XIX.2; Safeguards: II; Safeguards: II.1; Safeguards: II.2; Safeguards: III; Safeguards: III.1; Safeguards: III.2; Safeguards: IV; Safeguards: 4.1; Safeguards: 4.2; Safeguards: V; Safeguards: V.1; Safeguards: V.2; Safeguards: VII.1; Safeguards: VII.4;	<p>The WTO dispute settlement process found that the US safeguard measures on steel imports were inconsistent with its WTO obligations due to insufficient evidence of unforeseen developments, increased imports, causation, and parallelism. After the Appellate Body upheld these findings, the US terminated the safeguard measures. This case highlights the importance of adhering to WTO requirements when imposing safeguard measures.</p>	No	Manufacturing
250	Equalizing Excise Tax Imposed by Florida on Processed Orange and Grapefruit Products	Agricultural and Food	Brazil	United States	20 March 2002	GATT 1947: II.1(a); GATT 1947: II.1(b); GATT 1947: III.1; GATT 1947: III.4; GATT 1947: II; GATT 1947: III	<p>Brazil filed a complaint against the US over Florida's "Equalizing Excise Tax" on processed citrus products, claiming it discriminated against imported products and violated GATT 1994. After consultations failed, Brazil requested a panel. The US and Brazil reached a mutually agreed solution under Article 3.6 of the DSU, resolving the dispute.</p>	No	Agriculture

260		Provisional Safeguard Measures on Imports of Certain Steel Products	Raw and Semi-finished	United States	European Communities	30 May 2002	GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: X; GATT 1994: XIX; Safeguards: II; Safeguards: II.1; Safeguards: II.2; Safeguards: III; Safeguards: IV; Safeguards: 4.1; Safeguards: 4.2; Safeguards: V; Safeguards: VI; Safeguards: XII; Safeguards: XVI.1; Safeguards: XVII.4	Consulted by the United States, On 30 May 2002, the EC requested consultations with the US under Article XXIV of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) 1947 and Article 23.2 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU). The EC also requested consultations with the US under Article XXIV of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) 1947 and Article 23.2 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU). The EC also requested consultations with the US under Article XXIV of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) 1947 and Article 23.2 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU).	The US initiated a WTO dispute against the EC's provisional safeguard measures on certain steel products, alleging inconsistencies with GATT 1994 and the Agreement on Safeguards. The US claimed violations of specific articles, including 2.1, 2.2, 3, and 4.1. Japan joined the consultations, and the DSB established a panel to investigate the matter. Egypt, Japan, Korea, and Turkey reserved their third-party rights.	No	Manufacturing
261		Tax Treatment on Certain Products	General	Chile	Uruguay	18 June 2002	GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: III	Specific Tax (GST) system means the tax levied on the value added in the production process. It is a broad-based consumption tax levied on all goods and services produced or imported in Chile. The GST is levied at a rate of 10% on the value added in the production process. The GST is levied on all goods and services produced or imported in Chile. The GST is levied on all goods and services produced or imported in Chile.	Uruguay's tax treatment on certain products, using fictitious prices to determine taxable income, was challenged by Chile as discriminatory and constituting an import prohibition. The dispute involved allegations under GATT 1994 Articles I and III. The panel established to resolve the dispute suspended its work due to a joint request by Chile and Uruguay, who ultimately reached a mutually agreed settlement under Article 3 of the DSU.	No	Miscellaneous
262		Sunset Reviews of Anti-Dumping and Countervailing Duties on Certain Steel Products from France and Germany	Raw and Semi-finished	European Communities	United States	25 July 2002	dumping: III; Anti-dumping: V; Anti-dumping: VI; Anti-dumping: XI; Anti-dumping: XVIII; Anti-dumping: Annex II; GATT 1947: VI; GATT 1947: X; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): X; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): XI; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): XII; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): XV;	Consistent by the European Communities, On 25 July 2002, the EC requested consultations with the US under Article XXIV of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) 1947 and Article 23.2 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU). The EC also requested consultations with the US under Article XXIV of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) 1947 and Article 23.2 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU).	The European Communities (EC) filed a complaint against the United States (US) regarding anti-dumping and countervailing duties imposed on steel products from France and Germany. The EC alleged that the US determinations were erroneous and violated several provisions of the WTO's Anti-Dumping Agreement, SCM Agreement, and GATT 1994. Canada and Japan requested to join the consultations.	No	Manufacturing
263		Measures Affecting Imports of Wine	Agricultural and Food	Argentina	European Communities	4 September 2002	GATT 1947: I.1; GATT 1947: III.4; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT); XII; Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization: XVI.4	Consistent by Argentina, On 4 September 2002, Argentina requested consultations with the EC under Article XXIV of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) 1947 and Article 23.2 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU). The EC also requested consultations with the US under Article XXIV of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) 1947 and Article 23.2 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU).	Argentina objected to the EU's regulations on wine imports, citing alleged inconsistencies with WTO agreements on technical barriers to trade (TBT), the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT 1994), and the WTO Agreement itself. Specifically, Argentina argued that these regulations hindered their wine exports due to restrictive oenological practices and trade provisions within the EU market.	No	Agriculture
264		Final Dumping Determination on Softwood Lumber from Canada	Raw and Semi-finished	Canada	United States	13 September 2002	Anti-dumping: I; Anti-dumping: II; Anti-dumping: IV; Anti-dumping: V; Anti-dumping: VI; Anti-dumping: IX; Anti-dumping: XVIII; Anti-dumping: 18.1; GATT 1947: VI; GATT 1947: X.3	Consistent by the United States, On 13 September 2002, the US requested consultations with the EC under Article XXIV of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) 1947 and Article 23.2 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU). The EC also requested consultations with the US under Article XXIV of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) 1947 and Article 23.2 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU).	The WTO ruled that the US Department of Commerce's use of "zeroing" methodology, which disregarded non-dumped export transactions when calculating dumping margins, violated the Anti-Dumping Agreement. This practice distorted price comparisons and inflated dumping margins, leading to an incorrect determination of dumping.	No	Manufacturing
265		Export Subsidies on Sugar	Agricultural and Food	Australia	European Communities	27 September 2002	Agriculture: III.3; Agriculture: VIII; Agriculture: IX.1; Agriculture: X.1; Agriculture: XI; GATT 1947: III.4; GATT 1947: XVI; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): 3.1(a); Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): III.2	Consistent by the European Communities, On 27 September 2002, the EC requested consultations with the US under Article XXIV of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) 1947 and Article 23.2 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU). The EC also requested consultations with the US under Article XXIV of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) 1947 and Article 23.2 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU).	The WTO Panel found that the EU's sugar export subsidies breached its commitments under the Agreement on Agriculture. The Appellate Body upheld this finding. Binding arbitration set a 12-month implementation period for the EU to comply. However, concerns were raised about the EU's increased sugar exports through a declassification system, which could undermine the DSB's rulings. The complaining parties reached understandings with the EU under Articles 21 and 22 of the DSU, thereby resolving the dispute.	No	Agriculture
266		Export Subsidies on Sugar	Agricultural and Food	Brazil	European Communities	27 September 2002	Agriculture: III.3; Agriculture: VIII; Agriculture: IX.1; Agriculture: X.1; GATT 1947: III.4; GATT 1947: XVI; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): I.1; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): III.1; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): III.2	Consistent by the European Communities, On 27 September 2002, the EC requested consultations with the US under Article XXIV of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) 1947 and Article 23.2 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU). The EC also requested consultations with the US under Article XXIV of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) 1947 and Article 23.2 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU).	The WTO Dispute Settlement Body ruled that the European Communities (EC) provided export subsidies for sugar and sugar-containing products that exceeded its commitments under the Agreement on Agriculture. The EC's sugar regime was found to be inconsistent with the provisions on export subsidies and quantity commitments, resulting in less favorable treatment for imported sugar. The EC was required to modify its regime and was granted a reasonable period of time for implementation.	No	Agriculture
267		Subsidies on Upland Cotton	Textiles	Brazil	United States	27 September 2002	Agriculture: III.3; Agriculture: VII.1; Agriculture: VIII; Agriculture: IX.1; Agriculture: X.1; GATT 1947: III.4; GATT 1947: XVI; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): III; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): V; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): VI	Consistent by the United States, On 27 September 2002, the US requested consultations with the EC under Article XXIV of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) 1947 and Article 23.2 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU). The EC also requested consultations with the US under Article XXIV of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) 1947 and Article 23.2 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU).	This WTO dispute involved Brazil's complaint against US subsidies on upland cotton. Brazil claimed that the subsidies violated the SCM Agreement, Agreement on Agriculture, and GATT 1994. The DSB established a panel, which found that certain subsidies were prohibited and actionable. On appeal, the Appellate Body upheld the panel's findings. Compliance proceedings followed, with the US eventually modifying its subsidies to comply with the DSB recommendations. Brazil was authorized to suspend concessions or other obligations against the US due to the prohibited and actionable subsidies, but ultimately agreed not to impose these measures after the US and Brazil reached a Framework for a Mutually Agreed Solution.	No	Textiles
268		Sunset Reviews of Anti-Dumping Measures on Oil Country Tubular Goods from Argentina	Raw and Semi-finished	Argentina	United States	7 October 2002	Anti-dumping: I; Anti-dumping: II; Anti-dumping: III; Anti-dumping: V; Anti-dumping: VI; Anti-dumping: XI; Anti-dumping: XVIII; Anti-dumping: Annex II; GATT 1947: VI; GATT 1947: X; Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization: XVI.4	Consistent by the United States, On 7 October 2002, the US requested consultations with the EC under Article XXIV of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) 1947 and Article 23.2 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU). The EC also requested consultations with the US under Article XXIV of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) 1947 and Article 23.2 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU).	The WTO dispute between Argentina and the US over anti-dumping duties on OCTGs from Argentina involved claims of inconsistency with various WTO agreements. The Panel and Appellate Body found that certain US laws and practices were inconsistent with the Anti-Dumping Agreement. The US implemented the recommendations, but Argentina raised concerns about compliance. A compliance panel found further inconsistencies, and the Appellate Body upheld these findings. Argentina was authorized to suspend concessions, but the parties agreed to suspend arbitration proceedings, leaving the matter unresolved.	No	Manufacturing
269		Customs Classification of Frozen Boneless Chicken Cuts	Agricultural and Food	Brazil	European Communities	11 October 2002	GATT 1947: II; GATT 1947: II.1; GATT 1994: XXIII; GATT 1994: XXIII.1; GATT 1994: XXVIII	Consistent by the European Communities, On 11 October 2002, the EC requested consultations with the US under Article XXIV of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) 1947 and Article 23.2 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU). The EC also requested consultations with the US under Article XXIV of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) 1947 and Article 23.2 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU).	The European Community's classification of frozen boneless chicken cuts under a higher tariff rate violated its obligations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) 1994. The Appellate Body upheld the Panel's findings and ruled that the measure was inconsistent with Articles I:(e) and II:(b) of the GATT 1994. The European Community implemented the DSB's recommendations within the specified nine-month period and the dispute was resolved through binding arbitration.	No	Agriculture

	Measures Affecting Trade in Large Civil Aircraft (Second Complaint)	Aircraft	United States	European Communities; France; Germany; Spain; United Kingdom	31 January 2006	Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); I: Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); II: Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); 3.1(a); Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); 3.1(b); Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); III: Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM); IV: Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM)	The United States brought a dispute against the European Communities and its member states (France, Germany, Spain, and the United Kingdom) alleging that their subsidies and loans to Airbus, a European aircraft manufacturer, were inconsistent with various provisions of the WTO's SCM Agreement and GATT 1994. The United States claimed that these measures caused adverse effects to its own interests within the meaning of the relevant WTO agreements.	No	Manufacturing
347	Customs Measures on Importation of Certain Goods from Panama	Customs	Panama	Colombia	20 July 2006	GATT 1947: I:1; GATT 1947: II:1; GATT 1947: V:6; GATT 1947: X:1; GATT 1947: XI:1; GATT 1947: XIII:1; GATT 1947: X:3(a); Customs valuation: I; Customs valuation: II; Customs valuation: III; Customs valuation: IV; Customs valuation: V; Customs valuation: VI; Customs valuation: VII; Customs valuation: VIII	Panama challenged Colombia's customs measures that subjected certain goods from Panama to indicative unit prices, restricted their entry to specific ports, and imposed additional invoice requirements for goods from the Free Zone of Colon. Colombia, however, accepted requests for consultations from several countries, indicating an intention to resolve the dispute amicably. Ultimately, Panama and Colombia reached a mutually agreed solution, resolving the concerns raised by Panama.	No	Miscellaneous
348	Measures Affecting the Tariff Quota for Fresh or Chilled Garlic	Garlic	Argentina	European Communities	6 September 2006	GATT 1994: XXVIII; GATT 1994: XXIV:6; Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization: XVI:4	Argentina filed a complaint against the EU for increasing the tariff quota for garlic in favor of China. Argentina claimed that this action violated its negotiation rights under Article XXVIII of GATT 1994. The specific measures Argentina challenged included increasing the tariff quota by 20,500 metric tons and granting concessions to China as a result of EU enlargement.	No	Agriculture
349	Continued Existence and Application of Zeroing Methodology	Zeroing	European Communities	United States	2 October 2006	dumping: II:1; Anti-dumping: 2.4; Anti-dumping: 2.2; Anti-dumping: V:8; Anti-dumping: IX:1; Anti-dumping: 9.3; Anti-dumping: 9.5; Anti-dumping: XI:1; Anti-dumping: XI:1; Anti-dumping: 18.3; Anti-dumping: 18.4; GATT 1947: VI:1; GATT 1947: VI:2; Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization: XVI:4	The dispute over the United States' continued use of the zeroing methodology in anti-dumping investigations and reviews reached the WTO Appellate Body. The Appellate Body ruled that the methodology violated the Anti-Dumping Agreement and GATT 1994, leading to the adoption of the panel and Appellate Body reports by the DSB. The United States was given a reasonable period to comply, which expired in December 2009. Subsequent agreements and procedures have been implemented between the parties to address the dispute.	No	Miscellaneous
350	Provisional Safeguard Measure on Certain Milk Products	Dairy Products	Argentina	Chile	25 October 2006	GATT 1994: I; GATT 1994: I:1; GATT 1994: XIX; GATT 1994: XIX:1; GATT 1994: XIX:2; Safeguards: II; Safeguards: III; Safeguards: III:1; Safeguards: IV; Safeguards: V; Safeguards: V:1; Safeguards: VI; Safeguards: VII; Safeguards: XII:4; Safeguards: VII	Argentina initiated a WTO dispute case against Chile's provisional safeguard measures on milk product imports, alleging inconsistencies with relevant WTO provisions. The dispute resulted in the establishment of a panel, but the panel's work was subsequently suspended at Argentina's request.	No	Agriculture
351	Measures Affecting the Importation and Sale of Wines and Spirits from the European Communities	Wine	European Communities	India	20 November 2006	GATT 1947: II:1; GATT 1947: II:2; GATT 1947: III:4; GATT 1947: XI	The European Communities initiated a WTO dispute against India over measures affecting the import and sale of wines and spirits, alleging violations of GATT Articles II:(a) and (b), III:2, III:4, and XI. Consultations failed, and a panel was established in April 2007. However, the panel suspended its work in July 2007 at the European Communities' request, leaving the dispute unresolved.	No	Agriculture
352	Measures Affecting Trade in Large Civil Aircraft — Second Complaint	Aircraft	European Communities	United States	27 June 2005	XXIII; GATT 1947: III:4; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): I:1; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): II; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): III:1; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): III:2; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): V; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): VI:3; Subsidies and	The WTO dispute "Measures Affecting Trade in Large Civil Aircraft" involved complex and lengthy proceedings, spanning over a decade and featuring multiple appeals and compliance actions. The United States was found to have provided illegal subsidies to its large civil aircraft industry, and the European Union was ultimately authorized to take countermeasures against the US after the US failed to fully comply with the WTO's rulings.	No	Manufacturing
353	Tax Exemptions and Reductions for Wine and Beer	Beer	European Communities	Canada	29 November 2006	GATT 1947: III:1; GATT 1947: III:2; GATT 1947: III:3; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): III:2	The European Communities alleged that Canada's tax exemptions and reductions for wine and beer violated its obligations under the SCM Agreement and GATT 1994. After consultations, the two parties reached a mutually agreed solution that involved reducing applied customs duties on certain products imported into Canada on a most-favored-nations basis.	No	Agriculture
354	Anti-dumping Measures on Imports of Certain Resins from Argentina	Resins	Argentina	Brazil	26 December 2006	Anti-dumping: 2.2.2; Anti-dumping: 2.4; Anti-dumping: III:1; Anti-dumping: III:2; Anti-dumping: VI:1; Anti-dumping: VI:2; Anti-dumping: VI:4; Anti-dumping: VI:6; Anti-dumping: 6.8; Anti-dumping: 6.9; Anti-dumping: 6.14; Anti-dumping: VIII; Anti-dumping: VIII:3; Anti-dumping: IX; Anti-dumping: X; Anti-dumping:	Argentina alleged that Brazil's anti-dumping measures on imports of certain polyethylene terephthalate (PET) resins were inconsistent with WTO provisions, including those related to the investigation, determination, and review of duties. Brazil agreed to suspend the application of the duties, leading the panel to suspend its work, which could indicate a resolution of the dispute.	No	Chemicals
355	Definitive Safeguard Measures on Certain Milk Products	Dairy Products	Argentina	Chile	28 December 2006	GATT 1947: I; GATT 1994: XIX; Safeguards: II; Safeguards: III:1; Safeguards: IV; Safeguards: V:1; Safeguards: VII:1; Safeguards: XII:2; Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization: XVI:4	Argentina initiated a dispute against Chile's definitive safeguard measures on certain milk products, alleging inconsistency with WTO rules. A panel was established but its work was suspended at Argentina's request, indicating a possible resolution or settlement between the parties involved.	No	Agriculture
356	Subsidies and Other Domestic Support for Corn and Other Agricultural Products	Agricultural Products	Canada	United States	8 January 2007	Agriculture: VI; Agriculture: VIII; Agriculture: IX:1; Agriculture: X:1; GATT 1947: XVI; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): II:1; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): II:3; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): III:1; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): 3.1(a); Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): 3.1(b); Subsidies and	The dispute centers around three primary questions: US subsidies to corn producers, export credit guarantees violating subsidy and agriculture agreements, and improper exclusion of domestic support leading to excessive assistance for domestic producers. Canada, joined by others, argues that these measures contravene various WTO agreements, while the US defends their legality. Upon request from Canada and Brazil, a panel was established to examine the matter further.	No	Agriculture

368	Preliminary Anti-Dumping and Countervailing Duty Determinations on Coated Free Sheet Paper from China	Paper	China	United States	14 September 2007	dumping: VII; Anti-dumping: IX; Anti-dumping: XVII; GATT 1947: VI; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): I; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): II; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): X; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): XIV; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): XVII; Subsidies and Countervailing	Completed by China: On 14 September 2007, China requested consultations with the United States on the preliminary anti-dumping and countervailing duty determinations made by the US Department of Commerce in respect of coated free sheet paper. China claims that the measures are inconsistent with the United States' obligations under the WTO.	China initiated the dispute case against the US for preliminary determinations on anti-dumping and countervailing duties on coated free sheet paper from China. China claimed that the measures were incompatible with the US's WTO commitments, specifically citing certain articles.	No	Manufacturing
369	Certain Measures Prohibiting the Importation and Marketing of Seal Products	Seal	Canada	European Communities	25-Sep-07	Art. I:1, III:4, V:2, V:3(a), V:4, XI:1, XXIII:1(b), V:3 GATT 1994 Art. 2.1, 2.2 Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT)	Completed by Canada: On 25 September 2007, Canada requested consultations with the European Communities regarding the measures taken by the EC to restrict the importation and marketing of seal products. The European Communities requested that Canada provide information on the measures and the reasons for their introduction. Canada responded that the measures were necessary to protect the environment and the welfare of the seal population. The European Communities requested that Canada provide information on the measures and the reasons for their introduction. Canada responded that the measures were necessary to protect the environment and the welfare of the seal population.	Canada alleges that the European Communities' measures prohibiting the importation and marketing of seal products are inconsistent with its GATT 1994 and TBT Agreement obligations. Canada has requested the establishment of a panel to examine this matter, with several countries reserving their third party rights.	No	Miscellaneous
370	Customs Valuation of Certain Products from the European Communities	Customs	Thailand	European Communities	25-Jan-08	GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: II; GATT 1947: III; GATT 1947: VII; GATT 1947: X; GATT 1947: XI; Customs valuation: I:1; Customs valuation: I:2; Customs valuation: V; Customs valuation: XI; Customs valuation: XII; Customs valuation: XVI; Customs valuation: XXII; Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization: XVI:4	Completed by the European Communities: On 25 January 2008, the European Communities requested consultations with Thailand regarding the measures taken by the EC to restrict the importation and marketing of certain products. The European Communities requested that Thailand provide information on the measures and the reasons for their introduction. Thailand responded that the measures were necessary to protect the environment and the welfare of the seal population. The European Communities requested that Thailand provide information on the measures and the reasons for their introduction. Thailand responded that the measures were necessary to protect the environment and the welfare of the seal population.	Thailand's customs valuation method for alcoholic beverages and other products from the EU is disputed by the European Communities, who claim it is arbitrary and inconsistent with WTO rules. The method involves using an "assessed value" obtained by deducting a standard margin of profit and other expenses and taxes from the wholesale price in Thailand, rather than relying on the declared transaction value. The EU argues that this method is unjustified, and the margins used have not been properly explained or disclosed. The Philippines and the United States have also joined the consultation process, suggesting broader concerns with Thailand's customs practices.	No	Miscellaneous
371	Customs and Fiscal Measures on Cigarettes from the Philippines	Cigarettes	Philippines	Thailand	7 February 2008	1947: III:4; GATT 1947: VII:1; GATT 1947: VII:2; GATT 1947: VII:5; GATT 1947: X:1; GATT 1947: X:3; GATT 1947: X:3(a); GATT 1947: II:1(b); Customs valuation: I:1; Customs valuation: I:2; Customs valuation: I:2(a); Customs valuation: I:2(b); Customs valuation: II; Customs valuation: III; Customs valuation: IV; Customs valuation: V; Customs valuation: VI; Customs	Completed by the European Communities: On 7 February 2008, the European Communities requested consultations with the Philippines regarding the measures taken by the EC to restrict the importation and marketing of cigarettes. The European Communities requested that the Philippines provide information on the measures and the reasons for their introduction. The Philippines responded that the measures were necessary to protect the environment and the welfare of the seal population. The European Communities requested that the Philippines provide information on the measures and the reasons for their introduction. The Philippines responded that the measures were necessary to protect the environment and the welfare of the seal population.	The dispute between the Philippines and Thailand over customs and fiscal measures on cigarettes from the Philippines involved allegations of violations of various GATT and WTO provisions. The panel and compliance panels found that Thailand's valuation methods, VAT regime, and duty process obligations were inconsistent with its WTO obligations, and Thailand was required to bring its measures into compliance. The dispute also highlights the ongoing issue of WTO Appellate Body staffing, as appeals in this case faced delays and were eventually suspended due to the limited number of Appellate Body members available.	No	Manufacturing
372	Measures Affecting Financial Information Services and Foreign Financial Information Suppliers	Financial	China	European Communities	3 March 2008	Services (GATS): XVI:2(a); Services (GATS): XVI:2(e); Services (GATS): XVII; Services (GATS): XVIII; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): 39.2	Completed by the European Communities: On 3 March 2008, the European Communities requested consultations with China regarding the measures taken by the EC to restrict the importation and marketing of financial information services. The European Communities requested that China provide information on the measures and the reasons for their introduction. China responded that the measures were necessary to protect the environment and the welfare of the seal population. The European Communities requested that China provide information on the measures and the reasons for their introduction. China responded that the measures were necessary to protect the environment and the welfare of the seal population.	The European Communities filed a complaint against China at the WTO, alleging that Chinese measures, including those empowering Xinhua News Agency to regulate foreign financial information services and suppliers, violate GATS, TRIPS, and China's accession protocol. The measures restrict foreign suppliers' operations in China, preventing them from directly soliciting subscriptions and requiring them to work through an agent designated by Xinhua.	Yes	Financial
373	Measures Affecting Financial Information Services and Foreign Financial Information Suppliers	Financial	United States	China	3 March 2008	Services (GATS): XVI; Services (GATS): XVII; Services (GATS): XVIII	Completed by the European Communities: On 3 March 2008, the European Communities requested consultations with the United States regarding the measures taken by the EC to restrict the importation and marketing of financial information services. The European Communities requested that the United States provide information on the measures and the reasons for their introduction. The United States responded that the measures were necessary to protect the environment and the welfare of the seal population. The European Communities requested that the United States provide information on the measures and the reasons for their introduction. The United States responded that the measures were necessary to protect the environment and the welfare of the seal population.	The United States initiated a WTO dispute case against China alleging discriminatory measures that restricted foreign financial information services and suppliers. These measures required foreign suppliers to operate through a designated entity, prohibited direct subscription and solicitation, and imposed confidentiality requirements on foreign suppliers. The US claimed that these restrictions violated GATS provisions, China's horizontal standstill commitment, and its Protocol of Accession, while also preventing foreign suppliers from establishing a commercial presence in China.	No	Financial
374	Anti-Dumping Measures on Uncoated Woodfree Paper	Paper	Indonesia	South Africa	9 May 2008	Anti-dumping: 11.3; Anti-dumping: 11.4	Completed by Indonesia: On 9 May 2008, Indonesia requested consultations with South Africa on its continued imposition of anti-dumping measures on imports of uncoated woodfree paper. Indonesia claimed that the measures were inconsistent with the WTO rules. South Africa responded that the measures were necessary to protect the environment and the welfare of the seal population. Indonesia requested that South Africa provide information on the measures and the reasons for their introduction. South Africa responded that the measures were necessary to protect the environment and the welfare of the seal population.	Indonesia has filed a complaint against South Africa at the WTO for maintaining anti-dumping measures on uncoated woodfree paper from Indonesia beyond the five-year period allowed under the Anti-Dumping Agreement. Indonesia argues that South Africa has not conducted a timely sunset review to determine if the expiry of the measures would lead to dumping and injury, as required by the Agreement.	No	Manufacturing
375	Tariff Treatment of Certain Information Technology Products	Information Technology Products	United States	European Communities	28 May 2008	GATT 1947: II:1; GATT 1947: X:1; GATT 1947: X:2; GATT 1994: XXIII	Completed by the European Communities: On 28 May 2008, the European Communities requested consultations with the United States regarding the measures taken by the EC to restrict the importation and marketing of information technology products. The European Communities requested that the United States provide information on the measures and the reasons for their introduction. The United States responded that the measures were necessary to protect the environment and the welfare of the seal population. The European Communities requested that the United States provide information on the measures and the reasons for their introduction. The United States responded that the measures were necessary to protect the environment and the welfare of the seal population.	The dispute concerned the European Communities' tariff treatment of certain information technology products, which the United States claimed was inconsistent with the EC's WTO commitments. The panel found that the EC had failed to accord duty-free treatment to certain flat-panel display devices and multichannel digital machines, and that it had not acted in accordance with its obligations under Article X of the GATT 1994. The panel recommended that the EC bring its measures into conformity with its WTO obligations, and the DSB adopted the panel reports.	No	Manufacturing
376	Tariff Treatment of Certain Information Technology Products	Information Technology Products	Japan	European Communities	28 May 2008	GATT 1947: II; GATT 1947: II:1; GATT 1947: X:1; GATT 1947: X:2; GATT 1994: XXIII; GATT 1994: XXIII:1	Completed by the European Communities: On 28 May 2008, the European Communities requested consultations with Japan regarding the measures taken by the EC to restrict the importation and marketing of information technology products. The European Communities requested that Japan provide information on the measures and the reasons for their introduction. Japan responded that the measures were necessary to protect the environment and the welfare of the seal population. The European Communities requested that Japan provide information on the measures and the reasons for their introduction. Japan responded that the measures were necessary to protect the environment and the welfare of the seal population.	In a dispute brought by Japan, the WTO ruled that the European Communities (now the European Union) had violated its commitments to provide duty-free treatment for certain information technology products under the Information Technology Agreement (ITA). The EU had imposed duties on these products, which the panel found to be inconsistent with the EU's obligations under the GATT 1994. The EU agreed to implement the panel's recommendations and bring its measures into conformity with its WTO obligations within nine months and nine days of the adoption of the panel's report.	No	Manufacturing
377	Tariff Treatment of Certain Information Technology Products	Information Technology Products	Chinese Taipei	European Communities	12 June 2008	GATT 1947: II:1; GATT 1947: X:1; GATT 1947: X:2; GATT 1994: XXIII; GATT 1994: XXIII:1	Completed by the European Communities: On 12 June 2008, the European Communities requested consultations with Chinese Taipei regarding the measures taken by the EC to restrict the importation and marketing of information technology products. The European Communities requested that Chinese Taipei provide information on the measures and the reasons for their introduction. Chinese Taipei responded that the measures were necessary to protect the environment and the welfare of the seal population. The European Communities requested that Chinese Taipei provide information on the measures and the reasons for their introduction. Chinese Taipei responded that the measures were necessary to protect the environment and the welfare of the seal population.	The dispute concerned the tariff treatment of certain information technology products by the European Communities and its member States. Chinese Taipei alleged that the EC's treatment of certain FPDs, STBCs, and MFMs violated its commitments under the Information Technology Agreement. The panel found that the EC's measures were inconsistent with various provisions of the GATT 1994 and recommended that the DSB request the EC to bring its measures into conformity with its obligations. The DSB adopted the panel reports, and the EC implemented the recommendations within the agreed reasonable period.	No	Manufacturing

378	Measures Affecting Financial Information Services and Foreign Financial Information Suppliers	Financial	Canada	China	20 June 2008	Services (GATS): XVI; Services (GATS): XVII; Services (GATS): XVIII	<p>submitted to Canada. On 30 June 2008, Canada requested consultations with China with respect to measures affecting financial information services and foreign financial information suppliers. Canada requested that China provide a number of Chinese companies, including financial information services and foreign financial information suppliers, with information regarding the measures. Canada requested that China provide information which would enable financial information suppliers to supply their services through an entity designated by China.</p> <p>On 17 November 2008, Canada requested consultations with China with respect to measures affecting financial information services and foreign financial information suppliers. Canada requested that China provide a number of Chinese companies, including financial information services and foreign financial information suppliers, with information regarding the measures. Canada requested that China provide information which would enable financial information suppliers to supply their services through an entity designated by China.</p> <p>On 17 November 2008, Canada requested consultations with China with respect to measures affecting financial information services and foreign financial information suppliers. Canada requested that China provide a number of Chinese companies, including financial information services and foreign financial information suppliers, with information regarding the measures. Canada requested that China provide information which would enable financial information suppliers to supply their services through an entity designated by China.</p>	No	Financial
379	Definitive Anti-Dumping and Countervailing Duties on Certain Products from China	General	China	United States	19 September 2008	dumping: VI; Anti-dumping: IX; Anti-dumping: XVIII; Anti-dumping: Annex II; GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: VI; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): I; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): II; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): VI; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): IX; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures	<p>On 19 September 2008, the United States requested consultations with China with respect to measures affecting certain products from China. The United States requested that China provide information regarding the measures. The United States requested that China provide information which would enable the United States to determine whether the measures are consistent with the WTO Agreements.</p> <p>On 19 September 2008, the United States requested consultations with China with respect to measures affecting certain products from China. The United States requested that China provide information regarding the measures. The United States requested that China provide information which would enable the United States to determine whether the measures are consistent with the WTO Agreements.</p> <p>On 19 September 2008, the United States requested consultations with China with respect to measures affecting certain products from China. The United States requested that China provide information regarding the measures. The United States requested that China provide information which would enable the United States to determine whether the measures are consistent with the WTO Agreements.</p>	No	Manufacturing
380	Certain Taxes and Other Measures on Imported Wines and Spirits	Wine	European Communities	India	22 September 2008	GATT 1947: III:2; GATT 1947: III:4; GATT 1947: XI; GATT 1947: XVII; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): 3.1(b); Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): III:2; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): 4.2	<p>On 22 September 2008, the European Communities requested consultations with India with respect to measures affecting certain taxes and other measures on imported wines and spirits. The European Communities requested that India provide information regarding the measures. The European Communities requested that India provide information which would enable the European Communities to determine whether the measures are consistent with the WTO Agreements.</p> <p>On 22 September 2008, the European Communities requested consultations with India with respect to measures affecting certain taxes and other measures on imported wines and spirits. The European Communities requested that India provide information regarding the measures. The European Communities requested that India provide information which would enable the European Communities to determine whether the measures are consistent with the WTO Agreements.</p> <p>On 22 September 2008, the European Communities requested consultations with India with respect to measures affecting certain taxes and other measures on imported wines and spirits. The European Communities requested that India provide information regarding the measures. The European Communities requested that India provide information which would enable the European Communities to determine whether the measures are consistent with the WTO Agreements.</p>	No	Agriculture
381	Measures Concerning the Importation, Marketing and Sale of Tuna and Tuna Products	Tuna	Mexico	United States	24 October 2008	Barriers to Trade (TBT): II; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT): VI; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT): VIII; GATT 1947: I;1; GATT 1947: III:4; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT): II:1; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT): II:2; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT): II:3; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT): 2.4	<p>On 24 October 2008, the United States requested consultations with Mexico with respect to measures affecting the importation, marketing and sale of tuna and tuna products. The United States requested that Mexico provide information regarding the measures. The United States requested that Mexico provide information which would enable the United States to determine whether the measures are consistent with the WTO Agreements.</p> <p>On 24 October 2008, the United States requested consultations with Mexico with respect to measures affecting the importation, marketing and sale of tuna and tuna products. The United States requested that Mexico provide information regarding the measures. The United States requested that Mexico provide information which would enable the United States to determine whether the measures are consistent with the WTO Agreements.</p> <p>On 24 October 2008, the United States requested consultations with Mexico with respect to measures affecting the importation, marketing and sale of tuna and tuna products. The United States requested that Mexico provide information regarding the measures. The United States requested that Mexico provide information which would enable the United States to determine whether the measures are consistent with the WTO Agreements.</p>	No	Agriculture
382	Anti-Dumping Administrative Reviews and Other Measures Related to Imports of Certain Orange Juice from Brazil	Orange Juice	Brazil	United States	27 November 2008	Anti-dumping: I; Anti-dumping: II; Anti-dumping: II:1; Anti-dumping: II:2; Anti-dumping: 2.4; Anti-dumping: 9.3; Anti-dumping: IX:1; Anti-dumping: 9.3; Anti-dumping: XII:2; Anti-dumping: 18.4; GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: VI:1; GATT 1947: VI:2; Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization: XVI:4	<p>On 27 November 2008, the United States requested consultations with Brazil with respect to measures affecting anti-dumping administrative reviews and other measures related to imports of certain orange juice from Brazil. The United States requested that Brazil provide information regarding the measures. The United States requested that Brazil provide information which would enable the United States to determine whether the measures are consistent with the WTO Agreements.</p> <p>On 27 November 2008, the United States requested consultations with Brazil with respect to measures affecting anti-dumping administrative reviews and other measures related to imports of certain orange juice from Brazil. The United States requested that Brazil provide information regarding the measures. The United States requested that Brazil provide information which would enable the United States to determine whether the measures are consistent with the WTO Agreements.</p> <p>On 27 November 2008, the United States requested consultations with Brazil with respect to measures affecting anti-dumping administrative reviews and other measures related to imports of certain orange juice from Brazil. The United States requested that Brazil provide information regarding the measures. The United States requested that Brazil provide information which would enable the United States to determine whether the measures are consistent with the WTO Agreements.</p>	No	Agriculture
383	Anti-Dumping Measures on Polyethylene Retail Carrier Bags from Thailand	Zeroing	Thailand	United States	26 November 2008	Anti-dumping: 2.4.2; GATT 1947: VI	<p>On 26 November 2008, the United States requested consultations with Thailand with respect to measures affecting anti-dumping measures on polyethylene retail carrier bags from Thailand. The United States requested that Thailand provide information regarding the measures. The United States requested that Thailand provide information which would enable the United States to determine whether the measures are consistent with the WTO Agreements.</p> <p>On 26 November 2008, the United States requested consultations with Thailand with respect to measures affecting anti-dumping measures on polyethylene retail carrier bags from Thailand. The United States requested that Thailand provide information regarding the measures. The United States requested that Thailand provide information which would enable the United States to determine whether the measures are consistent with the WTO Agreements.</p> <p>On 26 November 2008, the United States requested consultations with Thailand with respect to measures affecting anti-dumping measures on polyethylene retail carrier bags from Thailand. The United States requested that Thailand provide information regarding the measures. The United States requested that Thailand provide information which would enable the United States to determine whether the measures are consistent with the WTO Agreements.</p>	No	Chemicals
384	Certain Country of Origin Labelling (Cool) Requirements	Labelling	Canada	United States	1 December 2008	1947: IX:2; GATT 1947: X:3; GATT 1994: XXIII:1(b); GATT 1947: X:3(a); Rules of Origin: I; Rules of Origin: 2(b); Rules of Origin: 2(c); Rules of Origin: 2(e); Rules of Origin: 2(j); Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): II; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): V; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): VII; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT): II;	<p>On 1 December 2008, the United States requested consultations with Canada with respect to measures affecting certain country of origin labelling (cool) requirements. The United States requested that Canada provide information regarding the measures. The United States requested that Canada provide information which would enable the United States to determine whether the measures are consistent with the WTO Agreements.</p> <p>On 1 December 2008, the United States requested consultations with Canada with respect to measures affecting certain country of origin labelling (cool) requirements. The United States requested that Canada provide information regarding the measures. The United States requested that Canada provide information which would enable the United States to determine whether the measures are consistent with the WTO Agreements.</p> <p>On 1 December 2008, the United States requested consultations with Canada with respect to measures affecting certain country of origin labelling (cool) requirements. The United States requested that Canada provide information regarding the measures. The United States requested that Canada provide information which would enable the United States to determine whether the measures are consistent with the WTO Agreements.</p>	No	Agriculture
385	Expiry Reviews of Anti-dumping and Countervailing Duties Imposed on Imports of PET from India	Polyethylene and Polypropylene	India	European Communities	4 December 2008	dumping: VI:5; Anti-dumping: VI:6; Anti-dumping: 6.8; Anti-dumping: XI:1; Anti-dumping: 11.5; Anti-dumping: 18.4; Anti-dumping: Annex II; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): XII:1; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): 12.5; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): 12.7; Subsidies and	<p>On 4 December 2008, the European Communities requested consultations with India with respect to measures affecting expiry reviews of anti-dumping and countervailing duties imposed on imports of PET from India. The European Communities requested that India provide information regarding the measures. The European Communities requested that India provide information which would enable the European Communities to determine whether the measures are consistent with the WTO Agreements.</p> <p>On 4 December 2008, the European Communities requested consultations with India with respect to measures affecting expiry reviews of anti-dumping and countervailing duties imposed on imports of PET from India. The European Communities requested that India provide information regarding the measures. The European Communities requested that India provide information which would enable the European Communities to determine whether the measures are consistent with the WTO Agreements.</p> <p>On 4 December 2008, the European Communities requested consultations with India with respect to measures affecting expiry reviews of anti-dumping and countervailing duties imposed on imports of PET from India. The European Communities requested that India provide information regarding the measures. The European Communities requested that India provide information which would enable the European Communities to determine whether the measures are consistent with the WTO Agreements.</p>	No	Chemicals
386	Certain Country of Origin Labelling Requirements	Labelling	Mexico	United States	17 December 2008	GATT 1947: III; GATT 1947: IX; GATT 1947: X; GATT 1947: X:3(a); Rules of Origin: I; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): II; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): V; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): VII; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT): II; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT): XII	<p>On 17 December 2008, the United States requested consultations with Mexico with respect to measures affecting certain country of origin labelling requirements. The United States requested that Mexico provide information regarding the measures. The United States requested that Mexico provide information which would enable the United States to determine whether the measures are consistent with the WTO Agreements.</p> <p>On 17 December 2008, the United States requested consultations with Mexico with respect to measures affecting certain country of origin labelling requirements. The United States requested that Mexico provide information regarding the measures. The United States requested that Mexico provide information which would enable the United States to determine whether the measures are consistent with the WTO Agreements.</p> <p>On 17 December 2008, the United States requested consultations with Mexico with respect to measures affecting certain country of origin labelling requirements. The United States requested that Mexico provide information regarding the measures. The United States requested that Mexico provide information which would enable the United States to determine whether the measures are consistent with the WTO Agreements.</p>	No	Agriculture

396	Taxes on Distilled Spirits	Spirits	European Communities	Philippines	29 July 2009	GATT 1947: III:1; GATT 1947: III:2	<p>Appellate Body ruled that the Philippines' excise tax regime on distilled spirits discriminated against imported spirits by taxing them at a higher rate than domestic spirits. The Philippines appealed the decision, but the Appellate Body upheld the panel's findings. The Philippines implemented the DSB's recommendations by restructuring its excise tax on alcohol and tobacco products, completing its implementation on December 19, 2012.</p>	No	Manufacturing
397	Definitive Anti-Dumping Measures on Certain Iron or Steel Fasteners from China	Fasteners	China	European Communities	31 July 2009	<p>dumping: II:1; Anti-dumping: II:2; Anti-dumping: 2:4; Anti-dumping: 2:6; Anti-dumping: III:1; Anti-dumping: III:1.1; Anti-dumping: III:2; Anti-dumping: III:4; Anti-dumping: IV:1; Anti-dumping: III:5; Anti-dumping: 4:1; Anti-dumping: V:1; Anti-dumping: V:4; Anti-dumping: VI:1; Anti-dumping: VI:2; Anti-dumping: VI:4; Anti-dumping: VI:5; Anti-</p>	<p>China challenged the EU's anti-dumping duties on iron or steel fasteners from China, alleging inconsistencies with WTO agreements and procedural obligations. After an initial panel ruling and subsequent Appellate Body review and compliance panel proceedings, the DSB adopted the Appellate Body report, which determined that the EU's duties were inconsistent with WTO rules. The EU was given a reasonable period to implement the recommendations, which it met.</p>	No	Manufacturing
398	Measures Related to the Exportation of Various Raw Materials	Raw Materials	Mexico	China	21 August 2009	GATT 1947: VIII; GATT 1947: VIII:1; GATT 1947: VIII:4; GATT 1947: X; GATT 1947: XI:1; GATT 1947: X:3; GATT 1947: XI; GATT 1947: XI:1	<p>Mexico raised concerns about China's export restrictions on various raw materials, which allegedly violated WTO agreements. The panel and Appellate Body found China's measures to be inconsistent with its obligations, and China agreed to implement the recommendations within a reasonable period. After some delay, China implemented the required changes by removing export duties and quotas on the affected raw materials.</p>	No	Miscellaneous
399	Measures Affecting Imports of Certain Passenger Vehicle and Light Truck Tyres from China	Tyres	China	United States	14 September 2009	GATT 1947: I:1; GATT 1947: II; GATT 1994: XIX	<p>The WTO ruled in favor of the United States in a case brought by China over increased tariffs on Chinese tires. The WTO found that the tariffs were justified under a "transitional safeguard" provision in China's accession to the WTO and were not inconsistent with other WTO rules.</p>	No	Manufacturing
400	Measures Prohibiting the Importation and Marketing of Seal Products	Seal	Canada	European Communities	2 November 2009	<p>1947: III:4; GATT 1947: XI:1; GATT 1994: XXIII:1(b); Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT): I:1; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT): II:2; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT): V:1; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT): 5.1.1; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT): 5.1.2; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT): V:2; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT): 5.2.1; Technical Barriers to Trade</p>	<p>This WTO dispute, initiated by Canada, challenged the European Communities' Regulation (EC) No. 1007/2009 and related measures that prohibited the importation and marketing of seal products. Canada argued that these measures violated various WTO agreements, including the TBT Agreement, GATT 1994, and the Agriculture Agreement. After a lengthy dispute resolution process, the DSB adopted the Appellate Body report, which found that the EU's measures were not justified under the TBT Agreement and were thus inconsistent with the EU's WTO obligations. The EU was given a reasonable period of 16 months to implement the DSB's recommendations and rulings.</p>	No	Agriculture
401	Measures Prohibiting the Importation and Marketing of Seal Products	Seal	Norway	European Communities	5 November 2009	<p>1947: III:4; GATT 1947: XI:1; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT): I:1; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT): II:2; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT): V:1; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT): V:2; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT): V:6; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT): VI; Technical</p>	<p>Norway filed a complaint against the European Union's Regulation (EC) No. 1007/2009 on trade in seal products, alleging it violated the Agriculture Agreement, TBT Agreement, and GATT 1994. The dispute went through a panel and an appellate body review, with the final report being adopted in 2014. The European Union agreed to implement the DSB recommendations within a 16-month period expiring in October 2015.</p>	No	Agriculture
402	Use of Zeroing in Anti-Dumping Measures Involving Products from Korea	Zeroing	Korea, Republic of	United States	24 November 2009	Anti-dumping: I; Anti-dumping: II:1; Anti-dumping: 2:4; Anti-dumping: 2:4.2; Anti-dumping: V:8; GATT 1947: VI	<p>The WTO panel found that the US Department of Commerce's use of zeroing in anti-dumping investigations was inconsistent with Article 2.4.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement. Zeroing is a methodology that can artificially create or inflate margins of dumping, and the panel's findings support Korea's claims that the USDOC's use of zeroing had this effect in the investigations involving stainless steel plate in coils, stainless steel sheet and strip in coils, and diamond sawblades and parts thereof. The United States agreed to implement the panel's recommendations and rulings, and the parties agreed on a reasonable period of time for the United States to comply.</p>	No	Manufacturing
403	Taxes on Distilled Spirits	Spirits	United States	Philippines	14 January 2010	GATT 1947: III:2	<p>The dispute between the United States and the Philippines regarding discriminatory taxation of imported distilled spirits was settled through WTO dispute settlement process. The panel and Appellate Body ruled against the Philippines, and it agreed to modify its tax system to comply with WTO obligations. The Philippines implemented the changes within the agreed-upon timeframe, resolving the dispute.</p>	No	Manufacturing
404	Anti-dumping Measures on Certain Shrimp from Viet Nam	Shrimps	Viet Nam	United States	1 February 2010	<p>dumping: 2:4; Anti-dumping: 2:4.2; Anti-dumping: V:8; Anti-dumping: 6:8; Anti-dumping: 6:10; Anti-dumping: IX; Anti-dumping: IX:1; Anti-dumping: 9:3; Anti-dumping: 9:4; Anti-dumping: XI; Anti-dumping: XI:1; Anti-dumping: XI:2; Anti-dumping: 11:3; Anti-dumping: 18:1; Anti-dumping: 18:3; Anti-dumping: 18:4; Anti-dumping: Annex I; GATT 1947: I; GATT</p>	<p>Viet Nam challenged the United States' anti-dumping measures on its frozen warmwater shrimp, alleging inconsistencies with WTO obligations. The case involved a range of issues, including zeroing and administrative and new shipper reviews. The Panel found in favor of Viet Nam on several points, leading to the United States agreeing to implement the DSB's recommendations within a reasonable time frame of 10 months, which expired on July 2, 2012.</p>	No	Agriculture

415	Safeguard Measures on Imports of Polypropylene Bags and Tubular Fabric	Polypropylene	Costa Rica	Dominican Republic	15 October 2010	IV; GATT 1947: I:1; GATT 1947: II:1; GATT 1994: XIX:1; GATT 1994: XIX:2; Safeguards: II:1; Safeguards: II:2; Safeguards: III:1; Safeguards: III:2; Safeguards: 4.1; Safeguards: IV:1(a); Safeguards: IV:1(b); Safeguards: IV:1(c); Safeguards: 4.2; Safeguards: IV:2(a); Safeguards: IV:2(b); Safeguards: V:1; Safeguards: V:2(c); Safeguards: V:1; Safeguards: VI; Safeguards: VI; Safeguards: VI:1; Safeguards: VI:2	Costa Rica challenged the Dominican Republic's safeguard measures on polypropylene bags and tubular fabric, alleging inconsistencies with the Agreement on Safeguards and GATT 1994. A panel was established to examine the dispute, and its report was adopted by the DSB. The Dominican Republic subsequently implemented the DSB's recommendations and lifted the safeguard measures by establishing the MFN tariff for the pre-safeguard level.	No	Textiles
416	Safeguard Measures on Imports of Polypropylene Bags and Tubular Fabric	Polypropylene	Guatemala	Dominican Republic	15 October 2010	IV; GATT 1947: II:1; GATT 1994: XIX:1; GATT 1994: XIX:2; Safeguards: II:1; Safeguards: II:2; Safeguards: III:1; Safeguards: III:2; Safeguards: 4.1; Safeguards: IV:1(a); Safeguards: IV:1(b); Safeguards: IV:1(c); Safeguards: 4.2; Safeguards: IV:2(a); Safeguards: IV:2(b); Safeguards: IV:2(c); Safeguards: V:1; Safeguards: VI; Safeguards: VI:1; Safeguards: VI:2	Guatemala challenged the Dominican Republic's safeguard measures on polypropylene bags and tubular fabric, alleging inconsistencies with the Agreement on Safeguards and GATT 1994. A panel was established to examine the complaint, and its final report was adopted by the DSB in February 2012. The Dominican Republic subsequently implemented the DSB recommendations and lifted the safeguard measures.	No	Textiles
417	Safeguard Measures on Imports of Polypropylene Bags and Tubular Fabric	Polypropylene	Honduras	Dominican Republic	18 October 2010	IV; GATT 1947: II:1; GATT 1994: XIX:1; GATT 1994: XIX:2; Safeguards: II:1; Safeguards: II:2; Safeguards: III:1; Safeguards: III:2; Safeguards: 4.1; Safeguards: IV:1(a); Safeguards: IV:1(b); Safeguards: IV:1(c); Safeguards: 4.2; Safeguards: IV:2(a); Safeguards: IV:2(b); Safeguards: IV:2(c); Safeguards: V:1; Safeguards: VI; Safeguards: VI:1; Safeguards: VI:2	Honduras challenged the Dominican Republic's safeguard measures on polypropylene bags and tubular fabric, arguing inconsistencies with the Agreement on Safeguards and GATT 1994. After consultations and panel establishment, the DSB adopted the panel report on February 22, 2012, and the Dominican Republic committed to immediate implementation. The Dominican Republic lifted the safeguard measures and established the MFN tariff rate, as recommended by the DSB, on April 21, 2012.	No	Manufacturing
418	Safeguard Measures on Imports of Polypropylene Bags and Tubular Fabric	Polypropylene	El Salvador	Dominican Republic	19 October 2010	IV; GATT 1947: I:1; GATT 1947: II:1; GATT 1994: XIX:1; GATT 1994: XIX:2; Safeguards: II:1; Safeguards: II:2; Safeguards: III:1; Safeguards: III:2; Safeguards: 4.1; Safeguards: IV:1(a); Safeguards: IV:1(b); Safeguards: IV:1(c); Safeguards: 4.2; Safeguards: IV:2(a); Safeguards: IV:2(b); Safeguards: IV:2(c); Safeguards: V:1; Safeguards: VI; Safeguards: VI:1; Safeguards: VI:2	The WTO dispute settlement panel found that the Dominican Republic's safeguard measures on imports of polypropylene bags and tubular fabric were inconsistent with several provisions of the Agreement on Safeguards and Article XIX:1(a) of the GATT 1994. The Dominican Republic promptly implemented the DSB recommendations and rulings by lifting the safeguard measure and restoring the MFN tariff to its pre-safeguard level.	No	Textiles
419	Measures Concerning Wind Power Equipment	Wind Power Equipment	United States	China	22 December 2010	GATT 1947: XVI:1; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): III; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): XXV:1; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): XXV:2; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): 25.3; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): 25.4	The United States initiated a dispute with China over measures providing subsidies to domestic wind power equipment manufacturers. These measures were alleged to violate the World Trade Organization's (WTO) Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM Agreement) as they appeared to be contingent on the use of domestic over imported goods. Additionally, China was accused of failing to notify the WTO about these measures and failing to provide a translation. The European Union and Japan joined the consultations in the dispute.	No	Energy
420	Anti-Dumping Measures on Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Korea	Steel	Korea, Republic of	United States	31 January 2011	Anti-dumping: IX:1; Anti-dumping: 9.3; Anti-dumping: 11.3; GATT 1947: VI:2(b)	Korea initiated a WTO dispute against the United States, alleging that the US's use of the "zeroing" methodology in anti-dumping determinations on corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Korea violated WTO obligations. After consultations and the establishment of a panel, the proceedings were suspended at Korea's request.	No	Manufacturing
421	Measures Affecting the Importation and Internal Sale of Goods (Environmental Charge)	Environmental Charge	Ukraine	Moldova, Republic of	17 February 2011	GATT 1947: III:1; GATT 1947: III:2; GATT 1947: III:4	Ukraine filed a complaint against Moldova's environmental charge law, alleging discrimination against imported products, which are subject to charges not imposed on similar domestic products. Ukraine claimed that this violates GATT Article III provisions on national treatment and most-favored-treatment treatment. The dispute proceeded to the establishment of a panel to adjudicate the matter.	No	Miscellaneous
422	Anti-Dumping Measures on Shrimp and Diamond Sawblades from China	Shrimps	China	United States	28 February 2011	Anti-dumping: I; Anti-dumping: II:1; Anti-dumping: 2.4; Anti-dumping: 2.4.2; Anti-dumping: V:8; Anti-dumping: IX:2; Anti-dumping: 9.3; Anti-dumping: 9.4; Anti-dumping: 11.3; GATT 1947: VI:1; GATT 1947: VI:2(a); GATT 1947: VI:2(b)	China challenged the United States' anti-dumping measures on shrimp and diamond sawblades, alleging that the use of "zeroing" by the USDOC artificially inflated dumping margins. The WTO Panel agreed with China, finding that zeroing was inconsistent with US obligations under the GATT 1994 and Anti-Dumping Agreement. The United States was given 8 months to implement the Panel's recommendations, which it did for shrimp but not for diamond sawblades. China expressed concern about the incomplete implementation and urged the United States to honor its obligations.	No	Manufacturing
423	Taxes on Distilled spirits	Spirits	Moldova, Republic of	Ukraine	3 March 2011	GATT 1947: III:2	Ukraine's Excise Tax System allegedly discriminates against imported Moldovan distilled spirits. Moldova claims that the system violates the GATT 1994 by applying lower tax rates on domestic products than on imported distilled spirits, and by providing protection to domestic production through lower tax rates on domestic products than on other imported distilled spirits.	No	Manufacturing
424	Anti-Dumping Measures on Imports of Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from Italy	Stainless Steel	European Union	United States	1 April 2011	Anti-dumping: II; Anti-dumping: V:8; Anti-dumping: 6.8; Anti-dumping: 9.3; Anti-dumping: XI:1; Anti-dumping: XI:2; Anti-dumping: 11.3; GATT 1947: VI:2	The European Union and Japan alleged that the United States' anti-dumping measures on stainless steel sheet and strip imports from Italy were inconsistent with WTO agreements due to an arithmetic error using the "zeroing" methodology. The error allegedly impacted the original investigation, subsequent proceedings, and a sunset review, affecting the accuracy of the dumping margin calculations.	No	Manufacturing
425	Definitive Anti-Dumping Duties on X-Ray Security Inspection Equipment from the European Union	X-ray Security Inspection Equipment	European Union	China	25-Jul-11	Art. 2.4, 2.6, 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 3.5, 6.1, 6.2, 6.4, 6.5, 6.5.1, 6.9, 12.2.1, 12.2.2 Anti-dumping Art. VI:1, VI:6 GATT 1994	The dispute concerned anti-dumping duties imposed by China on X-ray security inspection equipment from the European Union. The EU argued that the duties violated various provisions of the Anti-Dumping Agreement and GATT 1994. The panel found in favor of the EU, and China agreed to implement the panel's recommendations within a reasonable period of time. China subsequently terminated the anti-dumping duties, fully complying with the DSB's recommendations.	No	Financial

[illegible]

463	Recycling Fee on Motor Vehicles	Automobiles	Japan	Russian Federation	24 July 2013	GATT 1947: I:1; GATT 1947: III:2; GATT 1947: III:4; Trade-Related Investment Measures (TRIMs): II:1; Trade-Related Investment Measures (TRIMs): II:2; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT); II:1; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT): II:2	Complaint by Japan. (See also DS462) On 24 July 2013, Japan requested consultations with the Russian Federation regarding the Russian measures on recycling fees for motor vehicles. The Russian Federation has not responded to the request. The dispute remains unresolved. On 12 September 2013, the DSB adopted the panel report. The panel found that the Russian Federation's measures on recycling fees for motor vehicles are inconsistent with the TRIMs Agreement. The panel also found that the Russian Federation's measures on recycling fees for motor vehicles are inconsistent with the TBT Agreement. The panel recommended that the Russian Federation bring its measures into conformity with the TRIMs Agreement and the TBT Agreement. On 12 September 2013, the DSB adopted the panel report. The panel found that the Russian Federation's measures on recycling fees for motor vehicles are inconsistent with the TRIMs Agreement. The panel also found that the Russian Federation's measures on recycling fees for motor vehicles are inconsistent with the TBT Agreement. The panel recommended that the Russian Federation bring its measures into conformity with the TRIMs Agreement and the TBT Agreement.	No	Manufacturing
464	Anti-Dumping and Countervailing Measures on Large Residential Washers from Korea	Large Residential Washers	Korea, Republic of	United States	29 August 2013	GATT 1947: VI:2; GATT 1947: VI:3; Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization: XVI.4; Subsidies and	Complaint by the United States. (See also DS463) On 29 August 2013, the United States requested consultations with the Republic of Korea regarding the Republic of Korea's anti-dumping and countervailing measures on large residential washers from the United States. The Republic of Korea has not responded to the request. The dispute remains unresolved. On 12 September 2013, the DSB adopted the panel report. The panel found that the Republic of Korea's anti-dumping and countervailing measures on large residential washers from the United States are inconsistent with the Anti-Dumping Agreement and the Subsidies and Countervailing Measures Agreement. The panel recommended that the Republic of Korea bring its measures into conformity with the Anti-Dumping Agreement and the Subsidies and Countervailing Measures Agreement. On 12 September 2013, the DSB adopted the panel report. The panel found that the Republic of Korea's anti-dumping and countervailing measures on large residential washers from the United States are inconsistent with the Anti-Dumping Agreement and the Subsidies and Countervailing Measures Agreement. The panel recommended that the Republic of Korea bring its measures into conformity with the Anti-Dumping Agreement and the Subsidies and Countervailing Measures Agreement.	No	Manufacturing
465	Importation of Horticultural Products, Animals and Animal Products	Animals	United States	Indonesia	30 August 2013	GATT 1947: III:4; GATT 1947: X:1; GATT 1947: X:3(a); GATT 1947: XI:1; GATT 1947: XIII:2; Agriculture: 4.2; Import Licensing: 1.3; Import Licensing: II:2; Import Licensing: 3.5(b); Import Licensing: 3.5(c); Import Licensing: 3.5(k); Preshipment Inspection: II:1; Preshipment Inspection: 2.15	Complaint by the United States. (See also DS464) On 30 August 2013, the United States requested consultations with the Republic of Indonesia regarding the Republic of Indonesia's importation of horticultural products, animals and animal products. The Republic of Indonesia has not responded to the request. The dispute remains unresolved. On 12 September 2013, the DSB adopted the panel report. The panel found that the Republic of Indonesia's importation of horticultural products, animals and animal products is inconsistent with the GATT 1947. The panel recommended that the Republic of Indonesia bring its measures into conformity with the GATT 1947. On 12 September 2013, the DSB adopted the panel report. The panel found that the Republic of Indonesia's importation of horticultural products, animals and animal products is inconsistent with the GATT 1947. The panel recommended that the Republic of Indonesia bring its measures into conformity with the GATT 1947.	No	Agriculture
466	Importation of Horticultural Products, Animals and Animal Products	Animals	New Zealand	Indonesia	30 August 2013	Agriculture: 4.2; GATT 1947: III:4; GATT 1947: X:1; GATT 1947: X:3(a); GATT 1947: XI:1; GATT 1947: XIII:2; Import Licensing: 1.3; Import Licensing: 3.5(b); Import Licensing: 3.5(c); Preshipment Inspection: II:1; Preshipment Inspection: 2.15	Complaint by New Zealand. (See also DS465) On 30 August 2013, New Zealand requested consultations with the Republic of Indonesia regarding the Republic of Indonesia's importation of horticultural products, animals and animal products. The Republic of Indonesia has not responded to the request. The dispute remains unresolved. On 12 September 2013, the DSB adopted the panel report. The panel found that the Republic of Indonesia's importation of horticultural products, animals and animal products is inconsistent with the GATT 1947. The panel recommended that the Republic of Indonesia bring its measures into conformity with the GATT 1947. On 12 September 2013, the DSB adopted the panel report. The panel found that the Republic of Indonesia's importation of horticultural products, animals and animal products is inconsistent with the GATT 1947. The panel recommended that the Republic of Indonesia bring its measures into conformity with the GATT 1947.	No	Agriculture
467	Certain measures Concerning Trademarks, Geographical Indications and Other Plain Packaging Requirements Applicable to Tobacco Products and Packaging	Tobacco	Indonesia	Australia	20 September 2013	Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT): II:2; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): II:1; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): III:1; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): 15.4; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): XVI:1; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): XX; Intellectual Property (TRIPS): 22.2(b); Intellectual Property (TRIPS): 24.3; GATT	Complaint by Australia. (See also DS466) On 20 September 2013, Australia requested consultations with the Republic of Indonesia regarding the Republic of Indonesia's certain measures concerning trademarks, geographical indications and other plain packaging requirements applicable to tobacco products and packaging. The Republic of Indonesia has not responded to the request. The dispute remains unresolved. On 12 September 2013, the DSB adopted the panel report. The panel found that the Republic of Indonesia's certain measures concerning trademarks, geographical indications and other plain packaging requirements applicable to tobacco products and packaging are inconsistent with the TRIPS Agreement and the GATT 1947. The panel recommended that the Republic of Indonesia bring its measures into conformity with the TRIPS Agreement and the GATT 1947. On 12 September 2013, the DSB adopted the panel report. The panel found that the Republic of Indonesia's certain measures concerning trademarks, geographical indications and other plain packaging requirements applicable to tobacco products and packaging are inconsistent with the TRIPS Agreement and the GATT 1947. The panel recommended that the Republic of Indonesia bring its measures into conformity with the TRIPS Agreement and the GATT 1947.	Yes	Manufacturing
468	Definitive Safeguard Measures on Certain Passenger Cars	Automobiles	Japan	Ukraine	30 October 2013	Safeguards: IV:1(a); Safeguards: IV:1(b); Safeguards: IV:2(a); Safeguards: IV:2(b); Safeguards: IV:2(c); Safeguards: V:1; Safeguards: VII:1; Safeguards: VII:4; Safeguards: VII:11; Safeguards: 11.1(a); Safeguards: XII:1; Safeguards: XII:2; Safeguards: XII:3; GATT 1947: II:1(b); GATT 1994: XIX:1; Safeguards: 12.5; GATT 1947: X:3(a)	Complaint by Japan. (See also DS467) On 30 October 2013, Japan requested consultations with the Republic of Ukraine regarding the Republic of Ukraine's definitive safeguard measures on certain passenger cars. The Republic of Ukraine has not responded to the request. The dispute remains unresolved. On 12 September 2013, the DSB adopted the panel report. The panel found that the Republic of Ukraine's definitive safeguard measures on certain passenger cars are inconsistent with the Safeguards Agreement. The panel recommended that the Republic of Ukraine bring its measures into conformity with the Safeguards Agreement. On 12 September 2013, the DSB adopted the panel report. The panel found that the Republic of Ukraine's definitive safeguard measures on certain passenger cars are inconsistent with the Safeguards Agreement. The panel recommended that the Republic of Ukraine bring its measures into conformity with the Safeguards Agreement.	No	Manufacturing
469	Measures on Atlanto-Scandian Herring	Fish	Denmark	European Union	4 November 2013	GATT 1947: I:1; GATT 1947: V:2; GATT 1947: XI:1	Complaint by Denmark. (See also DS468) On 4 November 2013, Denmark requested consultations with the European Union regarding the European Union's measures on Atlanto-Scandian herring. The European Union has not responded to the request. The dispute remains unresolved. On 12 September 2013, the DSB adopted the panel report. The panel found that the European Union's measures on Atlanto-Scandian herring are inconsistent with the GATT 1947. The panel recommended that the European Union bring its measures into conformity with the GATT 1947. On 12 September 2013, the DSB adopted the panel report. The panel found that the European Union's measures on Atlanto-Scandian herring are inconsistent with the GATT 1947. The panel recommended that the European Union bring its measures into conformity with the GATT 1947.	No	Agriculture
470	Anti-Dumping and Countervailing Duty Investigations on Certain Paper Products from Indonesia	Paper	Indonesia	Pakistan	27 November 2013	1947: VI:1; GATT 1947: VI:2; GATT 1947: VI:3; Anti-dumping: I; Anti-dumping: 18.1; Anti-dumping: 5.10; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): X; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): 11.1; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): 32.1; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): 32.5; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures	Complaint by Indonesia. (See also DS469) On 27 November 2013, Indonesia requested consultations with Pakistan regarding the Pakistan's anti-dumping and countervailing duty investigations on certain paper products from Indonesia. The Pakistan has not responded to the request. The dispute remains unresolved. On 12 September 2013, the DSB adopted the panel report. The panel found that the Pakistan's anti-dumping and countervailing duty investigations on certain paper products from Indonesia are inconsistent with the Anti-Dumping Agreement and the Subsidies and Countervailing Measures Agreement. The panel recommended that the Pakistan bring its measures into conformity with the Anti-Dumping Agreement and the Subsidies and Countervailing Measures Agreement. On 12 September 2013, the DSB adopted the panel report. The panel found that the Pakistan's anti-dumping and countervailing duty investigations on certain paper products from Indonesia are inconsistent with the Anti-Dumping Agreement and the Subsidies and Countervailing Measures Agreement. The panel recommended that the Pakistan bring its measures into conformity with the Anti-Dumping Agreement and the Subsidies and Countervailing Measures Agreement.	No	Manufacturing
471	Certain Methodologies and their Application to Anti-Dumping Proceedings Involving China	Zeroing	China	United States	3 December 2013	GATT 1947: VI:2; Anti-dumping: 2.4.2; Anti-dumping: VI:1; Anti-dumping: 6.8; Anti-dumping: 6.10; Anti-dumping: IX:2; Anti-dumping: 9.3; Anti-dumping: 9.4; GATT 1994: Annex II	Complaint by the United States. (See also DS470) On 3 December 2013, the United States requested consultations with the People's Republic of China regarding the People's Republic of China's certain methodologies and their application to anti-dumping proceedings involving China. The People's Republic of China has not responded to the request. The dispute remains unresolved. On 12 September 2013, the DSB adopted the panel report. The panel found that the People's Republic of China's certain methodologies and their application to anti-dumping proceedings involving China are inconsistent with the Anti-Dumping Agreement. The panel recommended that the People's Republic of China bring its measures into conformity with the Anti-Dumping Agreement. On 12 September 2013, the DSB adopted the panel report. The panel found that the People's Republic of China's certain methodologies and their application to anti-dumping proceedings involving China are inconsistent with the Anti-Dumping Agreement. The panel recommended that the People's Republic of China bring its measures into conformity with the Anti-Dumping Agreement.	No	Manufacturing
472	Certain Measures Concerning Taxation and Charges	Tax	European Union	Brazil	19 December 2013	GATT 1947: I:1; GATT 1947: II:1(b); GATT 1947: III:2; GATT 1947: III:4; GATT 1947: III:5; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): 3.1(b); Trade-Related Investment Measures (TRIMs): II:1; Trade-Related Investment Measures (TRIMs): II:2; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): III:2; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): I:1	Complaint by the European Union. (See also DS471) On 19 December 2013, the European Union requested consultations with the Republic of Brazil regarding the Republic of Brazil's certain measures concerning taxation and charges. The Republic of Brazil has not responded to the request. The dispute remains unresolved. On 12 September 2013, the DSB adopted the panel report. The panel found that the Republic of Brazil's certain measures concerning taxation and charges are inconsistent with the GATT 1947. The panel recommended that the Republic of Brazil bring its measures into conformity with the GATT 1947. On 12 September 2013, the DSB adopted the panel report. The panel found that the Republic of Brazil's certain measures concerning taxation and charges are inconsistent with the GATT 1947. The panel recommended that the Republic of Brazil bring its measures into conformity with the GATT 1947.	No	Manufacturing

	Anti-Dumping Measures on Biodiesel from Argentina	Biodiesels	Argentina	European Union	19 December 2013	dumping: 2.2.1.1; Anti-dumping: 2.2.2; Anti-dumping: 2.4; Anti-dumping: III.1; Anti-dumping: III.2; Anti-dumping: III.4; Anti-dumping: III.5; Anti-dumping: VI.2; Anti-dumping: VI.4; Anti-dumping: VI.5; Anti-dumping: 6.5.1; Anti-dumping: 9.3; Anti-dumping: 18.4; GATT 1947: VI.2; Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization: XVI.4; GATT 1947: VI.1; Anti-dumping: II;	On 12 May 2013, the European Union requested the Argentine authorities to initiate an investigation into alleged dumping of biodiesel originating from Argentina. The investigation was initiated by the European Commission on 12 May 2013. On 12 June 2013, the European Commission issued a notice of initiation of an anti-dumping investigation. On 12 July 2013, the European Commission issued a preliminary ruling. On 12 August 2013, the European Commission issued a final ruling. On 12 September 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on appeal. On 12 October 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on review. On 12 November 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on sunset review. On 12 December 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on expiry review.	Argentina challenged the European Union's anti-dumping measures on biodiesel from Argentina, claiming it was inconsistent with WTO rules. The dispute went through the EU's dispute settlement process, with a panel and an appellate body ruling against the EU. The EU agreed to implement the rulings, including adjusting or revoking the anti-dumping measures, within a specified period. The parties later agreed on a sequencing agreement for the implementation.	No	Energy
473	Cost Adjustment Methodologies and Certain Anti-Dumping Measures on Imports from Russia	Import Measures	Russian Federation	European Union	23 December 2013	dumping: 2.2.1; Anti-dumping: 2.2.1.1; Anti-dumping: 2.2.2; Anti-dumping: 2.4; Anti-dumping: III.1; Anti-dumping: III.2; Anti-dumping: III.3; Anti-dumping: III.4; Anti-dumping: III.5; Anti-dumping: IX.2; Anti-dumping: 9.3; Anti-dumping: XI.1; Anti-dumping: XI.2; Anti-dumping: 11.3; Anti-dumping: 18.1; Anti-dumping: 18.4; Anti-dumping: Annex I;	On 12 May 2013, the European Union requested the Russian authorities to initiate an investigation into alleged dumping of biodiesel originating from Russia. The investigation was initiated by the European Commission on 12 May 2013. On 12 June 2013, the European Commission issued a notice of initiation of an anti-dumping investigation. On 12 July 2013, the European Commission issued a preliminary ruling. On 12 August 2013, the European Commission issued a final ruling. On 12 September 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on appeal. On 12 October 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on review. On 12 November 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on sunset review. On 12 December 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on expiry review.	The Russian Federation alleged that the European Union's cost adjustment methodologies used in anti-dumping investigations were inconsistent with WTO rules. The dispute focused on the EU's rejection of cost and price data from Russia, which led to the imposition of anti-dumping duties. China, Indonesia, and other countries joined the consultations and reserved their third-party rights.	No	Manufacturing
474	Measures on the Importation of Live Pigs, Pork and Other Pig Products from the European Union	Animal Products	European Union	Russian Federation	8 April 2014	(SPS): II.2; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): II.3; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): III.1; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): III.2; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): III.3; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): V.1; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): V.2; Sanitary and Phytosanitary	On 12 May 2013, the European Union requested the Russian authorities to initiate an investigation into alleged dumping of biodiesel originating from Russia. The investigation was initiated by the European Commission on 12 May 2013. On 12 June 2013, the European Commission issued a notice of initiation of an anti-dumping investigation. On 12 July 2013, the European Commission issued a preliminary ruling. On 12 August 2013, the European Commission issued a final ruling. On 12 September 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on appeal. On 12 October 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on review. On 12 November 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on sunset review. On 12 December 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on expiry review.	The dispute emerged when the European Union challenged the Russian Federation's import restrictions on live pigs, pork, and other pig products due to concerns about African swine fever. After a lengthy dispute process involving a panel report, an appeal to the Appellate Body, and a compliance panel, the Russian Federation was found to be in violation of its WTO obligations. The European Union was initially granted authorization to suspend concessions, but the matter was later referred to arbitration.	No	Agriculture
475	Certain Measures Relating to the Energy Sector	Distribution	Russian Federation	European Union	30 April 2014	Services (GATS): XVI; Services (GATS): XVII; GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: III; GATT 1947: X; GATT 1947: XI; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): III; Trade-Related Investment Measures (TRIMs): II; Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization: XVI.4; Services (GATS): XVI.1; GATT 1947: III.4; Services (GATS): II.1; Services (GATS): VI.1; Services	On 12 May 2013, the European Union requested the Russian authorities to initiate an investigation into alleged dumping of biodiesel originating from Russia. The investigation was initiated by the European Commission on 12 May 2013. On 12 June 2013, the European Commission issued a notice of initiation of an anti-dumping investigation. On 12 July 2013, the European Commission issued a preliminary ruling. On 12 August 2013, the European Commission issued a final ruling. On 12 September 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on appeal. On 12 October 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on review. On 12 November 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on sunset review. On 12 December 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on expiry review.	The Russian Federation brought a dispute against the European Union's Third Energy Package, claiming inconsistencies with WTO obligations. The dispute was complex and time-consuming, with multiple requests for extensions to finalize the panel and Appellate Body reports. The Appellate Body faced challenges due to its heavy workload and limited resources, resulting in delays in issuing its report.	No	Energy
476	Importation of Horticultural Products, Animals and Animal Products	Animal Products	New Zealand	Indonesia	8 May 2014	GATT 1947: III.4; GATT 1947: X.1; GATT 1947: XI.1; Agriculture: 4.2; Import Licensing: 1.2; Import Licensing: 1.5; Import Licensing: II.2; Import Licensing: II.3; Import Licensing: V.1; Import Licensing: V.2; Preshipment Inspection: II.1; Preshipment Inspection: 2.15; Import Licensing: 2.2(a)	On 12 May 2013, the European Union requested the Indonesian authorities to initiate an investigation into alleged dumping of biodiesel originating from Indonesia. The investigation was initiated by the European Commission on 12 May 2013. On 12 June 2013, the European Commission issued a notice of initiation of an anti-dumping investigation. On 12 July 2013, the European Commission issued a preliminary ruling. On 12 August 2013, the European Commission issued a final ruling. On 12 September 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on appeal. On 12 October 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on review. On 12 November 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on sunset review. On 12 December 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on expiry review.	New Zealand initiated a dispute against Indonesia regarding measures on the importation of horticultural products, animals, and animal products. The measures were deemed inconsistent with WTO agreements, and a panel and the Appellate Body were established to examine the dispute. Indonesia eventually agreed to comply with the DSB's recommendations and rulings within an 8-month reasonable period of time, with additional time granted for specific measures.	No	Agriculture
477	Importation of Horticultural Products, Animals and Animal Products	Animal Products	United States	Indonesia	8 May 2014	GATT 1947: III.4; GATT 1947: X.1; GATT 1947: XI.1; Agriculture: 4.2; Import Licensing: 1.2; Import Licensing: 1.5; Import Licensing: II.2; Import Licensing: II.3; Import Licensing: V.1; Import Licensing: V.2; Preshipment Inspection: II.1; Preshipment Inspection: 2.15; Import Licensing: 2.2(a)	On 12 May 2013, the European Union requested the Indonesian authorities to initiate an investigation into alleged dumping of biodiesel originating from Indonesia. The investigation was initiated by the European Commission on 12 May 2013. On 12 June 2013, the European Commission issued a notice of initiation of an anti-dumping investigation. On 12 July 2013, the European Commission issued a preliminary ruling. On 12 August 2013, the European Commission issued a final ruling. On 12 September 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on appeal. On 12 October 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on review. On 12 November 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on sunset review. On 12 December 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on expiry review.	The dispute over Indonesia's import restrictions on horticultural products, animals, and animal products was resolved through WTO consultations, panel proceedings, and an appeal to the Appellate Body. Indonesia agreed to amend its regulations to comply with WTO rules, and a reasonable period was set for compliance. After Indonesia implemented the necessary changes, the dispute was concluded with the United States and New Zealand agreeing to delay further proceedings for a specific period.	No	Agriculture
478	Anti-Dumping Duties on Light Commercial Vehicles from Germany and Italy	Light Commercial Vehicles	European Union	Russian Federation	21 May 2014	dumping: II.3; Anti-dumping: 2.4; Anti-dumping: III.1; Anti-dumping: III.2; Anti-dumping: III.4; Anti-dumping: III.5; Anti-dumping: 4.1; Anti-dumping: VI.2; Anti-dumping: VI.4; Anti-dumping: VI.5; Anti-dumping: 6.5.1; Anti-dumping: 6.8; Anti-dumping: 6.9; Anti-dumping: 6.10; Anti-dumping: IX.2; Anti-dumping: 9.3; Anti-dumping: XII.2; Anti-dumping: 12.2.2; Anti-	On 12 May 2013, the European Union requested the Russian authorities to initiate an investigation into alleged dumping of biodiesel originating from Russia. The investigation was initiated by the European Commission on 12 May 2013. On 12 June 2013, the European Commission issued a notice of initiation of an anti-dumping investigation. On 12 July 2013, the European Commission issued a preliminary ruling. On 12 August 2013, the European Commission issued a final ruling. On 12 September 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on appeal. On 12 October 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on review. On 12 November 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on sunset review. On 12 December 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on expiry review.	The European Union challenged Russia's anti-dumping duties on light commercial vehicles from Germany and Italy, alleging inconsistency with WTO rules. After a lengthy dispute process involving a panel report and an appeal to the Appellate Body, the DSB adopted the Appellate Body report, which upheld key complaints from the EU. Russia subsequently implemented the DSB's recommendations and removed the duties.	No	Financial
479	Anti-Dumping Measures on Biodiesel from Indonesia	Biodiesels	Indonesia	European Union	10 June 2014	dumping: II.1; Anti-dumping: II.2; Anti-dumping: 2.2.1.1; Anti-dumping: 2.2.2; Anti-dumping: II.3; Anti-dumping: 2.4; Anti-dumping: III.1; Anti-dumping: III.2; Anti-dumping: III.3; Anti-dumping: III.4; Anti-dumping: III.5; Anti-dumping: VII.1; Anti-dumping: VII.2; Anti-dumping: IX.2; Anti-dumping: 9.3; Anti-dumping: XV; Anti-dumping: 18.4;	On 12 May 2013, the European Union requested the Indonesian authorities to initiate an investigation into alleged dumping of biodiesel originating from Indonesia. The investigation was initiated by the European Commission on 12 May 2013. On 12 June 2013, the European Commission issued a notice of initiation of an anti-dumping investigation. On 12 July 2013, the European Commission issued a preliminary ruling. On 12 August 2013, the European Commission issued a final ruling. On 12 September 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on appeal. On 12 October 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on review. On 12 November 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on sunset review. On 12 December 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on expiry review.	Indonesia alleges that anti-dumping measures by the EU on biodiesel imports are inconsistent with WTO rules. The dispute has undergone a lengthy panel process and has been delayed several times. The panel report was adopted by the DSB in February 2018, and the parties agreed on an eight-month implementation period expiring in October 2018.	No	Energy
480	Recourse to Article 22.2 of the DSU in the US & Clove Cigarettes dispute	DSU	European Union	Indonesia	13 June 2014	N/A	On 12 May 2013, the European Union requested the Indonesian authorities to initiate an investigation into alleged dumping of biodiesel originating from Indonesia. The investigation was initiated by the European Commission on 12 May 2013. On 12 June 2013, the European Commission issued a notice of initiation of an anti-dumping investigation. On 12 July 2013, the European Commission issued a preliminary ruling. On 12 August 2013, the European Commission issued a final ruling. On 12 September 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on appeal. On 12 October 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on review. On 12 November 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on sunset review. On 12 December 2013, the European Commission issued a decision on expiry review.	The European Union, Australia, and Brazil raised concerns regarding Indonesia's recourse to Article 22.2 of the DSU, alleging that it resulted in the exclusion of third parties from proceedings in the US - Clove Cigarettes dispute. The complainants argued that this was inconsistent with various provisions of the DSU, particularly those related to transparency and third-party participation.	No	Miscellaneous
481										

	Anti-Dumping Measures on Imports of Certain Carbon Steel Welded Pipe from The Separate Customs Territory of Taiwan, Penghu, Kinmen and Matsu	Carbon Steel Welded Pipe	Chinese Taipei	Canada		dumping: III.1; Anti-dumping: III.2; Anti-dumping: III.4; Anti-dumping: III.5; Anti-dumping: III.7; Anti-dumping: V.8; Anti-dumping: 6.8; Anti-dumping: 6.10; Anti-dumping: XVII.1; GATT 1994: Annex II; Anti-dumping: VII.(ii); Anti-dumping: VII.5; Anti-dumping: IX.2; Anti-dumping: II.2; GATT 1947: VI.2; Anti-dumping: 9.3; Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization:	The WTO dispute over anti-dumping measures on carbon steel welded pipe from Chinese Taipei alleged inconsistencies with various provisions of the Anti-Dumping Agreement. Following consultations and the establishment of a panel, the panel report was adopted by the DSB, and Canada agreed to a reasonable period of 14 months to implement the recommendations and rulings. Canada subsequently informed the DSB that it had complied by making legislative amendments and issuing an amended final determination.	No	Manufacturing
482						dumping: II.2; Anti-dumping: 2.2.1.1; Anti-dumping: 2.2.2; Anti-dumping: 2.4; Anti-dumping: III.1; Anti-dumping: III.2; Anti-dumping: III.4; Anti-dumping: III.5; Anti-dumping: 4.1; Anti-dumping: VI.2; Anti-dumping: 6.8; Anti-dumping: 6.9; Anti-dumping: 6.10; Anti-dumping: 6.10.2; Anti-dumping: VIII.1; Anti-dumping: VIII.3; Anti-dumping: XII.2; Anti-dumping: 12.2.2; Anti-			
483	Anti-Dumping Measures on Imports of Cellulose Pulp from Canada	Cellulose Pulp	Canada	China	15 October 2014	(SPS): II.2; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): II.3; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): III.1; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): V; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): V.1; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): V.2; Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS): V.5; Sanitary and Phytosanitary	Canada initiated a WTO dispute against China's anti-dumping duties imposed on Canadian cellulose pulp imports. The panel ruled in Canada's favor, concluding that China's measures were inconsistent with WTO rules. China agreed to implement the recommendations within 11 months and launched a re-investigation. However, Canada later requested consultations under Article 21.5 of the DSU, indicating ongoing concerns about China's compliance with the ruling.	No	Chemicals
484	Measures Concerning the Importation of Chicken Meat and Chicken Products	Chicken Meat	Brazil	Indonesia	16 October 2014		Brazil initiated this dispute, alleging that Indonesia's import measures for chicken meat and products were inconsistent with WTO regulations. The dispute went through multiple stages, including panel establishment, report issuance, and adoption. Indonesia received a reasonable timeframe to implement changes, and Brazil later requested a compliance panel due to concerns about Indonesia's implementation efforts. However, the compliance panel's work was suspended several times at Brazil's request. Indonesia appealed certain legal interpretations in the panel report to the Appellate Body, and Brazil cross-appealed.	No	Agriculture
	Tariff Treatment of Certain Agricultural and Manufacturing Products	Certain Agricultural and Manufacturing Products	European Union	Russian Federation	31 October 2014	GATT 1947: II.1(a); GATT 1947: II.1(b); GATT 1947: VII; Customs valuation: I; Customs valuation: II; Customs valuation: III; Customs valuation: IV; Customs valuation: V; Customs valuation: VI; Customs valuation: VII	The European Union filed a WTO dispute complaint against the Russian Federation concerning the tariff treatment of certain agricultural and manufacturing products. The EU claimed that the measures violated several provisions of the WTO Agreement. After a panel was established and a report was issued, the DSB adopted the report. The Russian Federation and the European Union agreed to a reasonable implementation period of 7 months and 15 days, which expired on May 11, 2017. The Russian Federation subsequently notified the DSB that it had complied with the DSB's recommendations and rulings.	No	Manufacturing
485						Countervailing Measures (SCM): I; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): 1.1(a); Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): 1.1(a)(i); Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): 1.1(a)(ii); Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): III; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): 3.1(a); Subsidies and Countervailing Measures	Pakistan challenged the European Union's countervailing measures on certain polyethylene terephthalate imports from Pakistan, alleging inconsistency with WTO rules. After a delayed panel process, the panel issued a report in 2017. Both the EU and Pakistan appealed to the Appellate Body, which issued its report in 2018. The DSB adopted the Appellate Body and panel reports, leading to the resolution of the dispute.	No	Chemicals
486	Conditional Tax Incentives for Large Civil Aircraft	Aircraft	European Union	United States	19 December 2014	(SCM): I; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): II; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): 1.1(a)(i); Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): 1.1(b); Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): 3.1(b); Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): III.2; Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): II.3; Subsidies and	The dispute concerned conditional tax incentives provided by the State of Washington to Boeing, which the EU alleged constituted specific and prohibited subsidies under the SCM Agreement. The Appellate Body ultimately found that the incentives were subsidies, but only partly prohibited. The United States made various concessions to bring the measures into compliance with the SCM Agreement.	No	Manufacturing
487	Anti-Dumping Measures on Certain Oil Country Tubular Goods from Korea	Polypropylene	Korea, Republic of	United States	22 December 2014	dumping: 2.2.1.1; Anti-dumping: 2.2.2; Anti-dumping: II.2; Anti-dumping: 2.4; Anti-dumping: VI.2; Anti-dumping: VI.4; Anti-dumping: 6.9; Anti-dumping: 6.10; Anti-dumping: 6.10.1; Anti-dumping: 6.10.2; Anti-dumping: 12.2.2; Anti-dumping: 18.4; GATT 1947: I; GATT 1947: X.3; Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization: XVI.4; Anti-dumping: XII.2(ii); Anti-dumping:	South Korea filed a complaint with the WTO against the United States' anti-dumping measures on oil country tubular goods (OCTG) from Korea. The dispute went through various stages, including panel establishment, report issuance, and compliance proceedings. Eventually, the United States and Korea agreed on a sequencing agreement to expedite the compliance process and avoid further appeals. However, Korea requested authorization to suspend concessions owed to the United States' failure to comply within the agreed-upon timeframe. The matter of suspension level was referred to arbitration.	No	Manufacturing
488	Measures Related to Demonstration Bases and Common Service Platforms Programmes	Textiles	United States	China	11 February 2015	Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): 3.1(a); Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM): III.2	The United States challenged China's export subsidy measures, alleging inconsistency with WTO rules. Several countries joined the consultations. After the establishment of a panel, China and the United States reached an agreement, resolving the dispute through a Memorandum of Understanding.	No	Manufacturing
489	Safeguard on Certain Iron or Steel Products	Flat-rolled product of iron	Chinese Taipei	Indonesia	12 February 2015	GATT 1947: I.1; GATT 1994: XIX.1; GATT 1994: XIX.2; Safeguards: II.1; Safeguards: III.1; Safeguards: IV.1(a); Safeguards: IV.1(b); Safeguards: IV.1(c); Safeguards: IV.2(a); Safeguards: IV.2(b); Safeguards: IV.2(c); Safeguards: XIII.2	Chinese Taipei filed a complaint against Indonesia's safeguard measure on flat-rolled iron or steel products, alleging inconsistency with WTO rules. After a panel ruling and an appeal, the Appellate Body upheld the panel's findings. Indonesia was granted a reasonable period to comply, which expired in March 2019. Both parties agreed to a sequencing arrangement for implementation, and Indonesia subsequently removed the safeguard measure, signaling its compliance with the WTO's recommendations.	No	Manufacturing

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

549	Certain Measures on the Transfer of Technology	Transfer of Technology	European Union	China	1 June 2018	Intellectual Property (TRIPS); III; Intellectual Property (TRIPS); 28.1(a); Intellectual Property (TRIPS); 28.1(b); Intellectual Property (TRIPS); 28.2; Intellectual Property (TRIPS); XXXIII; Intellectual Property (TRIPS); 39.1; Intellectual Property (TRIPS); 39.2; GATT 1947: X:3(a)	Complied by the European Union On 1 June 2018, the European Union requested consultations with China regarding its measures relating to intellectual property rights. The United States also requested consultations with China on 6 June 2018. The European Union requested consultations with China on 15 June 2018. The Chinese Government responded to the request for consultations on 15 June 2018. The European Union requested consultations with China on 15 June 2018. The Chinese Government responded to the request for consultations on 15 June 2018.	The European Union has raised concerns over China's measures related to the transfer of foreign technology, alleging that they may violate certain WTO provisions. The dispute involves several specific regulations, including those governing joint ventures, new energy vehicles, crop seed enterprises, and the import and export of technologies. Other WTO members, including Japan, the United States, and Chinese Taipei, have expressed interest and requested to join the consultations on this matter.	No	Manufacturing
550	Certain Measures on Steel and Aluminium Products	Aluminium and Steel Products	Canada	United States	1 June 2018	1947: II.1(a); GATT 1947: II.1(b); GATT 1947: X:3(a); GATT 1947: XI.1; GATT 1994: XIX.1; GATT 1994: XIX.2; Safeguards: II.1; Safeguards: II.2; Safeguards: III.1; Safeguards: 4.1; Safeguards: 4.2; Safeguards: V.1; Safeguards: VII; Safeguards: VIII.1; Safeguards: 11.1(a); Safeguards: 11.1(b); Safeguards: XII.1; Safeguards: XII.2; Safeguards: XII.3;	The dispute between Canada and the United States over steel and aluminum tariffs was resolved through a mutually agreed solution. The United States eliminated certain duties on steel and aluminium products from Canada, leading to the conclusion of the case before a WTO panel was reached.	No	Manufacturing	
551	Certain Measures on Steel and Aluminium Products	Aluminium and Steel Products	Mexico	United States	5 June 2018	1947: II.1(a); GATT 1947: II.1(b); GATT 1947: X:3(a); GATT 1947: XI.1; GATT 1994: XIX.1; GATT 1994: XIX.2; GATT 1994: XXII.1(b); Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization: XVI.4; Safeguards: II.1; Safeguards: II.2; Safeguards: III.1; Safeguards: 4.1; Safeguards: 4.2; Safeguards: V.1; Safeguards: VI.1; Safeguards: IX;	This WTO dispute concerned certain measures imposed by the United States on steel and aluminium imports, which Mexico claimed were inconsistent with various WTO agreements. The dispute was resolved through a mutually agreed solution, involving the elimination of certain duties by the United States.	No	Manufacturing	
552	Certain Measures on Steel and Aluminium Products	Aluminium and Steel Products	Norway	United States	12 June 2018	GATT 1947: I.1; GATT 1947: II.1(a); GATT 1947: II.1(b); GATT 1947: X:3(a); GATT 1947: XI.1; GATT 1994: XIX.1; GATT 1994: XIX.2; Safeguards: II.1; Safeguards: II.2; Safeguards: III.1; Safeguards: 4.1; Safeguards: 4.2; Safeguards: V.1; Safeguards: VI.1; Safeguards: VII; Safeguards: XII.2; Safeguards: XII.3;	Norway, supported by several WTO members, has filed a dispute against the United States' steel and aluminium tariffs, alleging violations of WTO rules. Despite the case being filed in 2018, it has faced delays due to the pandemic and the complexity of the dispute. The panel report was finally issued in December 2022, and the United States has appealed certain aspects of it to the Appellate Body, prolonging the resolution of the dispute.	No	Manufacturing	
553	Sunset Review of Anti-Dumping Duties on Stainless Steel Bars	Stainless Steel	Japan	Korea, Republic of	18 June 2018	Anti-dumping: I; Anti-dumping: VI.5; Anti-dumping: 6.5.1; Anti-dumping: 6.8; Anti-dumping: 6.9; Anti-dumping: 11.3; Anti-dumping: 11.4; Anti-dumping: XII.2; Anti-dumping: 12.2.2; Anti-dumping: XII.3; Anti-dumping: Annex II; GATT 1947: VI; GATT 1947: VI.6	Japan initiated a WTO dispute settlement case against Korea regarding the continuation of anti-dumping duties on stainless steel bars from Japan. Japan alleged that Korea's determination was inconsistent with WTO rules. Following a panel ruling in Japan's favor, Korea appealed to the Appellate Body, which is currently non-operational. As a result, the Appellate Body's procedural deadlines are suspended, and Japan has indicated its intention to reserve its rights to appeal if necessary.	No	Manufacturing	
554	Certain Measures on Steel and Aluminium Products	Aluminium and Steel Products	Russian Federation	United States	29 June 2018	1947: II.1(b); GATT 1947: X:3(a); GATT 1947: XI.1; GATT 1994: XIX.1; GATT 1994: XIX.2; Safeguards: II.1; Safeguards: II.2; Safeguards: III.1; Safeguards: 4.1; Safeguards: 4.2; Safeguards: V.1; Safeguards: VII; Safeguards: VIII.1; Safeguards: 11.1(a); Safeguards: 11.1(b); Safeguards: XII.1; Safeguards: XII.2; Safeguards: XII.3;	The Russian Federation filed a complaint against the United States for imposing measures on steel and aluminium imports, claiming inconsistencies with WTO agreements. The US, rejecting requests from other countries to join the consultations, maintains that the measures relate to national security and are not subject to WTO review. The panel's final report, initially expected in 2020, has been repeatedly delayed due to the dispute's complexity and the COVID-19 pandemic. The panel's work is currently suspended at the Russian Federation's request, and if the suspension exceeds 12 months, the panel's authority will expire.	No	Manufacturing	
555	Provisional Anti-Dumping Measures on School Exercise Books from Tunisia	School Exercise Books	Tunisia	Morocco	5 July 2018	dumping: 2.2.1.1; Anti-dumping: 2.2.2; Anti-dumping: 2.4; Anti-dumping: III.1; Anti-dumping: III.2; Anti-dumping: III.4; Anti-dumping: III.5; Anti-dumping: 4.1; Anti-dumping: V.1; Anti-dumping: V.2; Anti-dumping: V.3; Anti-dumping: V.8; Anti-dumping: VI.1; Anti-dumping: VI.4; Anti-dumping: VI.5; Anti-dumping: 6.5.1; Anti-dumping: IX; Anti-	Tunisia filed a complaint with the WTO against Morocco's provisional anti-dumping duties on imported school exercise books from Tunisia. Tunisia alleges that the duties violate several provisions of the Anti-Dumping Agreement, including the requirement for a fair and impartial investigation and the prohibition against using methods that are not based on sound evidence. The dispute is ongoing, and a panel has been established to review the matter.	No	Manufacturing	
556	Certain Measures on Steel and Aluminium Products	Aluminium and Steel Products	Switzerland	United States	9 July 2018	1947: II.1(b); GATT 1947: X:3(a); GATT 1947: XI.1; GATT 1994: XIX.1; GATT 1994: XIX.2; Safeguards: II.1; Safeguards: II.2; Safeguards: III.1; Safeguards: 4.1; Safeguards: 4.2; Safeguards: V.1; Safeguards: VII; Safeguards: VIII.1; Safeguards: 11.1(a); Safeguards: XII.1; Safeguards: XII.2; Safeguards: XII.3; Agreement Establishing the World Trade	Switzerland lodged a complaint against the United States' imposed measures on steel and aluminium imports, alleging inconsistency with certain WTO agreements. Despite requests from multiple countries to join the consultations, the US rejected them, asserting national security concerns. After the establishment of a panel, the reporting process has faced significant delays due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the dispute's complexity. On December 9, 2022, the panel report was circulated to members, and the US has since notified its intention to appeal certain aspects of the ruling to the Appellate Body.	No	Manufacturing	
557	Additional Duties on Certain Products from the United States	Certain Products	United States	Canada	16 July 2018	GATT 1947: I.1; GATT 1947: II.1(a); GATT 1947: II.1(b)	The dispute between the United States and Canada, regarding Canada's imposition of increased duties on certain US products, was resolved through a mutually agreed solution on May 23, 2019. Canada agreed to eliminate surcharges on those imports. The WTO panel report acknowledged the resolution and provided a brief summary of the case without further analysis or rulings.	No	Miscellaneous	

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]