



11 March 2016

(16-1439)

Page: 1/2

Original: English

**UNITED STATES – COUNTERVAILING MEASURES ON CERTAIN HOT-ROLLED CARBON
STEEL FLAT PRODUCTS FROM INDIA**

STATUS REPORT BY THE UNITED STATES

Addendum

The following communication, dated 10 March 2016, from the delegation of the United States to the Chairperson of the Dispute Settlement Body, is circulated pursuant to Article 21.6 of the DSU.

Status Report Regarding the Implementation of the
DSB Recommendations and Rulings in the Dispute
*United States – Countervailing Measures on Certain Hot-Rolled
Carbon Steel Flat Products from India*
(WT/DS436)

The United States submits this report in accordance with Article 21.6 of the *Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes* ("DSU").

On 19 December 2014, the Dispute Settlement Body ("DSB") adopted its recommendations and rulings in *United States – Countervailing Measures on Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from India* (WT/DS436). At the following DSB meeting, the United States informed the DSB of its intention to implement the recommendations and rulings of the DSB in connection with this matter.

On 24 March 2015, the United States and India informed the DSB that they had agreed that a reasonable period of time for the United States to implement the recommendations and rulings of the DSB would end on 19 March 2016. On 9 March 2016, the United States and India informed the DSB that they had agreed to extend the reasonable period of time so as to expire on 18 April 2016.

US authorities are conferring with interested parties and working to implement the recommendations and rulings of the DSB in a manner that is appropriate. On 5 October 2015, the US Trade Representative requested, pursuant to section 129(b)(2) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act ("URAA"), the Secretary of Commerce to issue a determination that would render the determinations by the Department of Commerce subject to the DSB's recommendations not inconsistent with those recommendations and rulings. Also on 5 October 2015, the US Trade Representative requested, pursuant to section 129(a)(1) of the URAA, the US International Trade Commission ("USITC") to issue an advisory report on whether US law permits the USITC to take steps in connection with the particular proceeding that would render its determination subject to the DSB's recommendations not inconsistent with those recommendations and rulings.

On 23 October 2015, the USITC issued an affirmative advisory report to the US Trade Representative, indicating that Title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 permits the USITC to take steps that would render its action in that proceeding not inconsistent with the DSB's recommendations and rulings. On 6 November 2015, the US Trade Representative requested, pursuant to section 129(a)(4) of the URAA, that the USITC issue a determination that would render its action in that proceeding not inconsistent with the DSB's recommendation and rulings. On 7 March 2016,

the USITC issued a determination pursuant to Section 129(a)(4). The USITC "f[ou]nd that an industry in the United States is materially injured by reason of imports of hot-rolled steel found by the US Department of Commerce (Commerce) to be subsidized, and ma[d]e an affirmative determination regarding subsidized hot-rolled steel imports from India."¹ This USITC determination pursuant to Section 129(a)(4) renders its action subject to the DSB's recommendations not inconsistent with those recommendations and rulings.

¹ USITC Publication 4599, at 2 (March 2016) (footnotes omitted).