

WTO CASE REVIEW 2012*

Raj Bhala, David A. Gantz,
Shannon B. Keating, & Bruno Germain Simões^α

* This *WTO Case Review* is the 13th in our annual series on substantive international trade adjudications issued by the Appellate Body of the World Trade Organization. Each *Review* explains and comments on Appellate Body reports adopted by the WTO Dispute Settlement Body during the preceding calendar year (January 1st through December 31st), excluding decisions on compliance with recommendations contained in previously adopted reports. Our preceding *Reviews* are:

- *WTO Case Review 2011*, 29 ARIZ. J. INT'L & COMP. L. 287-476 (2012).
- *WTO Case Review 2010*, 28 ARIZ. J. INT'L & COMP. L. 239-360 (2011).
- *WTO Case Review 2009*, 27 ARIZ. J. INT'L & COMP. L. 83-190 (2010).
- *WTO Case Review 2008*, 26 ARIZ. J. INT'L & COMP. L. 113-228 (2009).
- *WTO Case Review 2007*, 25 ARIZ. J. INT'L & COMP. L. 75-155 (2008).
- *WTO Case Review 2006*, 24 ARIZ. J. INT'L & COMP. L. 299-387 (2007).
- *WTO Case Review 2005*, 23 ARIZ. J. INT'L & COMP. L. 107-345 (2006).
- *WTO Case Review 2004*, 22 ARIZ. J. INT'L & COMP. L. 99-249 (2005).
- *WTO Case Review 2003*, 21 ARIZ. J. INT'L & COMP. L. 317-439 (2004).
- *WTO Case Review 2002*, 20 ARIZ. J. INT'L & COMP. L. 143-289 (2003).
- *WTO Case Review 2001*, 19 ARIZ. J. INT'L & COMP. L. 457-642 (2002).
- *WTO Case Review 2000*, 18 ARIZ. J. INT'L & COMP. L. 1-101 (2001).

We are grateful to the editors and staff of the *Arizona Journal of International and Comparative Law* for their excellent editorial assistance and continuing support of our work.

The WTO reports we discuss are available on the WTO website, at www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/find_dispu_cases_e.htm. The texts of the WTO agreements we discuss also are available on the WTO website, at www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/legal_e.htm, and are published in a variety of sources, including RAJ BHALA, *INTERNATIONAL TRADE LAW: INTERDISCIPLINARY THEORY AND PRACTICE – DOCUMENTS SUPPLEMENT* (3d ed. 2008). We endeavor to minimize footnotes and, toward that end, provide citations to indicate sources from which various portions of our discussion are drawn.

^α Raj Bhala is Rice Distinguished Professor, University of Kansas School of Law, Green Hall, 1535 West 15th Street, Lawrence, KS 66045-7577 U.S.A. (www.law.ku.edu). Tel. 785-864-9224. Fax. 785-864-5054. Foreign Legal Consultant, Heenan Blaikie, L.L.P., Canada. J.D., Harvard (1989); M.Sc., Oxford (1986); M.Sc., London School of Economics (1985); A.B., Duke (1984). Marshall Scholar (1984-86). Member, Council on Foreign Relations, Royal Society for Asian Affairs, All India Law Teachers' Congress and Fellowship of Catholic Scholars. Author of the monograph *TRADE, DEVELOPMENT, AND SOCIAL JUSTICE* (2003), textbook *INTERNATIONAL TRADE LAW: INTERDISCIPLINARY THEORY AND PRACTICE* (3d ed. 2008) (4th ed. forthcoming), reference *DICTIONARY OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE LAW* (2d ed. 2012), textbook *UNDERSTANDING ISLAMIC LAW (SHARĪ'A)* (2011), and treatise *MODERN GATT LAW* (2d ed. 2013) (two volumes). The discussion of the cases herein will appear in modified form in the 2nd edition of *MODERN GATT LAW*.

David A. Gantz is Samuel M. Fegtly Professor of Law; Director, International Trade Law Program; and Associate Director, National Law Center for Inter-American Free Trade, University of Arizona, James E. Rogers College of Law (www.law.arizona.edu). Associate Director, National Law Center for Inter-American Free Trade. Tel. 520-621-1801. Fax. 520-621-9140. J.D., J.S.M., Stanford Law School (1967, 1970); A.B., Harvard College (1964). Publications: NAFTA AND FREE TRADE IN THE AMERICAS (with Ralph Folsom & Michael Gordon) (2d ed. 2005); REGIONAL TRADE AGREEMENTS: LAW, POLICY AND PRACTICE (2009); TRADE REMEDIES IN NORTH AMERICA (with Greg Bowman, Nick Covelli & Ihn Uhm) (2010); and LIBERALIZING INTERNATIONAL TRADE AFTER DOHA: MULTILATERAL, PLURILATERAL, REGIONAL AND UNILATERAL INITIATIVES (2013).

Shannon B. Keating is a Member of the Kansas Bar Association (Student Division). J.D., University of Kansas (2013); B.A., Austin College (2005).

Bruno Germain Simões is a Staff Editor at the *Kansas Journal of Law & Public Policy*; and a Member of the Kansas Bar Association (Student Division). J.D., University of Kansas (2013); B.S.B., University of Kansas (2010).

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION	217
II. DISCUSSION OF THE 2012 CASE LAW FROM THE APPELLATE BODY	220
<u>A. GATT Obligations: <i>Philippines—Distilled Spirits</i></u>	220
<u>1. Citation</u>	220
Appellate Body Report, <i>Philippines—Taxes on Distilled Spirits</i> , WT/DS396/AB/R, WT/DS403/AB/R (December 21, 2011) (<i>adopted</i> January 20, 2012).	
<u>2. Facts and Panel Rulings</u>	220
<u>3. Appellate Issues and Holdings Under Article III:2, First Sentence</u>	222
a. Article III:2, First Sentence and Physical Characteristics	224
b. Article III:2, First Sentence and Consumer Tastes and Habits	226
c. Article III:2, First Sentence and Tariff Classification	227
d. Article III:2, First Sentence and Regulatory Regimes	227
e. Conclusion on “Likeness” Under Article III:2, First Sentence	228
<u>4. Appellate Issues and Holdings Under Article III:2, Second Sentence</u>	229
a. Article III:2, Second Sentence and “Directly Competitive or Substitutable Products”	230
b. Article III:2, Second Sentence and Affording Protection to Domestic Production	231
<u>5. Commentary</u>	235

<u>B. GATT Obligations: <i>China—Raw Materials</i></u>	236
<u>1. Citation</u>	236
Appellate Body Report, <i>China—Measures Related to the Exportation of Various Raw Materials</i> , WT/DS394/AB/R, WT/DS395/AB/R, WT/DS398/AB/R (January 30, 2012) (<i>adopted</i> February 22, 2012).	
<u>2. Facts</u>	236
<u>3. Overview of Three Appellate Issues</u>	241
<u>4. Issue 1: GATT Article XX Defense for Non-GATT Obligations?</u>	241
<u>5. Issue 2: GATT Article XI:2(a) Critical Shortage Defense?</u>	250
<u>6. Issue 3: GATT Article XX(g) Conservation Defense?</u>	255
<u>7. Commentary</u>	258
a. Significant Victory on Issue 1	258
b. Modestly Useful Ruling on Issue 2	258
<u>C. WTO Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade: <i>United States—Clove Cigarettes</i></u>	259
<u>1. Citation</u>	259
Appellate Body Report, <i>United States—Measures Affecting the Production and Sale of Clove Cigarettes</i> , WT/DS406/AB/R (April 4, 2012) (<i>adopted</i> April 24, 2012).	
<u>2. Facts</u>	259
a. Section 907(a)(1)(A) Flavored Cigarettes Ban	259
b. Cigarette Market in the United States	260

c. International Anti-Smoking Efforts	261
<u>3. Overview of Two Appellate Issues</u>	262
<u>4. Issue 1: National Treatment?</u>	263
a. “Likeness” under <i>TBT Agreement</i> Article 2:1	263
b. “Likeness” and End Uses	265
c. “Likeness” and Consumer Tastes and Habits	266
d. “Treatment Less Favorable” and <i>TBT Agreement</i> Article 2:1	268
<u>5. Issue 2: Transparency, <i>TBT Agreement</i> Article 2:12, and Technical Regulations?</u>	274
<u>6. Commentary</u>	280

D. WTO *TBT Agreement*, Continued:

<u><i>United States—Tuna II (Mexico)</i></u>	283
<u>1. Citation</u>	283
Appellate Body Report, <i>United States—Measures Concerning the Importation, Marketing and Sale of Tuna and Tuna Products</i> , WT/DS381/AB/R (May 16, 2012) (adopted June 13, 2012).	
<u>2. Facts</u>	283
<u>3. Overview of Three Appellate Issues</u>	285
<u>4. Issue 1: MFN, National Treatment, and <i>TBT Agreement</i> Article 2:1?</u>	287
a. Interpretation of “Treatment No Less Favorable”	289
b. Application of “Treatment No Less Favorable”	291
<u>5. Issue 2: More Trade Restrictive than Necessary Under <i>TBT Agreement</i> Article 2:2?</u>	293

a. Interpretation of <i>TBT Agreement</i> Article 2:2	295
b. Application of <i>TBT Agreement</i> Article 2:2	297
<u>6. Issue 3: “International Standard” in <i>TBT Agreement</i> Article 2:4?</u>	298
a. Interpretation of “International Standard” Under <i>TBT Agreement</i>	299
b. <i>AIDCP</i> as a “Relevant International Standard” Under <i>TBT Agreement</i>	304
<u>7. Commentary: Significance of <i>TBT Agreement</i> Articles 2:1 and 2:4 Rulings</u>	306

E. WTO *TBT Agreement*, Continued: *United States—COOL*

<u>1. Citation</u>	307
Appellate Body Report, <i>United States—Certain Country of Origin Labelling (COOL) Requirements</i> , WT/DS384/AB/R, WT/DS386/AB/R (June 29, 2012) (<i>adopted</i> July 23, 2012).	
<u>2. Fact</u>	307
<u>3. Overview of Three Appellate Issues</u>	312
<u>4. Issue 1: MFN, National Treatment, and <i>TBT Agreement</i> Article 2:1?</u>	314
a. Interpretation of “Treatment No Less Favorable”	315
b. Application of “Treatment No Less Favorable”	317
<u>5. Issue 2: More Trade Restrictive than Necessary Under <i>TBT Agreement</i> Article 2:2?</u>	320
a. “Legitimate Objective”	321
b. “More Trade Restrictive than Necessary to Fulfill a Legitimate Objective”	324
<u>6. Commentary</u>	327

a. Deciding Too Much?	327
b. Future Implications?	328

**F. Trade Remedies—WTO Countervailing and Antidumping Duties:
China—GOES**329

<u>1. Citation</u>	329
--------------------------	-----

Appellate Body Report, *China—Countervailing and Anti-Dumping Duties on Grain Oriented Flat-Rolled Electrical Steel from the United States*, WT/DS414/AB/R (October 18, 2012) (*adopted* November 16, 2012).

<u>2. Background</u>	329
----------------------------	-----

<u>3. Overview of Three Appellate Issues</u>	330
--	-----

<u>4. Issue 1: Interpretation and Application of <i>Antidumping Agreement</i> Article 3:2 and <i>SCM Agreement</i> Article 15:2?</u>	331
--	-----

<u>5. Issue 2: Disclosure of “Essential Facts” Under <i>Antidumping Agreement</i> Article 6:9 and <i>SCM Agreement</i> Article 12:8?</u>	337
--	-----

<u>6. Issue 3: Adequate Public Notice and Explanation Under <i>Antidumping Agreement</i> Article 12:2:2 and <i>SCM Agreement</i> Article 22:5?</u>	339
--	-----

<u>7. Commentary: Political Case</u>	342
--	-----

**G. Trade Remedies—WTO Countervailing Duties:
United States—Boeing**343

<u>1. Citation</u>	343
--------------------------	-----

Appellate Body Report, *United States—Measures Affecting Trade in Large Civil Aircraft (Second Complaint)*, WT/DS353/AB/R (March 12, 2012) (*adopted* March 23, 2012).

<u>2. Background</u>	343
----------------------------	-----

a. Lengthy, Painful Reading (Again)	343
---	-----

b. Who is the Worst Offender?	344
<u>3. Synopsis of Key Facts and Conclusions</u>	345
a. United States Federal Government Measures	347
1) Aeronautics R&D Measures	347
2) Allocation of Patent Rights	351
3) FSC/ETI and Successor Legislation	353
b. State and Local Measures	354
1) State of Washington	354
i. Washington State B&O Tax Rate Reduction	355
ii. Washington State B&O Tax Credits	356
iii. Washington State Sales and Use Tax Exemptions	357
2) Wichita (Kansas) Industrial Revenue Bonds (IRBs)	357
<u>4. Four Key Appellate Issues and Holdings</u>	359
a. Financial Contribution Under <i>SCM Agreement</i> Article 1:1(a)?	359
1) NASA Procurement Contracts and USDOD Assistance Instruments	359
i. NASA Procurement Contracts	362
ii. USDOD Assistance Insurance	363
2) Washington State B&O Tax Rate Reduction	366

b. NASA Procurement Contracts and USDOD Assistance Instruments, and Conferral of Benefit Under <i>SCM Agreement</i> Article 1:1(b)?	369
c. Specificity of a Benefit Under <i>SCM Agreement</i> Articles 1-2?	371
1) NASA and USDOD Allocation of Patent Rights	372
2) Washington State B&O Tax Rate Reduction	376
3) City of Wichita IRBS	377
d. Yellow Light Subsidies and Adverse Effects in Form of Serious Prejudice Under GATT Article XVI:1 and <i>SCM Agreement</i> Articles 5-6?	381
1) Appellate Body and Causation-Non-Attribution Analysis	382
2) Overview of Appellate Body Findings on Causation of Adverse Effects	384
3) Technology Effects	384
i. Five Specific Grounds for American Appeal	385
ii. American Appeal of Panel Counterfactual Analysis	388
iii. American Appeal Relating to Second Stage of Panel Analysis	390
iv. Significant Lost Sales?	391
v. Threat of Displacement and Impedance?	393
vi. Significant Price Suppression	396
4) Price Effects: Step 1 – Proper Causation Analysis?	399

i. Reliance on an Impermissible Presumption?	399
ii. Magnitude of Tied Tax Subsidies?	400
iii. Counterfactual Analysis of Panel?	402
iv. Effects of Other Factors?	402
5) Price Effects: Step 2 – Proper Analysis of Significant Price Suppression, Significant Lost Sales, and Displacement and Impedance?	404
i. Significant Price Suppression	405
ii. Significant Lost Sales	405
iii. Displacement and Impedance	406
6) Price Effects: Step 3 – Appellate Body Completion of Analysis	408
7) Collective Assessment of Subsidies and Their Effects	411
i. Should Effects of Aeronautics R&D Subsidies and B&O Tax Rate Reductions Have Been Assessed Collectively?	412
ii. Should Effects of Tied Tax Subsidies and Remaining Subsidies Have Been Assessed Collectively	413
iii. Appellate Body Completion of Analysis	414
<u>5. Commentary</u>	417
a. Less Obvious Comment	417
b. Betraying Kansas	417
c. To What End?	418