

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <i>Page</i> |
|---|-------------|
| United States - Certain Methodologies and their Application to Anti-Dumping Proceedings Involving China (WT/DS471) | |
| Report of the Panel | 1589 |
| China - Anti-Dumping Measures on Imports of Cellulose Pulp from Canada (WT/DS483) | |
| Report of the Panel | 1961 |
| Cumulative List of Published Disputes | 2167 |

**UNITED STATES - CERTAIN METHODOLOGIES AND
 THEIR APPLICATION TO ANTI-DUMPING
 PROCEEDINGS INVOLVING CHINA**

Report of the Panel

BCI deleted, as indicated [[BCI]]

WT/DS471/R and Add.1

*Adopted by the Dispute Settlement Body
 on 22 May 2017
 as Modified by the Appellate Body Report*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 1606 |
| 1.1 Complaint by China | 1606 |
| 1.2 Panel Establishment and Composition | 1606 |
| 1.3 Panel Proceedings..... | 1607 |
| 1.3.1 General..... | 1607 |
| 1.3.2 Additional Working Procedures on Business Confidential Information (BCI) | 1607 |
| 2. FACTUAL ASPECTS..... | 1607 |
| 3. PARTIES' REQUESTS FOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... | 1609 |
| 4. ARGUMENTS OF THE PARTIES | 1614 |
| 5. ARGUMENTS OF THE THIRD PARTIES | 1614 |
| 6. INTERIM REVIEW | 1614 |
| 6.1 China's Claims Concerning the USDOC's Use of the WA-T Methodology under Article 2.4.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement | 1615 |
| 6.2 Whether the Six Administrative Review Determinations Introduced at the Panel's First Substantive Meeting with the Parties Are Within the Panel's Terms of Reference..... | 1619 |

Report of the Panel

| | | |
|---------|---|------|
| 6.3 | Whether the Single Rate Presumption is, as such and as Applied in 38 Determinations, Inconsistent with Articles 6.10, 9.2, and the Second Sentence of Article 9.4 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement | 1620 |
| 6.4 | China's Claims under Articles 6.1 and 6.8, Paragraphs 1 and 7 of Annex II, and the First Sentence of Article 9.4 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement..... | 1624 |
| 7. | FINDINGS | 1626 |
| 7.1 | China's Claims Concerning the USDOC'S Use of the WA-T Methodology under Article 2.4.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement..... | 1626 |
| 7.1.1 | Provisions at issue..... | 1626 |
| 7.1.2 | Factual background..... | 1627 |
| 7.1.3 | China's claim under the pattern clause of Article 2.4.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement | 1630 |
| 7.1.3.1 | Main arguments of the parties..... | 1630 |
| 7.1.3.2 | Main arguments of the third parties | 1637 |
| 7.1.3.3 | Evaluation by the Panel | 1640 |
| 7.1.4 | China's claim under the explanation clause of Article 2.4.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement..... | 1679 |
| 7.1.4.1 | Main arguments of the parties..... | 1679 |
| 7.1.4.2 | Main arguments of the third parties | 1680 |
| 7.1.4.3 | Evaluation by the Panel | 1682 |
| 7.1.5 | China's claim under the second sentence of Article 2.4.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement with respect to the USDOC's application of the WA-T methodology to <i>all</i> export transactions in the three challenged investigations | 1689 |
| 7.1.5.1 | Main arguments of the parties..... | 1689 |
| 7.1.5.2 | Main arguments of the third parties | 1692 |
| 7.1.5.3 | Evaluation by the Panel | 1693 |
| 7.1.6 | China's claim under Article 2.4.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement concerning the USDOC's use of zeroing in the application of the WA-T methodology | 1699 |
| 7.1.6.1 | Main arguments of the parties..... | 1700 |
| 7.1.6.2 | Main arguments of the third parties | 1701 |
| 7.1.6.3 | Evaluation by the Panel | 1703 |
| 7.2 | Use of the WA-T Methodology in the Third Administrative Review in PET Film: Alleged Violation of Article 9.3 of | |

 US - Anti-Dumping Methodologies (China)

| | | |
|-----|--|------|
| | the Anti-Dumping Agreement and Article VI:2 of the GATT 1994 | 1714 |
| | 7.2.1 Provisions at issue | 1714 |
| | 7.2.2 Factual background | 1714 |
| | 7.2.3 Main arguments of the parties | 1715 |
| | 7.2.3.1 China | 1715 |
| | 7.2.3.2 United States | 1716 |
| | 7.2.4 Main arguments of the third parties | 1717 |
| | 7.2.4.1 European Union | 1717 |
| | 7.2.4.2 Japan | 1717 |
| | 7.2.5 Evaluation by the Panel | 1718 |
| 7.3 | Whether the Six Administrative Review Determinations Introduced at the Panel's First Substantive Meeting with the Parties Are Within the Panel's Terms of Reference | 1720 |
| | 7.3.1 Introduction | 1720 |
| | 7.3.2 Whether China's panel request covers the six determinations | 1722 |
| | 7.3.3 Whether the six determinations should have been subject to consultations | 1729 |
| | 7.3.4 Conclusion | 1730 |
| 7.4 | Whether the Single Rate Presumption is, as Such and as Applied in 38 Determinations, Inconsistent with Articles 6.10, 9.2, and the Second Sentence of Article 9.4 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement | 1731 |
| | 7.4.1 Introduction | 1731 |
| | 7.4.2 Provisions at issue | 1731 |
| | 7.4.3 Main arguments of the parties | 1732 |
| | 7.4.3.1 China | 1732 |
| | 7.4.3.2 United States | 1736 |
| | 7.4.4 Main arguments of the third parties | 1739 |
| | 7.4.4.1 European Union | 1739 |
| | 7.4.4.2 Viet Nam | 1740 |
| | 7.4.5 Evaluation by the Panel | 1740 |
| | 7.4.5.1 Whether the Single Rate Presumption constitutes a measure that can be challenged as such in WTO dispute settlement | 1741 |
| | 7.4.5.2 Whether the Single Rate Presumption is, as such and as applied in 38 | |

Report of the Panel

| | | |
|---------|--|------|
| | determinations, inconsistent with Articles 6.10 and 9.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement..... | 1760 |
| 7.4.5.3 | China's as such and as applied claims under the second sentence of Article 9.4 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement | 1780 |
| 7.4.5.4 | Overall conclusion | 1782 |
| 7.5 | China's Claims Under Articles 6.1 and 6.8, Paragraphs 1 and 7 of Annex II, and the First Sentence of Article 9.4 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement..... | 1782 |
| 7.5.1 | Introduction..... | 1782 |
| 7.5.2 | Provisions at issue..... | 1783 |
| 7.5.3 | Main arguments of the parties..... | 1785 |
| 7.5.3.1 | China..... | 1785 |
| 7.5.3.2 | United States | 1789 |
| 7.5.4 | Main arguments of the third parties..... | 1793 |
| 7.5.4.1 | European Union | 1793 |
| 7.5.4.2 | Brazil..... | 1794 |
| 7.5.4.3 | Viet Nam..... | 1794 |
| 7.5.5 | Evaluation by the Panel | 1795 |
| 7.5.5.1 | Whether the AFA Norm is inconsistent, as such, with Article 6.8 and paragraph 7 of Annex II to the Anti-Dumping Agreement..... | 1795 |
| 7.5.5.2 | China's as applied claims under Articles 6.1 and 6.8, paragraphs 1 and 7 of Annex II, and the first sentence of Article 9.4 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement concerning 30 determinations ... | 1822 |
| 8. | CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... | 1837 |

LIST OF ANNEXES

ANNEX A

WORKING PROCEDURES OF THE PANEL

| Contents | | Page |
|-----------|---|------|
| Annex A-1 | Working Procedures of the Panel | 1841 |
| Annex A-2 | Additional Working Procedures of the Panel concerning Business Confidential Information | 1848 |

ANNEX B

ARGUMENTS OF THE PARTIES

CHINA

| Contents | | Page |
|-----------|--|------|
| Annex B-1 | First part of the executive summary of the arguments of China | 1851 |
| Annex B-2 | Second part of the executive summary of the arguments of China | 1865 |

UNITED STATES

| Contents | | Page |
|-----------|--|------|
| Annex B-3 | First part of the executive summary of the arguments of the United States | 1880 |
| Annex B-4 | Second part of the executive summary of the arguments of the United States | 1898 |

Report of the Panel

ANNEX C

ARGUMENTS OF THE THIRD PARTIES

| Contents | | Page |
|-----------------|--|-------------|
| Annex C-1 | Executive summary of the arguments of Brazil | 1917 |
| Annex C-2 | Executive summary of the arguments of Canada | 1923 |
| Annex C-3 | Executive summary of the arguments of the European Union | 1926 |
| Annex C-4 | Executive summary of the arguments of Japan | 1932 |
| Annex C-5 | Executive summary of the arguments of Korea | 1940 |
| Annex C-6 | Executive summary of the arguments of Norway | 1948 |
| Annex C-7 | Executive summary of the written submission of Turkey | 1952 |
| Annex C-8 | Executive summary of the arguments of Viet Nam | 1956 |