

INDEX

- aggregation of effects of subsidies, xv, 146–49, 150, 152–53, 163, 168
- Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT Agreement), *See* Article 2.2 exceptions (TBT Agreement)
- Antidumping Agreement, 101, 119, 136, 140
 - Article 3.1, 3, 240
 - Article 3.5, xiv, 3, 70, 95, 108, 240
 - see also* antidumping measures
- antidumping measures, 68
 - breaking the causal link
 - Japan—Hot-Rolled Steel*, 95–96
 - ‘injury’ in the trade remedies context, 75
 - multi-factorial approach
 - non-attribution analysis, incompatibility of, 81, 83
 - US—Hot-Rolled Steel*, 79
 - other known factors, 100
 - qualification analysis, 118
- applied apportionment causal link test
 - causal factor test, xiv, 103–5, 106
 - NESS test, xiv, 105–8, 109–10
 - sine qua non* test, xiv, 103–5, 104
- apportionment analysis of Tripartite Non-attribution/Causal Link Analysis, 99–100
- causal relationship between
 - measures and policy objectives
 - disentanglement, 200–2
 - other known factors, 200
- identification of other known factors, 100–11
- retaliatory measures
 - disentanglement, 230–32
- serious prejudice under the SCM Agreement
 - amalgamation of sub-effects, 146–53
 - causes of sub-effects, 142–47
 - disentanglement, 153–55
 - other known factors, 153
- trade remedies
 - disentanglement, 112–16
 - other known factors, 99–111
- arbitrators
 - Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) of WTO, 220
- econometric analysis, 218
- no causation findings
 - Canada—Aircraft (Article 22.6)*, 211–12
 - EC—Hormones (Article 22.6)*, 212
- nullification and impairment
 - EC—Hormones (Article 22.6)*, 214
 - presumption of, 213–14
- see also* determining nullification and impairment; nullification or impairment of benefits
 - US—COOL*, 217–19
 - US—Countervailing Measures (China)*, 219–20
 - US—Gambling (Article 22.6—United States)*, 214–16
 - US—Tuna case*, 216–17
- other known factors, 218–19
- sine qua non* test
 - hypothetical world problem, 212

- Article 2.2 exceptions (TBT Agreement), 4, 14, 169, 170–71, 240
 causal relationship between measures and policy objectives, 174, 175, 177, 203, 205
Australia—Tobacco Plain Packaging (Indonesia), 181, 186
 GATT compared, 178, 189
 design and structure test, 175
 econometric analysis, 31
 Tripartite Non-attribution/Causal Link Analysis, xv, 199
 attributive use of causation, 1, 32
 explanatory use compared, 171
 predictive use compared, 172
- breach of obligations, 16, 28
 Article X:3 GATT, 16–17
 SPS Agreement, 17–18
 breaking the causal link, 13, 71
 antidumping context
Japan—Hot-Rolled Steel, 95–96
 Appellate Body's approach to, 91–96
 countervailing duties
EU—PET (Pakistan), 91–94
 domestic competent authorities, 84–86
 EU, 86–87
 United States, 87–88
EU—PET (Pakistan)
 absence of any quantitative threshold, 94
 failing to appreciate the interaction between causal factors, 93–94
 omitted variable bias, 91–93
 safeguards context
US—Wheat Gluten, 94–95
 serious prejudice under SCM Agreement, 144–46, 168
- causal factor test (Hart and Honoré), 50–51, 51
 applied apportionment causal link test, xiv, 103–5, 106
 cause-in-fact theories of causation, 50–51
 duplicative over-determination, 51
- increased imports and 'serious injury or threat thereof', 120
 other known factors, xiv, 103–5, 106
 trade remedies
 other known factors, 105–6
 causal relationship between measures and policy objectives, 242
 Article 2.2 of the TBT Agreement, 174, 177–80, 186–88
see also Article 2.2 exceptions (TBT Agreement)
Australia—Tobacco Plain Packaging (Indonesia), 181, 182
 degree of connection, 203
 determining causation, 181–83
 difficulty estimating future effects, 183
 Article 2.2 of the TBT Agreement 186–89
Australia—Plain Packaging Tobacco (Indonesia), 186–89
Brazil—Retreaded Tyres, 183–85
EC—Seal Products, 185–86
 General Exceptions, 183–86
 Linear Regression Analysis, 192–95
 Statistical Inference Approach, 189–97
 Statistical Significance Test, 189–92
Dominican Republic—Import and Sale of Cigarettes, 173
EC—Seal Products, 177–78, 180, 182
 General Exceptions, 173–76
Korea—Various Measures on Beef, 173
 level of contribution of measures, 176–77
 Article 2.2 of the TBT Agreement and General Exceptions compared, 177–80
 SPS Agreement, 19–24
 Tripartite Non-attribution/Causal Link Analysis
 apportionment analysis (Step 2a – disentanglement), 200–2
 apportionment analysis (Step 2a – other known factors), 200

- causal relationship between measures and policy objectives (cont.)
 - causal link (Step 3), 204
 - qualification analysis (Step 2b), 202–4
 - separating sub-effects (Step 1), 198–200
- US—Gasoline*, 178–79
- causation in WTO law, 1–3
 - retaliatory measures, 4–5
 - see also* retaliatory measures
 - serious prejudice, 4
 - see also* serious prejudice under the SCM Agreement
 - trade remedies, 3–4
 - see also* trade remedies
- cause-in-fact theories of causation, 34
 - Linear Regression Analysis, 54–57
 - non-quantitative approaches to causation, 36–37
 - sine qua non* test, 37–44
 - weak necessity/strong sufficiency test, 44–54
 - quantitative approaches to causation, 54
 - Linear Regression Analysis, 54–57
 - statistical significance test, 57–61
- sine qua non* test, 34, 65
 - counterfactual theory, 37–39
 - hypothetical world problem, 39–40, 43–44
 - limitations, 40–44
 - over-inclusiveness, 40
 - under-inclusiveness, 40–43
- statistical significance test, 57–61
- weak necessity/strong sufficiency test, 34, 44–46, 65
 - causal factor test, 50–51
 - duplicative over-determination, 45–46
 - INUS test, 52–54
 - NESS test, 51–52
 - pre-emptive over-determination, 45–48
- cause-in-law theories of causation, 34, 35
 - attribution of responsibility, 61–62
 - torts, 62
 - Tripartite Non-attribution/Causal Link Analysis, 35, 62–64
- Commercial Policy Analysis System (COMPAS)
 - impact of imports and other known factors, 113–16
- cost of production test, 10, 116
- counterfactual approach to causation
 - arbitrators, 210, 227
 - determining the nullification and impairment
 - EC—Bananas III (Article 22.6)*, 223
 - EC—Hormones (Article 22.6)*, 222
 - EC—Large Civil Aircraft (Article 22.6)*, 224
 - US—Anti-Dumping Methodologies (China) (Article 22.6)*, 220
 - US—Gambling (Article 22.6—US)*, 221, 234
 - US—Large Civil Aircraft (2nd complaint) (Article 22.6)*, 224
 - US—Tuna II (Mexico) (Article 22.6—US)*, 221
 - US—Washing Machines (Article 22.6—US)*, 223
- hypothetical world problem, 39–40
 - sine qua non* test, 37–39, 41, 159
- countervailing duties, 68
 - breaking the causal link
 - EU—PET (Pakistan)*, 91–94
 - EC—Countervailing Measures on DRAM Chips*, 243
- ‘genuine and substantial relationship of cause and effect’, 72
 - US—Large Civil Aircraft (2nd complaint)*, 80
- ‘injury’ in the trade remedies context, 75
- multi-factorial approach
 - EU—PET (Pakistan)*, 79
 - non-attribution analysis, incompatibility of, 83
- other known factors, 100
- qualification analysis, 118
- see also* Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM) Agreement

- country of origin labelling requirements, 196
- cumulation of effects of subsidies, 150–51, 152–53, 164, 168
- data, absence of sufficient, 115
 - Australia—Apples*, 9
 - difficulty estimating future effects
 - Article 2.2 of the TBT Agreement 186–89
 - Australia—Plain Packaging Tobacco (Indonesia)*, 186–89
- design and structure test, 180, 242
 - Article 2.2 of the TBT Agreement 175
 - General Exceptions, 175, 178
- determining nature of market phenomena
 - bifurcated approach, 166
 - EC and certain member States—Large Civil Aircraft*, 137
 - US—Upland Cotton*, 137
 - serious prejudice
 - displacement and impedance, 129
 - unitary approach, 136, 166
 - criticisms, 138–40
 - Korea—Commercial Vessels*, 137
 - sine qua non* test, relationship with, 137
 - US—Upland Cotton*, 137
- determining nullification and impairment, 210
 - counterfactual analysis, 220–22
 - EC—Bananas III (Article 22.6)*, 223
 - EC—Hormones (Article 22.6)*, 222
 - EC—Large Civil Aircraft (Article 22.6)*, 224
 - hypothetical world problem, 222–23
 - US—Anti-Dumping Methodologies (China) (Article 22.6)*, 220
 - US—Gambling (Article 22.6—US)*, 221, 234
 - US—Large Civil Aircraft (2nd complaint) (Article 22.6)*, 224
 - US—Tuna II (Mexico) (Article 22.6—US)*, 221
 - US—Washing Machines (Article 22.6—US)*, 223
 - ‘reasonable period of time’, 225–26
 - see also* nullification or impairment of benefits
- disentanglement stage
 - Tripartite Non-attribution/Causal Link Analysis, 97–99
- causal link between measures and policy objectives, 200–2
- domestic competent authorities’ discretion, 112
- econometric analysis, 30, 64–65, 112–16
 - serious prejudice under SCM Agreement, 153–55
 - trade remedies, 112–16
- Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) of WTO, 207
 - Canada—Aircraft (Article 22.6)*, 211–12
 - EC—Hormones (Article 22.6)*, 212–13
 - other known factors, 220
 - see also* arbitrators
- domestic competent authorities, 13
 - breaking the causal link, 70–71, 84–86, 88–91, 93–94, 123
 - EU, 86–87
 - United States, 87–88
- discretion when disentangling the injurious effects of imports, 112, 118, 123
- genuine and substantial relationship of cause and effect
 - determination of, 119
 - other known factors, 107, 200
 - qualification analysis, 116, 117
- duplicative over-determination
 - weak necessity/strong sufficiency test, 46–48, 48
 - causal factor test, 51
 - NESS analysis, 53
- econometric analysis, 5
 - arbitrators, 218
 - COMPAS methodology, 113–14
 - cost of production test, 116

- econometric analysis (cont.)
 GATS, 31
 GATT, 30
 simultaneous equations, 114
 TBT Agreement, 31
 Tripartite Non-attribution/Causal Link Analysis
 Disentanglement Stage, 30, 64–65, 112–16
 explanatory use of causation, 1, 32, 171–72
- factual basis of causation, *See* cause-in-fact theories of causation
- failure to comply with DSB rulings, 4, 15, 209, 213–14, 220, 226
 Canada—Aircraft (Article 22.6), 211–12
 causal link, 233
 disaggregation of harms, 228, 229
 disentanglement of sub-injuries, 230
EC—Hormones (Article 22.6), 212
 nullification and impairment, causal link with, 228, 238
 quantification, 234–35, 238
 qualification analysis, 232–33
 ‘reasonable period of time’, 225–26
see also Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes (DSU)
 US—COOL, 217
 US—Countervailing Measures (China), 220
 US—Gambling (Article 22.6—United States), 215, 221
 US—Tuna case, 216
- General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)
 Article XX, 4, 14, 240
 econometric analysis, 30
see also General Exceptions (Art. XX GATT/Art. XIV GATS)
 Tripartite Non-attribution/Causal Link Analysis, xv, 199
 Article XXIII:1, 27, 211, 238
see also nullification or impairment of benefits
- General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS)
 Article XIV, 4, 14, 240
 econometric analysis, 30
see also General Exceptions (Art. XX GATT/Art. XIV GATS)
 Tripartite Non-attribution/Causal Link Analysis, xv, 199
 Article XXIII:3, 27
see also nullification or impairment of benefits
- General Exceptions (Art. XX GATT/Art. XIV GATS), 169–70, 242
 causal relationship between measures and policy objectives, 173–76
 Article 2.2 TBT Agreement compared 177–80
 difficulty estimating future effects, 183–86
 design and structure test, 175, 178
 ‘genuine and substantial relationship of cause and effect’, 63
 countervailing measures context, 72, 148, 149–51
 EU—PET (Pakistan), 107
 US—Large Civil Aircraft (2nd complaint), 80, 82, 134, 165
 US—Tyres (China), 134, 165
 US—Upland Cotton, 144
 US—Wheat Gluten, 95, 134
 domestic competent authorities, 119
 import-induced injury, 72–74
 increased imports and ‘serious injury or threat thereof’, 119, 121
 multi-factorial approach, 80
 safeguards context, 72
 serious prejudice context, 73–74, 133–35, 156, 165
 trade remedies, 72–74
- hypothetical world problem
 counterfactual approach to causation, 39–40
 nullification or impairment, 222–23

- EC and certain member States—Large Civil Aircraft*, 161–62
EC—Hormones (Article 22.6), 212–14
sine qua non test
 DSB rulings, 161, 210, 213, 225
 methodological problems, 43–44, 103, 159, 213
- increased imports and ‘serious injury or threat thereof’
 ‘genuine and substantial relationship of cause and effect’, 119, 121
 sine qua non test, 119–20
 weak necessity/strong sufficiency test, 119–20
 causal factor test, 120
 INUS test, 121
 NESS test, 120, 122–23
- inference, 10
 see also Statistical Inference Approach
- ‘injury’ in the trade remedies context
 antidumping context, 74
 countervailing duties context, 75
 general harm to an industry, 75
 safeguards context, 74
 serious prejudice compared, 126–27
 sub-injuries, 75–76, 75–76
- INUS test (Mackie)
 cause-in-fact theories of causation, 52–54
 increased imports and ‘serious injury or threat thereof’, 121
 non-quantitative approaches to causation, 52–54
 weak necessity/strong sufficiency test, 52–54
- legal reasoning, 62
 see also failure to comply with DSB rulings
- less favourable treatment, 196
- level playing field concept, 72, 124
- Linear Regression Analysis, xv, 12, 35, 54–56, 66, 192–93, 194, 205
- alternative hypothesis, 56
 EC—Seal Products, 195
- benefits, 57
- null hypothesis, 56
 EC—Seal Products, 194
- lost sales, 128
 EC—Large Civil Aircraft (Article 22.6), 224
 US—Large Civil Aircraft (2nd complaint) (Article 22.6), 224–25
- market distortion, 141
- multi-factorial approach, xiv, 78, 124
 causal relationship between measures and policy objectives, 202
- increased imports and ‘serious injury or threat thereof’, 78
- non-attribution analysis,
 incompatibility of
 antidumping context, 81, 83
 countervailing duties, 83
 safeguards context, 81, 83
 threshold of import-induced sub-injury, 81–84
- policy implications, 80, 124
- serious prejudice under SCM Agreement, 156–58
 US—Large Civil Aircraft (2nd complaint), 157–58
- NESS test (Wright)
 applied apportionment causal link test, xiv, 105–8, 109–10
 cause-in-fact theories of causation, 51–52
 duplicative over-determination, 53
 increased imports and ‘serious injury or threat thereof’, 120, 122–23
- non-quantitative approaches to causation
 example, 36–37
 sine qua non test, 37–40, 65
 limitations, 40–44
 see also sine qua non test
- weak necessity/strong sufficiency tests, 66

- non-quantitative approaches to causation (cont.)
 - causal factor test, 50–51
 - INUS test, 52–54
 - NESS test, 51–52
 - see also* weak necessity/strong sufficiency test
- nullification or impairment of benefits, 5, 27–28
 - determining nullification and impairment, 210
 - counterfactual analysis, 220–27
 - EC—Bananas III (Article 22.6)*, 223
 - EC—Hormones (Article 22.6)*, 222
 - EC—Large Civil Aircraft (Article 22.6)*, 224
 - US—Anti-Dumping Methodologies (China) (Article 22.6)*, 220
 - US—Gambling (Article 22.6—US)*, 221, 234
 - US—Large Civil Aircraft (2nd complaint) (Article 22.6)*, 224
 - US—Tuna II (Mexico) (Article 22.6—US)*, 221
 - US—Washing Machines (Article 22.6—US)*, 223
 - EC—Hormones (Article 22.6)*, 214
- equivalence of retaliatory measures, 208
- other known factors, 218
- presumption of 100 per cent
 - nullification and impairment, 226
- presumption of nullification and impairment, 213–14
- price suppression, 217
- quantification
 - lack of consistency, 234
 - Tripartite Non-attribution/Causal Link Analysis, 234–38
- see also* determining nullification and impairment
- US—COOL*, 217–19
- US—Countervailing Measures (China)*, 219–20
- US—Gambling (Article 22.6—United States)*, 214–16
- US—Tuna case*, 216–17
- other known factors, 2
 - achievement of policy objectives, 200
 - antidumping context, 100
 - arbitrators, 218–19
 - countervailing duties, 100
 - nullification and impairment, 218
 - prior knowledge, 101
 - safeguards context, 100
 - serious prejudice under the SCM Agreement, 153, 156
 - ‘genuine and substantial causal link’, 144
 - sine qua non* test, xiv, 103–5, 104
 - trade remedies, 100–3, 111
 - causal factor test, 105–6
 - NESS Test, 105–10
 - sine qua non* test, 103–5
 - weak necessity/strong sufficiency test
 - causal factor test, xiv, 103–5, 106
 - NESS test, xiv, 105–8, 109–10
- philosophy of causation and causality, 33
- policy implications
 - multi-factorial approach, 80, 124
 - serious prejudice under SCM Agreement, 167–68
 - sufficiency of imports approach, 80, 124
- policy objectives, *See* causal relationship between measures and policy objectives
- potential market impacts, 24–27, 28
- predictive use of causation, 1, 32, 172
 - contribution of a measure to a policy objective, 176
- pre-emptive over-determination
 - weak necessity/strong sufficiency test, 48, 50
- price depression and/or significant price suppression, 128, 136
 - determining cause and effect of market phenomena
 - unitary approach, 137
- EC and certain member States—Large Civil Aircraft*, 130, 137
- Korea—Commercial Vessels*, 131, 137, 145, 162

- nullification and impairment, 217
 - price depression and suppression
 - compared, 130–33
 - US—*Upland Cotton*, 130, 132, 137, 144, 130–33
- price suppression, *See* price depression and/or significant price suppression
- price-contingent subsidies, 137, 144
- qualification analysis of Tripartite Non-attribution/Causal Link Analysis
 - antidumping measures, 118
 - causal relationship between measures and policy objectives, 202–4
 - countervailing duties, 118
 - domestic competent authorities, 116, 117
 - failure to comply with DSB rulings, 232–33
 - multi-factorial approach, 117–18
 - retaliatory measures, 232–33
 - safeguard measures, 116–18
 - serious prejudice under the SCM Agreement, 155–58
 - sufficiency of imports approach, 116–17, 119
 - trade remedies, 116–18
- quantitative causal tests, *See* Linear Regression Analysis, *See* Statistical Significance Test
- real-world data, collection of, 5, 172, 182, 205, 242
- regulating for non-trade purposes
 - Article 2.2 of the TBT Agreement 169
 - see also* Article 2.2 exceptions (TBT Agreement)
 - Article XIV GATS, 169
 - see also* General Exceptions (Art. XX GATT/Art. XIV GATS)
 - Article XX GATT, 169
 - see also* General Exceptions (Art. XX GATT/Art. XIV GATS)
- see also* causal relationship between measures and policy objectives
- reparation concept, 206
- retaliatory measures
 - Article 22.6 DSUxv, 15, 231
 - see also* Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes (DSU)
 - Article 4.10 SCM Agreementxv, 15, 231
 - see also* Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM) Agreement: Article 4.10
 - ‘equivalent’ to the nullification or impairment of benefits, 208
 - policy objectives, 207–8
 - Tripartite Non-attribution/Causal Link Analysis, 227–29
 - apportionment analysis (Step 2a – disentanglement), 230–32
 - causal link (Step 3), 233–34
 - separation of injuries (Step 1), 229–30
- safeguard measures, 68
 - breaking the causal link
 - US—*Wheat Gluten*, 94–95
 - ‘genuine and substantial relationship of cause and effect’, 72, 134
 - ‘injury’ in the trade remedies context, 74
- multi-factorial approach, 79
 - non-attribution analysis, incompatibility of, 83
 - other known factors, 100
 - qualification analysis, 116–18
 - see also* Safeguards Agreement
 - sufficiency of imports approach, 76–78
- Safeguards Agreement, 6, 118, 244
 - Article 2.1, 3, 240
 - Article 4.2, xiv, 3, 70, 240
 - see also* safeguard measures
 - serious injury defined, 74
- Sanitary or Phytosanitary Measures (SPS) Agreement
 - Australia—Apples*, 22

- Sanitary or Phytosanitary Measures (SPS) Agreement (cont.)
 breach of obligation, 17–18
 Canada—Continued Suspension, 23
 EC—Biotech Products, 22–23
 EC—Hormones, 18, 20
 international standards, guidelines or recommendations, relationship with, 20–21
 Japan—Agricultural Products, 19
 Japan—Apples, 18, 20
 measure and the specific purposes, relationship between, 21–22
 object to be protected and the risk it seeks to protect, relationship between, 22–24
 policy objectives
 causal link with SPS measures, 19–22
 risk assessments, 17–18
 scientific evidence, relationship with, 19–20
 serious injury threshold, 76–80
 serious prejudice under the SCM Agreement, 4, 14, 125–26, 128–33, 240, 241
 adverse effects, 128
 breaking the causal link, 144–46, 168
 displacement and impedance of imports
 EC and certain member States—Large Civil Aircraft, 129
 ‘genuine and substantial relationship of cause and effect’, 73–74, 133–35, 141, 156, 165
 ‘injury’ under the trade remedy agreements compared, 126–27
 Korea—Commercial Vessels, 126
 Tripartite Non-attribution/Causal Link Analysis, 140–41
 apportionment analysis (Step 2a – amalgamation of sub-effects), 146–53
 apportionment analysis (Step 2a – disentanglement), 153–55
 apportionment analysis (Step 2a – other known factors), 153
 causal link between subsidies and market phenomena (Step 3), 158–65
 causes of sub-effects (Step 1), 142–47
 qualification analysis (Step 2b), 155–58
 separating sub-effects (Step 1), 142
 US—Upland Cotton, 126, 242
 significant price suppression, *See* price depression and/or significant price suppression
 sine qua non test, 12, 34, 38, 45
 applied apportionment causal link test, xiv, 103–5, 104
 counterfactual theory, 37–40
 hypothetical world problem, 39–40
 DSB rulings, 212
 limitations, 43–44
 identification of other known factors, xiv, 103–5, 104
 limitations, 34
 hypothetical world problem, 43–44
 over-inclusiveness, 40
 under-inclusiveness, 40–43
 price suppression/price depression
 Korea—Commercial Vessels, 137
 serious prejudice under SCM Agreement, 158–63
 spurious correlations, 7–8
 safeguards from
 common sense/intuition, 9
 contextualising nature of the law, 9
 quality controls, 8–9
 Statistical Inference Approach, 189
 see also Linear Regression Analysis;
 Statistical Significance Test
 statistical significance test, 12, 34, 57, 66, 205
 alternative hypothesis, 59–61
 EC—Seal Measures, 190–92
 null hypothesis, 57–59
 EC—Seal Measures, xv, 190–92, 191

- sub-injuries, xv, 124, 237
 - categories of causal responsibility, 112
 - ‘injury’ in the trade remedies context, 75–76, 75–76
 - multi-factorial approach
 - non-attribution analysis, incompatibility of, 81–84
- Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM) Agreement
 - Article 4.10, 4, 15, 210, 241
 - Tripartite Non-attribution/Causal Link Analysis, xv, 231
 - Article 5 (c), 4, 125–26, 128, 240
 - Article 6.3, 4, 128–33, 166, 240
 - EC and certain member States—Large Civil Aircraft*, 136
 - see also* serious prejudice under the SCM Agreement
 - Tripartite Non-attribution/Causal Link Analysis, xv, 143
 - US—Large Civil Aircraft*, 134, 135
 - US—Tyres (China)*, 134
 - US—Upland Cotton*, 134, 135
 - US—Wheat Gluten*, 134
 - Article 15.5, xiv, 4, 71, 240
 - see also* countervailing duties
- sufficiency of imports approach, xiv, 77, 77, 82, 124
 - increased imports and ‘serious injury or threat thereof’, 76–78
 - policy implications, 80, 124
 - qualification analysis, 116–17, 119
 - US—Lamb*, 78
 - US—Wheat Gluten*, 77–78
- trade remedies, 13, 123
 - confusion and lack of clarity, 69–70
 - domestic competent authorities, tools for, 71
 - ‘genuine and substantial relationship of cause and effect’ defined, 72–74
 - ‘injury’ defined, 74–76
 - see also* antidumping measures; countervailing duties; safeguard measures
 - serious injury threshold
 - multi-factorial approach, xiv, 78–80
 - sufficiency of imports approach, xiv, 77–78, 77
- Tripartite Non-attribution/Causal Link Analysis, xiv
 - apportionment analysis (Step 2a – disentanglement), 112–16
 - apportionment analysis (Step 2a – other known factors), 99–111
 - causal link between imports and ‘serious injury or threat thereof’ (Step 3), 118–23
 - qualification analysis (Step 2b), 116–18
 - separating sub-injuries to industries (Step 1), 97
- Tripartite Non-attribution/Causal Link Analysis, xiv, 35
 - advantages, 6–7, 228–29, 244
 - apportionment analysis, 99–100
 - disentanglement stage, 112–16
 - identification of other known factors, 100–11
 - causal relationship between measures and policy objectives
 - apportionment analysis (Step 2a – disentanglement), 200–2
 - apportionment analysis (Step 2a – other known factors), 200
 - causal link (Step 3), 589.v, 122, 204
 - qualification analysis (Step 2b), 202–4
 - disentanglement stage, 97–99
 - econometric analysis, 30, 64–65, 112–16
 - trade remedies, 112–16
 - drawbacks
 - insufficient panel expertise, 10–12
 - insufficient reliable data, 9–10
 - spurious correlations, 7–9
 - identification of other known factors
 - stage
 - antidumping context, 100
 - countervailing duties, 100
 - safeguards context, 100
 - trade remedies, 100–11

- Tripartite Non-attribution/Causal Link Analysis (cont.)
- qualification analysis
 - antidumping measures, 118
 - countervailing duties, 118
 - multi-factorial approach, 117–18
 - safeguard measures, 116–18
 - sufficiency of imports approach, 117
 - retaliatory measures, 239
 - apportionment analysis (Step 2a – disentanglement), 230–32
 - causal link (Step 3), 233
 - disaggregation of harms, 228
 - identification of types of
 - nullification and impairment, 228
 - qualification analysis (Step 2b), 232–33
 - quantification of nullification and impairment, 234–38
 - separation of injuries (Step 1), xv, 229–30, 231
 - separating sub-injuries to industries, 142
 - trade remedies, 97
 - serious prejudice, 140–41
 - serious prejudice under the SCM Agreement, 140–41
 - apportionment analysis (Step 2a – amalgamation of sub-effects), 146–53
 - apportionment analysis (Step 2a – disentanglement), 153–55
 - apportionment analysis (Step 2a – other known factors), 153
 - causal link between subsidies and market phenomena (Step 3), 158–65
 - causes of sub-effects (Step 1), 142–47
 - qualification analysis (Step 2b), 155–58
 - separating sub-effects (Step 1), 142
 - trade remedies, xiv
 - apportionment analysis (Step 2a – disentanglement), 112–16
 - apportionment analysis (Step 2a – other known factors), 99–111
 - causal link between imports and ‘serious injury or threat thereof’ (Step 3), 118–23
 - qualification analysis (Step 2b), 116–18
 - separating sub-injuries to industries (Step 1), 97
 - US—Wheat Gluten*, 6
- Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes (DSU) Article 22.6, 4, 15, 210, 238, 241
- see also* failure to comply with DSB rulings
- Tripartite Non-attribution/Causal Link Analysis, xv, 231
- expert review groups, 243
- weak necessity/strong sufficiency test, 12, 34, 45
- benefits, 34
- causal factor test, 50–51, 51
- identifying other known factors, xiv, 105–6, 106
- duplicative over-determination, 46–48, 48
- INUS test, 52–54
- NESS test, 51–52, 53
- identifying other known factors, xiv, 105–8, 109–10
- pre-emptive over-determination, 48, 50
- serious prejudice under SCM Agreement, 164
- aggregation model, 163
 - cumulation model, 164
- sine qua non* test compared
- necessity criterion, strength of, 45
 - number of causal factors, 45
 - relationship with the injury, 46