

WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

Dispute Settlement Reports

1999
Volume V

Pages 1797-2094

Cambridge University Press & Assessment
978-0-521-80324-3 — Dispute Settlement Reports 1999
Edited by World Trade Organization
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)



Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge CB2 8EA, United Kingdom
One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre, New Delhi – 110025, India
103 Penang Road, #05–06/07, Visioncrest Commercial, Singapore 238467

Cambridge University Press is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

We share the University's mission to contribute to society through the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521803243

© World Trade Organization, 2002. Material in this report may be reproduced, provided the source is acknowledged.

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press & Assessment.

French edition and Spanish edition paperbacks of this title are both available directly from WTO Publications, World Trade Organization, Centre William Rappard, 154 rue de Lausanne, CH-1211 Geneva 21, Switzerland <http://www.wto.org>

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-0-521-80324-3 Hardback

Cambridge University Press & Assessment has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

THE WTO DISPUTE SETTLEMENT REPORTS

The *Dispute Settlement Reports* of the World Trade Organization (the "WTO") include panel and Appellate Body reports, as well as arbitration awards, in disputes concerning the rights and obligations of WTO Members under the provisions of the *Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization*. The *Dispute Settlement Reports* are available in English, French and Spanish. Starting with 1999, the first volume of each year contains a cumulative index of published disputes.

This volume may be cited as DSR 1999:V

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
India - Quantitative Restrictions on Imports of Agricultural, Textile and Industrial Products (WT/DS90)	
Report of the Panel.....	1799
Canada - Measures Affecting the Importation of Milk and the Exportation of Dairy Products (WT/DS103)	
Report of the Appellate Body.....	2057

INDIA - QUANTITATIVE RESTRICTIONS ON IMPORTS OF AGRICULTURAL, TEXTILE AND INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTS

Report of the Panel WT/DS90/R

*Adopted by the Dispute Settlement Body
on 22 September 1999
as upheld by the Appellate Body Report*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1802
II. FACTUAL ASPECTS	1803
A. Consultations in the Committee on Balance-of-Payments Restrictions	1803
B. Quantitative Restrictions	1806
1. Legal Basis under Domestic Law for Import Restrictions and Import Licensing	1806
2. Licensing Régime	1809
III. CLAIMS AND MAIN ARGUMENTS	1812
A. Scope of the Complaint	1812
B. Article XI:1	1814
1. United States	1814
2. India	1824
3. Nullification and Impairment	1831
C. Article 4.2 of the WTO Agreement on Agriculture	1833
D. Article XVIII:B	1834
1. Competence of the Panel	1834
2. Burden of Proof	1861
3. Article XVIII:9, XVIII:11 and the Note <i>Ad Article XVIII:11</i>	1867
4. Removal of Restrictions According to Article XVIII:11, Article XVIII:12(c)(ii) and Paragraph 13 of the Understanding	1879

 Report of the Panel

		Page
	5. Article XVIII:B: Special and Differential Treatment	1888
	6. Article XVIII:10 and the 1994 Understanding	1890
	7. Arguments Drawn from Consultations in the Committee on Balance-of-Payments Restrictions	1893
	8. Additional Evidence	1903
	9. Consultations with the International Monetary Fund	1927
	E. Article XIII:2(a) and the Import Licensing Agreement	1962
IV.	INTERIM REVIEW	1968
	A. Comments by the United States	1969
	B. Comments by India	1970
	1. Review of the Balance-of-Payments Justification of India's Measures	1971
	2. Immediate Removal of the Measures and Consequence Thereof	1976
	3. Other Specific Comments	1978
V.	FINDINGS	1979
	A. Facts Leading to the Dispute	1979
	B. Rulings Made by the Panel in the Course of the Proceedings	1981
	1. Request by India for Sufficient Time to Prepare and Present its Argumentation, Pursuant to Article 12.10 of the DSU	1981
	2. Consultation with the International Monetary Fund	1982
	C. Scope of the Complaint	1983
	1. Claims of Violation of Article XIII of GATT and of Article 3 of the Agreement on Import Licensing Procedures	1983
	2. Provisions of Article XVIII:B other than Article XVIII:11	1984
	3. Phase-out Period	1985

	Page
D. Competence of the Panel.....	1985
1. The Issue: Are Panels Competent to Review the Justification of Balance-of-Payments Measures under Article XVIII:B?.....	1985
2. Surveillance and Review of Balance-of-Payments Measures Prior to the Entry into Force of the WTO.....	1986
3. Applicable Provisions under the WTO Agreement.....	1994
4. Competence of Panels to Review the Justification of Measures Taken under Article XVIII:B	1996
5. Conclusion	2016
E. Burden of Proof with Respect to the Claims	2017
F. Article XI:1	2019
1. India's Import Licensing System for Products on the "Negative List of Imports".....	2020
2. Canalization of Imports Through Government Agencies	2022
3. The Special Import Licence (SIL) System.....	2023
4. The Actual User Requirement	2024
5. Summary.....	2025
G. Article XVIII:B of GATT 1994.....	2025
1. Special and Differential Treatment.....	2027
2. Is India Experiencing Balance-of-Payments Difficulties within the Meaning of Article XVIII:9?	2029
3. Is India Entitled under the <i>Ad Note</i> to Article XVIII:11 to Maintain Measures for Balance-of- Payments Purposes when the Conditions Contemplated in Article XVIII:9 are no Longer Met?.....	2037
4. Is India Entitled to Maintain its Balance-of- Payments Measures on the Basis of the Proviso to Article XVIII:11?	2046
5. Right to Maintain Balance-of-Payments Measures until they are Found to be Inconsistent by the General Council and the Right to a Phase-out of Balance-of-Payments Measures.....	2047
6. Conclusion	2051
H. Article 4.2 of the Agreement on Agriculture.....	2051

 Report of the Panel

	Page
I. Article XIII of GATT 1994	2052
J. Nullification or Impairment	2052
VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	2053
VII. SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION	2053

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 On 16 July 1997, the United States requested consultations with India, pursuant to Article 4 of the Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes ("DSU"), Article XXII:1 of the GATT, Article 19 of the Agreement on Agriculture (to the extent it incorporates by reference Article XXII of the GATT), and Article 6 of the Agreement on Import Licensing Procedures (to the extent it incorporates by reference Article XXII of the GATT), concerning quantitative restrictions maintained by India on the importation of a number of agricultural, textile and industrial products (WT/DS90/1). The United States considered that the quantitative restrictions maintained by India, including, but not limited to, those tariff lines notified in Annex I, Part B of WT/BOP/N/24, appeared to be inconsistent with India's obligations under Article XI:1 and XVIII:11 of the GATT 1994, Article 4.2 of the Agreement on Agriculture and Article 3 of the Agreement on Import Licensing Procedures. At the same time, Australia, Canada, the European Communities, New Zealand and Switzerland requested consultations with India on these quantitative restrictions (WT/DS91/1; WT/DS92/1; WT/DS93/1; WT/DS94/1; WT/DS96/1) on the basis of similar claims to those set forth by the United States.¹ Subsequently, Japan, the European Communities, Canada, Australia, Switzerland and New Zealand asked to join in the consultations requested by the United States (WT/DS90/2, WT/DS90/3, WT/DS90/4, WT/DS90/5, WT/DS90/6, WT/DS90/7). The United States and India formally consulted on these measures in Geneva on 17 September 1997, and Japan participated as an interested third party under Article 4.11 of the DSU.

1.2 On 3 October 1997, the United States requested that the WTO Dispute Settlement Body ("DSB") establish a panel to examine this dispute.² In its request, the United States considered that quantitative restrictions maintained by India, including, but not limited to, the more than 2,700 agricultural and industrial product tariff lines notified to the WTO in Annex I, Part B of WT/BOP/N/24 dated 22 May 1997, appeared to be inconsistent with India's obligations under Articles XI:1 and XVIII:11 of GATT 1994 and Article 4.2 of the Agreement on Agriculture. Furthermore, the import licensing procedures and practices of the Government of India are inconsistent with fundamental WTO

¹ Switzerland did not refer to Article 4 of the Agreement on Agriculture in its request.

² WT/DS90/8, 6 October 1997.