

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
<b>India - Quantitative Restrictions on Imports of Agricultural, Textile and Industrial Products (WT/DS90)</b>	
Report of the Panel.....	1799
<b>Canada - Measures Affecting the Importation of Milk and the Exportation of Dairy Products (WT/DS103)</b>	
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.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> 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

---

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

<sup>2</sup> WT/DS90/8, 6 October 1997.