

US - Ripe Olives from Spain

# UNITED STATES – ANTI-DUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTIES ON RIPE OLIVES FROM SPAIN

## Report of the Panel BCI deleted, as indicated [[\*\*\*]] WT/DS577/R and Add.1

Adopted by the Dispute Settlement Body on 20 December 2021

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

|    |      |          |  | Page |
|----|------|----------|--|------|
| 1. | INTI | RODUCT   | ΓΙΟΝ   | 33   |
|    | 1.1  | Compl    | aint by the European Union   | 33   |
|    | 1.2  | Panel I  | Establishment and Composition  | 33   |
|    | 1.3  | Panel I  | Proceedings  | 34   |
|    |      | 1.3.1    | General  | 34   |
|    |      | 1.3.2    | Preliminary ruling on the Panel's terms of reference   | 36   |
|    |      | 1.3.3    | Request to address certain aspects of the USDOC's Remand Redetermination of 29 May 2020          | 36   |
| 2. | FAC  | TUAL A   | SPECTS: THE MEASURES AT ISSUE  | 37   |
| 3. | PAR  | TIES' RE | EQUESTS FOR FINDINGS AND   |      |
|    | REC  | OMMEN    | NDATIONS   | 38   |
| 4. | ARG  | UMENT    | S OF THE PARTIES   | 42   |
| 5. | ARG  | UMENT    | S OF THE THIRD PARTIES   | 43   |
| 6. | INTI | ERIM RE  | EVIEW  | 43   |
| 7. | FINI | DINGS    |  | 43   |
|    | 7.1  |          | al Principles Regarding Treaty Interpretation, the cable Standard of Review, and Burden of Proof | 43   |
|    |      | 7.1.1    | Treaty interpretation  |      |
|    |      | 7.1.2    | Standard of review   |      |
|    |      | 7.1.3    | Burden of proof  | 45   |
|    |      |          | -  |      |



Report of the Panel

| or tile r | anci    |             |   |  |    |
|-----------|---------|-------------|---|--|----|
| 7.2       | de jure | Specificity | y Findings in                               | Concerning the USDOC's the Ripe Olives   | 45 |
|           | 7.2.1   | The Euro    | opean Union<br>'s Remand R                  | 's request to address the edetermination as it relates to ecificity findings   |    |
|           | 7.2.2   | _           |   | 's claims under Articles 2.1,  |    |
|           |         | 2.1(a), a   | nd 2.4 of the                               | SCM Agreement  | 48 |
|           |         | 7.2.2.1     | Introduction                                | on   | 48 |
|           |         | 7.2.2.2     | Article 2.1 determine                       | ne USDOC was entitled under (a) of the SCM Agreement to de jure specificity based on rning the amount of a subsidy   | 50 |
|           |         | 7.2.2.3     | The USDC and GP pro inherent de subsidies p | OC's conclusion that the BPS or  |    |
|           |         |             | 7.2.2.3.1                                   | The USDOC's reliance on facts pertaining to past subsidy programmes  | 55 |
|           |         |             | 7.2.2.3.2                                   | The USDOC's alleged finding that the SPS, BPS, and GP subsidies were de jure specific to olive growers because they were coupled (or tied) to the production of olives |    |
|           |         |             | 7.2.2.3.3                                   | Entitlement values under<br>the BPS programme for<br>new farmers, farmers<br>holding transferred<br>entitlements, and farmers<br>no longer growing olives              | 69 |
|           |         |             | 7.2.2.3.4                                   | The USDOC's rejection of arguments concerning the "convergence" factor   | 81 |
|           |         |             | 7.2.2.3.5                                   | The USDOC's analysis and findings with respect to the "regional rate"  | 86 |
|           |         |             | 7.2.2.3.6                                   | The USDOC's alleged finding concerning differences in BPS  |    |



US - Ripe Olives from Spain

|     |        |  |  | payments based on "the amount of grant money the different regions received under the SPS"  | 90  |
|-----|--------|--|--|---|-----|
|     |        |  | 7.2.2.3.7                                      | The USDOC's findings with respect to the SPS programme  |     |
|     |        |  | 7.2.2.3.8                                      | The USDOC's findings with respect to the COMOF programme  | 100 |
|     |        |  | 7.2.2.3.9                                      | Conclusion regarding the USDOC's findings that the BPS and GP programmes retained the inherent <i>de jure</i> specificity of the subsidies provided under the COMOF programme | 104 |
|     | 7.2.3  |  |  | 's claims under Articles 2.1,<br>SCM Agreement  | 108 |
|     | 7.2.4  |  |  | 's claim under Article 1.2 of   | 112 |
| 7.3 | of the | Γariff Act o   | of 1930 and                                    | in Relation to Section 771B its Application in the Ripe avestigation  | 112 |
|     | 7.3.1  | The European Union's complaint against<br>Section 771B of the Tariff Act of 1930 "as such" 113 |  |   |     |
|     |        | 7.3.1.1  |  | irements for conducting a gh analysis   | 115 |
|     |        | 7.3.1.2  | Legal char<br>of Section                       | racterization of the operation 771B of the Tariff Act of  |     |
|     |        | 7.3.1.3  |  | n   |     |
|     | 7.3.2  | USDOC'<br>Spanish 1  | opean Union<br>s application<br>ripe olives co | 's challenge concerning the<br>n of Section 771B in the<br>ountervailing duty   |     |
|     |        | 7.3.2.1  | The USDO in the Span                           | OC's determination of benefit nish ripe olives countervailing tigation  |     |
|     |        | 7.3.2.2  | Whether th                                     | ne USDOC's determination of the Spanish ripe olive  |     |



Report of the Panel

| me ra | IIICI  |  |   |     |
|-------|--------|--|---|-----|
|       |        |  | investigation complied with the applicable legal standard   | 128 |
|       |        | 7.3.2.3                                | Conclusion  | 128 |
| 7.4   | The US | ITC's Affin                            | rmative Final Injury Determination  | 129 |
|       | 7.4.1  | that claim<br>SCM Agr<br>Anti-Dun      | ed States' request for a preliminary ruling as under Article 15.4 of the reement and Article 3.4 of the apping Agreement are outside the rms of reference   | 130 |
|       | 7.4.2  | adverse in<br>United St                | pean Union's request that the Panel make nferences concerning the ates' failure to provide certain on requested by the Panel  | 137 |
|       | 7.4.3  | The USIT examinate Articles 3 Anti-Dun | CC's analysis of customer groups in its ion of volume and price effects under 3.1 and 3.2 of the inping Agreement and Articles 15.1 and its SCM Agreement   |     |
|       |        | 7.4.3.1                                | Whether the USITC conducted a "segmented analysis" of volume and price effects that was inconsistent with Articles 3.1 and 3.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement and Articles 15.1 and 15.2 of the SCM Agreement                      | 140 |
|       |        | 7.4.3.2                                | Whether the USITC's definition of the domestic industry made it improper to consider customer groups  | 148 |
|       |        | 7.4.3.3                                | Conclusion on the USITC's alleged "segmented analysis" of customer groups in its examination of volume and price effects under Articles 3.1 and 3.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement and Articles 15.1 and 15.2 of the SCM Agreement |     |
|       | 7.4.4  |  | C's examination of the volume of and subsidized ripe olives from Spain  |     |
|       |        | 7.4.4.1                                | Whether the USITC failed to consider whether there has been a significant increase in dumped or subsidized imports as required by the first sentence in Article 3.2 of the  |     |



US - Ripe Olives from Spain

|         |   | ping Agreement and  |  |  |
|---------|---|---|--|--|
| 7.4.4.2 | Whether the USITC's volume analysis was not based on an objective examination of positive evidence in violation of Articles 3.1 and 3.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement and Articles 15.1 and 15.2 of the SCM Agreement |   |  |  |
|         | 7.4.4.2.1   | Factual background156   |  |  |
|         | 7.4.4.2.2   | Whether the USITC only analysed the retail customer group and failed to consider the industry as a whole  |  |  |
|         | 7.4.4.2.3   | Whether the USITC improperly drew conclusions about the industry as a whole from the retail sector  |  |  |
|         | 7.4.4.2.4   | Whether the USITC failed to consider the distributional and institutional customer groups in like manner as the retail customer group, without satisfactory explanation                     |  |  |
|         | 7.4.4.2.5   | Whether the USITC failed to consider the distributional and institutional/food processor customer groups to the extent required for an objective examination based on positive evidence 161 |  |  |
|         | 7.4.4.2.6   | Whether the USITC's volume analysis failed to provide a meaningful basis for causation  |  |  |
| 7.4.4.3 |   | n on the USITC's volume<br>nder Articles 3.1 and 3.2 of   |  |  |

DSR 2021:I 11

the Anti-Dumping Agreement and



Report of the Panel

| 1101  |  |  |  |       |  |
|-------|--|--|--|-------|--|
|       |  |  | 5.1 and 15.2 of the eement                         | 164   |  |
| 7.4.5 | The USITC's examination of the price effects of  |  |  |       |  |
|       | dumped and subsidized ripe olives from Spain 1   |  |  |       |  |
|       | 7.4.5.1  | Whether the USITC's examination of                                       |  |       |  |
|       |  |  | price undercutting constituted a second            |       |  |
|       | 7.450  | volume analysis  |  |       |  |
|       | 7.4.5.2  | Whether the USITC's price effects analysis was not based on an objective |  |       |  |
|       |  |  | on of positive evidence in                         |       |  |
|       |  |  | of Articles 3.1 and 3.2 of the                     |       |  |
|       |  |  | ping Agreement and                                 |       |  |
|       |  |  | 5.1 and 15.2 of the                                | 170   |  |
|       |  | •  | Eastwal background                                 |       |  |
|       |  | 7.4.5.2.1  | Factual background                                 | 1/1   |  |
|       |  | 7.4.5.2.2  | Whether the USITC concluded that underselling      |       |  |
|       |  |  | resulted in a loss of market                       |       |  |
|       |  |  | share in the retail sector                         |       |  |
|       |  |  | without adequate                                   | 1.50  |  |
|       |  | <b>5.450</b> 0   | supporting evidence                                | 172   |  |
|       |  | 7.4.5.2.3  | Whether the USITC only considered price effects in |       |  |
|       |  |  | the retail sector and not at                       |       |  |
|       |  |  | the level of the domestic                          |       |  |
|       |  |  | industry as a whole                                | 176   |  |
|       |  | 7.4.5.2.4  | Whether the USITC                                  |       |  |
|       |  |  | improperly extended its                            |       |  |
|       |  |  | conclusions concerning the consideration of price  |       |  |
|       |  |  | effects in the retail sector to                    |       |  |
|       |  |  | the domestic industry as a                         |       |  |
|       |  |  | whole  | 178   |  |
|       | 7.4.5.3  |  | n on the USITC's price effects                     |       |  |
|       |  |  | nder Articles 3.1 and 3.2 of                       |       |  |
|       |  |  | Oumping Agreement and 5.1 and 15.2 of the          |       |  |
|       |  |  | eement   | . 179 |  |
| 7.4.6 | The USI  | C  | ation of the consequent                            |       |  |
|       | impact of dumped and subsidized ripe olives from |  |  |       |  |
|       | •  |  |  | 180   |  |
|       | 7.4.6.1  |  | he USITC could have made a                         |       |  |
|       |  | linging of   | consequent impact on the                           |       |  |



US - Ripe Olives from Spain

|       |         |  | findings concerning volume fects180  |
|-------|---------|--|--|
|       | 7.4.6.2 | was not bas<br>examination<br>violation of<br>Anti-Dump<br>Articles 15.                | e USITC's impact analysis ed on an objective n of positive evidence in Articles 3.1 and 3.4 of the ing Agreement and 1 and 15.4 of the ement                                     |
|       |         | 7.4.6.2.1  | Factual background   |
|       |         | 7.4.6.2.2  | Whether the USITC's impact analysis only examined the retail sector and not the industry as a whole  |
|       |         | 7.4.6.2.3  | Whether the USITC's impact analysis improperly extended the USITC finding of market share losses in the retail sector to the industry as a whole                                 |
|       | 7.4.6.3 | analysis und<br>the Anti-Du<br>Articles 15.  | on the USITC's impact<br>der Articles 3.1 and 3.4 of<br>imping Agreement and<br>1 and 15.4 of the<br>ement187  |
| 7.4.7 |         | C's causation  | n analysis of dumped and from Spain187   |
|       | 7.4.7.1 | Whether the analysis of to consumption objective exercise in 3.5 of the A and Articles | e USITC's non-attribution the decline in apparent n was not based on an tamination of positive violation of Articles 3.1 and nti-Dumping Agreement s 15.1 and 15.5 of the tement |
|       | 7.4.7.2 | Whether the analysis of a Morocco was examination violation of                         | e USITC's non-attribution<br>non-subject imports from<br>as not based on an objective<br>n of positive evidence in<br>Articles 3.1 and 3.5 of the<br>ing Agreement and           |



Report of the Panel

| I tile I | arrer  |                            |  |   |     |
|----------|--------|----------------------------|--|---|-----|
|          |        |                            |  | 5.1 and 15.5 of the eement  | 191 |
|          |        | 7.4.7.3                    | Conclusion analysis un the Anti-Darticles 15 | n on the USITC's causation<br>nder Articles 3.1 and 3.5 of<br>Dumping Agreement and<br>5.1 and 15.5 of the<br>element |     |
|          | 7.4.8  | Consequ                    | _  | 3   |     |
|          | 7.4.9  | Conclusi                   | on in relatio                                | n to the USITC's Injury   |     |
| 7.5      | Guada  | ıropean Un<br>İquivir's Fi | iion's Claims nal Subsidy                    | Concerning Aceitunas<br>Margin and Countervailing   |     |
|          | Duty R | ate Calcul                 | ation  |   | 194 |
|          | 7.5.1  |                            |  |   | 194 |
|          | 7.5.2  | Guadalq                    | uivir's final s                              | ation of Aceitunas<br>subsidy margin and<br>ate   | 196 |
|          |        | 7.5.2.1                    | European the calcula Guadalqui               | basis of the Union's claims in relation to ation of Aceitunas vir's subsidy margin and iling duty rate                | 197 |
|          |        | 7.5.2.2                    | Whether the determined Guadalqui             | he USDOC properly<br>d Aceitunas<br>vir's subsidy margin and<br>ding countervailing duty rate                         |     |
|          |        |                            | 7.5.2.2.1                                    | The USDOC's initial 4 August 2017 questionnaire   |     |
|          |        |                            | 7.5.2.2.2                                    | The USDOC's information requests following the 4 August 2017 questionnaire  | 205 |
|          |        |                            | 7.5.2.2.3                                    |   |     |
|          |        |                            | 7.5.2.2.4                                    | Aceitunas Guadalquivir's submissions on the reported volume of raw olive purchases after the final determination      |     |
|          |        |                            | 7.5.2.2.5                                    | Conclusion  | 215 |
|          | 7.5.3  | The USI                    | OC's calcul                                  | ation of an "all others" rate   | 216 |



|    |           | US - Ripe Olives fro  | m Spain |
|----|-----------|---|---------|
|    | 7.5.4     | Whether the USDOC properly requested information on purchases of raw olives used to produce ripe olives consistently with Article 12.1 of the SCM Agreement | 216     |
|    | 7.5.5     | Whether the USDOC informed interested parties of the essential facts under consideration consistent with Article 12.8 of the                                |         |
|    |           | SCM Agreement   | 219     |
|    | 7.5.6     | Conclusion  | 227     |
| 8. | CONCLUSIO | NS AND RECOMMENDATION   | 227     |



US - Ripe Olives from Spain

#### LIST OF ANNEXES

#### ANNEX A

## PANEL DOCUMENTS

| Contents  |   |     |  |  |
|-----------|---|-----|--|--|
| Annex A-1 | Working Procedures of the Panel   | 234 |  |  |
| Annex A-2 | Additional Working Procedures concerning Business<br>Confidential Information   | 243 |  |  |
| Annex A-3 | Communication from the Panel to the parties of 18 September 2020 concerning certain procedural matters                                      | 246 |  |  |
| Annex A-4 | Additional Working Procedures of the Panel concerning holding a Substantive Meeting Conducted via Cisco Webex – Adopted on 9 October 2020   | 248 |  |  |
| Annex A-5 | Additional Working Procedures of the Panel concerning holding a Substantive Meeting Conducted via Cisco Webex – Adopted on 30 November 2020 | 254 |  |  |
| Annex A-6 | Additional Working Procedures of the Panel: Open<br>Meetings (Delayed Online Broadcast)   | 259 |  |  |
| Annex A-7 | Interim Review  | 261 |  |  |