

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-14468-2 - WTO Dispute Settlement and the Trips Agreement: Applying Intellectual Property Standards in a Trade Law Framework

Matthew Kennedy

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

WTO DISPUTE SETTLEMENT AND THE TRIPS AGREEMENT

The TRIPS Agreement was implemented in the WTO to gain access to a functioning dispute settlement mechanism that could authorize trade sanctions. Yet TRIPS and the WTO Dispute Settlement Understanding are based on systems that developed independently in WIPO and GATT. In this book, Matthew Kennedy exposes the challenges created by the integration and independence of TRIPS within the WTO by examining how this trade organization comes to grips with intellectual property disputes. He contrasts the way intellectual property disputes between governments have been handled before and after the establishment of the WTO. Based on practical experience, this book provides a comprehensive review of the issues that arise under the DSU, TRIPS, GATT 1994 and other WTO agreements in intellectual property matters. These range from procedural pitfalls to substantive treaty interpretation and conflicts as well as remedies, including cross-retaliation.

MATTHEW KENNEDY is a professor in the Faculty of Law at the University of International Business and Economics, Beijing. He was formerly a senior lawyer in the WTO Secretariat and Secretary of the WTO Council for TRIPS.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-14468-2 - WTO Dispute Settlement and the Trips Agreement: Applying Intellectual Property Standards in a Trade Law Framework

Matthew Kennedy

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND ECONOMIC LAW

Series Editors

Dr Lorand Bartels, *University of Cambridge*
 Professor Thomas Cottier, *University of Berne*
 Professor William Davey, *University of Illinois*

As the processes of regionalization and globalization have intensified, there have been accompanying increases in the regulations of international trade and economic law at the levels of international, regional and national laws.

The subject matter of this series is international economic law. Its core is the regulation of international trade, investment and cognate areas such as intellectual property and competition policy. The series publishes books on related regulatory areas, in particular human rights, labour, environment and culture, as well as sustainable development. These areas are vertically linked at the international, regional and national level, and the series extends to the implementation of these rules at these different levels. The series also includes works on governance, dealing with the structure and operation of related international organizations in the field of international economic law, and the way they interact with other subjects of international and national law.

Books in the series

WTO Dispute Settlement and the TRIPS Agreement: Applying Intellectual Property Standards in a Trade Law Framework

Matthew Kennedy

Establishing Judicial Authority in International Economic Law Edited by Joanna Jemielniak, Laura Nielsen and Henrik Palmer Olsen

Trade, Investment, Innovation and Their Impact on Access to Medicines: An Asian Perspective

Locknie Hsu

The Law, Economics and Politics of International Standardisation

Panagiotis Delimatsis

The WTO and International Investment Law: Converging Systems

Jürgen Kurtz

Export Restrictions on Critical Minerals and Metals: Testing the Adequacy of WTO Disciplines

Ilaria Espa

Optimal Regulation and the Law of International Trade: The Interface between Societal Values and WTO Law

Boris Rigod

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-14468-2 - WTO Dispute Settlement and the Trips Agreement: Applying Intellectual Property Standards in a Trade Law Framework

Matthew Kennedy

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

The Social Foundations of World Trade: Norms, Community and Constitution

Sungjoon Cho

Public Participation and Legitimacy in the WTO

Yves Bonzon

The Challenge of Safeguards in the WTO

Fernando Piérola

General Interests of Host States in International Investment Law Edited by Giorgio Sacerdoti, Pia Acconci, Mara Valenti and Anna De Luca

The Law of Development Cooperation: A Comparative Analysis of the World Bank, the EU and Germany

Philipp Dann

WTO Disciplines on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures: Balancing Policy Space and Legal Constraints

Dominic Coppens

Domestic Judicial Review of Trade Remedies: Experiences of the Most Active WTO Members

Müslüm Yilmaz

International Organizations in WTO Dispute Settlement: How Much Institutional Sensitivity?

Marina Foltea

Public Services and International Trade Liberalization: Human Rights and Gender Implications

Barnali Choudhury

The Law and Politics of WTO Waivers: Stability and Flexibility in Public International Law

Isabel Feichtner

African Regional Trade Agreements as Legal Regimes

James Thuo Gathii

Liberalizing International Trade after Doha

David Gantz

Processes and Production Methods (PPMs) in WTO Law: Interfacing Trade and Social Goals

Christiane R. Conrad

Non-Discrimination in International Trade in Services: 'Likeness' in WTO/GATS

Nicolas Diebold

The Law, Economics and Politics of Retaliation in WTO Dispute Settlement Edited by Chad P. Bown and Joost Pauwelyn

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-14468-2 - WTO Dispute Settlement and the Trips Agreement: Applying Intellectual Property Standards in a Trade Law Framework

Matthew Kennedy

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

The Multilateralization of International Investment Law

Stephan W. Schill

Trade Policy Flexibility and Enforcement in the WTO: A Law and Economics Analysis

Simon A.B. Schropp

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-14468-2 - WTO Dispute Settlement and the Trips Agreement: Applying Intellectual Property Standards in a Trade Law Framework

Matthew Kennedy

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

WTO DISPUTE SETTLEMENT AND THE TRIPS AGREEMENT

Applying Intellectual Property Standards
in a Trade Law Framework

MATTHEW KENNEDY



Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-14468-2 - WTO Dispute Settlement and the Trips Agreement: Applying Intellectual Property Standards in a Trade Law Framework

Matthew Kennedy

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107144682

© Matthew Kennedy 2016

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.

First published 2016

Printed in the United Kingdom by Lightning Source UK Ltd

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

ISBN 978-1-107-14468-2 Hardback

Cambridge University Press 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.

CONTENTS

Foreword
BY LARS ANELL page ix
Series editor foreword
BY THOMAS COTTIER xiii
Acknowledgements xv
*Table of GATT and WTO dispute settlement reports and
arbitration awards* xvi
Table of TRIPS disputes xxxiv
*Table of arbitrations on suspension of TRIPS
obligations* xxxvii
List of abbreviations and acronyms xxxviii
List of figures xliii

1 Introduction 1
2 Achievement of objectives 40
3 Procedural foundations 106
4 Interpretation of TRIPS 158
5 Relation of TRIPS to other WTO agreements 226
6 Remedies 288
7 Non-violation and situation complaints 352
8 Conclusions 383

Appendix: case summaries 428
Index 435

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-14468-2 - WTO Dispute Settlement and the Trips Agreement: Applying Intellectual Property Standards in a Trade Law Framework

Matthew Kennedy

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-14468-2 - WTO Dispute Settlement and the Trips Agreement: Applying Intellectual Property Standards in a Trade Law Framework

Matthew Kennedy

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

FOREWORD

Until the mid-nineties the legal framework that governed international trade, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), dealt almost exclusively with issues related to trade in goods. There were no provisions for the rapidly expanding trade in services. The status of agriculture was also uncertain. Trade in textiles and clothing was subject to quotas. The agreement said precious little about protection of intellectual property rights. The system for the settlement of disputes functioned reasonably well because all countries knew how much strain it could take. Strictly speaking, GATT was not even a proper organization; it was an agreement signed by ‘contracting parties’ who were willing to share the cost for a secretariat. Unlike almost all other international organizations, the show was run by the participating countries.

In view of this, the outcome of the Uruguay Round negotiations, which started in 1986 in Punta del Este and ended in 1994 in Marrakesh, was well-nigh revolutionary. Practically all the basic principles of GATT were clarified and strengthened. In agriculture, prior forms of border protection were transformed into tariffs. Quotas for trade in textiles and clothing were to be phased out. The improved Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU) gave members automatic access to the system, the right to an appeal and virtually automatic adoption of reports. A whole new agreement covered trade in services (GATS). Even though it was not on the agenda when the Round began, GATT was transformed into the World Trade Organization (WTO). However, the most surprising addition was the comprehensive Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), which built on treaties developed in another organization altogether (WIPO).

I had the privilege to chair the negotiating group on TRIPS. When we began in 1986, it was anybody’s guess what the outcome would be. The Punta del Este Ministerial Declaration spoke of ‘trade-related aspects of intellectual property rights, including trade in counterfeit goods’. Quite early it was clear that several countries wanted a far-reaching agreement

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-14468-2 - WTO Dispute Settlement and the Trips Agreement: Applying Intellectual Property Standards in a Trade Law Framework

Matthew Kennedy

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

that included minimum standards for intellectual property protection. Many other countries regarded this as something that they had to accept to obtain results elsewhere in the single undertaking. An agreement was reached at a high-level meeting in 1989 that future negotiations should encompass basic principles, minimum standards, enforcement, dispute prevention and settlement, and transitional arrangements. By the end of 1991, the negotiating group had reached a provisional agreement covering all of those objectives.

The negotiations started very slowly and ambiguity about the mandate was not the only reason. TRIPS was truly a new subject in the GATT framework. There were almost no government experts posted in Geneva, and many countries could not rely on qualified expertise in capitals. It had to be a steep learning curve. Regarding minimum standards, there were no GATT provisions that could serve as a basis for negotiations. The numerous texts produced by the participants differed in several respects, and the lack of one common reference text made orderly negotiations very difficult. It was only in 1990 that I was allowed to produce a Chairman's draft. It was a rather unwieldy document since it was based on a commitment to reflect fully all proposals in the submitted texts – but it put the negotiations on a solid track. All negotiators in the room could then refer to the same paragraph on the same page in the same document.

The TRIPS negotiating group was one of fifteen when the Uruguay Round began; later there were seven negotiating groups. There were fora where common issues could be addressed but coordination was patchy at best. All participants kept an eye on the emerging package of what was a single undertaking but the negotiating groups were to a large extent autonomous. Thus – and this is at the heart of Matthew Kennedy's analysis – a comprehensive minimum standards agreement for the protection of private rights was negotiated in parallel with a DSU that primarily dealt with trade issues concerning members' rights and obligations.

The TRIPS negotiations aimed at providing effective and expeditious procedures for multilateral dispute prevention and settlement in intellectual property matters and to reduce the tensions surrounding unilateral redress. The latter objective primarily concerned actions by the United States on the basis of Section 301 of the US Trade Act of 1974. These two objectives have been broadly achieved. Before the Marrakesh Agreement entered into force, there was no functioning enforcement mechanism linked to any of the WIPO treaties and no intellectual property case has ever been referred to the International Court of

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-14468-2 - WTO Dispute Settlement and the Trips Agreement: Applying Intellectual Property Standards in a Trade Law Framework

Matthew Kennedy

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

FOREWORD

xi

Justice even today. The cases dealt with by WTO panels have provided positive solutions in the large majority of cases within a reasonable period of time. For all practical purposes, the WTO has become the forum of first choice for the formal settlement of intellectual property disputes between governments.

Beneath the surface, the operation of this system is more nuanced. This book presents an admirably clear, critical – but also constructive – analysis of the uneasy existence of a minimum standards agreement protecting private rights in a framework designed to solve trade disputes between states. Without unduly simplifying the distinction, it is fair to say that the TRIPS Agreement informs countries what they must do, while trade rules usually deal with what countries are not allowed to do in terms of discrimination or restrictions on imports. And there is almost no adaptation in the DSU to accommodate TRIPS.

The book highlights a number of problems. It questions the incautious use of GATT practices by TRIPS panels. In some cases this has led to an injudicious reversal of the burden of proof. There also seems to be a tendency to disregard the implications of public policy concerns. A more mundane, but equally important, challenge is the supply of expertise regarding intellectual property rights. However, the book's most critical comments are saved for the Appellate Body. Only a few TRIPS cases have been appealed, and Professor Kennedy believes that we should be pleased with that.

There is no doubt that one reason why the proponents wanted TRIPS to be part of GATT, or WTO, was the attraction of an enforcement mechanism that could allow the complainant to retaliate. In some quarters it has been proposed that respect for human rights, decent working conditions or protection of the environment should be linked to the WTO. It is therefore important to clarify that the value of the dispute settlement mechanism before and after WTO is that parties bring their legislation or practice in compliance with rulings of panels. Retaliation is a very blunt instrument. It normally allows a country to stop importing products that it wants to import. In other words, a right to retaliate gives you the opportunity to shoot yourself in the foot hoping it would hurt the other party more. If the world community wants to promote or prevent certain actions, there are far more effective measures available.

Professor Kennedy's book is not only a balanced and lucid exposition of how TRIPS has been integrated into the WTO family. It also lists a number of open issues that need to be addressed and gives advice on how

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-14468-2 - WTO Dispute Settlement and the Trips Agreement: Applying Intellectual Property Standards in a Trade Law Framework

Matthew Kennedy

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xii

FOREWORD

to go about it. Fluent in intellectual property law and in trade law, this volume makes a valuable contribution to both.

Lars Anell

Former Chairman

*Negotiating Group on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property
Rights, including Trade in Counterfeit Goods*

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-14468-2 - WTO Dispute Settlement and the Trips Agreement: Applying Intellectual Property Standards in a Trade Law Framework

Matthew Kennedy

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

SERIES EDITOR FOREWORD

The advent of the new and binding system of dispute resolution of the World Trade Organization, in operation since 1995, fundamentally altered the role and status of law in the international trading system. While before dispute settlement was conciliatory and at the disposition of parties, the new system with its two tiers of panels and the Appellate Body under the Dispute Settlement Understanding strongly reinforced legal disciplines of GATT and its related agreements. Principles and rules, often limiting and containing regulatory powers of States in the process of trade liberalization for goods and services, have been refined in a continuous stream of cases, evolving the law of international trade regulation. Rulings adopted by the Dispute Settlement Body become binding upon parties and, in case of non-compliance, enforceable by means of the imposition of trade sanctions and selective withdrawal of concessions relating to market access rights.

These changes are even more profound for intellectual property, which was so far completely devoid in practice of interstate arbitration. The rules of the Paris and Berne Conventions had no case law prior to their incorporation into the TRIPs Agreement. While these conventions are subject to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, no case law evolved ever since these treaties were adopted in 1883 and 1886, respectively. Application and interpretation was left to domestic legislation and domestic courts, resulting in great variance in the interpretation of scope and effects of international rules relating to the protection of intellectual property rights. Since 1995, the new WTO system also applies to intellectual property protection enshrined in the TRIPs Agreement of the WTO. It has profoundly changed the landscape.

Unlike GATT and GATS, the TRIPs Agreement contains a set of detailed minimal standards. They are essentially of a behind-the-border regulatory nature, both in terms of substance and procedures, which States agreed to adopt and comply with on the basis of the TRIPs Agreement. The normative nature of these rules thus is somewhat

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-14468-2 - WTO Dispute Settlement and the Trips Agreement: Applying Intellectual Property Standards in a Trade Law Framework

Matthew Kennedy

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xiv

SERIES EDITOR FOREWORD

different from those of GATT and GATS. The present thesis examines how these differences play out within the DSU developed and designed for GATT, but equally applied to the rules of intellectual property protection. It examines the case law and the experience of the first twenty years of the DSU. In doing so, it explores commonalities and differences in a horizontal and systematic manner, and assesses to what extent the system is suitable for other and new areas of regulatory convergence, which increasingly dominate modern trade policy.

The treatise was written in Beijing, where Matthew Kennedy teaches international trade law and technology law, and at the World Trade Institute of the University of Bern during longer periods of research. The author regularly attended the doctoral seminars of the WTI doctoral programme, presenting issues and progress in an exemplary clear and lucid manner. He was able to benefit from his extensive experience as a former legal counsellor in the WTO Secretariat in Geneva, combining theory and practice. Supervising his work was a particular pleasure and a learning experience in exploring the intricacies of the new field of IPRs in WTO dispute settlement. The present book, based upon the author's doctoral thesis submitted to the Faculty of Law of the University of Bern, not only amounts to the leading treatise on the subject, but will also provide long-term guidance to other areas of regulatory, behind-the-border issues increasingly dominating international economic law.

Thomas Cottier

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-14468-2 - WTO Dispute Settlement and the Trips Agreement: Applying Intellectual Property Standards in a Trade Law Framework

Matthew Kennedy

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author thanks Thomas Cottier for his guidance throughout this project and is grateful both to him and to Bill Davey for reviewing an earlier version of this book. The author thanks former WTO colleagues Doaa Abdel Motaal, Rudolf Adlung, Susan Hainsworth, Edwini Kessie, Jesse Kreier, Lauro Locks, Thu-Lang Tran Wasescha, Hannu Wager and Jayashree Watal for reviewing selected chapters and sections. Celso Amorim, Roxana Blasetti, Claude Burcky, Gabriela Catalani, François Curchod, Edward Kwakwa, Martin Lukas, Mark Orr, Bill Reinsch, Geralyn Ritter, Eric Schwartz, Debra Steger and Celso de Tarso Pereira kindly responded to questions. Betty Lagogianes made many helpful editorial suggestions. Lise McLeod and Ulrike Fischer generously assisted with references. Thomas Cottier, the Hathi Trust, Knowledge Ecology International, the Licensing Executives Society International and the WIPO library made available archived and other materials. The author is especially grateful to Omar and Luka for their unstinting moral support.

This is an independent work gladly produced without support from any government, company, industry body, non-governmental organization or foundation. The author was involved in certain disputes under discussion in his former capacity as a WTO Secretariat official. The book includes some ideas that the author published in ‘The “Three-Step Test” and the Burden of Proof in Disputes under the TRIPS Agreement’, *IIC – International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law* 45(2): 161–77 (2014); ‘Blurred Lines: Reading TRIPS with GATT glasses’, *Journal of World Trade* 49(5) 735–55 (2015); and ‘Enforcing the WTO rulings on trade marks and trade names in *Havana Club*’, *Queen Mary Journal of Intellectual Property* 5(4) 430–48 (2015).

TABLE OF GATT AND WTO DISPUTE SETTLEMENT
REPORTS AND ARBITRATION AWARDS

Short title	Full case title and citation
<i>Argentina – Footwear (EC)</i>	Appellate Body Report, <i>Argentina – Safeguard Measures on Imports of Footwear</i> , WT/DS121/AB/R, adopted 12 January 2000, DSR 2000:I, p. 515
<i>Argentina – Textiles and Apparel</i>	Panel Report, <i>Argentina – Measures Affecting Imports of Footwear, Textiles, Apparel and Other Items</i> , WT/DS56/R, adopted 22 April 1998, as modified by Appellate Body Report WT/DS56/AB/R, DSR 1998:III, p. 1033
<i>Australia – Ammonium Sulphate</i>	GATT Working Party Report, <i>The Australian Subsidy on Ammonium Sulphate</i> , GATT/CP.4/39, adopted 3 April 1950, BISD II/188
<i>Australia – Automotive Leather II (Article 21.5 – US)</i>	Panel Report, <i>Australia – Subsidies Provided to Producers and Exporters of Automotive Leather – Recourse to Article 21.5 of the DSU by the United States</i> , WT/DS126/RW and Corr.1, adopted 11 February 2000, DSR 2000:III, p. 1189
<i>Australia – Salmon</i>	Appellate Body Report, <i>Australia – Measures Affecting Importation of Salmon</i> , WT/DS18/AB/R, adopted 6 November 1998, DSR 1998:VIII, p. 3327
<i>Brazil – Aircraft (Article 22.6 – Brazil)</i>	Decision by the Arbitrators, <i>Brazil – Export Financing Programme for Aircraft – Recourse to Arbitration by Brazil under Article 22.6 of the DSU and Article 4.11 of the SCM Agreement</i> , WT/DS46/ARB, 28 August 2000, DSR 2002:I, p. 19
<i>Brazil – Desiccated Coconut</i>	Appellate Body Report, <i>Brazil – Measures Affecting Desiccated Coconut</i> , WT/DS22/

(cont.)

Short title	Full case title and citation
	AB/R, adopted 20 March 1997, DSR 1997:I, p. 167
<i>Brazil – Internal Taxes</i>	GATT Working Party Report, <i>Brazilian Internal Taxes</i> , adopted 30 June 1949, BISD II/181
<i>Brazil – Retreaded Tyres</i>	Panel Report, <i>Brazil – Measures Affecting Imports of Retreaded Tyres</i> , WT/DS332/R, adopted 17 December 2007, as modified by Appellate Body Report WT/DS332/AB/R, DSR 2007:V, p. 1649
<i>Canada – Aircraft</i>	Appellate Body Report, <i>Canada – Measures Affecting the Export of Civilian Aircraft</i> , WT/DS70/AB/R, adopted 20 August 1999, DSR 1999:III, p. 1377
<i>Canada – Aircraft</i>	Panel Report, <i>Canada – Measures Affecting the Export of Civilian Aircraft</i> , WT/DS70/R, adopted 20 August 1999, upheld by Appellate Body Report WT/DS70/AB/R, DSR 1999:IV, p. 1443
<i>Canada – Aircraft Credits and Guarantees (Article 22.6 – Canada)</i>	Decision by the Arbitrator, <i>Canada – Export Credits and Loan Guarantees for Regional Aircraft – Recourse to Arbitration by Canada under Article 22.6 of the DSU and Article 4.11 of the SCM Agreement</i> , WT/ DS222/ARB, 17 February 2003, DSR 2003: III, p. 1187
<i>Canada – Dairy</i>	Appellate Body Report, <i>Canada – Measures Affecting the Importation of Milk and the Exportation of Dairy Products</i> , WT/DS103/ AB/R, WT/DS113/AB/R and Corr.1, adopted 27 October 1999, DSR 1999:V, p. 2057
<i>Canada – Dairy (Article 21.5 – New Zealand and US II)</i>	Appellate Body Report, <i>Canada – Measures Affecting the Importation of Milk and the Exportation of Dairy Products – Second Recourse to Article 21.5 of the DSU by New Zealand and the United States</i> , WT/DS103/

xviii TABLE OF GATT AND WTO DISPUTE SETTLEMENT

(cont.)

Short title	Full case title and citation
	AB/RW2, WT/DS113/AB/RW2, adopted 17 January 2003, DSR 2003:I, p. 213
<i>Canada – FIRA</i>	GATT Panel Report, <i>Canada – Administration of the Foreign Investment Review Act</i> , adopted 7 February 1984, BISD 30S/140
<i>Canada – Herring and Salmon</i>	GATT Panel Report, <i>Canada – Measures Affecting Exports of Unprocessed Herring and Salmon</i> , adopted 22 March 1988, BISD 35S/98
<i>Canada – Patent Term</i>	Appellate Body Report, <i>Canada – Term of Patent Protection</i> , WT/DS170/AB/R, adopted 12 October 2000, DSR 2000:X, p. 5093
<i>Canada – Patent Term</i>	Panel Report, <i>Canada – Term of Patent Protection</i> , WT/DS170/R, adopted 12 October 2000, upheld by Appellate Body Report WT/DS170/AB/R, DSR 2000:XII, p. 5121
<i>Canada – Patent Term (Article 21.3(c))</i>	Award of the Arbitrator, <i>Canada – Term of Patent Protection – Arbitration under Article 21.3(c) of the DSU</i> , WT/DS170/10, 28 February 2001, DSR 2001:V, p. 2031
<i>Canada – Periodicals</i>	Appellate Body Report, <i>Canada – Certain Measures Concerning Periodicals</i> , WT/DS31/AB/R, adopted 30 July 1997, DSR 1997:I, p. 449
<i>Canada – Pharmaceutical Patents</i>	Panel Report, <i>Canada – Patent Protection of Pharmaceutical Products</i> , WT/DS114/R, adopted 7 April 2000, DSR 2000:V, p. 2289
<i>Canada – Pharmaceutical Patents (Article 21.3(c))</i>	Award of the Arbitrator, <i>Canada – Patent Protection of Pharmaceutical Products – Arbitration under Article 21.3(c) of the DSU</i> , WT/DS114/13, 18 August 2000, DSR 2002:I, p. 3
<i>Canada – Renewable Energy/Canada – Feed-in Tariff Program</i>	Appellate Body Reports, <i>Canada – Certain Measures Affecting the Renewable Energy Generation Sector / Canada – Measures</i>

(cont.)

Short title	Full case title and citation
	<i>Relating to the Feed-in Tariff Program</i> , WT/DS412/AB/R / WT/DS426/AB/R, adopted 24 May 2013
<i>Canada – Wheat Exports and Grain Imports</i>	Panel Report, <i>Canada – Measures Relating to Exports of Wheat and Treatment of Imported Grain</i> , WT/DS276/R, adopted 27 September 2004, upheld by Appellate Body Report WT/DS276/AB/R, DSR 2004:VI, p. 2817
<i>Chile – Price Band System</i>	Panel Report, <i>Chile – Price Band System and Safeguard Measures Relating to Certain Agricultural Products</i> , WT/DS207/R, adopted 23 October 2002, as modified by Appellate Body Report WT/DS207AB/R, DSR 2002:VIII, p. 3127
<i>Chile – Price Band System (Article 21.5 – Argentina)</i>	Appellate Body Report, <i>Chile – Price Band System and Safeguard Measures Relating to Certain Agricultural Products – Recourse to Article 21.5 of the DSU by Argentina</i> , WT/DS207/AB/RW, adopted 22 May 2007, DSR 2007:II, p. 513
<i>China – Auto Parts</i>	Appellate Body Reports, <i>China – Measures Affecting Imports of Automobile Parts</i> , WT/DS339/AB/R / WT/DS340/AB/R / WT/DS342/AB/R, adopted 12 January 2009, DSR 2009:I, p. 3
<i>China – Auto Parts</i>	Panel Reports, <i>China – Measures Affecting Imports of Automobile Parts</i> , WT/DS339/R / WT/DS340/R / WT/DS342/R / Add.1 and Add.2, adopted 12 January 2009, upheld (WT/DS339/R) and as modified (WT/DS340/R / WT/DS342/R) by Appellate Body Reports WT/DS339/AB/R / WT/DS340/AB/R / WT/DS342/AB/R, DSR 2009:I, p. 119
<i>China – Intellectual Property Rights</i>	Panel Report, <i>China – Measures Affecting the Protection and Enforcement of Intellectual</i>

XX TABLE OF GATT AND WTO DISPUTE SETTLEMENT

(cont.)

Short title	Full case title and citation
	<i>Property Rights</i> , WT/DS362/R, adopted 20 March 2009, DSR 2009:V, p. 2097
<i>China – Publications and Audiovisual Products</i>	Appellate Body Report, <i>China – Measures Affecting Trading Rights and Distribution Services for Certain Publications and Audiovisual Entertainment Products</i> , WT/DS363/AB/R, adopted 19 January 2010, DSR 2010:I, p. 3
<i>China – Rare Earths</i>	Appellate Body Reports, <i>China – Measures Related to the Exportation of Rare Earths, Tungsten, and Molybdenum</i> , WT/DS431/AB/R / WT/DS432/AB/R / WT/DS433/AB/R, adopted 29 August 2014
<i>China – Raw Materials</i>	Appellate Body Reports, <i>China – Measures Related to the Exportation of Various Raw Materials</i> , WT/DS394/AB/R / WT/DS395/AB/R / WT/DS398/AB/R, adopted 22 February 2012, DSR 2012:VII, p. 3295
<i>China – Raw Materials</i>	Panel Reports, <i>China – Measures Related to the Exportation of Various Raw Materials</i> , WT/DS394/R / WT/DS395/R / WT/DS398/R / Add.1 and Corr.1, adopted 22 February 2012, as modified by Appellate Body Reports WT/DS394/AB/R / WT/DS395/AB/R / WT/DS398/AB/R, DSR 2012:VII, p. 3501
<i>Dominican Republic – Import and Sale of Cigarettes</i>	Appellate Body Report, <i>Dominican Republic – Measures Affecting the Importation and Internal Sale of Cigarettes</i> , WT/DS302/AB/R, adopted 19 May 2005, DSR 2005:XV, p. 7367
<i>EEC – Apples (US)</i>	GATT Panel Report, <i>European Economic Community – Restrictions on Imports of Apples – Complaint by the United States</i> , adopted 22 June 1989, BISD 36S/135
<i>EC – Approval and Marketing of Biotech Products</i>	Panel Reports, <i>European Communities – Measures Affecting the Approval and Marketing of Biotech Products</i> , WT/DS291/

(cont.)

Short title	Full case title and citation
	R / WT/DS292/R / WT/DS293/R / Add.1 to Add.9 and Corr.1, adopted 21 November 2006, DSR 2006:III, p. 847
EC – Asbestos	Appellate Body Report, <i>European Communities – Measures Affecting Asbestos and Asbestos-Containing Products</i> , WT/DS135/AB/R, adopted 5 April 2001, DSR 2001:VII, p. 3243
EC – Bananas III	Appellate Body Report, <i>European Communities – Regime for the Importation, Sale and Distribution of Bananas</i> , WT/DS27/AB/R, adopted 25 September 1997, DSR 1997:II, p. 591
EC – Bananas III (Ecuador) (Article 22.6 – EC)	Decision by the Arbitrators, <i>European Communities – Regime for the Importation, Sale and Distribution of Bananas – Recourse to Arbitration by the European Communities under Article 22.6 of the DSU</i> , WT/DS27/ARB/ECU, 24 March 2000, DSR 2000:V, p. 2237
EC – Bananas III (US) (Article 22.6 – EC)	Decision by the Arbitrators, <i>European Communities – Regime for the Importation, Sale and Distribution of Bananas – Recourse to Arbitration by the European Communities under Article 22.6 of the DSU</i> , WT/DS27/ARB, 9 April 1999, DSR 1999:II, p. 725
EEC – Canned Fruits	GATT Panel Report, <i>European Economic Community – Production Aids Granted on Canned Peaches, Canned Pears, Canned Fruit Cocktail and Dried Grapes</i> , 20 February 1985, unadopted, L/5778
EC – Chicken Cuts	Appellate Body Report, <i>European Communities – Customs Classification of Frozen Boneless Chicken Cuts</i> , WT/DS269/AB/R, WT/DS286/AB/R, adopted 27 September 2005, DSR 2005:XIX, p. 9157
EC – Citrus	GATT Panel Report, <i>European Community – Tariff Treatment on Imports of Citrus</i>

(cont.)

Short title	Full case title and citation
	<i>Products from Certain Countries in the Mediterranean Region</i> , 7 February 1985, unadopted, L/5776
EC – Computer Equipment	Appellate Body Report, <i>European Communities – Customs Classification of Certain Computer Equipment</i> , WT/DS62/AB/R, WT/DS67/AB/R, WT/DS68/AB/R, adopted 22 June 1998, DSR 1998:V, p. 1851
EC – Export Subsidies on Sugar	Appellate Body Report, <i>European Communities – Export Subsidies on Sugar</i> , WT/DS265/AB/R, WT/DS266/AB/R, WT/DS283/AB/R, adopted 19 May 2005, DSR 2005:XIII, p. 6365
EC – Fasteners (China)	Appellate Body Report, <i>European Communities – Definitive Anti-Dumping Measures on Certain Iron or Steel Fasteners from China</i> , WT/DS397/AB/R, adopted 28 July 2011, DSR 2011:VII, p. 3995
EC – Hormones	Appellate Body Report, <i>EC Measures Concerning Meat and Meat Products (Hormones)</i> , WT/DS26/AB/R, WT/DS48/AB/R, adopted 13 February 1998, DSR 1998:I, p. 135
EC – Hormones (Canada)	Panel Report, <i>EC Measures Concerning Meat and Meat Products (Hormones), Complaint by Canada</i> , WT/DS48/R/CAN, adopted 13 February 1998, as modified by Appellate Body Report WT/DS26/AB/R, WT/DS48/AB/R, DSR 1998:II, p. 235
EC – Hormones (US) (Article 22.6 – EC)	Decision by the Arbitrators, <i>European Communities – Measures Concerning Meat and Meat Products (Hormones), Original Complaint by the United States – Recourse to Arbitration by the European Communities under Article 22.6 of the DSU</i> , WT/DS26/ARB, 12 July 1999, DSR 1999:III, p. 1105
EEC – Oilseeds I	GATT Panel Report, <i>European Economic Community – Payments and Subsidies Paid to Processors and Producers of Oilseeds and</i>

(cont.)

Short title	Full case title and citation
	<i>Related Animal-Feed Proteins</i> , adopted 25 January 1990, BISD 37S/86
EEC – Oilseeds II	GATT Panel Report, <i>European Economic Community – Follow-Up on the Panel Report “Payments and Subsidies Paid to Processors and Producers of Oilseeds and Related Animal-Feed Proteins”</i> , 31 March 1992, BISD 39S/91
EC – Seal Products	Appellate Body Reports, <i>European Communities – Measures Prohibiting the Importation and Marketing of Seal Products</i> , WT/DS400/AB/R / WT/DS401/AB/R, adopted 18 June 2014
EC – Seal Products	Panel Reports, <i>European Communities – Measures Prohibiting the Importation and Marketing of Seal Products</i> , WT/DS400/R / WT/DS401/R / and Add.1, adopted 18 June 2014, as modified by Appellate Body Reports WT/DS400/AB/R / WT/DS401/AB/R
EC – Sugar Exports (Australia)	GATT Panel Report, <i>European Communities – Refunds on Exports of Sugar</i> BISD 26S/290, 28S/80, 29S/82, 27S/69
EC – Tariff Preferences	Appellate Body Report, <i>European Communities – Conditions for the Granting of Tariff Preferences to Developing Countries</i> , WT/DS246/AB/R, adopted 20 April 2004, DSR 2004:III, p. 925
EC – Trademarks and Geographical Indications (Australia)	Panel Report, <i>European Communities – Protection of Trademarks and Geographical Indications for Agricultural Products and Foodstuffs, Complaint by Australia</i> , WT/DS290/R, adopted 20 April 2005, DSR 2005:X, p. 4603
EC – Trademarks and Geographical Indications (US)	Panel Report, <i>European Communities – Protection of Trademarks and Geographical Indications for Agricultural Products and Foodstuffs, Complaint by the United States</i> ,

(cont.)

Short title	Full case title and citation
	WT/DS174/R, adopted 20 April 2005, DSR 2005:VIII, p. 3499
<i>EC and certain member states – Large Civil Aircraft</i>	Appellate Body Report, <i>European Communities and Certain Member States – Measures Affecting Trade in Large Civil Aircraft</i> , WT/DS316/AB/R, adopted 1 June 2011, DSR 2011:I, p. 7
<i>Germany – Sardines</i>	GATT Working Party Report, <i>Treatment by Germany of Imports of Sardines</i> , adopted 31 October 1952, BISD 1S/53
<i>Germany – Starch Duties</i>	GATT Working Party Report, <i>German Import Duties on Starch and Potato Flour</i> , 16 February 1955, unadopted, BISD 3S/77
<i>India – Additional Import Duties</i>	Appellate Body Report, <i>India – Additional and Extra-Additional Duties on Imports from the United States</i> , WT/DS360/AB/R, adopted 17 November 2008, DSR 2008:XX, p. 8223
<i>India – Autos</i>	Panel Report, <i>India – Measures Affecting the Automotive Sector</i> , WT/DS146/R, WT/DS175/R and Corr.1, adopted 5 April 2002, DSR 2002:V, p. 1827
<i>India – Patents (EC)</i>	Panel Report, <i>India – Patent Protection for Pharmaceutical and Agricultural Chemical Products, Complaint by the European Communities and their member States</i> , WT/DS79/R, adopted 22 September 1998, DSR 1998:VI, p. 2661
<i>India – Patents (US)</i>	Appellate Body Report, <i>India – Patent Protection for Pharmaceutical and Agricultural Chemical Products</i> , WT/DS50/AB/R, adopted 16 January 1998, DSR 1998:I, p. 9
<i>India – Patents (US)</i>	Panel Report, <i>India – Patent Protection for Pharmaceutical and Agricultural Chemical Products, Complaint by the United States</i> , WT/DS50/R, adopted 16 January 1998, as modified by Appellate Body Report WT/DS50/AB/R, DSR 1998:I, p. 41

(cont.)

Short title	Full case title and citation
<i>Indonesia – Autos</i>	Panel Report, <i>Indonesia – Certain Measures Affecting the Automobile Industry</i> , WT/DS54/R, WT/DS55/R, WT/DS59/R, WT/DS64/R and Corr.1 and Corr.2, adopted 23 July 1998, DSR 1998:VI, p. 2201
<i>Japan – Agricultural Products I</i>	GATT Panel Report, <i>Japan – Restrictions on Imports of Certain Agricultural Products</i> , adopted 2 March 1988, BISD 35S/163
<i>Japan – Alcoholic Beverages I</i>	GATT Panel Report, <i>Japan – Customs Duties, Taxes and Labelling Practices on Imported Wines and Alcoholic Beverages</i> , L/6216, adopted 10 November 1987, BISD 34S/83
<i>Japan – Alcoholic Beverages II</i>	Appellate Body Report, <i>Japan – Taxes on Alcoholic Beverages</i> , WT/DS8/AB/R, WT/DS10/AB/R, WT/DS11/AB/R, adopted 1 November 1996, DSR 1996:I, p. 97
<i>Japan – Film</i>	Panel Report, <i>Japan – Measures Affecting Consumer Photographic Film and Paper</i> , WT/DS44/R, adopted 22 April 1998, DSR 1998:IV, p. 1179
<i>Japan – Leather II (US)</i>	GATT Panel Report, <i>Panel on Japanese Measures on Imports of Leather</i> , adopted 15 May 1984, BISD 31S/94
<i>Japan – Semi-Conductors</i>	GATT Panel Report, <i>Japan – Trade in Semi-Conductors</i> , adopted 4 May 1988, BISD 35S/116
<i>Korea – Dairy</i>	Appellate Body Report, <i>Korea – Definitive Safeguard Measure on Imports of Certain Dairy Products</i> , WT/DS98/AB/R, adopted 12 January 2000, DSR 2000:I, p. 3
<i>Korea – Procurement</i>	Panel Report, <i>Korea – Measures Affecting Government Procurement</i> , WT/DS163/R, adopted 19 June 2000, DSR 2000:VIII, p. 3541
<i>Korea – Various Measures on Beef</i>	Appellate Body Report, <i>Korea – Measures Affecting Imports of Fresh, Chilled and Frozen Beef</i> , WT/DS161/AB/R, WT/DS169/AB/R, adopted 10 January 2001, DSR 2001:I, p. 5

(cont.)

Short title	Full case title and citation
<i>Mexico – Anti-Dumping Measures on Rice</i>	Appellate Body Report, <i>Mexico – Definitive Anti-Dumping Measures on Beef and Rice, Complaint with Respect to Rice</i> , WT/DS295/AB/R, adopted 20 December 2005, DSR 2005:XXII, p. 10853
<i>Mexico – Taxes on Soft Drinks</i>	Appellate Body Report, <i>Mexico – Tax Measures on Soft Drinks and Other Beverages</i> , WT/DS308/AB/R, adopted 24 March 2006, DSR 2006:I, p. 3
<i>Mexico – Telecoms</i>	Panel Report, <i>Mexico – Measures Affecting Telecommunications Services</i> , WT/DS204/R, adopted 1 June 2004, DSR 2004:IV, p. 1537
<i>Norway – Trondheim Toll Ring</i>	GATT Panel Report, <i>Panel Report on Norwegian Procurement of Toll Collection Equipment for the City of Trondheim</i> , adopted 13 May 1992, BISD 40S/319
<i>Thailand – Cigarettes</i>	GATT Panel Report, <i>Thailand – Restrictions on Importation of and Internal Taxes on Cigarettes</i> , adopted 7 November 1990, BISD 37S/200
<i>US – 1916 Act</i>	Appellate Body Report, <i>United States – Anti-Dumping Act of 1916</i> , WT/DS136/AB/R, WT/DS162/AB/R, adopted 26 September 2000, DSR 2000:X, p. 4793
<i>US – 1916 Act (EC) (Article 22.6 – US)</i>	Decision by the Arbitrators, <i>United States – Anti-Dumping Act of 1916, Original Complaint by the European Communities – Recourse to Arbitration by the United States under Article 22.6 of the DSU</i> , WT/DS136/ARB, 24 February 2004, DSR 2004:IX, p. 4269
<i>US – Carbon Steel</i>	Appellate Body Report, <i>United States – Countervailing Duties on Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Germany</i> , WT/DS213/AB/R and Corr.1, adopted 19 December 2002, DSR 2002:IX, p. 3779

(cont.)

Short title	Full case title and citation
US – Cement	GATT Panel Report, <i>United States – Anti-Dumping Duties on Gray Portland Cement and Cement Clinker from Mexico</i> , 7 September 1992, unadopted, ADP/82
US – Clove Cigarettes	Appellate Body Report, <i>United States – Measures Affecting the Production and Sale of Clove Cigarettes</i> , WT/DS406/AB/R, adopted 24 April 2012, DSR 2012: XI, p. 5751
US – Continued Suspension	Appellate Body Report, <i>United States – Continued Suspension of Obligations in the EC – Hormones Dispute</i> , WT/DS320/AB/R, adopted 14 November 2008, DSR 2008:X, p. 3507
US – Continued Zeroing	Appellate Body Report, <i>United States – Continued Existence and Application of Zeroing Methodology</i> , WT/DS350/AB/R, adopted 19 February 2009, DSR 2009:III, p. 1291
US – COOL	Appellate Body Reports, <i>United States – Certain Country of Origin Labelling (COOL) Requirements</i> , WT/DS384/AB/R / WT/DS386/AB/R, adopted 23 July 2012, DSR 2012:V, p. 2449
US – COOL	Panel Reports, <i>United States – Certain Country of Origin Labelling (COOL) Requirements</i> , WT/DS384/R / WT/DS386/R, adopted 23 July 2012, as modified by Appellate Body Reports WT/DS384/AB/R / WT/DS386/AB/R, DSR 2012:VI, p. 2745
US – COOL (Article 21.5 – Canada and Mexico)	Panel Reports, <i>United States – Certain Country of Origin Labelling (COOL) Requirements – Recourse to Article 21.5 of the DSU by Canada and Mexico</i> , WT/DS384/RW / WT/DS386/RW, adopted 29 May 2015, as modified by Appellate Body Reports WT/DS384/AB/RW / WT/DS386/AB/RW

(cont.)

Short title	Full case title and citation
US – Corrosion-Resistant Steel Sunset Review	Appellate Body Report, <i>United States – Sunset Review of Anti-Dumping Duties on Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Japan</i> , WT/DS244/AB/R, adopted 9 January 2004, DSR 2004:I, p. 3
US – Countervailing and Anti-Dumping Measures (China)	Appellate Body Report, <i>United States – Countervailing and Anti-Dumping Measures on Certain Products from China</i> , WT/DS449/AB/R and Corr.1, adopted 22 July 2014
US – FSC	Appellate Body Report, <i>United States – Tax Treatment for “Foreign Sales Corporations”</i> , WT/DS108/AB/R, adopted 20 March 2000, DSR 2000:III, p. 1619
US – FSC (Article 22.6 – US)	Decision by the Arbitrator, <i>United States – Tax Treatment for “Foreign Sales Corporations” – Recourse to Arbitration by the United States under Article 22.6 of the DSU and Article 4.11 of the SCM Agreement</i> , WT/DS108/ARB, 30 August 2002, DSR 2002:VI, p. 2517
US – Gambling	Appellate Body Report, <i>United States – Measures Affecting the Cross-Border Supply of Gambling and Betting Services</i> , WT/DS285/AB/R, adopted 20 April 2005, DSR 2005:XII, p. 5663
US – Gambling (Article 21.5 – Antigua and Barbuda)	Panel Report, <i>United States – Measures Affecting the Cross-Border Supply of Gambling and Betting Services – Recourse to Article 21.5 of the DSU by Antigua and Barbuda</i> , WT/DS285/RW, adopted 22 May 2007, DSR 2007:VIII, p. 3105
US – Gambling (Article 22.6 – US)	Decision by the Arbitrator, <i>United States – Measures Affecting the Cross-Border Supply of Gambling and Betting Services – Recourse to Arbitration by the United States under Article 22.6 of the DSU</i> , WT/DS285/ARB, 21 December 2007, DSR 2007:X, p. 4163

(cont.)

Short title	Full case title and citation
US – Gasoline	Appellate Body Report, <i>United States – Standards for Reformulated and Conventional Gasoline</i> , WT/DS2/AB/R, adopted 20 May 1996, DSR 1996:I, p. 3
US – Gasoline	Panel Report, <i>United States – Standards for Reformulated and Conventional Gasoline</i> , WT/DS2/R, adopted 20 May 1996, as modified by Appellate Body Report WT/DS2/AB/R, DSR 1996:I, p. 29
US – Hot-Rolled Steel	Appellate Body Report, <i>United States – Anti-Dumping Measures on Certain Hot-Rolled Steel Products from Japan</i> , WT/DS184/AB/R, adopted 23 August 2001, DSR 2001:X, p. 4697
US – Large Civil Aircraft	Appellate Body Report, <i>United States – Measures Affecting Trade in Large Civil Aircraft (Second Complaint)</i> , WT/DS353/AB/R, adopted 23 March 2012, DSR 2012:I, p. 7
US – Line Pipe	Appellate Body Report, <i>United States – Definitive Safeguard Measures on Imports of Circular Welded Carbon Quality Line Pipe from Korea</i> , WT/DS202/AB/R, adopted 8 March 2002, DSR 2002:IV, p. 1403
US – Malt Beverages	GATT Panel Report, <i>United States – Measures Affecting Alcoholic and Malt Beverages</i> , adopted 19 June 1992, BISD 39S/206
US – Manufacturing Clause	GATT Panel Report, <i>United States Manufacturing Clause</i> , L/5609, adopted 15 May 1984, BISD 31S/74
US – Nicaraguan Trade	GATT Panel Report, <i>United States – Trade measures affecting Nicaragua</i> , circulated 13 October 1986, unadopted, L/6053
US – Offset Act (Byrd Amendment)	Appellate Body Report, <i>United States – Continued Dumping and Subsidy Offset Act of 2000</i> , WT/DS217/AB/R, WT/DS234/AB/R, adopted 27 January 2003, DSR 2003:I, p. 375

XXX TABLE OF GATT AND WTO DISPUTE SETTLEMENT

(cont.)

Short title	Full case title and citation
US – <i>Offset Act</i> (<i>Byrd Amendment</i>) (Canada) (Article 22.6 – US)	Decision by the Arbitrator, <i>United States – Continued Dumping and Subsidy Offset Act of 2000, Original Complaint by Canada – Recourse to Arbitration by the United States under Article 22.6 of the DSU</i> , WT/DS234/ARB/CAN, 31 August 2004, DSR 2004:IX, p. 4425
US – <i>Offset Act</i> (<i>Byrd Amendment</i>) (EC) (Article 22.6 – US)	Decision by the Arbitrator, <i>United States – Continued Dumping and Subsidy Offset Act of 2000, Original Complaint by the European Communities – Recourse to Arbitration by the United States under Article 22.6 of the DSU</i> , WT/DS217/ARB/EEC, 31 August 2004, DSR 2004:IX, p. 4591
US – <i>Oil Country Tubular Goods Sunset Reviews</i>	Appellate Body Report, <i>United States – Sunset Reviews of Anti-Dumping Measures on Oil Country Tubular Goods from Argentina</i> , WT/DS268/AB/R, adopted 17 December 2004, DSR 2004:VII, p. 3257
US – <i>Section 110(5) Copyright Act</i>	Panel Report, <i>United States – Section 110(5) of the US Copyright Act</i> , WT/DS160/R, adopted 27 July 2000, DSR 2000:VIII, p. 3769
US – <i>Section 110(5) Copyright Act</i> (Article 21.3(c))	Award of the Arbitrator, <i>United States – Section 110(5) of the US Copyright Act – Arbitration under Article 21.3(c) of the DSU</i> , WT/DS160/12, 15 January 2001, DSR 2001:II, p. 657
US – <i>Section 110(5) Copyright Act</i> (Article 25)	Award of the Arbitrators, <i>United States – Section 110(5) of the US Copyright Act – Recourse to Arbitration under Article 25 of the DSU</i> , WT/DS160/ARB25/1, 9 November 2001, DSR 2001:II, p. 667
US – <i>Section 211 Appropriations Act</i>	Appellate Body Report, <i>United States – Section 211 Omnibus Appropriations Act of 1998</i> , WT/DS176/AB/R, adopted 1 February 2002, DSR 2002:II, p. 589