

**UNITED STATES - ANTI-DUMPING MEASURES ON  
 CERTAIN OIL COUNTRY TUBULAR GOODS  
 FROM KOREA**

**Report of the Panel**  
 WT/DS488/R and Add.1

**BCI deleted, as indicated [[\*\*]]**

*Adopted by the Dispute Settlement Body  
 on 12 January 2018*

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	Page
1. INTRODUCTION .....	21
1.1 Complaint by Korea .....	21
1.2 Panel Establishment and Composition .....	21
1.3 Panel Proceedings.....	22
1.3.1 General.....	22
1.3.2 Additional working procedures on Business Confidential Information (BCI) .....	22
2. FACTUAL ASPECTS.....	22
2.1 The Measures at Issue .....	22
3. PARTIES' REQUESTS FOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	23
4. ARGUMENTS OF THE PARTIES .....	27
5. ARGUMENTS OF THE THIRD PARTIES .....	27
6. INTERIM REVIEW .....	27
7. FINDINGS .....	28
7.1 General Principles Regarding Treaty Interpretation, the Standard of Review, and Burden of Proof.....	28
7.1.1 Treaty interpretation.....	28
7.1.2 Standard of review .....	28
7.1.3 Burden of proof.....	30
7.2 Whether the "viability test" is Inconsistent with Article 2.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement.....	31

Report of the Panel

7.2.1	Provision at issue .....	32
7.2.2	Whether the "viability test" is as such inconsistent with Article 2.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement.....	32
7.2.2.1	Main arguments of the parties .....	32
7.2.2.2	Main arguments of third parties.....	33
7.2.2.3	Evaluation by the Panel .....	33
7.2.3	Whether the "viability test" as applied in the underlying investigation is inconsistent with Article 2.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement.....	35
7.2.3.1	Main arguments of the parties .....	35
7.2.3.2	Evaluation by the Panel .....	35
7.2.4	Conclusion .....	36
7.3	Whether the USDOC's Determination of Profit Rates for the Korean Respondents in the Final and Remand Determinations is Inconsistent with Articles 2.2.2 and 2.4 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement .....	36
7.3.1	Provisions at issue.....	37
7.3.2	USDOC's profit rate determination in the underlying investigation.....	38
7.3.2.1	Whether the USDOC's failure to use "actual data" as a CV profit source is inconsistent with Article 2.2.2 .....	39
7.3.2.1.1	Main arguments of the parties.....	39
7.3.2.1.2	Main arguments of third parties .....	40
7.3.2.1.3	Evaluation by the Panel .....	40
7.3.2.1.4	Conclusion .....	47
7.3.2.2	Whether the USDOC's interpretation and application of "same general category of products" was inconsistent with Articles 2.2.2(i) and 2.2.2(iii) .....	47
7.3.2.2.1	Main arguments of the parties.....	47
7.3.2.2.2	Main arguments of third parties .....	48
7.3.2.2.3	Evaluation by the Panel .....	48
7.3.2.3	Whether the USDOC's use of profit data from the Tenaris financial statements in constructing normal value was a "reasonable method" within the meaning of Article 2.2.2(iii) .....	53
7.3.2.3.1	Main arguments of the parties.....	53
7.3.2.3.2	Main arguments of third parties .....	54

	US - OCTG (Korea)
	7.3.2.3.3 Evaluation by the Panel..... 55
7.3.2.4	Whether the USDOC acted inconsistently with Article 2.2.2(iii) and Article 2.2 by failing to calculate and apply a profit cap ..... 61
	7.3.2.4.1 Main arguments of the parties ..... 61
	7.3.2.4.2 Main arguments of third parties ..... 61
	7.3.2.4.3 Evaluation by the Panel..... 62
7.3.2.5	Whether the USDOC acted inconsistently with Article 2.4 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement by failing to make due allowance for differences in the profit rates reflected in the constructed normal value and the export price..... 64
	7.3.2.5.1 Main arguments of the parties ..... 64
	7.3.2.5.2 Evaluation by the Panel..... 65
7.3.2.6	Conclusions ..... 66
7.3.3	The USDOC's profit rate determination in the remand investigation ..... 66
	7.3.3.1 Main arguments of the parties with respect to the Panel's jurisdiction ..... 67
	7.3.3.2 Evaluation by the Panel..... 67
7.4	Whether the USDOC's Decision to Construct NEXTEEL's Export Price Was Inconsistent with Article 2.3 of the Anti- Dumping Agreement ..... 72
	7.4.1 Provision at issue..... 73
	7.4.2 Factual background..... 74
	7.4.3 Main arguments of the parties ..... 75
	7.4.4 Main arguments of the third parties ..... 76
	7.4.5 Evaluation by the Panel..... 76
	7.4.5.1 Whether the USDOC's conclusion of association between the concerned entities was inconsistent with Article 2.3 ..... 78
	7.4.5.1.1 Meaning of "association" under Article 2.3..... 78
	7.4.5.1.2 The USDOC's conclusions regarding association..... 78
	7.4.5.2 Whether the USDOC erred in not considering evidence allegedly pertaining to the reliability of the export price..... 86
7.4.6	Conclusion ..... 88

Report of the Panel

---

7.5	Whether the USDOC's Decision to Reject the Price at Which NEXTEEL Purchased Steel Coils from POSCO Was Inconsistent with Article 2.2.1.1 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement.....	88
7.5.1	Provision at issue .....	88
7.5.2	Factual background.....	88
7.5.3	Main arguments of the parties.....	89
7.5.4	Main arguments of the third parties .....	89
7.5.5	Evaluation by the Panel .....	90
7.6	Whether the USDOC Acted Inconsistently with Articles 6.2, 6.4, and 6.9 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement .....	93
7.6.1	Provisions at issue.....	94
7.6.2	Whether the USDOC acted inconsistently with Articles 6.2, 6.4, and 6.9 in connection with the Tenaris financial statements.....	95
7.6.2.1	Main arguments of the parties .....	95
7.6.2.2	Main arguments of third parties.....	96
7.6.2.3	Evaluation by the Panel .....	97
7.6.2.3.1	Whether the USDOC acted inconsistently with Article 6.2 in not disclosing, until its final determination, that it had accepted the Tenaris financial statements on the record.....	98
7.6.2.3.2	Whether the USDOC acted inconsistently with Article 6.4 in not disclosing, until its final determination, that it had accepted the Tenaris financial statements on the record and that it was using those statements in determining CV profit.....	102
7.6.2.3.3	Whether the USDOC acted inconsistently with Article 6.9 in not disclosing, until its final determination, that it had accepted the Tenaris financial statements on the record and that it relied on those statements in determining CV profit.....	103
7.6.2.4	Conclusion .....	107

	US - OCTG (Korea)
7.6.3	Whether the USDOC acted inconsistently with Articles 6.4 and 6.9 in connection with the disclosure of certain communications ..... 108
7.6.3.1	Main arguments of the parties ..... 108
7.6.3.2	Main arguments of third parties ..... 108
7.6.3.3	Evaluation by the Panel ..... 109
7.7	Whether the USDOC's decision to limit its examination to NEXTEEL and HYSCO was inconsistent with Articles 6.10 and 6.10.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement ..... 112
7.7.1	Provisions at issue ..... 113
7.7.2	Factual background ..... 113
7.7.3	Main arguments of the parties ..... 114
7.7.4	Main arguments of the third parties ..... 114
7.7.5	Evaluation by the Panel ..... 115
7.7.5.1	Article 6.10 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement ..... 115
7.7.5.1.1	The USDOC's determination that it would be "impracticable" to examine all known exporters ..... 115
7.7.5.1.2	The USDOC's decision to limit its examination to two mandatory respondents ..... 118
7.7.5.2	Article 6.10.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement ..... 120
7.7.6	Conclusion ..... 124
7.8	Whether the USDOC Acted Inconsistently with Article 12.2.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement by Failing to Provide Reasons for Rejecting Certain Arguments ..... 124
7.8.1	Provisions at issue ..... 124
7.8.2	Main arguments of the parties ..... 125
7.8.3	Main arguments of third parties ..... 126
7.8.4	Evaluation by the Panel ..... 126
7.8.4.1	The USDOC's alleged failure to address the Korean respondents' arguments concerning the use of the Tenaris profit data ..... 128
7.8.4.2	The USDOC's alleged failure to address NEXTEEL's arguments that it was not affiliated with POSCO, Company A, and Company B ..... 131
7.8.5	Conclusion ..... 132

Report of the Panel

---

7.9	Whether the USDOC Acted Inconsistently with Article X:3(a) of the GATT 1994 in the Administration of US Laws and Regulations .....	133
7.9.1	Provisions at issue.....	134
7.9.2	Main arguments of the parties.....	134
7.9.3	Main arguments of the third-parties.....	136
7.9.4	Evaluation by the Panel .....	136
7.9.4.1	Whether the USDOC's alleged deviation from established agency practice for determining CV profit is within the Panel's terms of reference .....	136
7.9.4.2	Whether the USDOC failed to administer 19 C.F.R. § 351.301 in a uniform and reasonable manner .....	138
7.9.5	Conclusion.....	141
7.10	Consequential Claims under Articles 1, 9.3, and 18.4 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement, Article VI of the GATT 1994, and Article XVI:4 of the WTO Agreement.....	142
7.11	Korea's claim under Article I:1 of the GATT 1994 .....	143
7.11.1	Provision at issue .....	143
7.11.2	Main arguments of the parties.....	144
7.11.3	Main arguments of the third parties .....	144
7.11.4	Evaluation by the Panel .....	144
7.11.4.1	Whether Korea's claims under Article I:1 of the GATT 1994 is within our terms of reference .....	144
7.11.4.2	The USDOC's alleged denial of an opportunity for the Korean respondents to comment on the Tenaris financial statements .....	147
7.11.5	Conclusion .....	147
8.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	148

## LIST OF ANNEXES

### ANNEX A

#### WORKING PROCEDURES OF THE PANEL

Contents		Page
Annex A-1	Working Procedures of the Panel	153
Annex A-2	Additional Working Procedures of the Panel concerning business confidential information	160

### ANNEX B

#### ARGUMENTS OF KOREA

Contents		Page
Annex B-1	Executive Summary of the First Written Submission of Korea	163
Annex B-2	Executive Summary of the Oral Statements of Korea at the First Panel Meeting	176
Annex B-3	Executive Summary of the Second Written Submission of Korea	182
Annex B-4	Executive Summary of the Oral Statements of Korea at the Second Panel Meeting	194

Report of the Panel

---

## ANNEX C

### ARGUMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES

Contents		Page
Annex C-1	Executive Summary of the First Written Submission of the United States	201
Annex C-2	Executive Summary of the Oral Statements of the United States at the First Panel Meeting	214
Annex C-3	Executive Summary of the Second Written Submission of the United States	220
Annex C-4	Executive Summary of the Oral Statements of the United States at the Second Panel Meeting	232

## ANNEX D

### ARGUMENTS OF THE THIRD PARTIES

Contents		Page
Annex D-1	Executive Summary of the Arguments of China	239
Annex D-2	Integrated Executive Summary of the Arguments of the European Union	242
Annex D-3	Executive Summary of the Arguments of Turkey	249

## ANNEX E

### PROCEDURAL RULING

Contents		Page
Annex E-1	Procedural ruling on the United States' request to partially open the substantive meetings for public observation	253



## ANNEX F

## INTERIM REVIEW

Contents		Page
Annex F-1	Interim Review	257

## CASES CITED IN THIS REPORT

Short title	Full case title and citation
<i>Argentina – Import Measures</i>	Appellate Body Reports, <i>Argentina – Measures Affecting the Importation of Goods</i> , WT/DS438/AB/R / WT/DS444/AB/R / WT/DS445/AB/R, adopted 26 January 2015
<i>Argentina – Poultry Anti-Dumping Duties</i>	Panel Report, <i>Argentina – Definitive Anti-Dumping Duties on Poultry from Brazil</i> , WT/DS241/R, adopted 19 May 2003, DSR 2003:V, p. 1727
<i>Australia – Apples</i>	Appellate Body Report, <i>Australia – Measures Affecting the Importation of Apples from New Zealand</i> , WT/DS367/AB/R, adopted 17 December 2010, DSR 2010:V, p. 2175
<i>Canada – Welded Pipe</i>	Panel Report, <i>Canada – Anti-Dumping Measures on Imports of Certain Carbon Steel Welded Pipe from the Separate Customs Territory of Taiwan, Penghu, Kinmen and Matsu</i> , WT/DS482/R and Add.1, adopted 25 January 2017
<i>Chile – Price Band System</i>	Appellate Body Report, <i>Chile – Price Band System and Safeguard Measures Relating to Certain Agricultural Products</i> , WT/DS207/AB/R, adopted 23 October 2002, DSR 2002:VIII, p. 3045 (Corr.1, DSR 2006:XII, p. 5473)
<i>China – Broiler Products</i>	Panel Report, <i>China – Anti-Dumping and Countervailing Duty Measures on Broiler Products from the United States</i> , WT/DS427/R and Add.1, adopted 25 September 2013, DSR 2013:IV, p. 1041
<i>China – GOES</i>	Appellate Body Report, <i>China – Countervailing and Anti-Dumping Duties on Grain Oriented Flat-Rolled Electrical Steel from the United States</i> , WT/DS414/AB/R, adopted 16 November 2012, DSR 2012:XII, p. 6251
<i>China – GOES</i>	Panel Report, <i>China – Countervailing and Anti-Dumping Duties on Grain Oriented Flat-Rolled Electrical Steel from the United States</i> , WT/DS414/R and Add.1, adopted 16 November 2012, upheld by Appellate Body Report WT/DS414/AB/R, DSR 2012:XII, p. 6369
<i>China – HP-SSST (Japan) / China – HP-SSST (EU)</i>	Appellate Body Reports, <i>China – Measures Imposing Anti-Dumping Duties on High-Performance Stainless Steel Seamless Tubes (“HP-SSST”) from Japan / China – Measures Imposing Anti-Dumping Duties on High-Performance Stainless Steel Seamless Tubes (“HP-SSST”) from the European Union</i> , WT/DS454/AB/R and Add.1 / WT/DS460/AB/R and Add.1, adopted 28 October 2015

## Report of the Panel

Short title	Full case title and citation
<i>China – HP-SSST (Japan) / China – HP-SSST (EU)</i>	Panel Reports, <i>China – Measures Imposing Anti-Dumping Duties on High-Performance Stainless Steel Seamless Tubes ("HP-SSST") from Japan / China – Measures Imposing Anti-Dumping Duties on High-Performance Stainless Steel Seamless Tubes ("HP-SSST") from the European Union</i> , WT/DS454/R and Add.1 / WT/DS460/R, Add.1 and Corr.1, adopted 28 October 2015, as modified by Appellate Body Reports WT/DS454/AB/R / WT/DS460/AB/R
<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, Add.1 and Corr.1 / WT/DS395/R, Add.1 and Corr.1 / 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>China – X-Ray Equipment</i>	Panel Report, <i>China – Definitive Anti-Dumping Duties on X-Ray Security Inspection Equipment from the European Union</i> , WT/DS425/R and Add.1, adopted 24 April 2013, DSR 2013:III, p. 659
<i>EC – Bed Linen</i>	Panel Report, <i>European Communities – Anti-Dumping Duties on Imports of Cotton-Type Bed Linen from India</i> , WT/DS141/R, adopted 12 March 2001, as modified by Appellate Body Report WT/DS141/AB/R, DSR 2001:VI, p. 2077
<i>EC – Chicken Cuts</i>	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, and Corr.1, DSR 2005:XIX, p. 9157
<i>EC – Fasteners (China)</i>	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
<i>EC – Fasteners (China) (Article 21.5 – China)</i>	Appellate Body Report, <i>European Communities – Definitive Anti-Dumping Measures on Certain Iron or Steel Fasteners from China – Recourse to Article 21.5 of the DSU by China</i> , WT/DS397/AB/RW and Add.1, adopted 12 February 2016
<i>EC – Fasteners (China) (Article 21.5 – China)</i>	Panel Report, <i>European Communities – Definitive Anti-Dumping Measures on Certain Iron or Steel Fasteners from China – Recourse to Article 21.5 of the DSU by China</i> , WT/DS397/RW and Add.1, adopted 12 February 2016, as modified by Appellate Body Report WT/DS397/AB/RW
<i>EC – Hormones</i>	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
<i>EC – IT Products</i>	Panel Reports, <i>European Communities and its member States – Tariff Treatment of Certain Information Technology Products</i> , WT/DS375/R / WT/DS376/R / WT/DS377/R, adopted 21 September 2010, DSR 2010:III, p. 933
<i>EC – Salmon (Norway)</i>	Panel Report, <i>European Communities – Anti-Dumping Measure on Farmed Salmon from Norway</i> , WT/DS337/R, adopted 15 January 2008, and Corr.1, DSR 2008:I, p. 3