




WORLD TRADE  
ORGANIZATION

**Dispute Settlement Reports 2010**  
**Volume V: Pages 1907 to 2368**

2010




CAMBRIDGE

WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

Dispute Settlement Reports

2010  
Volume V

Pages 1907-2368



 **CAMBRIDGE**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore,  
São Paulo, Delhi, Tokyo, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press  
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)

Information on this title: [www.cambridge.org/9781107017191](http://www.cambridge.org/9781107017191)

© World Trade Organization 2003, 2005, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011

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 2011

Printed and bound by CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon CRO 4YY

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

*Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data*

ISBN 978-1-107-01719-1 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.

## 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. Volumes comprising one or more complete cases contain a cumulative list of published disputes. The cumulative list for cases that cover more than one volume is to be found in the first volume for that case.

*This volume may be cited as DSR 2010:V*



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

*Page*

**United States - Certain Measures Affecting Imports  
of Poultry from China (WT/DS392)**

Report of the Panel ..... 1909

**Australia - Measures Affecting the Importation of  
Apples from New Zealand (WT/DS367)**

Report of the Appellate Body ..... 2175

**Cumulative List of Published Disputes ..... 2347**



# UNITED STATES – CERTAIN MEASURES AFFECTING IMPORTS OF POULTRY FROM CHINA

## Report of the Panel WT/DS392/R

*Adopted by the Dispute Settlement Body  
on 25 October 2010*

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1934
II. FACTUAL ASPECTS.....	1935
A. Background .....	1935
B. The measure at issue.....	1936
C. The United States' regime for the importation of poultry.....	1936
1. First Stage: Initial equivalence determination.....	1938
(a) Document review .....	1939
(b) On-site audit.....	1939
(c) Publication in the Federal Register .....	1939
2. Second Stage: Certification of establishments for export by the eligible exporting country .....	1940
3. Third Stage: Ongoing equivalence verification.....	1940
D. China's request for equivalence .....	1940
III. PARTIES' REQUESTS FOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	1944
IV. ARGUMENTS OF THE PARTIES .....	1945
A. Executive summary of the first written submission of China...	1945
1. Introduction.....	1945
2. The measures at issue.....	1946
(a) Section 727 of the Agriculture Appropriations Act 2009 .....	1946
(b) Ongoing moratorium on the establishment or implementation of authorization for the importation of poultry products from China .....	1947
3. US regulations and procedures applicable to the authorization of poultry products .....	1947



(a)	US regulations and procedures.....	1947
(b)	Application of procedures before and after the moratorium .....	1948
(i)	China .....	1948
(ii)	All other WTO Members .....	1948
4.	Legal analysis and argument.....	1948
(a)	Section 727 and the moratorium each violate Article I:1 of GATT 1994.....	1949
(b)	Section 727 and the moratorium each violate Article XI:1 of GATT 1994.....	1949
(c)	Section 727 and the moratorium each violate Article 4.2 of the <i>Agreement on Agriculture</i> .....	1950
(d)	Claims under the <i>Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures</i> .....	1950
(i)	To the extent they are SPS measures, the measures are inconsistent with Article 2.3 of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	1950
(ii)	To the extent they are SPS measures, the measures are inconsistent with Article 5.5 of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	1951
(iii)	To the extent they are SPS measures, the measures are inconsistent with Article 5.1 and 5.2 of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	1952
(iv)	To the extent they are SPS measures, the measures are inconsistent with Article 2.2 of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	1952
(v)	To the extent they are SPS measures, the measures are inconsistent with Article 5.6 of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	1952
(vi)	To the extent they are SPS measures, the measures are inconsistent with Article 8 of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	1953
5.	The US Preliminary Ruling Request must fail, as consultations pursuant to the <i>SPS Agreement</i> were requested and held .....	1953
(a)	China's consultations request clearly invoked Article 11 of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	1954
(b)	Pursuant to its consultations request, China actually consulted regarding the	

	<i>SPS Agreement</i> , and in a manner fully consistent with Article 4 of the DSU .....	1954
B.	Executive summary of the first written submission of the United States.....	1955
1.	Introduction.....	1955
2.	Section 727 is the only measure at issue in this dispute .....	1956
3.	China mischaracterizes the legal effect of Section 727 in US domestic law .....	1958
4.	Of the three claims presented by China, the Panel need only consider the claim under Article XI of the GATT 1994 .....	1959
5.	Section 727 is justified pursuant to GATT Article XX(b) .....	1961
6.	China has not made a prima facie case in support of its claims under the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	1965
7.	Reply to China's response and third party comments on US Preliminary Ruling request of 1 October .....	1966
C.	Executive summary of the opening oral statement of China at the first substantive meeting of the Panel .....	1967
1.	Introduction and background .....	1967
2.	Section 727 of the Agriculture Appropriations Act 2009.....	1968
(a)	Section 727 is inconsistent with Articles 2.2, 2.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.5, 5.6, and 8 of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	1968
(i)	Relationship between the <i>SPS</i> <i>Agreement</i> and GATT Article XX(b) .....	1968
(ii)	Section 727 is inconsistent with Articles 5.5 and 2.3 of the <i>SPS</i> <i>Agreement</i> .....	1969
(iii)	Section 727 is inconsistent with Articles 2.2, 5.1, and 5.2 of the <i>SPS</i> <i>Agreement</i> .....	1969
(iv)	Section 727 is inconsistent with Article 5.6 of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	1970
(v)	Section 727 is inconsistent with Article 8 of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	1970
(b)	Section 727 is inconsistent with Article I:1 of GATT 1994.....	1970

	(c)	The United States concedes that Section 727 is inconsistent with GATT Article XI:1 and Article 4.2 of the <i>Agreement on Agriculture</i> .....	1971
	(d)	Inconsistency of Section 727 with GATT 1994 and the <i>Agreement on Agriculture</i> cannot be justified on the basis of GATT Article XX(b) .....	1971
	(i)	Section 727 is not "necessary" within the meaning of GATT Article XX(b) .....	1971
	(ii)	Section 727 does not comply with the <i>chapeau</i> of GATT Article XX .....	1972
3.		Section 743 of the Agriculture Appropriations Act of 2010 .....	1972
4.		Request for enhanced third party rights .....	1973
D.		Executive summary of the closing statement of China at the first substantive meeting of the Panel .....	1973
E.		Executive summary of the oral statement of the United States at the first substantive meeting of the Panel .....	1978
F.		Executive summary of the second written submission of China .....	1984
1.		Introduction and summary .....	1984
2.		The United States cannot sustain its argument that China and the United States did not consult under the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	1985
3.		China has established prima facie claims under Articles I:1 and XI:1 of GATT 1994 and the <i>Agreement on Agriculture</i> .....	1985
	(a)	China's claims under Article I:1 of GATT 1994 .....	1985
	(b)	China's claims under Article XI:1 of GATT 1994 .....	1985
	(c)	China maintains its claim under Article 4.2 of the <i>Agreement on Agriculture</i> .....	1985
4.		The United States has not established that Section 727 falls within the exception under Article XX(b) of GATT 1994 .....	1986
	(a)	Introduction .....	1986
	(i)	Section 727 is not "necessary" to the protection of human life and health under paragraph (b) of Article XX .....	1986

	(ii)	Section 727 does not fulfil the requirements of the <i>chapeau</i> to Article XX .....	1986
	(b)	Various US Arguments related to its Article XX(b) defence are unsupported by the evidence and legally erroneous .....	1987
	(i)	China did <i>not</i> have access to normal PPIA/FSIS procedures, by the explicit terms of Section 727 and its predecessor .....	1987
	(ii)	Section 727 was not necessary because there were no "imminent" imports of Chinese poultry at the time it was enacted.....	1988
	(iii)	FSIS equivalence procedures for poultry are not inherently more risky for human life and health than non-equivalence safety and inspection procedures.....	1989
	(iv)	US arguments alleging a fear of a breach of APHIS Regulations and avian influenza do not support a conclusion that Section 727 is necessary.....	1990
	(v)	The United States references anecdotal news reports on eggs and animal feed, but provides no evidence of food safety problems related to processed poultry .....	1991
	(vi)	The United States fails to demonstrate that china is different than all other countries in a manner that justifies arbitrary discrimination .....	1992
	5.	China's claims under the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	1994
G.		Executive summary of the second written submission of the United States.....	1994
	1.	Introduction .....	1994
	2.	Section 727 is justified under GATT Article XX(b).....	1995
	3.	China has failed to show that Section 727 results in a breach of any obligation under the <i>SPS Agreement</i> ...	2002
H.		Executive summary of the opening oral statement of China at the second substantive meeting of the Panel .....	2005

1.	Section 727 is inconsistent with the <i>SPS Agreement</i> ....	2005
(a)	Section 727 is not an intermediate step in FSIS equivalence procedures.....	2005
(b)	727 is subject to Articles 2.2, 2.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.5, 5.6, and 8 of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	2006
(c)	China has sustained its burden of proving a violation of Article 5.5 of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> ...	2007
(i)	The two situations identified by China are comparable under Article 5.5 of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	2007
(ii)	The United States applies distinct ALOPs to comparable situations.....	2008
(d)	In addition to Article 5.5, Section 727 is inconsistent with Articles 2.2, 2.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.6, and 8 of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	2008
(e)	SPS violations cannot be justified on the basis of GATT Article XX(b).....	2009
(i)	Violations of GATT 1994 and of the Agreement on Agriculture cannot be justified under Article XX(b) .....	2009
(f)	Section 727 was not "necessary" .....	2009
(i)	Section 727 did not materially contribute to its objective .....	2009
(ii)	FSIS procedures are a reasonably available alternative to Section 727.....	2009
(g)	Section 727 is inconsistent with the requirements of the Article XX chapeau .....	2010
I.	Closing statement of China at the second substantive meeting of the Panel.....	2010
J.	Executive summary of the oral statement by the United States at the second substantive meeting of the Panel.....	2012
V.	ARGUMENTS OF THE THIRD PARTIES.....	2018
A.	European Union .....	2018
1.	Executive summary of the third party written submission by the European Union .....	2018
(a)	Concerning the existence of the alleged measures .....	2018
(i)	On the notion of "future closely- related measures".....	2018

	(ii)	On the notion of the "moratorium" .....	2019
	(iii)	On the expiry of Section 727 and the letter of 12 November 2009 .....	2020
	(b)	Claims relating to the application of the GATT .....	2020
	(i)	On the application of GATT XI .....	2020
	(ii)	On the relation between GATT XX(b) and the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	2021
	(c)	Claims relating to the application of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	2023
	(d)	Request for enhanced third party rights .....	2025
B.	Korea .....		2026
	1.	Executive summary of the third-party submission of Korea .....	2026
C.	Chinese Taipei .....		2027
	1.	Oral statement by Chinese Taipei .....	2027
D.	Turkey .....		2028
	1.	Oral statement by Turkey .....	2028
VI.	INTERIM REVIEW .....		2030
A.	General .....		2030
B.	China's comments on the interim report .....		2030
	1.	Factual aspects .....	2030
	2.	Whether Section 727 is an SPS measure .....	2031
	3.	Miscellaneous .....	2032
C.	United States' comments on the interim report .....		2032
	1.	General comments on judicial economy .....	2032
	2.	Factual aspects .....	2039
	3.	Whether Article 4 is the only provision of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> applicable to Section 727 .....	2040
	4.	Whether Section 727 is based on scientific principles and is not maintained without sufficient scientific evidence as required by Article 2.2 of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	2041
	5.	Whether Section 727 is inconsistent with Article 5.5 of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	2043
	6.	Miscellaneous .....	2044
VII.	FINDINGS .....		2044
	A.	Preliminary issues .....	2044

1.	Terms of reference of the panel .....	2044
(a)	Introduction .....	2044
(b)	Request for a preliminary ruling by the United States.....	2045
(i)	Background .....	2045
(ii)	Arguments of the parties .....	2049
(iii)	Analysis by the Panel .....	2054
(iv)	Conclusion.....	2061
2.	Whether the Panel may rule on an expired measure .....	2061
(a)	Background.....	2061
(b)	Arguments of the parties.....	2062
(c)	Analysis by the Panel .....	2062
(d)	Conclusion.....	2063
3.	European Union's request for enhanced third party rights .....	2064
B.	Order of analysis of China's claims and the United States' defence .....	2064
C.	Whether Section 727 is an sps measure within the scope of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	2067
1.	Background.....	2067
2.	Arguments of the parties.....	2068
3.	Analysis by the Panel.....	2070
(a)	The concept of SPS measure under the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	2070
(i)	Definition of SPS measures.....	2070
(ii)	Directly or indirectly affect[s] international trade.....	2072
(b)	Whether Section 727 is an SPS measure under the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	2073
(i)	The measure at issue.....	2073
(ii)	Whether Section 727 falls within the definition of Annex A(1).....	2074
(iii)	Whether Section 727 affects directly or indirectly international trade .....	2080
(c)	Conclusion.....	2081
D.	Whether Article 4 is the only provision of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> applicable to Section 727 .....	2081
1.	Background.....	2081

2.	Arguments of the parties .....	2082
3.	Analysis by the Panel .....	2083
E.	Order of analysis of China's claims under the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	2090
F.	Whether Section 727 is inconsistent with Articles 2.2, 5.1 and 5.2 of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	2091
1.	Arguments of the parties .....	2091
2.	Analysis by the Panel .....	2093
(a)	Relationship between Articles 2.2, 5.1 and 5.2 of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> – Order of analysis ...	2093
(b)	Article 5.1 and 5.2 of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	2093
(i)	The concept of risk assessment pursuant to Annex A(4) of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	2094
(ii)	When is a measure "based" on a risk assessment? .....	2096
(c)	Whether the United States has conducted a risk assessment and whether Section 727 is based on such a risk assessment.....	2097
(d)	Whether Section 727 is based on scientific principles and is not maintained without sufficient scientific evidence as required by Article 2.2 of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	2099
(i)	Arguments of the parties.....	2099
(ii)	Analysis by the Panel.....	2100
(e)	Conclusion .....	2102
G.	Whether Section 727 is inconsistent with Article 5.5 of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	2102
1.	Arguments of the parties .....	2102
2.	Analysis by the Panel .....	2105
(a)	Article 5.5 of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	2106
(b)	The importation of Chinese poultry products <i>vis-à-vis</i> that of poultry products from other WTO Members .....	2107
(i)	Whether Section 727 results in distinctions in ALOPS in different yet comparable situations .....	2107
(ii)	Arbitrary or unjustifiable differences in ALOPs .....	2115



	(iii) Discrimination or disguised restriction on international trade.....	2119
	(iv) Conclusion.....	2124
	(c) The importation of Chinese poultry products <i>vis-à-vis</i> that of other food products from China.....	2125
H.	Whether Section 727 is inconsistent with Article 2.3 of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	2128
	1. Arguments of the parties.....	2128
	2. Analysis by the Panel.....	2130
	(a) Article 2.3 of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	2130
	(b) Conclusion.....	2131
I.	Whether Section 727 is inconsistent with Article 5.6 of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	2131
	1. Arguments of the parties.....	2131
	2. Analysis by the Panel.....	2133
	(a) Article 5.6 of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	2133
	(b) Conclusion.....	2136
J.	Whether Section 727 is inconsistent with Article 8 of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	2136
	1. Arguments of the parties.....	2136
	2. Analysis by the Panel.....	2138
	(a) Article 8 and Annex C(1)(a) of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	2138
	(b) Whether the procedures applied by the FSIS in the equivalence determination process are control, inspection and approval procedures within the scope of Annex C(1) of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	2140
	(c) Whether Section 727 has resulted in an undue delay of the FSIS equivalence determination process in respect of poultry products from China within the meaning of Annex C(1)(a) of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	2145
	(d) Whether by failing to observe the provisions of Annex C(1)(a) of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> , the United States has acted inconsistently with Article 8 of the <i>SPS Agreement</i> .....	2148
	(e) Conclusion.....	2149