

manner consistent with Article 2.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement and Article VI:1(b)(ii) of the GATT 1994.

6.286. Like the Panel, we consider that "Argentina has established that Article 2(5), second subparagraph, is capable of being applied in a manner that is inconsistent with the European Union's obligations under Article 2.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement and ... Article VI:1(b)(ii) of the GATT 1994."⁶⁵⁵ To the extent that the Panel may have been expressing a legal standard for an "as such" challenge when it stated that "Argentina has not demonstrated that this provision cannot be applied in a WTO-consistent manner"⁶⁵⁶, we consider that this would be a misreading of a statement by the Appellate Body in *US – Carbon Steel (India)*. In any event, the mere fact that the application of the second subparagraph of Article 2(5) could, in some circumstances, lead to WTO-inconsistency is not sufficient to discharge Argentina's burden to make a *prima facie* case that the second subparagraph of Article 2(5) of the Basic Regulation is inconsistent "as such" with Article 2.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement and Article VI:1(b)(ii) of the GATT 1994.

6.287. Consequently, we uphold the Panel's finding, in paragraphs 7.174 and 8.1.b.ii of its Report, that Argentina had not established that the second subparagraph of Article 2(5) of the Basic Regulation is inconsistent "as such" with Article 2.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement and Article VI:1(b)(ii) of the GATT 1994.

6.2.5 Article XVI:4 of the WTO Agreement and Article 18.4 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement

6.288. Argentina submits that, because it has demonstrated that the Panel erred in finding that the second subparagraph of Article 2(5) of the Basic Regulation is not inconsistent "as such" with Articles 2.2.1.1 and 2.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement and Article VI:1(b)(ii) of the GATT 1994, it necessarily follows that the European Union has not ensured the conformity of its laws, regulations, and administrative procedures with the provisions of the Anti-Dumping Agreement.

7.1.1 Determination of dumping

7.1.1.1 Article 2.2.1.1 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement

7.2. We consider that the second condition in the first sentence of Article 2.2.1.1 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement – that the records kept by the exporter or producer under investigation reasonably reflect the costs associated with the production and sale of the product under

reasons set out above. ⁶⁵⁸ Given these findings, and notwithstanding our reservations about certain aspects of the Panel's analysis under Article 2.4 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement, we do not

7.2 Claims concerning the second subparagraph of Article 2(5) of the Basic Regulation

7.2.1 Article 2.2.1.1 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement

7.7. Having reviewed the Panel's evaluation of all the elements submitted by Argentina, we do not consider that Argentina has established that the Panel erred in its assessment of the second subparagraph of Article 2(5) of the Basic Regulation. Like the Panel, we do not see support in the text of the Basic Regulation, or in the other elements relied on by Argentina, for the view that it is in applying the second subparagraph of Article 2(5) that the EU authorities are to determine that the records of the party under investigation do not reasonably reflect the costs associated with the production and sale of the product under consideration when those records reflect prices that are considered to be artificially or abnormally low as a result of a distortion. In this regard, we further consider that the Panel conducted a proper examination and undertook a holistic assessment of the various elements before it. We therefore reject Argentina's claim that the Panel acted inconsistently with Article 11 of the DSU in ascertaining the meaning of the second subparagraph of Article 2(5) of the Basic Regulation. Accordingly, we find that the Panel did not err, and did not fail to comply with its duties under Article 11 of the DSU, in concluding that Argentina had not established its case regarding the meaning of the challenged measure, or in finding, for this reason, that Argentina had not established that the second subparagraph of Article 2(5) of the Basic Regulation is inconsistent "as such" with Article 2.2.1.1 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement.⁶⁶³

- a. For these reasons, we uphold the Panel's finding, in paragraphs 7.154 and 8.1.b.i of the Panel Report, that Argentina had not established that the second subparagraph of Article 2(5) of the Basic Regulation is inconsistent "as such" with Article 2.2.1.1 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement.

7.2.2 Article 2.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement and Article VI:1(b)(ii) of the GATT 1994

7.8. Having reviewed the Panel's evaluation of all the relevant elements, we find as follows. As regards Argentina's first line of argument, we find that Argentina has not established that the Panel erred in rejecting the assertion that the second subparagraph of Article 2(5) of the Basic Regulation means that, where the costs of other domestic producers or exporters in the same country cannot be used, the EU authorities are required to use information from other representative markets that does not reflect the costs of production in the country of origin. In this regard, we further consider that the Panel conducted a proper examination and undertook a holistic assessment of the various elements before it. We therefore reject Argentina's claim that the Panel acted inconsistently with Article 11 of the DSU in ascertaining the meaning of the second subparagraph of Article 2(5) of the Basic Regulation.

7.9. For these reasons, we find that the Panel did not err, and did not fail to comply with its duties under Article 11 of the DSU, in stating that, "even when information from 'other representative markets' is used, Article 2(5), second subparagraph, does not ... require the EU authorities to establish the costs of production so as to reflect costs prevailing in other countries."⁶⁶⁴

7.10. With respect to Argentina's second line of argument, precisely what is required to establish that a measure is inconsistent "as such" will vary, depending on the particular circumstances of each case, including the nature of the measure and the WTO obligations at issue. As regards the nature of the WTO obligations at issue, Article 2.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement and Article VI:1(b)(ii) of the GATT 1994 do not limit the sources of information or evidence that may be used in establishing the costs of production in the country of origin. However, whatever the information that it uses, an investigating authority has to ensure that such information is used to arrive at the "cost of production" "in the country of origin". Compliance with this obligation may require the investigating authority to adapt the information that it collects. As regards the measure at issue, we understand that nothing in the second subparagraph of Article 2(5) of the Basic Regulation precludes the possibility that, when the EU authorities rely on "information from other representative markets", they could adapt that information to reflect the costs of production in the country of origin, in a manner consistent with Article 2.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement

⁶⁶³ Panel Report, para. 7.154.

⁶⁶⁴ Panel Report, para. 7.172. (emphasis original)

and Article VI:1(b)(ii) of the GATT 1994. We therefore find that Argentina has not satisfied its burden of proving that the second subparagraph of Article 2(5) of the Basic Regulation restricts, in a material way, the discretion of the EU authorities to construct the costs of production in a manner consistent with Article 2.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement and Article VI:1(b)(ii) of the GATT 1994.

7.11. Like the Panel, we consider that "Argentina has established that Article 2(5), second subparagraph, is capable of being applied in a manner that is inconsistent with the European Union's obligations under Article 2.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement and ... Article VI:1(b)(ii) of the GATT 1994."⁶⁶⁵ To the extent that the Panel may have been expressing a legal standard for an "as such" challenge when it stated that "Argentina has not demonstrated that this provision cannot be applied in a WTO-consistent manner"⁶⁶⁶, we consider that this would be a misreading of a statement by the Appellate Body in US – Carbon Steel (India). In any event, the mere fact that the application of the second subparagraph of Article 2(5) could, in some circumstances, lead to WTO-inconsistency is not sufficient to discharge Argentina's burden to make a prima facie case that the second subparagraph of Article 2(5) of the Basic Regulation is inconsistent "as such" with Article 2.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement and Article VI:1(b)(ii) of the GATT 1994.

- a. Consequently, we uphold the Panel's finding, in paragraphs 7.174 and 8.1.b.ii of the Panel Report, that Argentina had not established that the second subparagraph of Article 2(5) of the Basic Regulation is inconsistent "as such" with Article 2.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement and Article VI:1(b)(ii) of the GATT 1994.

7.2.3 Article XVI:4 of the WTO Agreement and Article 18.4 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement

7.12. We have upheld the Panel's findings that Argentina had not established that the second subparagraph of Article 2(5) of the Basic Regulation is inconsistent "as such" with Articles 2.2.1.1 and 2.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement and Article VI

Signed in the original in Geneva this 6th day of September 2016 by:

Ujal Singh Bhatia
Presiding Member

Peter Van den Bossche
Member

Yuejiao Zhang
Member
