

Index

- ad hoc PPP approach 38 *see also* India and WTO DSU
- Advisory Centre on World Trade Organization Law (ACWL) 26, 29–30, 46, 163, 202, 206–7
- Airbus 89
- aircraft industry 32, 36, 60, 88–9, 131–3
- alternative dispute resolution *see* WTO Dispute Settlement
- Understanding (DSU), overview
- ‘ambulance chasing’ by law firms 208–9
- American Meat Institute 76
- anonymity *see* confidentiality and anonymity requirements
- anti-dumping duties 36, 43, 109, 164–7
- appeal rights 184–5
- arbitral tribunals *see also* WTO Dispute Settlement
- Understanding (DSU), overview
- Australia and WTO DSU
 - EC – Export Subsidies on Sugar (Australia)* 88–9
 - sugar industry 31, 44, 46, 48, 88–9
- banana industry 75–6, 78, 88–9
- Bangladesh and WTO DSU
 - Bangladesh Tariff Commission (BTC) 43
 - India’s anti-dumping duties and 36, 43
 - TPRM assessments 41–2
- Beijing WTO Affairs Centre 109
- BIC (Brazil, India, and China)
 - explanation of 5
 - multidisciplinary dispute management 209–10
 - see also individual countries*
- bilateral/multilateral consultations
 - 44–5, 72, 83–4, 99–100, 105, 111–12, 183–4
- Bohanes, Jan 17, 24–5
- Bombardier 131–3
- bottom-up approach 28, 63
- Bown, Chad P 29, 40, 47–8, 206
- brain drain 65
- Brazil and WTO DSU 12, 38, 122–46
 - Agriculture, Ministry of 135–6
 - Aircraft* cases 32, 36, 60, 131–3
 - approachable bureaucracy 66
 - characteristics of public private partnerships 122–3, 140–41
 - complaints filed with SPS Committee vs. WTO DSU 213–16
 - complaints filed with TBT Committee vs. WTO DSU 213
 - compulsory taxation on businesses 128, 201
 - Constitution and Consolidated Labor Laws 128
 - Development, Industry and Foreign Trade, Ministry of 64, 125
 - domestic capacity-building strategies 32–3
 - EC – Export Subsidies on Sugar (Brazil)* 31–2, 133–5, 210
 - EC – Measures Affecting Soluble Coffee* 138–9
 - financing of WTO disputes 61
 - Foreign Affairs, Ministry of 64, 125–6, 129, 141, 210
 - formal vs. informal PPP arrangement 144–5
 - institutional and procedural framework 123–30
 - instrumental role of national media in 130, 132, 134–5
 - organised private sector 137–8, 141, 197–8

- political pressure on disputes 60
- regulatory threat 139, 142–4
- as self-designated developing country 5–7
- successful performance 31–2
- sugar industry 31, 44, 46, 48
- summary conclusion 145–6, 221–3
- US – Upland Cotton* 31–2, 135–8, 142, 205
- use of dispute system (1995–2017) 21–2, 122
- see also* General Coordination of Disputes/Dispute Settlement Unit (CGC) (Brazil); Inter-Ministerial Foreign Trade Chamber (CAMEX) (Brazil)
- Brazilian Association of Cotton Producers (ABRAPA) 135–6, 137–8
- Brazilian Center for International Relations (CEBRI) 129
- Brazilian Soluble Coffee Industry Association (ABICS) 138, 197
- burden-reducing waivers 117
- Bureau of Fair Trade for Import and Export (BOFT) (China) 106–9, 111, 114
- bureaucracy 66, 93
- Busch, Marc 19–20, 25
- business entities *see* private sector; *individual companies and corporations*
- California, Small Claims Legal Advisor Program 217
- Camargo, Pedro de 134
- Canada and WTO DSU, *Aircraft* case 32, 36, 60, 131–3
- capacity building, in developing countries *see* developing country participation, at WTO DSU; dispute settlement partnerships, lessons learnt; *individual Member States*
- capacity gap 25–6, 41
- Centre for WTO Studies, Indian Institute of Foreign Trade (IIFT) 49
- achievements of 204
- consultations with private stakeholders 155–6, 168
- dispute settlement stages 153
- external (detailed) investigation stage 154–5
- informal initiatives for settlement of dispute 155
- internal (preliminary) investigation stage 153–4
- multidisciplinary dispute management 210
- as think tank for Ministry of Commerce 151
- chambers of commerce
 - in India 151–2, 156, 160
 - for organised private sector 171
 - proposed guidelines 200–201, 203
 - see also individual chambers of commerce*
- China Aquatic Products Processing and Marketing Association 111
- China Chamber of Commerce of Import and Export of Foodstuffs 111, 210
- China Chamber of Commerce for Import and Export of Machinery and Electronic Products 112–15
- China New Energy Chamber of Commerce of the All-China Federation of Industry and Commerce 112–15
- China-WTO Dispute Settlement Mechanism Centre 109
- China and WTO DSU 12, 38, 101–21
- Accession Protocol 114, 194
- Bureau of Fisheries of the Ministry of Agriculture 111, 209–10
- Commerce, Ministry of 209–10
- complaints filed with SPS Committee vs. WTO DSU 213–16
- complaints filed with TBT Committee vs. WTO DSU 213
- cultural/psychological barriers 56, 118
- domestic capacity-building strategies 32–3
- government role in economic development and trade 64
- institutional and procedural framework 106–10

- Japan – Quotas on Laver* 39, 110–13, 120, 209–10
 learning by observation 110, 207–8
 legal framework 103–6, 119–20
 level of transparency 119
 mixed/centralised dispute
 management 60, 64–5, 117
 non-litigious culture 56, 115–16
 overview 101–2
 participation vs. exports of goods/
 services 17–18
 private sector right to petition 178–9
 Rules on the Investigation of
 Foreign Trade Barriers 177–8
 as self-designated developing
 country 5–7
 successful performance 32
 summary conclusion 115–20, 121,
 222
 think tank contributions 109
 training by Ministry of Justice and
 Supreme People's Court of
 China 110
*US – Countervailing Measures
 (China)* 113–15, 120
 use of dispute system (1995–2017)
 22, 101, 116
see also Bureau of Fair Trade for
 Import and Export (BOFT)
 (China); Ministry of Commerce
 (MOFCOM) (China)
 Chiquita 75–6, 78
 coffee industry 135–9, 142
 compulsory taxation, proposed
 guidelines 201
 confederations of industries 10, 33,
 52–3, 88, 98, 128, 141, 187,
 200–201, 206
 confidentiality and anonymity
 requirements 57, 65, 94, 185–6,
 191
 conflict of interests 57
 conflict management stages 211–12
 Confucianism 104, 115–16, 118
 Cooperatives Europe 200
 corporate regulatory capture
 (Grossman) 50–51
 cost-benefit analysis, in pre-litigation
 stage 42–3, 156–7
 cotton industry 135–8, 205
 Cotton Textiles Export Promotion
 Council of India (TEXPROCIL)
 61–2, 162–7, 174, 197
 counter-retaliation capacity 43–4, 61
 Court of Justice of the European
 Union 195
 Cuba and WTO DSU, use of dispute
 system 21
 Datagro 46, 134, 210
 De Lacy, Keith 48
 developing countries, characteristics
 of 6
 developing countries, definitions of
 21
 developing country participation, at
 WTO DSU 11, 13–34
 benefits for member states and
 business entities 14–20
 building domestic participation
 capacity 30–34
 compliance challenges 23–6
 meaning and self-classification 21–3
 overview 13–14, 68
 proposals for change at international
 level 26–30
 proposed guidelines for domestic
 management of disputes 176–7,
 181, 185, 191–3, 195, 197,
 198–208
 summary conclusion 221
 use of WTO Committee System
 213–16
 Dewey Ballantine LLP 76
 DG Trade *see* Directorate-General for
 Trade (DG Trade)
 diplomatic pressures on disputes 61–2
 Directorate-General for Trade (DG
 Trade)
 comparison of TBR mechanism to
 USTR Section 301 procedure
 99–100
 Examination Report 86, 91
 lack of anonymity provisions 186
 Market Access Advisory Committee
 82, 84–5, 86, 91, 98, 180
 Market Access Database 41, 81–2,
 95
 Market Access Unit 81–2, 87–8
 Notice of Initiation 85, 94

- procedural simplification
 - recommendations 95–6
- requests for court review 194–5
- TBR Committee 83–4, 85
- Trade Barrier Regulation (TBR)
 - mechanism 83–8, 90–98, 177–8, 182, 184, 194–5
- underutilisation of TBR mechanism 90–98, 186
- discriminatory protection of trade
 - interests 51–2, 169, 174
- DISCUS (Distilled Spirits Council of the United States) 75, 100
- dispute settlement partnerships, lessons learnt 176–219
 - confidentiality and anonymity requirements 185–6, 191
 - creation of ‘strong’ industry representatives 197–201
 - financing of WTO disputes 201–10
 - future research 226–8
 - government obligation to
 - administer/examine petitions 179–81
 - government right to determine suitable course of action 183–4
 - governmental specialised dispute settlement units 186–9
 - individual right to appeal
 - government decisions 184–5
 - individual right to petition 177–9
 - individual right to provide information 181–2
 - individual right to withdraw petition 182–3
 - small claims procedures for non-litigable matters 211–18
 - summary conclusion 218–19, 220–26
 - transparency and regulation provisions 189–97
 - see also individual proposed guidelines*
- distilled spirits industry 75, 88
- domestic legal expertise, proposed guidelines 206–8
- DSU Agreement *see* WTO Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU), overview
- economies of scale 16–19, 41, 62, 174, 192–3, 202, 206, 227
- electronic payment services 172
- Embraer 131–3
- emerging superpowers *see* China and WTO DSU; India and WTO DSU
- Essar Steel 167–9
- European Commission (EC) 60, 61, 81
 - Article 207 Committee 83, 87, 91
 - Common Agricultural Policy 133
 - Council Regulation (EC) No. 33286/94, TBR establishment 83, 86
- Court of Justice review of decisions 195
- decentralised partnerships 82
- defence litigation 88–9
- European Small Claims Procedure 217
- Guidelines for Successful Public Private Partnerships 143, 189
- industry right to petition 83–6
- reliance on industry 37
- use of lawyers 89–90
- European Confederation of Producers of Spirits 88
- European Council
 - Article 207 procedure (TFEU) 82–3
 - establishment of TBR 83
 - intergovernmental fragmentation 60
- European Union (EU) and WTO DSU 38, 81–100
 - comparison to US experience 97–100
- dispute settlement partnerships in practice 87–91
- Drug Arrangements 162
- EC – Bed Linen* 164–7, 169, 210
- EC – Export Subsidies on Sugar (Australia)* 88–9
- EC – Export Subsidies on Sugar (Brazil)* 31–2, 133–5, 210
- EC – Export Subsidies on Sugar (Thailand)* 44, 46, 48
- EC – Measures Affecting Soluble Coffee* 138–9
- EC – Tariff Preferences* 154, 161–4, 169, 223
- fisheries industry 199
- Generalised System of Preferences (GSP) 138–9, 161–2

- institutional framework 81–2
- inter-governmental institutional fragmentation 60
- as leader of government-industry coordination 33
- as leader user of system 68–9
- legal framework 82–7
- Market Access Strategy 81–2, 98
- performance review 91–8
- pharmaceutical industry 61
- summary conclusion 222
- top-down approach 63
- TPRM assessments 41
- Trade Barrier Regulation 41, 12
- see also* Directorate-General for Trade (DG Trade)
- exemption application, proposed guidelines 179–80
- expert consultative committees, proposed guidelines 191–3
- export promotion councils 171, 198–200 *see also* India and WTO DSU; *individual councils*
- ‘The Extended Litigation Process’ (Bown) 40
- extra-WTO retaliation 44, 61–2, 96
- Federal Register (US) 72
- financing of WTO disputes
 - in Brazil 61
 - in India 59–60, 163, 165–6
- financing of WTO disputes, proposed guidelines 201–10
 - creation of domestic legal expertise 206–8
 - creation of multidisciplinary dispute management team 209–10
 - creation of standing budget with chambers of commerce/trade associations 203–4
 - creation of standing governmental budget 202–3
 - creation of think tanks 204–5
 - in-house ‘ambulance chasing’ by law firms 208–9
 - NGO role in monitoring 205–6
- fisheries industry 53–4, 170–71, 199
- formal vs. informal PPP arrangements 38–9, 178 *see also individual Member States*
- Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) 228
- free-riders 34
- Galanter, M 15
- Gao, Henry 117
- Garza, Fernanda 17, 24–5
- General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) 21, 69, 114, 133, 138, 147, 161–2, 165, 167
- General Coordination of Disputes/ Dispute Settlement Unit (CGC) (Brazil)
 - establishment of 125–8
 - examples of coordination 133–8
 - private sector semi-formal approach 122–3, 140–41
- Gleason, Carolyn 76
- Global Sugar Alliance Trade Reform & Liberalisation 48, 197
- governance framework 55–6 *see also in-house lawyers*
- government, proposed guidelines
 - individual right to provide information 181–2
 - individual right to withdraw petition 182–3
 - obligation to administer/examine petitions 179–81
 - publication of materials 187–8, 190–91
 - right to determine suitable course of action 183–4
 - specialised dispute settlement units 186–9
 - standing budgets 202–3
- government-industry coordination
 - channels of communication 55–6, 166
 - explanation of 33–4
 - publication of materials for 187–8, 190–91
 - see also* WTO DSU partnership framework; *individual Member States*
- Grossman, Gene M 33–4, 43, 50–51, 56–7, 59
- Hathaway, Michael 76
- Helpman, Elhanan 34, 56–7
- Hogan Lovells 106, 108

- Horn, Henrik 4
Hylands Law Firm 108
- IDEAS Centre Geneva 205
- India and WTO DSU 12, 38, 147–75
anti-dumping duties 36, 43
bureaucratic complexity 66
Cabinet Committee on Economic Affairs 157
capacity to mobilise 25
Commerce, Ministry of 151–68, 172, 207, 209, 210
Competent Administrative Ministries 150–51, 154, 159–61
complaints filed with SPS Committee vs. WTO DSU 213–16
complaints filed with TBT Committee vs. WTO DSU 213
diplomatic pressures on disputes 61–2
domestic capacity-building strategies 32–3
EC – Bed Linen 164–7, 169, 210
EC – Tariff Preferences 154, 161–4, 169, 223
Export Promotion Councils (EPCs) 151–2, 160–67, 199, 210
External Affairs, Ministry of 157
Finance, Ministry of 172
financing of WTO disputes 59–60, 163, 165–6
fisheries industry 53–4, 170–71
Foreign Affairs, Ministry of 64, 161
institutional framework 64, 148–52
lack of government-industry coordination 172–3
Law and Justice, Ministry of 64
Legal Affairs Department 160
lessons learnt 169–74
License Raj policy legacies 149, 171
micro, small and medium enterprises (MSMEs), role in 151–2, 169, 170
participation vs. exports of goods/services 17–19
possible discrimination between resourceful/resource-constrained industries 169, 174
pottery industry 174
procedural stages framework 149–50, 152–61
Regional and Multilateral Trade Relations Department 159
reliance on domestic legal expertise 31
seafood industry 173–4
steel industry 167–9, 174
successful performance 32
summary conclusion 174–5, 222–3
Textiles, Ministry of 162, 165, 210
as third party 160–61
trade cooperatives 171, 199
unorganised private sector as constraint 151–2, 170–72
US – Carbon Steel (India) 8, 167–9
use of dispute system (1995–2017) 22, 147–8
as WTO respondent 159–60
as self-designated developing country 5–7
see also Centre for WTO Studies, Indian Institute of Foreign Trade (IIFT); Trade Policy Division (TPD), Ministry of Commerce (India)
Indian Institute of Foreign Trade *see* Centre for WTO Studies, Indian Institute of Foreign Trade (IIFT)
industry empowerment 63, 80, 97, 178, 181
Industry Trade Advisory Center (ITAC) (US) 70
informal PPP arrangements *see* formal vs. informal PPP arrangements
in-house lawyers
‘ambulance chasing’ by 208–9
benefits of 66
in China 106, 108, 207–8
in European Union 89–90
in India 31, 163, 207, 209
proposed guidelines 206–8
Institute for Assessing WTO Commitments concept 206
Institute of Studies on Trade and International Negotiations (ICONE) (Brazil) 129

- Integrated Trade Intelligence Portal (I-TIP) 190
- Interagency Trade Enforcement Center (ITEC) (US) 70
- Inter-Ministerial Foreign Trade Chamber (CAMEX) (Brazil)
examples of coordination 133–5, 141, 188
Management Executive Committee (GECEX) 144
Private Sector Consultative Council (CONEX) 128
role of 126–8
- interministerial management of
disputes, proposed guidelines 188–9
- International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD) 54, 192, 205
- international law firms 76, 208–9 *see also* lawyer pairing approach
- International Monetary Fund (IMF) 149–50
- International Trade Administration (US), Market Access and Compliance (MAC) team, Trade and Compliance Center 41
- Japan and WTO DSU
Global Quota System 112
Japan – Quotas on Laver 39, 110–13, 120, 209–10
public private partnership levels 61
- Jiangsu Laver Association 111–13, 117, 120, 197, 210
- Jindal Steel 167–8
- Johannesson, Louise 4
- judicial review of decisions, proposed guidelines 193–5
- King & Wood 108
- Kodak 76, 78
- Kooiman, Jan 37
- laver industry 39, 110–13, 120, 209–10
- Law Firm Study Center (Brazil) 129
- lawyer pairing approach 89–90, 106–7, 108, 112, 163, 207–8
- learning by observation, in China 110, 207–8
- least developed countries (LDCs)
cost of monitoring 41–2
proposed guidelines 193, 195, 197, 202–3
UN definition 21
- life cycle of trade conflicts 211–12
- Lindner, Carl 78
- litigation (Galanter) 15, 112
- LMC International 31, 46
- lobbying 75–6, 99
- Luthra & Luthra 209
- management of WTO disputes *see* stages of WTO disputes
- mandatory action requirement, by USTR 77–8, 80
- Marine Products Export Development Authority (MPEDA) 170
- Market Access Unit *see* Directorate-General for Trade (DG Trade)
- market size
definition 16
distinctions based on 30
negotiation/retaliation power and 16–19, 142–3
- Mavroidis, Petros C 4
- McDermott Will & Emery 76
- Melendez-Ortiz, Ricardo 33
- Mexico and WTO DSU, use of dispute system (1995–2017) 22
- Michalopoulos, Constantine 29
- MICs (middle income countries)
dependency on higher income countries 62
use of dispute system (1995–2017) 21–3, 30
see also individual Member States
- Ministry of Commerce (MOFCOM) (China) 64
administrative review of decisions 194
burden-reducing waivers 117
confidentiality and anonymity requirements 185–6
expert consultative committees 193
judicial review of decisions 194
organisational chart 107
role of 103–4

- Trade Barrier Investigation Mechanism (TBIM) 104–6, 110–15, 177–80, 182, 184, 193
- Treaty and Law Department, Law Division 106–8, 159
- underutilisation of TBIM 115–20, 197
- within legal hierarchy 119–20
- WTO Affairs, Department of 106
- monitoring
- costs of for LDCs 41–2
 - of foreign compliance by USTR 73–4
 - proposed NGO role in 205–6
- multidisciplinary dispute management team, proposed guidelines 209–10
- Nall, Frazier & Hathaway 76
- National Cattlemen's Beef Association 76, 78
- national media role *see* Brazil and WTO DSU
- Native Produce & Animal By-Products (China) 111
- Netherlands Economic Institute 210
- new generation industry associations, in China 117–18
- nongovernmental organisations (NGOs), proposed guidelines 205–6
- non-litigious culture *see* China and WTO DSU
- Nordstrom, Hakan 28
- Office of the United States Trade Representative *see* United States Trade Representative (USTR)
- Official Gazette (China) 111
- Official Journal of the European Union* (Official Journal) 85
- online availability of information 204, 225–6
- organised private sector
- in Brazil 137–8, 141, 197–8
 - in China 114–15
 - explanation of 52–4
- Ostry, Sylvia 78
- Oxfam International 136–7, 205, 210
- partnership framework *see* WTO DSU partnership framework
- Permanent Mission of Brazil 127–8, 129–30, 132–3, 141
- Permanent Mission of China 109, 172
- Permanent Mission of India 150, 151, 154–6, 159–61, 165, 168, 172
- Petersmann, Ernst-Ulrich 28
- petition rights, of private sector
- with EU TBR 83–8
 - evidential requirements 178–80
 - with MOFCOM 104–5, 110–15
 - proposed guidelines 177–9
 - with USTR 71–4, 76–80
 - within formal systems 38–9
- petition withdrawal, right to 182–3
- Pfizer 78
- pharmaceutical industry 61
- Plasai, Virachai 55
- political institutions, and dispute settlement 58–62
- political pressure on disputes 75–7, 99, 100
- Powell, Walter 37
- Preferential Trade Agreements (PTAs) 228
- private lawyers
- in BIC countries 10–11
 - in China 210
 - coordination by US/EU based 100
 - in India 210
 - legal internships in Brazil 129–30
 - see also* lawyer pairing approach
- private sector
- benefits for in developing countries 14–20
 - compulsory taxation on 128, 201
 - knowledge of trade barriers 34, 42, 70–71
 - organised 52–4, 114–15, 137–8, 141, 197–8
 - right to petition 71–4, 76–80, 104–5, 110–15, 177–80
 - Shaffer on aggressiveness of US 99
 - trade rights distinguished from governmental entities 36
 - unaware 54–5, 170–71
 - unorganised 52–4, 151–2, 170–72
 - see also individual companies and corporations*

- procedural simplification
 recommendations 95–6
- public hearings
 by BOFT 111, 119
 by DG Trade/EC 85
 legitimacy of requests 181–2
 by USTR 79
- public interest litigation (PIL), right to
 file 195–6
- public private partnership for WTO
 DSU, introduction 1–12
 academics, students and researchers
 11
 four characteristics of WTO DSU
 2–3
 guide for government officials 9–10
 outline of book 11–12
 policy audiences 8–9
 research methodology 7–8
 role of private lawyers 10–11
 selected WTO members 4–7
 system issues for industry officials 10
see also WTO DSU partnership
 framework
- publication of materials, for
 government–industry coordination
 187–8, 190–91
- publication requirements
 by DG Trade 81–2, 85
 by USTR 72, 79
- quasi-judicial bodies 184–5, 187, 193–5
- reciprocity
 in capacity building 90–91, 163
 in US/EU PPP arrangements 90–91
see also individual Member States
- regulatory capture threat 50–51, 139,
 142–4, 197
- regulatory practices, proposed
 guidelines 189–97
- Reinhardt, Eric 19–20, 25
- rent-seeking activities 51, 163, 196, 221
- Reserve Bank of India 172
- resource exchange
 during all phases of dispute
 settlement 48
 in capacity building 38, 224
 qualifications of legal expertise and
 66
 in US/EU PPP arrangements 90–91
 when acting as respondent 48–9
see also individual Member States
- resource interdependency
 in BIC arrangements 210
 in US/EU PPP arrangement 90–91
see also individual Member States
- retaliation
 anonymity of complainants and 57
 by developing countries 24–5
 diplomatic pressures and 61–2
 market size and capacity for 16–17,
 19–20, 58
 in post-litigation stage 48
 WTO-sanctioned economic 46–7
see also extra-WTO retaliation
- review of determinations, right to seek
 185
- Scotch Whisky Association (UK) 88,
 100
- Seafood Exporters Association of
 India (SEAI) 53–4, 152, 170
- Section 301 mechanism *see* United
 States Trade Representative
 (USTR)
- semi-formal PPP arrangements *see*
 Brazil and WTO DSU
- Serodio, Elisabeth 134
- Shaffer, Gregory C
 on aggressiveness of US business
 entities 99
 on Brazil's three pillar mechanism
 124–5
 on constraints on law, money, and
 politics 25
 on democratic leaders and special
 interests 59
 on effectiveness of BIC 33
 on expansion of ACWL 29–30
 on institutionalisation of PPP 186
 on market size and retaliation power
 17
 proposes WTO Small Claims
 Procedure 217
 on regulatory capture 50
 top-down approach 28
 on USTR legal provisions 74
- Shanghai WTO Affairs Consultation
 Centre 109

- Shenzhen WTO Affairs Centre 109
 Sidley Austin 134, 136, 210
 small claims procedures, for non-litigable matters 211–18
 conflict management stages 211–12
 proposed guidelines 217–18
 use of WTO Committee System 213–17
 solar energy industry 113–15
 Solar Energy Promotion Alliance 114–15
 special interest groups (Grossman) 33–4, 43, 50–51, 57
 specialised dispute settlement units, proposed guidelines 186–9
 administer, scrutinise and investigate private sector trade concerns 187
 conduct training workshops and seminars 187
 interministerial management of disputes 188–9
 prepare/present cases at WTO 187
 publication of relevant materials 187–8
 see also individual Member States
 stages of WTO disputes
 capacity building stages 39–41
 litigation phase of capacity building 40, 44–6
 post-litigation phase of capacity building 40, 46–9
 pre-litigation phase of capacity building 40, 41–4
 stages (chart) 40
 standing governmental budgets, proposed guidelines 202–3
 state-owned industries 63, 64
 steel industry 8, 167–9, 174
 Steptoe & Johnson 108
 ‘strong’ industry representatives, proposed guidelines 197–201
 compulsory taxation 201
 creation of chambers of commerce 200–201
 creation of export promotion councils 198–9
 formation of trade cooperatives 199–200
 structural asymmetry 53–4
 subsidised legal services *see* Advisory Centre on World Trade Organization Law (ACWL)
 sugar industry 31–2, 44, 46, 48, 88–9, 133–5, 197, 210
 supplementary information 181–2
 Sutton, Charles 17
 Tata Steel 167–8
 TBI Rules/TBIM *see* Ministry of Commerce (MOFCOM) (China)
 textile industry 161–7, 174
 Thai Sugar Association 48
 Thailand and WTO DSU
 complaints filed with SPS Committee vs. WTO DSU 213–16
 complaints filed with TBT Committee vs. WTO DSU 213
 EC – Export Subsidies on Sugar (Thailand) 44, 46, 48
 International Committee on Economic Policy 188
 successful performance 46
 sugar industry 31, 44, 46
 use of dispute system (1995–2017) 22
 think tanks
 in Brazil 129, 204
 in China 109
 in India 151
 proposed guidelines 204–5
 third parties to WTO disputes
 Chinese participation as 110, 207–8
 Indian participation as 160–61
 rights of 23
 Todora, Michael P 6
 top-down approach 28, 63
 trade associations
 in Brazil 210
 contingency funds 203–4
 export promotion council formation of 198–9
 foreign coordination by 100
 in India 151–2, 160–64, 170
 influence on USTR 76
 knowledge of trade barriers 42
 new generation type in China 117–18
 for organised private sector 171–2

- Union Contributions by in Brazil
 - 128
 - see also individual trade associations*
- Trade Barrier Investigation Mechanism (TBIM) *see* Ministry of Commerce (MOFCOM) (China)
- Trade Barrier Regulation (TBR)
 - mechanism *see* Directorate-General for Trade (DG Trade)
- trade cooperatives
 - in India 171
 - proposed guidelines 199–200
- Trade Policy Division (TPD), Ministry of Commerce (India) 64
 - consultations, litigation and compliance proceedings 159
 - coordination with Competent Administrative Ministries 150–51, 154, 159–60
 - cost-benefit analysis 156–7
 - decision-making stage 157
 - organisational chart 150
 - role in *US – Carbon Steel (India)* 168
 - selection of trade lawyers 157–9, 160
 - on TEXPROCIL's role in case 163
 - as WTO respondent 159–60
- trading stakes, impacts of high/small 16–19, 28, 45, 52, 62–3, 192–3, 202–3, 212, 227 *see also individual Member States*
- training workshops/seminars 110, 187, 198, 199
- transatlantic public private partnerships 100
- transparency
 - in Brazil 143–4
 - importance of 143
 - lack of by MOFCOM 119
 - in TBR mechanism 95
 - by USTR 79–80
 - within weak governance framework 55–6
- transparency, proposed guidelines 189–97
 - expert consultative committees 191–3
 - institutionalisation of regulatory practices 196–7
 - limits on judicial review of decisions 193–5
 - public interest litigation (PIL) 195–6
 - publication requirements 190–91
- Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) 195
 - Article 207 procedure 82–3
- Turkey and WTO DSU, diplomatic pressures on disputes 61–2
- unaware private sector 54–5, 170–71
- United Kingdom, small claims court
 - proceedings in England/Wales 217
- United Nations, least developed countries, use of term 21
- United States of America (US) and WTO DSU 12, 38, 68–80
 - bottom-up approach 63
 - Commerce Department 167
 - comparison to EU experience 97–100
 - dispute settlement partnerships in practice 74–7
 - fisheries industry 53–4
 - influence of corporate electoral campaign contributors 59, 75
 - institutional framework 69–70
 - as lead user of system 68–9
 - as leader of government-industry coordination 33
 - legal framework 70–74
 - performance review 77–80
 - small claims court proceedings 217
 - summary conclusion 222–3
 - TPRM assessments 41
 - US – Carbon Steel (India)* 8, 167–9
 - US – Countervailing Measures (China)* 113–15, 120
 - US – Upland Cotton* 31–2, 135–8, 142, 205
 - see also individual federal agencies*
- United States Trade Representative (USTR)
 - comparison of Section 301 procedure to EU TBR mechanism 99–100
 - confidentiality and anonymity requirements 185
 - industry information-gathering/fact-finding 75–9

- industry right to petition 38
- Industry Trade Advisory Center (ITAC) 70
- influence of corporate electoral campaign contributors 59, 75, 78
- mandatory action requirement 77–8, 80
- Private Sector Advisory Committee 70
- public hearings 181–2
- reliance on industry 37
- role of 69–71
- Section 135 procedures/expert committees 72, 191
- Section 301 procedures/petitions 71–4, 76, 77–80, 177–8
- Section 302 procedures/bilateral consultations 72
- Section 305 procedures/private sector advisory panel 191–2
- Watch List/Priority Watch List 100
- unorganised private sector
 - explanation of 52–4
 - in India 151–2, 170–72
- US Commerce Department (USDOC)
 - China dispute over SCM Agreement and 114
 - Industry Trade Advisory Center (ITAC) 70
 - International Trade Administration 41
- US Congress, influence on USTR 75, 76
- US Meat Export Federation 76
- Venugopal, Krishnan 163
- whole-of-government approach 70
- withdrawal of petition, right to 182–3
- Wolfe, Robert 189–97
- World Bank, country designations 4–5
- World Trade Organization (WTO)
 - Agreement on Agriculture 133, 135
 - Agreement on Preshipment Inspection 14
 - Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM Agreement) 114, 131, 133, 167
 - Anti-Dumping Agreement 164–7
 - Appellate Body 15–16, 110, 114, 131, 133, 159, 161–2, 165, 167–8
 - arbitral tribunals 47, 63
 - Committee System 29, 213–16
 - Enabling Clause 161–2
 - Integrated Trade Intelligence Portal (I-TIP) 190
 - Ministerial Meetings 27, 29
 - Most Favoured Nation (MFN) 161–4
 - overview 1, 147
 - Panels 15–16, 47, 89, 110, 114, 119, 131, 133, 159, 161–2, 164–5, 167–8
 - percentage of members self-designated as developing countries 21
 - SPS Committee 213–17
 - TBT Committee 213–14, 216–17
 - Trade Facilitation Agreement (TFA) 228
 - Trade Policy Review Mechanism (TPRM) 41–2, 206
- WTO Dispute Settlement
 - Understanding (DSU), overview 1–2, 13–14, 167
 - Arbitration and Alternative Dispute Resolution 63, 212, 216–17
 - complexity of 19–20
 - cost and affordability of 2, 19–20
 - Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) 24, 47, 58, 160
 - encouragement of bilateral/multilateral consultation 44
 - engagement of affected industries 2–3
 - inter-governmental process and exclusive authority 3
 - middle income countries at (1995–2017) 21–3
 - proposals for rule changes 27–8 as two-tier mechanism 2
 - see also individual Member States*
- WTO DSU partnership framework 11–12, 35–67
 - capacity building stages (chart) 39–41
 - conflict of interests 57
 - cultural/psychological barriers 56–7

- discriminatory protection of trade interests 51–2
- economic context 62–4
- formal vs. informal 38–9
- legislative, institutional and administrative context 64–7
- litigation phase of capacity building 40, 44–6
- meaning of public private partnership 36–9
- organised/unorganised private sector 52–4
- overview 35
- political, social and diplomatic context 58–62
- post-litigation phase of capacity building 40, 46–9
- pre-litigation phase of capacity building 40, 41–4
- regulatory capture threat 50–51
- summary conclusion 67
- unaware private sector 54–5
- weak governance framework 55–6
- see also* dispute settlement partnerships, lessons learnt
- Xiamen University, Chinese Society of International Economic Law 109–10

