European Journal of Interdisciplinary Research and Development
Volume- 51 May- 2026
Website: www.ejird.journalspark.org ISSN (E): 2720-5746

PRINCIPLES AND GUARANTEES FOR THE LAWFUL APPLICATION OF TRADE DEFENCE MEASURES

Sarvinoz Sunnatillaeva
Lecturer of International Law and Human Rights
Department of Tashkent State University of Law

Abstract
Trade defence measures occupy a special and sensitive position within the legal order of the World Trade Organization. Anti-dumping duties, countervailing measures and safeguards allow WTO Members to react to dumped imports, subsidised imports or sudden increases in imports causing injury to a domestic industry. At the same time, these instruments operate as exceptions to the general framework of trade liberalisation and therefore require strict legal control. This article analyses the main principles and guarantees that determine the lawful application of trade defence measures under WTO law. It argues that the legality of such measures depends not only on the existence of dumping, subsidisation or increased imports, but also on compliance with procedural and evidentiary standards, including due process, transparency, confidentiality safeguards, objective examination, causation, non-attribution, proportionality, temporariness and effective review. Particular attention is paid to WTO dispute settlement practice, where panels and the Appellate Body have developed the standards of "positive evidence", "objective examination", "reasoned and adequate explanation" and "genuine and substantial relationship of cause and effect". The article concludes that trade defence measures remain legitimate only when they function as disciplined corrective mechanisms and not as disguised instruments of protectionism.

Keywords: WTO law, trade defence measures, anti-dumping, countervailing duties, safeguards, due process, injury, causation, non-attribution, proportionality, domestic industry.

Introduction

Trade defence measures are among the most controversial instruments of international economic law. They allow a WTO Member to restrict imports where those imports are alleged to cause injury to a domestic industry. However, their legal nature is exceptional. Anti-dumping duties, countervailing duties and safeguard measures are not ordinary instruments of trade management. They are legally controlled departures from the ordinary disciplines of tariff bindings, non-discrimination and market access.

This exceptional character explains why WTO law subjects trade defence measures to a dense network of substantive and procedural requirements. A Member cannot impose such a measure merely because imports are politically inconvenient, commercially disruptive or harmful to a particular domestic producer. It must establish the relevant legal elements: dumping, subsidisation or increased imports; injury or threat of injury; and a causal relationship between the imports and the injury. Moreover, these findings must be reached

through an investigation that respects the procedural rights of interested parties and produces an evidence-based determination.

The central issue is therefore not whether WTO Members may protect domestic industries. WTO law clearly permits such protection in certain circumstances. The more important question is under what conditions that protection remains lawful. This question is particularly significant because trade defence measures may easily become disguised protectionist barriers if they are applied without strict discipline.

This article examines the principles and guarantees that secure the lawful application of trade defence measures. It proceeds in five sections. The first section discusses the principle of legality and the exceptional character of trade defence measures. The second section analyses procedural legality, due process, transparency and confidentiality. The third section examines evidentiary standards, injury, causation and non-attribution. The fourth section discusses proportionality, temporariness and non-discrimination. The fifth section analyses good faith, international review and domestic control.

Legality and the Exceptional Character of Trade Defence Measures

The principle of legality is the starting point for any analysis of trade defence measures. Under WTO law, a Member may impose an anti-dumping, countervailing or safeguard measure only where the relevant covered agreement permits it and only in accordance with the procedure prescribed by that agreement. This principle excludes the possibility of relying on broad claims of economic necessity, industrial policy or political expediency as independent grounds for restricting imports.

The Anti-Dumping Agreement expresses this idea with particular clarity. Article 1 provides that an anti-dumping measure may be applied only under the circumstances provided for in Article VI of the GATT 1994 and pursuant to investigations initiated and conducted in accordance with the Agreement [1]. This formulation has two important consequences. First, anti-dumping measures are not free-standing trade policy tools. They are treaty-based responses to a specific legal phenomenon: dumping causing injury. Secondly, the investigation is part of the legality of the measure itself. A finding of dumping reached through an improper procedure cannot support a lawful duty.

The same logic applies to countervailing measures under the SCM Agreement. A countervailing duty requires more than evidence of foreign government support. The investigating authority must establish the existence of a financial contribution or income or price support, the conferral of a benefit, the specificity of the subsidy and injury to the domestic industry where a duty is imposed [2]. Article 12 of the SCM Agreement further requires that interested Members and interested parties be informed of the information required and be given ample opportunity to present evidence [3]. Thus, a countervailing measure cannot be justified by a general reference to industrial policy or foreign state support. The authority must prove each element required by WTO law.

Safeguard measures are even more exceptional because they are imposed not against unfair trade, but against fairly traded imports. Article 2.1 of the Agreement on Safeguards permits such measures only where a product is being imported in such increased quantities and under

such conditions as to cause or threaten to cause serious injury to the domestic industry [4]. Unlike anti-dumping and countervailing duties, safeguards do not respond to wrongful pricing or subsidisation. They allow temporary relief from import pressure even in the absence of unfair conduct. For that reason, WTO law requires strict proof of increased imports, serious injury and causation.

The principle of legality therefore performs a constitutional function within WTO trade remedy law. It prevents Members from converting trade defence measures into open-ended instruments of market closure. The legal basis of the measure must be identifiable; the substantive elements must be proven; and the investigation must be conducted in accordance with the applicable treaty discipline.

This principle is also important for distinguishing trade defence measures from general exceptions under Article XX of the GATT 1994. Article XX allows Members to justify certain measures adopted for public policy objectives, such as the protection of human, animal or plant life or health, or the conservation of exhaustible natural resources. Trade defence measures, by contrast, are governed by specialised agreements with more detailed economic and procedural criteria. A Member cannot bypass the specific disciplines of the Anti-Dumping Agreement, the SCM Agreement or the Agreement on Safeguards by invoking a general notion of industrial necessity or economic policy.

Accordingly, legality in the field of trade defence measures means more than the formal existence of national legal authority. It requires compliance with the full legal structure of WTO law. Trade defence measures are lawful only when they remain exceptional, evidence-based and procedurally disciplined responses to specific trade-related injury.

Procedural Legality: Due Process, Transparency and Confidentiality

The legality of trade defence measures is inseparable from the quality of the investigation. WTO law does not treat the investigation as a merely administrative formality preceding the imposition of a duty. Rather, the investigation is the legal process through which the Member establishes whether the conditions for the measure exist. If that process is defective, the resulting measure may also be defective.

Article 6 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement is central in this respect. It requires that all interested parties be given notice of the information required and ample opportunity to present evidence relevant to the investigation [5]. Exporters and foreign producers receiving questionnaires must be given at least thirty days to reply [6]. Interested parties must also be provided opportunities to defend their interests, present information, comment on the evidence and access non-confidential information relevant to the defence of their rights.

The Appellate Body in Mexico – Anti-Dumping Measures on Rice characterised the rights contained in Article 6 as due process rights. It emphasised that the right of exporters and foreign producers to have at least thirty days to respond to questionnaires is part of the procedural fairness guaranteed by the Anti-Dumping Agreement, even though such rights must be exercised within the time limits of an investigation [7]. This finding is important because it confirms that procedural guarantees are not secondary to substantive determinations. They are independent conditions of legality.

The SCM Agreement contains a parallel structure. Article 12.1 requires that interested Members and interested parties be given notice of the information required and ample opportunity to present evidence [8]. In China – GOES, the panel described Article 12 of the SCM Agreement as a provision that sets out evidentiary rules and due process rights for interested parties throughout the investigation [9]. Procedural fairness is therefore a general principle of trade remedy law, not a rule limited to anti-dumping cases.

Transparency is one of the most important components of due process. Interested parties must know not only that an investigation has been initiated, but also the factual and legal reasoning on which the authority relies. Article 6.9 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement requires disclosure of the essential facts under consideration before the final determination is made, in sufficient time for parties to defend their interests [10]. Article 12 requires public notice of preliminary and final determinations and explanations of findings and conclusions on issues of fact and law considered material by the investigating authorities [11]. Similar requirements appear in Article 22 of the SCM Agreement, which governs public notice and explanation in countervailing duty investigations [12].

Transparency serves several functions. It allows interested parties to understand the case against them. It disciplines the investigating authority by requiring it to explain its methodology and reasoning. It also enables domestic courts and WTO panels to review whether the authority relied on relevant evidence and applied the correct legal standard. Without transparency, neither private defence nor public accountability is possible.

At the same time, trade remedy investigations often involve commercially sensitive information. Export prices, production costs, profit margins, customer lists and contractual terms may be confidential. WTO law therefore recognises a balance between transparency and confidentiality. Article 6.5 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement permits confidential treatment of information that is by nature confidential or provided on a confidential basis upon good cause shown [13]. However, Article 6.5.1 requires the party submitting confidential information to provide a non-confidential summary in sufficient detail to permit a reasonable understanding of the substance of the information [14].

This balance is essential. If confidentiality is too easily accepted, the investigation becomes opaque and the right of defence is weakened. If confidentiality is not protected, firms may be unwilling to cooperate or may suffer commercial harm. WTO law therefore seeks to preserve both values: protection of sensitive business information and meaningful participation by interested parties.

Procedural legality also requires careful treatment of “facts available”. Investigating authorities may rely on facts available when a party refuses access to necessary information, fails to provide information within a reasonable period or significantly impedes the investigation. However, such reliance must not become a punitive shortcut. The authority should distinguish between non-cooperation and genuine difficulty, especially where exporters from developing countries or small firms face complex data requirements. Excessive reliance on adverse inferences can turn a procedural mechanism into a substantive instrument for inflating margins.

Thus, due process, transparency and confidentiality are not merely procedural accessories. They are safeguards against arbitrary decision-making. They ensure that a trade defence investigation is adversarial, reasoned and reviewable. Without them, a measure may formally appear to be based on dumping or subsidisation, while in substance functioning as an opaque restriction on imports.

Evidence, Injury, Causation and Non-Attribution

The substantive legality of trade defence measures depends on the quality of the evidence supporting them. WTO agreements repeatedly require objective, evidence-based determinations. In anti-dumping law, Article 3.1 provides that a determination of injury must be based on "positive evidence" and involve an "objective examination" of the volume of dumped imports, their effect on prices and their consequent impact on domestic producers [15].

The terms "positive evidence" and "objective examination" are not decorative. They require the investigating authority to base its findings on affirmative, credible and relevant evidence. The authority must not select only those facts that support the imposition of a measure while ignoring contrary evidence. The WTO Analytical Index describes Article 3.1 as an overarching obligation that informs the injury analysis as a whole [16]. The legal test is not satisfied by a formal recital of economic indicators. The authority must explain why the evidence supports its conclusion.

This requirement becomes particularly important in injury analysis. Domestic industries may suffer injury for many reasons: falling demand, changes in consumer preferences, increased domestic competition, technological backwardness, rising input costs, poor management or global economic downturns. WTO law does not permit the investigating authority to attribute such injury automatically to imports. It must establish a causal relationship between the relevant imports and the injury.

Article 3.5 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement requires a demonstration of a causal relationship between dumped imports and injury. It further provides that injury caused by other known factors must not be attributed to dumped imports [17]. Article 4.2(b) of the Agreement on Safeguards contains a similar discipline: there must be a causal link between increased imports and serious injury, and injury caused by other factors must not be attributed to increased imports [18].

WTO jurisprudence has developed this requirement into a demanding non-attribution standard. In US – Lamb, the Appellate Body held that causation requires a "genuine and substantial relationship of cause and effect" between increased imports and serious injury or threat thereof [19]. Mere coincidence between increased imports and poor industry performance is not enough. A temporal correlation may be relevant, but it cannot replace causal analysis.

The standard was further refined in US – Line Pipe. The Appellate Body held that competent authorities must explicitly establish, through a reasoned and adequate explanation, that injury caused by factors other than increased imports has not been attributed to increased imports [20]. A mere assertion that non-attribution has been performed is insufficient. The authority

must separate and distinguish the injurious effects of other factors from the injurious effects of increased imports [21].

This jurisprudence is of fundamental importance. It prevents trade defence measures from becoming mechanisms for compensating domestic industries for all forms of economic difficulty. If the domestic industry's injury is caused by internal inefficiency, declining demand or technological change, trade restrictions against imports cannot be justified as corrective measures.

The standard of "reasoned and adequate explanation" also plays a broader role. In US – Lamb, the Appellate Body held that, in reviewing a safeguard determination, a panel must examine whether the competent authorities evaluated all relevant factors and provided a reasoned and adequate explanation of how the facts support their determination [22]. This does not mean that WTO panels conduct a de novo investigation. They do not replace national authorities. However, they must examine whether the authority's reasoning is coherent, evidence-based and legally sufficient.

The same logic applies across trade defence law. A lawful measure must be reasoned. The authority must explain the choice of data, the treatment of conflicting evidence, the calculation methodology, the finding of injury, the causal link and the exclusion of other factors. Without adequate reasoning, neither interested parties nor reviewing bodies can verify whether the measure is lawful.

In this sense, evidentiary discipline is one of the most important guarantees against disguised protectionism. A state may claim that its industry is injured by imports, but WTO law requires that claim to be demonstrated through evidence and reasoning. The burden is not satisfied by political assertions, general references to import pressure or selective statistical trends. The authority must construct a legally and economically coherent explanation of injury and causation.

Proportionality, Temporariness and Non-Discrimination

Although WTO law does not adopt a general proportionality doctrine in the same way as some domestic or regional legal systems, the functional logic of proportionality is present throughout the trade defence regime. Trade defence measures must be limited in level, scope and duration. They should remedy injury, not punish exporters or permanently shield domestic industries from competition.

In anti-dumping law, the most basic limitation is that an anti-dumping duty must not exceed the margin of dumping. The WTO also recognises that it is desirable to impose a duty lower than the dumping margin where such lesser duty is adequate to remove injury [23]. This lesser duty rule is not mandatory for all WTO Members, but it reflects an important principle: the measure should be no more restrictive than necessary to remove the injury.

In safeguards, the proportionality logic is expressed more directly. Article 5.1 of the Agreement on Safeguards provides that a Member shall apply safeguard measures only to the extent necessary to prevent or remedy serious injury and to facilitate adjustment [24]. The reference to adjustment is crucial. A safeguard measure is not intended to freeze the domestic industry in its existing structure. It should provide temporary relief while the industry adapts

to import competition. In US – Line Pipe, the Appellate Body found that a safeguard measure exceeding what was necessary to remedy serious injury was inconsistent with Article 5.1 [25]. The temporary character of trade defence measures reinforces this discipline. Anti-dumping duties are subject to sunset review. Article 11.3 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement provides that an anti-dumping duty shall be terminated not later than five years after its imposition unless a review determines that expiry would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and injury [26]. Article 21.3 of the SCM Agreement establishes a comparable rule for countervailing duties [27]. Safeguards are also temporary. Article 7.1 of the Agreement on Safeguards provides that a safeguard measure shall apply only for such period as may be necessary and normally may not exceed four years unless extended under the Agreement [28]. Temporariness is not a technical detail. It prevents the transformation of exceptional measures into permanent barriers. If a trade defence measure remains in place indefinitely, it ceases to be a temporary corrective instrument and becomes an element of industrial protection. This is particularly problematic in anti-dumping practice, where measures may remain in force for long periods through repeated sunset reviews. Effective review should therefore test seriously whether the conditions for continuation remain present.

Non-discrimination operates differently across the trade defence instruments. Anti-dumping and countervailing duties are inherently targeted because they respond to dumping or subsidisation attributable to particular exporters, producers or countries. Their selective character is tolerated because it is linked to the finding of unfair trade. Safeguards are different. Article 2.2 of the Agreement on Safeguards requires that safeguard measures be applied to a product being imported irrespective of its source [29]. Since safeguards respond to fairly traded imports, they must be applied on an MFN basis.

This distinction shows that WTO law does not apply a single model of equality across trade remedies. Rather, the applicable form of non-discrimination depends on the nature of the measure. Where the measure responds to unfair conduct, selectivity may be permissible. Where the measure responds to increased fair trade, selectivity is generally inconsistent with the logic of safeguards.

A modern understanding of proportionality also requires attention to consumers and downstream industries. WTO agreements do not impose a general public interest test, but the economic legitimacy of trade defence measures increasingly depends on their broader market effects. A duty on steel may assist steel producers but harm automobile manufacturers, construction companies and consumers. Kotsiubska notes that the public interest clause and the lesser duty rule are WTO-plus mechanisms: the lesser duty rule limits the duty to the level necessary to remove injury, while the public interest clause examines the effect of the duty on other sectors of the economy [30]. Such mechanisms do not eliminate trade defence measures, but they reduce the risk that the protection of one industry will create disproportionate costs for the rest of the economy.

Thus, proportionality, temporariness and non-discrimination operate as structural safeguards. They prevent trade defence measures from becoming excessive, permanent or arbitrarily selective. They also preserve the balance between the legitimate protection of domestic industry and the broader interests of the multilateral trading system.

Good Faith, International Review and Domestic Control

The lawful application of trade defence measures also depends on good faith and effective review. Good faith is a general principle of international law. Article 31(1) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties requires that treaties be interpreted in good faith in accordance with the ordinary meaning of their terms, in their context and in light of their object and purpose [31]. In WTO trade remedy law, good faith requires Members to use investigative procedures for their proper purpose: the correction of established trade distortions or import-related injury, not political pressure or disguised protection.

Good faith is relevant at several stages of the investigation. It is relevant when the authority decides whether to initiate a proceeding, selects the period of investigation, requests information, treats confidential data, applies facts available, evaluates injury and conducts reviews. Bad faith may be difficult to prove directly, but its practical manifestations are recognisable: selective use of evidence, artificial construction of margins, refusal to consider contrary data, manipulation of procedural deadlines or use of investigations as negotiating pressure.

International review plays a crucial role in controlling these risks. WTO panels and the Appellate Body do not replace national investigating authorities. They do not recalculate margins or conduct a full new investigation. Their role is to determine whether the national authority acted consistently with the relevant WTO obligations and whether its findings were supported by evidence and adequate reasoning.

In anti-dumping disputes, Article 17.6 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement provides a special standard of review. A panel must determine whether the authorities' establishment of the facts was proper and whether their evaluation of those facts was unbiased and objective. It must also assess the legal interpretation of the Anti-Dumping Agreement [32]. At the same time, Article 11 of the DSU requires panels to make an objective assessment of the matter, including the facts and the applicability of the covered agreements. The WTO Analytical Index confirms that Article 17.6 supplements rather than replaces the DSU and Article 11 [33].

This standard creates a careful balance. On the one hand, WTO adjudicators do not conduct a de novo review. They respect the fact-finding role of domestic authorities. On the other hand, they are not passive. They examine whether the authority's reasoning is objective, coherent and supported by positive evidence. In US – Lamb, the Appellate Body stated that a panel must critically examine the competent authorities' explanation in depth and in light of the facts [34].

Domestic review is equally important. Article 13 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement requires Members with anti-dumping legislation to maintain judicial, arbitral or administrative tribunals or procedures for prompt review of administrative actions relating to final determinations and reviews [35]. Article 23 of the SCM Agreement contains a parallel obligation in relation to countervailing duty determinations [36].

For states developing or modernising their trade defence systems, domestic review is especially significant. It ensures that WTO standards are not merely written into legislation, but are actually applied in administrative practice. A national system that lacks independent review risks allowing trade remedies to become instruments of unchecked administrative

discretion. Conversely, a system with effective review can discipline investigating authorities, improve reasoning and strengthen the legitimacy of trade defence measures.

This is particularly relevant for states in the process of accession to the WTO or in the process of building national trade remedy legislation. Such states must not only adopt anti-dumping, countervailing and safeguard laws. They must also build institutions capable of conducting technically complex, transparent and fair investigations. The central challenge is to create a system that protects domestic industry where protection is legally justified, while avoiding the use of trade remedies as disguised protectionism.

Conclusion

The principles and guarantees governing trade defence measures form a multi-layered legal framework. They ensure that anti-dumping duties, countervailing duties and safeguards remain exceptional corrective instruments rather than ordinary protectionist tools. The legality of these measures depends on both substantive and procedural conditions: dumping, subsidisation or increased imports; injury; causation; proper investigation; due process; transparency; objective examination; non-attribution; proportionality; temporariness; non-discrimination; good faith; and effective review.

WTO dispute settlement practice has played an essential role in developing these principles. It has transformed treaty language into operational legal standards: positive evidence, objective examination, reasoned and adequate explanation, genuine and substantial causal link and separation of injury caused by other factors. These standards require investigating authorities to justify their determinations through evidence and reasoning, not through assumptions or political preferences.

The broader significance of these principles lies in their function within the WTO legal order. They preserve the legitimacy of trade defence measures by ensuring that exceptions remain exceptions. They also protect the balance between the right of Members to defend domestic industries and the collective interest in an open, predictable and rules-based trading system.

For states designing or reforming their trade defence regimes, the lesson is clear. A lawful trade defence system requires more than legislation authorising duties. It requires procedures, institutions, methodologies and review mechanisms capable of applying WTO standards in practice. Only under these conditions can trade defence measures perform their legitimate function without becoming disguised barriers to trade.

References

1. WTO, Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994, Article 1. Available at: https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/19-adp_01_e.htm
2. WTO, Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures, Articles 1, 2, 11 and 15, pp. 231–234, 256–257, 262–265 / PDF pp. 1–4, 11–12, 17–20. Available at: https://www.wto.org/English/docs_e/legal_e/24-scm.pdf
3. WTO, Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures, Article 12.1, p. 257 / PDF p. 12. Available at: https://www.wto.org/English/docs_e/legal_e/24-scm.pdf

4. WTO, Agreement on Safeguards, Article 2.1. Available at: https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/sg_e.htm
5. WTO, Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994, Article 6.1. Available at: https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/adp_e.htm
6. WTO, Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994, Article 6.1.1; WTO, Analytical Index: Anti-Dumping Agreement – Article 6, p. 2. Available at: https://www.wto.org/english/res_e/publications_e/ai17_e/anti_dumping_art6_oth.pdf
7. Appellate Body Report, Mexico – Definitive Anti-Dumping Measures on Beef and Rice, WT/DS295/AB/R, 29 November 2005, paras. 280–282, pp. 104–105 / official pp. 97–98. Available at: https://www.worldtradelaw.net/document.php?id=reports/wtoab/mexico-rice(ab).pdf&mode=download
8. WTO, Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures, Article 12.1, p. 257 / PDF p. 12. Available at: https://www.wto.org/English/docs_e/legal_e/24-scm.pdf
9. [9] Panel Report, China – Countervailing and Anti-Dumping Duties on Grain Oriented Flat-Rolled Electrical Steel from the United States, WT/DS414/R, 15 June 2012, para. 7.322, p. 117. Available at: https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/414r_e.pdf
10. WTO, Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994, Article 6.9. Available at: https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/adp_e.htm
11. WTO, Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994, Articles 12.2 and 12.2.2. Available at: https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/adp_e.htm
12. [12] WTO, Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures, Articles 22.3–22.5, pp. 270–271 / PDF pp. 25–26. Available at: https://www.wto.org/English/docs_e/legal_e/24-scm.pdf
13. WTO, Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994, Article 6.5. Available at: https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/adp_e.htm
14. WTO, Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994, Article 6.5.1. Available at: https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/adp_e.htm
15. WTO, Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994, Article 3.1. Available at: https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/adp_e.htm
16. WTO, Analytical Index: Anti-Dumping Agreement – Article 3, pp. 1–3. Available at: https://www.wto.org/english/res_e/publications_e/ai17_e/anti_dumping_art3_jur.pdf
17. WTO, Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994, Article 3.5. Available at: https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/adp_e.htm
18. WTO, Agreement on Safeguards, Article 4.2(b). Available at: https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/sg_e.htm
19. Appellate Body Report, United States – Safeguard Measures on Imports of Fresh, Chilled or Frozen Lamb Meat from New Zealand and Australia, WT/DS177/AB/R,

WT/DS178/AB/R, 1 May 2001, paras. 177–178, pp. 63–64. Available at: https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/177-178abr_e.pdf
20. Appellate Body Report, United States – Definitive Safeguard Measures on Imports of Circular Welded Carbon Quality Line Pipe from Korea, WT/DS202/AB/R, 15 February 2002, paras. 217–220, pp. 73–75. Available at: https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/202abr_e.pdf
21. Appellate Body Report, United States – Definitive Safeguard Measures on Imports of Circular Welded Carbon Quality Line Pipe from Korea, WT/DS202/AB/R, 15 February 2002, paras. 214–217, pp. 72–73. Available at: https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/202abr_e.pdf
22. Appellate Body Report, United States – Safeguard Measures on Imports of Fresh, Chilled or Frozen Lamb Meat from New Zealand and Australia, WT/DS177/AB/R, WT/DS178/AB/R, 1 May 2001, paras. 103–106, pp. 40–41. Available at: https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/177-178abr_e.pdf
23. WTO, Technical Information on Anti-Dumping, section "Imposition and collection of duties". Available at: https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/adp_e/adp_info_e.htm
24. WTO, Agreement on Safeguards, Article 5.1. Available at: https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/sg_e.htm
25. Appellate Body Report, United States – Definitive Safeguard Measures on Imports of Circular Welded Carbon Quality Line Pipe from Korea, WT/DS202/AB/R, 15 February 2002, paras. 261–263, pp. 95–96. Available at: https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/202abr_e.pdf
26. WTO, Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994, Article 11.3. Available at: https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/adp_e.htm
27. WTO, Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures, Article 21.3, p. 269 / PDF p. 24. Available at: https://www.wto.org/English/docs_e/legal_e/24-scm.pdf
28. WTO, Agreement on Safeguards, Article 7.1. Available at: https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/sg_e.htm
29. WTO, Agreement on Safeguards, Article 2.2. Available at: https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/sg_e.htm
30. Viktoriia Kotsiubska, Public Interest Consideration in Domestic and International Anti-Dumping Law, Master's Thesis, World Trade Institute, 2010, p. 16 / PDF p. 15. Available at: https://www.wti.org/media/filer_public/82/63/82633863-36ea-42d8-9b8f-9d6a313b77c5/masters_thesis_viktoriia_kotsiubska.pdf
31. Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, 1969, Article 31(1).
32. WTO, Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994, Article 17.6. Available at: https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/adp_e.htm
33. WTO, Analytical Index: DSU – Appendix 1 and Appendix 2, p. 8. Available at: https://www.wto.org/english/res_e/publications_e/ai17_e/dsu_app1_jur.pdf
34. Appellate Body Report, United States – Safeguard Measures on Imports of Fresh, Chilled or Frozen Lamb Meat from New Zealand and Australia, WT/DS177/AB/R, WT/DS178/AB/R, 1 May 2001, para. 106, p. 41. Available at: https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/177-178abr_e.pdf

35. WTO, Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994, Article 13. Available at: https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/adp_e.htm
36. WTO, Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures, Article 23, p. 272 / PDF p. 27. Available at: https://www.wto.org/English/docs_e/legal_e/24-scm.pdf.