

IX. MONITORING AND ENFORCEMENT

FY 1999

Annual Performance Goals

- a. Settle or complete WTO and NAFTA dispute settlement proceedings that are pending at the beginning of FY 1999 in which the United States is a complainant, defendant or third party, or is monitoring foreign implementation in completed cases. Invoke dispute settlement procedures in instances where non-compliance has been determined through careful monitoring.
- b. Continue to monitor other governments' implementation of measures to comply with the rulings and recommendations of panels and the WTO Appellate Body in the following disputes that have completed the dispute settlement process so far: (1) Japanese liquor taxes; (2) Canadian imports of periodicals; (3) EU imports of beef; (4) Indian patent protection for pharmaceuticals and agricultural chemicals; as well as in the following additional disputes, if the United States should prevail on appeal: (5) Argentine imports of textiles and footwear; and (6) EU, Ireland and UK imports of local area network computer equipment.
- c. Enforce IPR agreements with China negotiated in 1995 and 1996.
- d. Monitor Chinese implementation of the 1992 Market Access MOU, including agriculture;
- e. Enforce existing bilateral agreements with Japan under USTR jurisdiction. Work with other agencies on enforcement of agreements under their jurisdiction.
- f. Achieve termination by Brazil and Argentina of the TRIMs regime for the automobile sector by the end of FY 1999.

Performance Indicator

- a. Dispute settlement proceedings where U.S. complaints succeed or agreements are reached to settle trade disputes should result in foreign governments taking the following satisfactory measures:
 - agreeing to eliminate or phase out measures that do not comply with trade agreement obligations;
 - agreeing to an imminent solution to the burden or restriction on U.S. commerce caused by the foreign measures; or
 - agreeing to provide the United States compensatory trade benefits that are satisfactory to the United States Government.
- b. Conduct of an annual review of agreements will allow for identification of non-compliance.
- c. De-restriction of panel reports must be negotiated with the parties to the Agreement. A successful negotiation will achieve the goal outlined above.

Performance Verification

- a. The U.S. has filed 48 formal complaints under the new World Trade Organization dispute settlement mechanism to date. The U.S. has successfully settled 10 of those disputes on favorable terms, and has won 12 of the 14 cases it has taken through the dispute settlement panel process so far. USTR has defended U.S. interests in 30 disputes where foreign governments have complained about U.S. laws, regulations or requirements.
- b. The following are foreign trade measures pursued by USTR in the WTO during FY 1999, *at some phase* of the dispute settlement process—including monitoring implementation of settlement agreements reached or panel recommendations: (for FY 1999, we did not indicate where in the dispute settlement process these cases were. The information is contained in the FY2000 column and reflects information as of March 1, 2000.)
- EU-banana import regime
 - EU-ban on meat produced with hormones
 - Canada-import ban and tax measures on magazines
 - India-patent protection for pharmaceuticals and chemicals
 - Argentina-textile and footwear imports
 - Australia-subsidies for automotive leather
 - Indonesia-auto regime
 - Japan-varietal testing of fruit
 - Denmark-civil procedures for enforcement of intellectual property rights
 - Ireland - copyright and neighboring rights
 - Korea - taxes on distilled spirits
 - Sweden - civil procedures for enforcement of intellectual property rights
 - India - import restrictions on industrial, textile and agricultural products
 - Mexico - antidumping duties on high-fructose corn syrup
 - Canada - export subsidies and import quotas on dairy products
 - EU - circumvention of export subsidy commitments on dairy products
 - Greece - copyright enforcement
 - Belgium - income tax subsidies
 - France - income tax subsidies
 - Greece - income tax subsidies
 - Ireland - income tax subsidies
 - Netherlands - income tax subsidies
 - Korea - import restrictions on beef
 - Korea - restrictions in procurement of airport construction projects
 - Argentina - safeguard measure on imports of footwear
 - Canada - patent terms
 - Argentina - IP protection for pharmaceuticals and agricultural chemicals
 - France/EU - avionics subsidies
 - EU - geographic indications
 - India - trade-related investment restrictions in the motor vehicle sector

Disputes in which the U.S. participated as a third party:

- Chile-taxes on distilled spirits
- Brazil-export subsidies for aircraft
- Canada-export subsidies for aircraft
- Korea-safeguard measures on imports of dairy products

- EU-tariff rate quotas on butter products
 - EU-prohibition of asbestos and asbestos products
 - Canada-patent protection of pharmaceutical products
 - Canada-restrictions affecting the automotive industry
 - EU-patent protection for pharmaceutical and agricultural products.
 - Australia-import ban on salmon
- c. The following are U.S. trade measures defended by USTR in the WTO in FY 1999, *at some phase* of the dispute settlement process, when challenged by foreign governments:
- Import restrictions on shrimp harvested by methods that harm turtles
 - Rules of origin for textile and apparel products
 - Massachusetts government procurement from companies doing business in Burma
 - Antidumping duties on DRAMs from Korea
 - Tax treatment for Foreign Sales Corporations (FSCs)
 - Harbor maintenance tax
 - 1916 Antidumping Act
 - Countervailing duties on lead & bismuth steel products from the UK
 - Measures affecting imports of Canadian cattle, swine and grains
 - Sections 301-310 of the Trade Act of 1974
 - Section 110(5) of the U.S. Copyright Act
 - Withholding of liquidation on certain products from the EU
 - Wheat gluten safeguard action
 - Countervailing duty investigation on live cattle from Canada
 - New Zealand lamb safeguard
 - Australia lamb safeguard
 - Section 211 of the Appropriations Act
 - Antidumping duties on Korean stainless steel plate in coils and strip
 - Tariff reclassification of sugar syrups
- d. The following are U.S. trade measures defended by USTR under NAFTA at *some phase* of the dispute settlement procedures during FY 1999:
- Import quota on sugar from Mexico
 - Cross-border bus services from Mexico
 - Trucking regulations
 - Labeling requirements for beef and cattle from Canada
 - Labeling requirements for fruits and vegetables from Mexico
 - Measures affecting imports of Canadian cattle, swine and grains
 - North Dakota bill requiring certification of foreign agricultural products.
- e. USTR carefully monitored the six disputes listed:
- On enforcement of IPR agreements with China, the U.S. met bilaterally twice to discuss implementation of the bilateral IPR agreement and IPR commitments under WTO accession.
 - On monitoring Chinese implementation of the 1992 Market Access MOU, this agreement was carefully monitored. However, the WTO accession and the 1999 agricultural negotiation provide more benefits.

- USTR enforced existing bilateral agreements with Japan with a special emphasis on autos and auto parts, insurance and construction.
- Agreement was reached with Brazil to eliminate its Trade-Related Investment Measure on autos by January 1, 2000.
- Under Argentina's WTO obligations, it is required to phase out TRIMs by January 1, 2000.
- The Office also developed U.S. positions for the WTO review of the WTO Dispute Settlement Understanding in 1998 and 1999.

FY 2000

Performance Goals

- a. Successfully complete WTO and NAFTA dispute settlement proceedings that are pending at the beginning of FY 2000 in which the United States is a complainant, defendant or third party, or is monitoring foreign implementation in completed cases. Invoke dispute settlement procedures in instances where non-compliance has been determined through careful monitoring. (See Appendix IV for cases identified in FY 99. Several are likely to continue into FY 2000.)
- b. Create more openness and transparency in the dispute settlement procedures of trade agreements to which the United States is a party by making documents available to the public upon issuance to the parties.
- c. Continue to monitor other governments' implementation of measures to comply with the rulings and recommendations of panels and the WTO Appellate Body in the following disputes that have completed the dispute settlement process so far: (1) Japanese liquor taxes; (2) Canadian magazine imports; (3) EU imports of bananas; (4) EU imports of beef; (5) Argentine imports of textiles and footwear; (6) Indian patent protection for pharmaceuticals and agricultural chemicals; (7) Indonesian auto imports; (8) Korean liquor taxes, and (9) Japanese varietal testing.
- d. Monitor annually and enforce existing bilateral agreements under USTR jurisdiction. (See Appendix V)

Performance Indicator

- a. Dispute settlement proceedings where U.S. complaints succeed or agreements are reached to settle trade disputes should result in foreign governments taking the following satisfactory measures:
 - agreeing to eliminate or phase out measures that do not comply with trade agreement obligations;
 - agreeing to an imminent solution to the burden or restriction on U.S. commerce caused by the foreign measures; or
 - agreeing to provide the United States compensatory trade benefits that are satisfactory to the United States Government.
- b. Conduct of an annual review of agreements will allow for identification of non-compliance.
- c. De-restriction of panel reports must be negotiated with the parties to the Agreement. A successful

negotiation will achieve the goal outlined above.

Performance Verification

- a. The U.S. has filed 49 formal complaints under the new World Trade Organization dispute settlement mechanism to date. The U.S. has successfully settled 10 of those disputes on favorable terms, and has won 13 of the 15 cases it has taken through the dispute settlement panel process so far. USTR has defended U.S. interests in 36 disputes where foreign governments have complained about U.S. laws, regulations or requirements.
- b. The following are foreign trade measures pursued by USTR in the WTO during FY 2000, *at some phase* of the dispute settlement process—including monitoring implementation of settlement agreements reached or panel recommendations. (The number next to the case indicates its status: (1) won by the U.S. in litigation; (2) settled without litigation in U.S. favor; (3) lost by U.S. in litigation; (4) pending before a panel; (5) still in consultations, monitoring progress, or inactive.
- EU-banana import regime (1)
 - EU-ban on meat produced with hormones (1)
 - Canada-import ban and tax measures on magazines (1)
 - India-patent protection for pharmaceuticals and chemicals (1)
 - Argentina-textile and footwear imports (1)
 - Australia-subsidies for automotive leather (1)
 - Indonesia-auto regime (1)
 - Japan-varietal testing of fruit (1)
 - Denmark-civil procedures for enforcement of intellectual property rights (5)
 - Ireland - copyright and neighboring rights (5)
 - Korea - taxes on distilled spirits (1)
 - Sweden - civil procedures for enforcement of intellectual property rights (2)
 - India - import restrictions on industrial, textile and agricultural products (1)
 - Mexico - antidumping duties on high-fructose corn syrup (1)
 - Canada - export subsidies and import quotas on dairy products (1)
 - EU - circumvention of export subsidy commitments on dairy products (5)
 - Greece - copyright enforcement (5)
 - Belgium - income tax subsidies (5)
 - France - income tax subsidies (5)
 - Greece - income tax subsidies (5)
 - Ireland - income tax subsidies (5)
 - Netherlands - income tax subsidies (5)
 - Korea - import restrictions on beef (4)
 - Korea - restrictions in procurement of airport construction projects (5)
 - Argentina - safeguard measure on imports of footwear (4)
 - Canada - patent terms (4)
 - Argentina - IP protection for pharmaceuticals and agricultural chemicals (5)
 - France/EU - avionics subsidies (5)
 - EU - geographic indications (5)
 - India - trade-related investment restrictions in the motor vehicle sector (5)

Disputes in which the U.S. participated as a third party:

- Chile-taxes on distilled spirits
 - Brazil-export subsidies for aircraft
 - Canada-export subsidies for aircraft
 - Korea-safeguard measures on imports of dairy products
 - EU-tariff rate quotas on butter products
 - EU-prohibition of asbestos and asbestos products
 - Canada-patent protection of pharmaceutical products
 - Canada-restrictions affecting the automotive industry
 - EU-patent protection for pharmaceutical and agricultural products
 - Australia-import ban on salmon
- c. The following are U.S. trade measures defended by USTR in the WTO in FY 2000, *at some phase* of the dispute settlement process, when challenged by foreign governments: (The number next to the case indicates its status: (1) won by the U.S. in litigation; (2) settled without litigation; (3) lost by the U.S. in litigation; (4) pending before a panel or Appellate Body; (5) still in consultations, monitoring progress, or inactive.
- Import restrictions on shrimp harvested by methods that harm turtles (3)
 - Rules of origin for textile and apparel products (2)
 - Massachusetts government procurement from companies doing business in Burma (5)
 - Antidumping duties on DRAMs from Korea (3)
 - Tax treatment for Foreign Sales Corporations (FSCs) (3)
 - Harbor maintenance tax (5)
 - 1916 Antidumping Act (4)
 - Countervailing duties on lead & bismuth steel products from UK (4)
 - Measures affecting imports of Canadian cattle, swine and grains (5)
 - Sections 301-310 of the Trade Act of 1974 (1)
 - Section 110(5) of the U.S. Copyright Act (4)
 - Withholding of liquidation on certain products from the EU (4)
 - Wheat gluten safeguard action (4)
 - Countervailing duty investigation on live cattle from Canada (5)
 - New Zealand lamb safeguard (4)
 - Australia lamb safeguard (4)
 - Section 211 of the Appropriations Act (5)
 - Antidumping duties on Korean stainless steel plate in coils and strip (4)
 - Tariff reclassification of sugar syrups (5)
 - Antidumping duties on Japanese hot-rolled steel products (4)
 - Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (5)
- d. The following are U.S. trade measures defended or brought by USTR under NAFTA *at some phase* of the dispute settlement procedures during FY 2000: (The following numbers indicate the status of the case: (1) won by the U.S. in litigation; (2) settled; (3) lost by the U.S. in litigation; (4) proceeding in progress; (5) still in consultations, preliminary stages, monitoring progress, inactive, or moot.
- Import quota on sugar from Mexico (5)
 - Cross-border bus services from Mexico (5)
 - Trucking regulations (4)
 - Labeling requirements for beef and cattle from Canada (5– moot)

- Labeling requirements for fruits and vegetables from Mexico (2)
 - Measures affecting imports of Canadian cattle, swine and grains (5)
 - North Dakota bill requiring certification of foreign agricultural products.
 - Measures affecting imports of Mexican avocados (5-monitoring progress)
- e. USTR continues to monitor all agreements listed in the goals and will provide a complete assessment in the FY 2000 annual performance report
- f. The Office also developed U.S. positions for the WTO review of the WTO Dispute Settlement Understanding taking place in Geneva in 1998 and 1999 and continuing in 2000.

FY 2001

Performance Goals

- a. Successfully complete WTO and NAFTA dispute settlement proceedings that are pending at the beginning of FY 2001 in which the United States is a complainant, defendant or third party, or is monitoring foreign implementation in completed cases. Invoke dispute settlement procedures in instances where non-compliance has been determined through careful monitoring. (See Appendix IV for cases identified in FY 2000. Several are likely to continue into FY 2001.)
- b. Create more openness and transparency in the dispute settlement procedures of trade agreements to which the United States is a party by making documents available to the public upon issuance to the parties.
- c. Continue to monitor other governments' implementation of measures to comply with the rulings and recommendations of panels and the WTO Appellate Body in the following disputes that have completed the dispute settlement process so far: (1) Japanese liquor taxes; (2) Canadian magazine imports; (3) EU imports of bananas; (4) EU imports of beef; (5) Argentine imports of textiles and footwear; (6) Indian patent protection for pharmaceuticals and agricultural chemicals; (7) Indonesian auto imports; (8) Korean liquor taxes; (9) Japanese varietal testing; (10) Canadian subsidies and import restrictions on dairy products; (11) Australian subsidies on leather; (12) Indian import licensing restrictions; and (13) Mexican antidumping action on high-fructose corn syrup.
- d. Monitor annually and enforce existing bilateral agreements under USTR jurisdiction (See Appendix V).
- e. Monitor Chinese implementation of the 1992 Market Access MOU, including agriculture.
- f. If China accedes to the WTO in FY 2001, monitor and enforce China's implementation of its WTO obligations.
- g. Monitor implementation of existing bilateral agreements with Japan under USTR jurisdiction. Work with other agencies on enforcement of agreements under their jurisdiction.
- h. Establish formal processes and products that would ensure adequate allocation of resources for monitoring and enforcement among USTR, the Department of Commerce, the Department of

State, and the Department of Agriculture to handle the increasing compliance workload.

Performance Indicator

- a. Dispute settlement proceedings where U.S. complaints succeed or agreements are reached to settle trade disputes should result in foreign governments taking the following satisfactory measures:
 - agreeing to eliminate or phase out measures that do not comply with trade agreement obligations;
 - agreeing to an imminent solution to the burden or restriction on U.S. commerce caused by the foreign measures; or
 - agreeing to provide the United States compensatory trade benefits that are satisfactory to the United States Government.
- b. Conduct of an annual review of agreements will allow for identification of non-compliance.
- c. De-restriction of panel reports must be negotiated with the parties to the Agreement. A successful negotiation will achieve the goal outlined above.

Performance Verification

- a. Outcomes of WTO/ NAFTA dispute settlement and bilateral enforcement actions are published in press releases and on the USTR homepage. The results are also transmitted to the Congressional committees of appropriate jurisdiction.
- b. Panel reports will be publicly available on our website.
- c. The United States has filed 55 formal complaints under the World Trade Organization dispute settlement system to date. The US has successfully settled 17 of those disputes on favorable terms, and has won 15 of the 18 cases it has taken through the dispute settlement process so far. USTR has defended US interests in 52 disputes where foreign governments have complained about US laws, regulations, or requirements.

The following are foreign trade measures pursued by the USTR in the WTO during FY 2001, *at some phase* of the dispute settlement process – including monitoring implementation of settlement agreements reached or panel recommendations. (The number next to the case indicates its status: (1) won by the US in litigation; (2) settled without litigation in US favor; (3) lost by US in litigation; (4) pending before a panel; (5) still in consultations, monitoring progress, or inactive.

- Argentina - Patent protection and test data protection regime (5)
- Belgium - Rice Imports (4)
- Brazil - Customs Valuation (5)
- Brazil - Patent protection (2)
- Canada - Export subsidies and tariff rate quotas on dairy products (4)

- Canada - Patent protection term (1)
- Denmark - Measures affecting the enforcement of intellectual property rights (2)
- EU - Regime for the importation, sale and distribution of bananas (1)
- EU - Ban on meat from animals produced with growth producing hormones(1)

- EU - Protection of trademarks and geographic indications for agricultural products and foodstuffs(5)
- EU - Import surcharge on corn gluten feed(5)
- Greece - Enforcement of intellectual property rights(2)
- India - Measures affecting trade in the motor vehicle sector(4)
- India - Import quotas on agricultural, textile, and industrial products(1)
- Korea - Measures affecting imports of fresh, chilled, and frozen beef(1)
- Mexico - Antidumping duties on high fructose corn syrup from the United States(1)
- Mexico - Measures affecting trade in live swine(5)
- Mexico - Telecommunications trade barriers(5)
- Philippines - Measures affecting trade and investment in the motor vehicle sector(5)
- Romania - Customs valuation(2)

Disputes in which the US participated as a third party:

- EU - Measures affecting the prohibition of asbestos and asbestos products
- Turkey - Textiles
- Canada - Aircraft
- India - Hides and skin
- EC - Bed linen
- Canada - Autos
- Brazil - Import licensing
- Nicaragua - Nicaragua duties
- Argentina - Hides
- Argentina - Cotton fabrics from Argentina
- Turkey - Turkey pipe fittings
- Egypt - Turkish rebar
- Korea - Korea resins
- Mexico - Mexico transformers
- EC - EC cast iron fittings
- Chile - Chile price bands
- Canada - Aircraft subsidies
- Chile - Chile safeguard on Edible Oils
- Thailand - Antidumping duties on steel products from Poland
- Chile - Price band system and agricultural safeguards
- EC - Measures affecting soluble coffee from Brazil
- Argentina - Definitive antidumping measures on carton-board imports from Germany and definitive antidumping measures on imports of ceramic floor tiles
- Guatemala - Definitive antidumping measures on Grey Portland Cement from Mexico
- Argentina - Measures affecting the export of bovine hides and the import of finished leather from the EC
- EC - Antidumping duties on imports of cotton-type bed linen from India
- EC - Pharmaceuticals
- Canada - Pharmaceuticals

The following are U.S. trade measures defended by USTR in the WTO in FY 2001, *at some phase* of the dispute settlement process, when challenged by foreign governments. The number next to the case indicates its status: (1) won by the US in litigation; (2) settled without litigation; (3) lost by the U.S. in litigation; (4) pending before a panel or the Appellate Body; (5) still in

consultations, monitoring progress, or inactive.

- United States - 1916 Revenue Act (3)
- United States - Definitive safeguard measures on imports of line pipe from Korea (4)
- United States - Harbor Maintenance Fee (5)
- United States - Foreign Sales Corporation (FSC) tax provisions (3)
- United States - Measures treating export restraints as subsidies (1)
- United States - Transitional safeguard measure on combed cotton yarn from Pakistan (4)
- United States - Section 301-310 of the Trade Act of 1974(1)
- United States - Section 110(5) of the Copyright Act (3)
- United States - Definitive safeguard measures on imports of wheat gluten from the EU (3)
- United States - Section 211 of US Omnibus Appropriations Act (4)
- United States - Import prohibition on certain shrimp and shrimp products(3)
- United States - Antidumping duties on stainless steel from Korea (3)
- United States - Lamb meat safeguard (3)
- United States - Antidumping duties on hot-rolled steel from Japan(4)
- United States - Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930(5)
- United States - Safeguard measures on imports of EC line pipe (4)
- United States - Countervailing duties on carbon steel from Brazil (5)
- United States - Continued Dumping and Subsidy Offset of 2000 (4)
- United States - Section 129(c)(1) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (4)
- United States - Countervailing duty measures on certain products from the EC (4)
- United States - Antidumping duties on seamless pipe from Italy (5)

The following are complaints brought by the United States or U.S. measures defended under NAFTA *at some phase* of the dispute settlement process during FY 2001. (The following numbers indicate the status of the case: (1) won by the US in litigation ; (2) settled; (3) lost by the US in litigation; (4)proceeding is in progress; (5) still in consultations, preliminary stages, monitoring progress, inactive or moot.

- Mexico - Small parcel delivery (5)
 - Mexico - Dry beans (2)
 - Cross - border Mexican trucking services (3)
 - Mexico - Cross border scheduled bus services (4)
 - Import quota on sugar from Mexico (4)
 - Trade in avocados from Mexico (2)
 - Import of Canadian potatoes (2)
- d. Openness and transparency in FY 2001:
- In FY 2001, the United States continued to advocate greater transparency in the WTO dispute settlement process in the context of ongoing discussions of dispute settlement reform and in individual WTO disputes.
 - The United States makes all of its WTO submissions available to the public on the USTR website. The outcomes of all WTO and NAFTA dispute settlement and bilateral enforcement actions are published in press releases and on the USTR website. The results are also transmitted to Congressional committees of appropriate jurisdiction. WTO panel and Appellate Body reports are also available on the USTR website.
 - In dispute settlement reform discussions, the United States advocated greater transparency including reforms requiring earlier release of dispute settlement body reports to the public, that WTO members be required to provide public versions of their submissions in dispute settlement proceedings, and that panel proceedings be open to the public.
- e. In FY 2001, USTR carefully monitored foreign government implementation of WTO recommendations and rulings in the disputes listed and took action to secure implementation where appropriate. For example, the United States successfully challenged Mexico's redetermination of threat of injury in its antidumping proceeding against high-fructose corn syrup under Article 21.5. In FY 2001, the United States was also successful in reaching a mutually agreed resolution of the dispute on Japan varietal testing.
- f. USTR, together with relevant U.S. agencies, held a number of expert and high-level meetings with Japan in 2001 under our bilateral Enhanced Initiative for Deregulation and Competition Policy and the follow-on Regulatory Reform and Competition Policy Initiative to ensure full implementation of structural and regulatory reform commitments made by Japan in a large number of sectors, including telecommunications, information technology, and energy.

USTR led the annual review of the 1994 and 1996 U.S.-Japan Insurance Agreements in July 2001, which focused on a number of issues of high priority to U.S. insurers. Among these was further liberalization and expansion of the insurance market, including the introduction of new products such as variable annuities and possible expansion of sales of these products by banks. The United States and Japan also discussed administrative and regulatory changes in Japan's insurance sector,

including issues related to Japan's product approval process and the availability of needed resources and technology within FSA. Finally, the United States raised concerns related to recent changes related to the life and non-life Policyholder Protection Corporations and Japan's plans for the postal financial institutions.

In March 2001, USTR led reviews of Japanese Government procurement of foreign computer and telecommunications equipment and services under the auspices of the bilateral Computer and Telecommunications Procurement Agreements. The reviews included an analysis of data on recent government purchases provided by Japan and addressed issues of importance to the United States such as transparency of the procurement system, continued high use of sole-source tendering, and the need for Japan to move to a more modern bid evaluation system. USTR, in close coordination with other agencies and U.S. industry, continued to monitor Japan's commitments under our bilateral government procurement agreements related to construction, satellites and supercomputers.

- g. Continued to monitor China's implementation of our bilateral agreement on agriculture to open the market to U.S. citrus, meat and poultry, and wheat and other grains from the Pacific Northwest.
- h. Ensured that the terms and conditions under which China would accede to the WTO were at least equivalent to those agreed in 1999 US-China bilateral agreement. Monitored and ensured WTO-consistency of changes being made to China's laws and regulations in advance of China's entry into the WTO.
- i. USTR's Monitoring and Compliance Unit works closely with the Department of Commerce's Trade and Compliance Center, as well as the Departments of Agriculture, State and other agencies to coordinate our respective monitoring and compliance efforts, especially with respect to WTO Agreements. The \$22 million provided by the Congress in FY 2001 to bolster monitoring and enforcement resources at USTR, Commerce, Agriculture and State was an important first step in moving toward more coordinated planning of federal agency activities in this area. USTR has used this additional funding to add 13 new positions in the legal, geographic and sectoral units at USTR to support our monitoring and enforcement efforts. This funding has also enabled the Commerce Department to expand its staff assigned to compliance issues both in Washington and overseas. There are also initiatives underway through the Department of State Foreign Service Institute to provide compliance training courses to monitoring and enforcement staff in Washington and compliance staff posted at embassies overseas.
- j. USTR continues to monitor all agreements listed in the goals, including through preparation of the National Trade Estimate Report. USTR also chairs bi-monthly Monitoring and Enforcement TPSC Subcommittee meetings to facilitate improved interagency coordination on monitoring and enforcement issues and ensure the most efficient allocation of resources in handling the increasing monitoring and compliance workload.