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## Abbreviations used in this Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Dumping Agreement</td>
<td>Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs Valuation Agreement (or CVA)</td>
<td>Agreement on Implementation of Article VII of the GATT 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCs</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSB</td>
<td>Dispute Settlement Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSU</td>
<td>Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELSA</td>
<td>The European Law Students' Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATS</td>
<td>General Agreement on Trade in Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATT</td>
<td>General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNP</td>
<td>Gross National Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDB</td>
<td>Inter-American Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITC</td>
<td>International Trade Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDCs</td>
<td>Least-developed countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFN</td>
<td>Most-favoured-nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCM Agreement</td>
<td>Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPS Agreement</td>
<td>Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPS measures</td>
<td>Sanitary and phytosanitary measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBT Agreement</td>
<td>Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIMs</td>
<td>Agreement on Trade-Related Investment Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIPS Agreement</td>
<td>Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCTAD</td>
<td>United Nations Conference on Trade and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTO</td>
<td>World Trade Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ACWL was established to ensure that developing (DCs) and least-developed (LDCs) countries are able to participate fully in the WTO legal system. The ACWL provides, on demand, legal advice, assistance in WTO dispute settlement proceedings, and training on WTO law, to its developing country Members and to the LDCs.

These are challenging times for the WTO, with disruption in the dispute settlement system and much discussion about a perceived need for reform of various aspects of the WTO system. As I will explain briefly, to date, these challenges have led to sustained or increased demand for the services of the ACWL, as our developing country Members and the LDCs seek advice on how changes in the WTO system might affect their rights and obligations under the existing WTO agreements. Thus, the ACWL’s lawyers were once again very busy in 2019.

Looking forward, as the reform discussions progress, we expect that there will continue to be considerable demand for the services of the ACWL. In addition, ongoing negotiations on new disciplines in areas such as fisheries subsidies and e-commerce will continue to generate questions about the legal aspects of these issues. Here also, the ACWL will continue to play a vital role in ensuring that developing countries and LDCs can participate fully in the rules-based multilateral trading system.

Looking Back: 2019

Looking back over the past year, the ACWL’s services were in heavy demand in 2019. We provided 220 legal opinions, close to the total of 237 in 2018, which was the most in a single year since the creation of the ACWL. Many of these related to the legal aspects of the “reform” issues at the WTO, such as the Appellate Body and special and differential treatment. However, the vast majority related to the ongoing “normal” work of the WTO in regulating trade concerns and legal issues such as trade remedy measures, SPS measures and technical standards, agricultural and other subsidies, as well as the legal aspects of the negotiations on fisheries subsidies and e-commerce. This legal advice enables our developing country Members and the LDCs to ensure compliance with their own WTO obligations, to participate more effectively in the WTO legal system, and to defend their own rights under WTO law.

Notwithstanding the Appellate Body crisis, WTO Members continue to use the WTO dispute settlement system to regulate their differences. Over the course of 2019, the ACWL assisted developing countries in a total of 17 disputes, including 4 new disputes. This work covered each stage of the process, including consultations, panel proceedings, Appellate Body proceedings, and the implementation phase. Our lawyers frequently had to work very long hours to cope with the numerous deadlines imposed by this workload and all of them responded to the challenge with skill, hard work, and a great team spirit.
We continued to develop and improve our training programmes in 2019. Certificates were awarded to 38 delegates at the end of our annual training programme. Almost all of these chose to take an optional exam at the end of the course, and 33 received a certificate of achievement in the exam. We also continued to provide ad hoc training programmes on request of our Members and the LDCs, either at our offices in Geneva or by videoconference to government officials in capitals.

The Secondment Programme for Trade Lawyers continues to provide a unique opportunity for four lawyers from developing and least-developed countries each year to get hands-on training and practical experience in WTO law. To date, a total of 47 lawyers, 17 male and 30 female, from 18 different developing countries and from 10 different LDCs, have participated in the programme.

**Looking Forward**

In these turbulent times, we are often asked how we expect demand for the services to the ACWL to evolve in the future. The ACWL is required to provide its services on demand only to its developing and least-developed country users and, as such, cannot set targets for matters such as the number of dispute settlement proceedings in which it would participate or the number of legal opinions it would issue in a given year. Nevertheless, we give considerable thought each year to how best we can marshal our resources so as to provide the best possible service to our users.

Based both on experience over the past two-three years and our forward-looking analysis, we expect demand for the services of the ACWL to continue at least at the levels of recent years in the short- to medium-term future. At the establishment of the ACWL at the Seattle Ministerial Conference in 1999, former WTO Director General Mr. Renato Ruggiero spoke of how the "necessary complexity and comprehensiveness" of WTO rules and disciplines had the potential to become "an instrument of marginalisation of those who lack human resources and expertise". The ACWL was established precisely to prevent this from happening and the reputation it has acquired over the past 20 years speaks for itself.

The main lesson of the past few years is that the "complexity and comprehensiveness" of the WTO system will continue, especially if and when the reform agenda moves forward, leading to revised rules and practices. WTO Members with less resources and expertise are likely to have more, rather than fewer, questions for the ACWL as the WTO revises its rules and practices and, possibly, adopts new rights and obligations.

Ultimately, of course, the future of the ACWL is linked to the future of the WTO. Everything we have learned from the past 20 years of the ACWL suggests, however, that the ACWL will continue to play a key role in ensuring that developing and least-developed WTO Members can fully understand their rights and obligations in the multilateral trading system.

As always, I would like to thank all my colleagues for all of their hard work in a very busy year, as well as our General Assembly, our Management Board, and our developed and developing country Members and the LDCs, that work together to enable the ACWL to fulfil its mandate so successfully. Finally, on behalf of our entire team, I would like to thank all of the officials of the governments with whom we work on a daily basis for the trust and confidence they place in us. We look forward to continuing to work with you in the future.

[Signature]
# The ACWL in Figures

## Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal opinions</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total WTO disputes in which the ACWL provided support</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New requests for support in WTO disputes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of Training</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed country Members / Associate Members</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing country Members</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDCs entitled to the services of the ACWL</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries served by the ACWL</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers, including the Executive Director</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants in the Secondment Programme for Trade Lawyers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Throughout this report, the terms "country" and "developing country" include separate customs territories and countries with economies in transition.
**LEGAL ADVICE**

The ACWL provides legal advice on all aspects of WTO law at the request of its developing country Members and the LDCs.

- 220 Legal opinions in 2019
- 237 Legal opinions in 2018
- 204 Average no. of legal opinions, per annum 2015-2019
- 43 No. of individual countries that sought the ACWL’s advice in 2019
- 2953 Total legal opinions to date
- 98% Users highly/very satisfied with service provided

The advice of the ACWL is an indispensable tool for developing countries to find their way through the complexities of WTO law. For a country like mine, that lacks the necessary institutional capacity to undertake these legal analyses, the ACWL’s role was pivotal to help us make the right decisions in every issue that presented a problem to us.

- ACWL Member -

**ASSISTANCE IN DISPUTE SETTLEMENT PROCEEDINGS**

The ACWL assists developing country Members and LDCs in every phase of dispute settlement proceedings.

- 4 New disputes in 2019
- 17 Total disputes in 2019
- 65 Total disputes to date
- 19% Share of all WTO disputes since 2002

If the ACWL were considered as a country, its 65 disputes would make it the third most active participant as a complainant or respondent in WTO dispute settlement proceedings since its establishment in 2001.
The ACWL conducts an annual training course on WTO law for Geneva-based delegates and ad hoc seminars on legal topics of interest to delegates. The ACWL also provides video-conference training programmes for capital-based officials on request.

**TRAINING PROGRAMME**

The ACWL is an outstanding institution that makes a big contribution to developing countries’ capacity-building in Geneva. I hope that the training course continues for a long time to allow more people to benefit from it.

- ACWL Member -

**SECONDMENT PROGRAMME**

The ACWL employs four government lawyers from developing country Members and LDCs from September to June each year as junior counsel in its Secondment Programme.

- Participant -

The ACWL conducts an annual training course on WTO law for Geneva-based delegates and ad hoc seminars on legal topics of interest to delegates. The ACWL also provides video-conference training programmes for capital-based officials on request.

**Participants 2019-2020**

(3 DCs / 1 LDC) (2 F / 2 M)

**Participants 2018-2019**

(2 DCs / 2 LDCs) (2 F / 2 M)

**Total participants to date**

(30 F / 17 M) (31 DCs / 16 LDCs)

(from 18 different DCs / 10 LDCs)
In February 2019, the Permanent Mission of Uruguay to the WTO and the ACWL, in conjunction with the Inter-American Development Bank, hosted a reception at the WTO in honour of H.E. Ambassador Julio Lacarte-Muró (1918-2016). The former was a key architect and pillar of the multilateral trading system over a distinguished sixty-year career, from negotiating the Havana Charter and the GATT in the 1940s to his service as a member of the WTO Appellate Body and dispute settlement panels. The reception was hosted by H.E. Mr. José Luis Cancela, Uruguay’s Ambassador to the WTO, and Mr. Niall Meagher, the ACWL’s Executive Director, and was addressed by H.E. Mr. Rodolfo Nin Novoa, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Uruguay, Mr. Roberto Azevêdo, Director-General of the WTO, and Professor Georges Abi-Saab, former Member of the Appellate Body. The reception marked the launch of a series of video interviews with Ambassador Lacarte-Muró. These interviews detail his experiences throughout his career in international trade, from the negotiations of the Havana Charter and the GATT in the 1940s to the negotiations of the Uruguay Round half a century later. The interviews can be viewed on the ACWL’s website at https://www.acwl.ch/interview-with-ambassador-julio-lacarte-muro/.
In June, Morocco completed its accession process and became the 36th developing country Member of the ACWL. Morocco had signed its Protocol of Accession in 2017 and the accession was ratified by royal assent in 2019. The ACWL is delighted to welcome Morocco, which joins Egypt and Tunisia as the ACWL’s third Member from the North African region.

Kazakhstan signed its Protocol of Accession on 13 December 2019 to become a Member of the ACWL. Once the accession process is completed, Kazakhstan will become the 37th developing country Member of the ACWL. Kazakhstan is expected to complete the process of accession in 2020.
The ACWL continued to support the John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition on WTO Law. In 2019, an African team won for the first time. Strathmore University from Nairobi, coached by Harrison Mbori of Strathmore and the ACWL’s Christian Vidal-León, defeated Harvard University in the final. The ACWL provided other technical support to the African Round, including serving as judges and conducting training courses for the coaches of the African teams. The ACWL hosted a reception at the ACWL for the African teams that qualified for the final round in Geneva.
THE ACWL'S OPERATIONS

OVERVIEW

The ACWL was established to enhance the credibility and acceptability of the rules-based multilateral trading system by ensuring that all Members of the WTO can effectively participate in it. To that end, the ACWL is to be a source of legal training, expertise, and advice on WTO law that is readily accessible to developing and least-developed countries. The mandate of the ACWL is to provide those countries with (i) legal advice on issues of WTO law; (ii) assistance in WTO dispute settlement proceedings; and (iii) training on WTO law. The ACWL's goal is to assist developing and least-developed countries in participating in the WTO legal system, thereby enabling them to take full advantage of their membership in the WTO.

DEMAND

The ACWL provides its services based on the needs of its developing country Members and the LDCs as determined by those countries themselves. Thus, ACWL developing country Members and the LDCs request the ACWL's assistance in disputes and request advice or training on specific issues arising under WTO law. The ACWL may not pursue any legal issues or disputes on its own initiative (no "ambulance chasing").

OUTPUT

The ACWL responds to these requests by providing prompt and high-quality legal advice on issues of concern, support in WTO dispute settlement proceedings, and training on WTO law.

IMPACT

The ACWL's support in WTO dispute settlement proceedings enables developing country Members and LDCs to enforce their rights and protect their interests under WTO law; while the ACWL's advice and training enables them to understand fully their rights and obligations under WTO law and to pursue their trade policy objectives in a WTO-consistent manner. In addition, by providing legal opinions and representation in disputes, the ACWL addresses the immediate capacity deficiency problem suffered by LDCs and many developing countries. By providing seminars and training, the ACWL is building the future capacity of those countries. The ACWL's users consistently express a high degree of satisfaction with the legal advice and training provided.

OUTCOME

The ACWL thereby contributes to the effectiveness of a rules-based multilateral trading system and to the achievement of the development objectives both of the WTO and of the developing countries and LDCs themselves. In the words of WTO Director-General Roberto Azevêdo, the ACWL is "an indispensable part of the multilateral system" that has "prosper[ed] as an institution... by providing the highest level of performance and services to the countries that really need this service."
FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT THE ACWL

Who is eligible to receive the services of the ACWL?

The services of the ACWL are available to all developing country Members of the WTO that have become Members of the ACWL (36 to date). LDCs that are Members of the WTO or in the process of acceding to the WTO are entitled to the services of the ACWL without having to become Members of the ACWL (44 at present). Thus, 80 countries – almost half of the Membership of the WTO – are entitled to the services of the ACWL.

What is the process for accession to the ACWL?

A country wishing to accede must simply submit a letter requesting to become a Member and a proposed Protocol of Accession for the approval of the ACWL General Assembly. More information and sample documents can be found at https://www.acwl.ch/accessions.

What was the original purpose of the ACWL?

The original purpose of the ACWL was to ensure that developing and least-developed countries would enjoy permanent access to specialised legal advice on WTO matters. To enable these countries to participate in the same manner as developed countries that have both extensive in-house capacity and access to private law firms, the ACWL provides assistance in all stages of WTO dispute settlement proceedings and legal advice on WTO law. In addition, the ACWL’s training helps these countries to develop their own in-house capacity in WTO law.

Has the ACWL’s mandate or purpose changed since its creation?

The ACWL’s mandate and purpose have remained unchanged since its creation. In practice, countries are using the ACWL’s advice to ensure their own compliance with WTO law more than was originally anticipated. In addition, developing countries are increasingly involved in disputes against each other rather than against developed countries.

How does the ACWL ensure the neutrality and impartiality of its advice?

The ACWL provides only legal, not political, advice. The ACWL also refrains from taking its own positions on issues or from soliciting work from individual countries (to avoid any prejudice to its other Members or LDCs). The ACWL’s governing structure was designed to create a professional, non-political, centre of excellence free of control or influence by any Member or group of Members. An independent Management Board is responsible for ensuring the efficient and effective operation of the ACWL. The members of the Management Board are appointed by the ACWL General Assembly. However, they serve in their personal capacities and may not seek or accept instructions from any government in the performance of their duties.

How does the ACWL assist developing countries in their own compliance and in preventing disputes?

Much of the ACWL’s legal advice (about 35 per cent) is requested by developing countries and LDCs that seek the ACWL’s advice on whether their own measures or draft measures are WTO-consistent. By advising these countries on possible WTO-inconsistencies of their measures, the ACWL helps them ensure compliance and avoid challenges by their trading partners. In some instances, the ACWL’s legal opinions have been used informally by two countries as a basis for resolving their trade concerns without recourse to dispute settlement proceedings. The details are, of course, confidential.
The ACWL provides legal opinions on issues of WTO law free of charge to its developing country Members and to the LDCs. Consistently with the ACWL’s mandate, these opinions are limited to legal issues of WTO law. The ACWL may not provide political advice. In addition, the ACWL provides these legal opinions solely at the request of a developing country Member or LDC. The ACWL cannot and does not propose to provide legal opinions to its Members or the LDCs or develop its own positions on any issues of WTO law.

In these circumstances, the ACWL cannot predict with any certainty the demand for legal opinions in a given year or at any time during the year. For the past five years, however, the ACWL has provided an average of 204 legal opinions per year in response to requests from its developing country Members and the LDCs. In 2019, the ACWL provided 220 legal opinions, compared to 237 in 2018. While the ACWL cannot predict the demand for its legal opinions, it is expected that it will continue at the level of close to 200 legal opinions per year.

The ACWL’s legal opinions are provided on a strictly confidential basis. The ACWL’s Standards of Conduct require the ACWL to protect absolutely the confidentiality of its relationship with the governments that request the ACWL’s opinions. This means that the ACWL cannot make public its legal opinions and cannot disclose either the identity of the country requesting its opinions or the nature of the issues on which advice was sought. For this reason, in this Report on Operations, the ACWL can describe only in general terms the issues on which it provided advice during the year, except where the ACWL’s involvement was a matter of public record. Moreover, the ACWL cannot disclose how the requesting developing country Member or LDC subsequently used the advice provided by the ACWL.

Each year, the ACWL conducts a survey of the users of its legal advice to determine whether they were satisfied with the opinions provided. These ACWL Members and LDCs consistently report a high level of satisfaction with this service. They also consistently report that the ACWL provided high-quality advice in a timely manner that enabled them to pursue or resolve their legal concerns. This feedback also assists the ACWL in its ongoing internal efforts to maintain and improve the quality of its legal advice and its responsiveness to the needs of the users.

Developing country Members and LDCs seek the ACWL’s advice on three general categories of legal issues. The first category concerns legal questions arising in the WTO legal system, including issues relating to accession to the WTO, participation in WTO committees and other institutions, and legal questions arising out of WTO decision making and negotiations. These opinions enhance the capacity of
developing countries and LDCs to pursue their interests within the complex institutional framework of the WTO and to become more informed and active participants in WTO bodies. For example, the ACWL has advised its developing country Members and the LDCs on legal issues arising in accessions to the WTO, trade policy reviews, and in various WTO committees covering a wide range of WTO topics.

The second category of legal advice consists of requests by the ACWL’s developing country Members or LDCs for advice on general interpretative issues of WTO law or opinions on measures taken or contemplated by the developing country Member or LDC seeking the advice itself. These opinions help these countries to understand better their rights and obligations under WTO law and to realise their domestic and trade policy objectives consistently with WTO law. This category includes opinions on issues such as the WTO-consistency of domestic tax measures, technical regulations and sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) measures, tariffs, subsidies, trade remedy investigations and measures, intellectual property protection regimes, services regulations, and proposed regional trade agreements. Developing country Members or LDCs faced with internal disagreement within their governments as to the consistency with WTO law of a proposed measure often request the ACWL to provide a legal assessment of the WTO-consistency of the draft measure. In these cases, the ACWL is in a unique position to provide a neutral, objective assessment of the WTO legal issues that arise with respect to the proposed measure that provides the requesting country with a sound legal understanding to be used in developing and achieving its policy objectives consistently with WTO law.

The third category concerns requests for legal opinions regarding measures of other WTO Members that affect the developing country Member or LDC requesting the legal opinion. The ACWL evaluates the WTO-consistency of these measures and advises on the legal options available to the requesting country, including the possibility of a challenge in WTO dispute settlement proceedings. This category includes legal opinions on the WTO-consistency of measures such as technical regulations, SPS measures, subsidies, and trade remedy measures. In these cases, the ACWL’s opinions permit the developing country Member or LDC to assess its options, including the merits of pursuing dispute settlement proceedings, on the basis of a legal analysis prepared by an institution that is neither issue- nor profit-driven.
Number of legal opinions

In 2019, the ACWL provided 220 legal opinions in response to requests for legal advice from its developing country Members and LDCs, compared to 237 in 2018. The average number of legal opinions provided by the ACWL each year in the period 2015-2019 is 204.

The chart on the following page shows the number of legal opinions provided during the past ten years.

The ACWL counts as an individual legal opinion the advice given in response to each separate request by a developing country Member or LDC for the ACWL’s advice. A legal opinion can be given in many different forms, such as in the course of a three-hour meeting or in the form of a memorandum of over 100 pages, depending on the needs of the requesting country. A single legal opinion may require the ACWL to provide follow-up advice or to assist on ongoing legal issues over an extended period of several months. Informal discussions on WTO law that take place in brief email exchanges or conversations are not counted as legal opinions.

The time taken to respond to requests for advice varies with the legal and factual complexity of the matter submitted. Opinions required urgently are often provided in a meeting or through a conference call. Some opinions that are provided in the course of a meeting or conference call may nevertheless require detailed advance preparation. Generally, more complex issues are addressed in the form of a written opinion. The ACWL endeavours to provide written opinions within the timeframe requested by or agreed with the country involved. In 2019, 63 per cent of the written legal opinions were provided within five working days, 16 per cent within ten working days and 12 per cent within 15 working days. In the remaining 9 per cent of the cases, it took more than 15 working days, usually because further factual information was required to complete the legal analysis.
Given the high quality of advice based on in-depth analysis of the issues, we commend the expertise of the ACWL and thank them for being readily accessible.

- ACWL Member -
As noted above, the ACWL’s legal opinions are provided on a strictly confidential basis. Thus, the ACWL may describe the issues addressed in its legal opinions only in general terms and without any identification of the country involved. In addition, the ACWL cannot discuss the substance of the advice provided or how that advice was used. In this context, a general description is provided below of some of the key legal issues addressed in the ACWL’s legal opinions in 2019:

**GATT Issues**

As usual, many issues arose under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 (GATT 1994), including questions relating to the modification of Schedules of Concessions, the use of tariff-rate quotas, the imposition of internal taxes, import rules and formalities, and the scope of the exceptions provided in the GATT 1994.

**Trade Remedies and Subsidies**

The ACWL advised its developing country Members and LDCs on the implementation of their domestic laws and regulations on trade remedy (anti-dumping, countervailing duty, and safeguard) measures and on trade remedy measures imposed by other WTO Members. The ACWL also provided advice on several matters relating to subsidies, including agricultural subsidies and the legal aspects of the ongoing negotiations on fisheries subsidies.

**Issues relating to Dispute Settlement**

The ACWL advised on several issues related to the Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes (DSU). In particular, it provided advice on matters related to specific disputes, procedural matters, and systemic issues, such as the reform of the WTO dispute settlement system and the WTO Appellate Body crisis.
GATS Issues

The ACWL also advised on various issues under the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), including questions relating to the modification of Schedules of Commitments, the WTO-consistency of domestic regulations and services-related taxes and the legal impact of negotiation proposals on trade in services, most notably on domestic regulation and the services-related aspects of e-commerce.

SPS and TBT Measures

The ACWL responded to requests for advice on the WTO-consistency of SPS measures considered or adopted by its developing country Members, as well as measures taken by other WTO Members affecting the interest of the requesting ACWL Members. It also responded to several requests for advice on the WTO-consistency of technical regulations or standards affecting the sale of goods in the light of relevant decisions rendered by WTO panels and the Appellate Body.

Advice to LDCs

The ACWL’s assistance to the LDCs in 2019 included legal advice on issues relating to the implementation of laws on trade remedies as well as the conduct of specific aspects of trade remedy investigations, the consistency of trade-restrictive measures with the GATT 1994, issues relating to subsidies, and legal aspects of the ongoing negotiations at the WTO.

The legal opinions provided by the ACWL this year involved issues arising under virtually all of the WTO covered agreements, as indicated in the table on page 17.

External Counsel

In 2015, the General Assembly of the ACWL approved a proposal to expand the use of the ACWL’s Roster of External Counsel (see page 49 below) to cover situations in which the ACWL cannot provide a legal opinion through its staff because of a conflict of interest. Previously, the ACWL could provide assistance through the Roster of External Counsel only in the context of dispute settlement proceedings. Under the new decision, ACWL developing country Members and LDCs may now have access to the Roster in situations of conflict that do not involve or lead to dispute settlement proceedings. In such cases, the ACWL’s developing country Member or LDC receives legal advice from a lawyer or firm on the Roster free of charge, in the same manner as if it received advice directly from the ACWL. The ACWL agrees and pays the fees of the lawyer or firm selected by the country involved. During 2019, there was one situation of a conflict of interest in which a developing country Member obtained a legal opinion from a firm on the Roster in this manner.
We highly commend the ACWL's tremendous efforts in analysing the measures of our interest and providing reliable legal advice. The service provided by the ACWL helped us better understand our rights and obligations under the WTO Agreements and effectively served as a basis for policy suggestions.

- ACWL Member -

Note: Some legal opinions involved two or more subjects; accordingly, the total number of subjects exceeds the total number of legal opinions issued during the year.

Legal opinions by subject in 2019

Note: Some legal opinions involved two or more subjects; accordingly, the total number of subjects exceeds the total number of legal opinions issued during the year.
In 2019, 29 of the ACWL’s 36 developing country Members sought legal advice from the ACWL (compared to 32 in 2018). In addition, 14 LDCs individually sought legal advice from the ACWL (an increase from 11 in 2018). Thus, in 2019, a total of 43 different countries - a quarter of the WTO’s membership - sought legal advice from the ACWL. Due to the requirements of confidentiality discussed above, these individual countries cannot be identified in this Report.

The ACWL divides its developing country Members into categories A, B, and C, according to their GNP per capita and share of world trade, with category A Members having the highest GNP per capita and the largest share of world trade. The developing country Members in each category are listed in Appendix 4. As detailed in the chart below, category A Members requested three per cent of the opinions provided in 2019, while 48 per cent were requested by Category B Members. Category C Members sought 35 per cent of the opinions and LDCs sought 14 per cent.
As noted above, the ACWL’s legal advice can be divided into three broad categories of opinions. In 2019, 85 legal opinions (39 per cent of the total, compared to 27 per cent in 2018) concerned issues that arose in WTO decision making and negotiations in such areas as trade facilitation, non-agricultural market access, and accessions. The ACWL also responded to 69 requests from countries seeking advice relevant to their own laws and measures (31 per cent, compared to 38 per cent in 2018), including advice on proposed legislation on trade remedies, SPS regulations, and specific aspects of their trade remedy investigations. Finally, the ACWL provided 66 legal opinions regarding measures taken by other WTO Members (30 per cent, compared to 35 per cent in 2018).

The breakdown of the ACWL’s legal opinions among the three categories of legal opinions provided in 2019 is illustrated in the chart below, while the chart on the next page provides the breakdown between the three categories of legal opinions provided in the past five years (2015-2019).

---

**Categories of legal opinions**

As noted above, the ACWL’s legal advice can be divided into three broad categories of opinions. In 2019, 85 legal opinions (39 per cent of the total, compared to 27 per cent in 2018) concerned issues that arose in WTO decision making and negotiations in such areas as trade facilitation, non-agricultural market access, and accessions. The ACWL also responded to 69 requests from countries seeking advice relevant to their own laws and measures (31 per cent, compared to 38 per cent in 2018), including advice on proposed legislation on trade remedies, SPS regulations, and specific aspects of their trade remedy investigations. Finally, the ACWL provided 66 legal opinions regarding measures taken by other WTO Members (30 per cent, compared to 35 per cent in 2018).

The ACWL has been helpful in advising us on some of the legal challenges that we face in FTA negotiations, which have an impact on our rights and obligations at the WTO. Through their timely and comprehensive legal opinions, we have been able to unlock some stalemates in our negotiations.

- ACWL Member -

---

**Legal Opinions by Category of Opinion in 2019**

- WTO decision making and negotiations (39%)
- Measures of countries seeking advice (31%)
- Measures of other countries (30%)
Thus, 71 per cent of the legal opinions during the past five years enabled the ACWL’s developing country Members and LDCs to participate more effectively in WTO decision making (36 per cent) and to evaluate the consistency of their own measures with their WTO obligations (35 per cent). The LDCs, in particular, have requested opinions for these purposes. Only 29 per cent of the legal opinions provided during this period related to measures of other countries.

## Survey of satisfaction

Each year, the ACWL asks the developing country Members and LDCs to whom written legal opinions have been provided to respond to a survey of their satisfaction with the ACWL’s legal advice.² In keeping with the ACWL’s obligation to maintain the confidentiality of countries seeking its advice, the responses to this survey are confidential and can be reported here only on an aggregate basis.

In the 2019 survey, 98 per cent of those who responded found the legal advice to be either “highly satisfactory” (68 per cent) or “very satisfactory” (30 per cent). Only one respondent found the ACWL’s advice to be satisfactory (2 per cent). No respondent found the ACWL’s advice to be unsatisfactory. They also reported that the opinions addressed all legal issues raised in the request. The ACWL uses the feedback for improving its services.

² In 2019, 29 developing country Members and 14 LDCs sought the ACWL’s legal advice. With respect to the questionnaires sent out in 2019, the ACWL received 44 responses from 20 different developing country Members and 8 LDCs.
from the survey to review internally the quality and efficiency with which it provides its legal opinions.

All of the respondents to the ACWL's survey stated that the ACWL's legal opinions were helpful to their governments in furthering their understanding of their rights and obligations under WTO law. The respondents spoke very highly of the ACWL's work. The following is a selection of the comments provided by the respondents:

• "The ACWL's legal advice has not only helped us better to understand some obligations and options but has had a direct impact in the resolution of some of the legal issues we brought to their attention."

• "The ACWL's legal opinion benefitted my government in preparing its oral arguments and written submissions regarding trade remedies investigations, public hearings and bilateral consultations. The ACWL's legal advice is highly recommended by us."

• "The ACWL's legal advice is always sound and timely. It provides important inputs to improve our understanding of different aspects of WTO law, while it also contributes to the development of our positions and the consideration of possible future steps under each case."

• "The ACWL can be very helpful to LDCs with limited legal expertise; the ACWL's lawyers are experienced professionals who are always ready to assist. The legal opinions we received were clear and thorough such that the Government was able to make decisions having considered the legal aspects of the matter."

Survey of users' satisfaction with the ACWL's legal advice

- Highly satisfactory (68%)
- Very satisfactory (29.5%)
- Satisfactory (2.5%)
The ACWL provides support in WTO dispute settlement proceedings to its developing country Members and LDCs. As with its other services, the ACWL does so only at the request of a developing country Member or an LDC: the ACWL may not develop or propose dispute settlement proceedings on its own initiative (the no "ambulance chasing" rule).

The ACWL is, however, frequently requested to evaluate a potential dispute and assist in developing the legal aspects of the case. The ACWL works in partnership with the relevant developing country Member or LDC and assists the litigating country in every step of the dispute. Prior to the initiation of a dispute, the ACWL’s lawyers prepare a legal opinion, assessing the merits of the case and identifying its strengths and weaknesses. Once a dispute is initiated, the ACWL’s lawyers collaborate with delegates and capital-based officials to prepare for the consultations. During panel stage, Appellate Body procedures, and other proceedings, the ACWL’s lawyers work with these officials in drafting the written submissions, oral statements, and answers to questions. The ACWL’s lawyers also participate in the proceedings as part of the developing country’s or LDC’s delegation.

To the extent possible, the ACWL encourages and guides the government officials in participating to the greatest extent possible in the preparation and presentation of the case. This collaboration enables the ACWL to ensure both that the government has the best possible advice and that it can take advantage of the capacity building opportunity that participation in a WTO dispute provides.
In contrast to legal advice and training, which are provided free of charge, the ACWL charges fees – at rates substantially below those of commercial law firms – for its support in WTO dispute settlement proceedings. The current schedule of fees established by the ACWL’s Management Board is available at https://www.acwl.ch/fees.

Since its inception in 2001, the ACWL has provided direct support to its developing country Members and LDCs in 65 separate WTO dispute settlement proceedings through its own staff and in eight proceedings through external counsel. This is approximately 19 per cent of all WTO disputes initiated since 2002, the first full year of activity of the ACWL. A list of these disputes is set out in Appendix 1.

Most ACWL developing country Members and LDCs participate relatively infrequently in WTO disputes. Collectively, however, these countries participate as much as the main users of the WTO dispute settlement system. Through its extensive participation in disputes on behalf of its users, the ACWL has acquired legal experience comparable to that of the main users of the system. In fact, if it were a WTO Member, the ACWL would have been the third main user of the system (together with China), after the United States and the European Union. This enables the ACWL to pool the legal experience of developing countries and LDCs in WTO legal matters. At the same time, it enables each of those countries to draw on this collective experience to defend their individual interests in dispute settlement proceedings.

The table on the following page shows the number of new dispute settlement proceedings initiated each year in the WTO since 2002, the first full year in which the ACWL was in existence, as well as the number of new disputes each year in which the ACWL has provided support.

In addition to providing support to its developing country Members and LDCs directly through its staff lawyers, the ACWL also provides support through external legal counsel. WTO dispute settlement proceedings between developing countries, including

---

3 For this purpose, disputes involving multiple complainants are counted as a single dispute. For example, the proceedings in *Dominican Republic – Safeguard Measures on Imports of Polypropylene Bags and Tubular Fabric* (DS 415, DS 416, DS 417, and DS 418), in which Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras and El Salvador were complainants, are counted as a single dispute.

4 As main parties, the United States participated in 279 disputes; the European Union in 190 disputes; and the ACWL and China both participated in 65 disputes.
between those entitled to the ACWL's services, are increasingly common. The ACWL can provide direct support to two or more parties involved in the same proceeding when they have compatible objectives. When parties pursuing incompatible objectives request the services of the ACWL on the same matter, however, the ACWL's lawyers can assist only the party that first requested the ACWL's services. In these cases, the ACWL provides support to the other party through external counsel.

For this purpose, the ACWL has established a Roster of External Counsel, which is made up of law firms and individuals that have experience in WTO dispute settlement proceedings and that have agreed to represent developing countries and LDCs when the ACWL's lawyers cannot do so because of a conflict of interest. The party that cannot be assisted by the ACWL's lawyers selects its own counsel from the Roster.

The selected counsel provides the same support that the ACWL's lawyers would have provided in the absence of the conflict of interest. The ACWL finances the difference between the fees agreed with the external counsel and the fees that the ACWL would have charged for the same services. The law firms and lawyers on the Roster of External Counsel are listed in Appendix 2.

---

ACWL involvement in WTO dispute settlement proceedings (2002-2019)

Note: The statistics in this table are based on the number of new "DS numbers" assigned to new disputes each year since 2002 (the first full year of operations of the ACWL). Thus, cases with multiple complainants are counted separately (e.g. the EC - Sugar case counts as three disputes: DS 265, DS 266 and DS 283).
The chart below provides details on the distribution of the ACWL’s support in WTO dispute settlement proceedings during the period 2001-2019 by category of ACWL Member and LDCs.

*Assistance in dispute settlement proceedings by category of Member 2001-2019*

- Category A (1%)
- Category B (56%)
- Category C (41%)
- LDCs (2.5%)
In 2019, WTO Members initiated a total of 19 new dispute settlement proceedings. The ACWL is providing support to the complainant in two of these disputes and to the respondent in one of these disputes. In addition, during 2019, the ACWL began to work on a dispute that had been initiated in 2018 and continued to work on 13 other disputes that had begun in previous years. Thus, the ACWL was involved in a total of 17 separate dispute settlement proceedings during 2019. These disputes are described in more detail on the following pages.

NEW DISPUTES

- As complainant -

The ACWL is assisting Guatemala in India - Measures Concerning Sugar and Sugarcane (DS 581). On 15 March 2019, Guatemala requested consultations with India regarding certain domestic measures that allegedly support domestic producers of sugarcane and sugar, and certain alleged export subsidies that India provides for sugarcane and sugar. Guatemala alleged that the domestic support measures were inconsistent with Articles 3.2, 6.3 and 7.2(b) of the Agreement on Agriculture and that India's export subsidy measures were inconsistent with Articles 3.3, 8, 9.1 and 10.1 of the Agreement on Agriculture and with Article 3 of the SCM Agreement. Consultations were held on 22 May 2019. However, they failed to settle the dispute. On 11 July 2019, Guatemala requested the establishment of a panel. On 15 August 2019, the Dispute Settlement Body of the WTO (DSB) established a panel. On 28 October 2019, at Guatemala's request, the Director-General of the WTO composed the panel. The panel proceedings are currently underway.

The ACWL is also assisting Tunisia in Morocco - Definitive Anti-Dumping Measures on School Exercise Books from Tunisia (DS 578). On 21 February 2019, Tunisia requested consultations with Morocco concerning certain definitive anti-dumping measures imposed by Morocco on imports of school exercise books. Previously, in July 2018, Tunisia had requested consultations with Morocco regarding the provisional anti-dumping measures in the same investigation (DS 555).

Tunisia's request for consultations alleged that Morocco's definitive anti-dumping measures were inconsistent with various provisions of the Anti-Dumping Agreement: the dumping determination was inconsistent with Articles 2 and 6.8 and Annex II; the injury and causation determinations were inconsistent with Articles 3 and 4; procedural aspects of Morocco's investigation were inconsistent with Articles 5, 6, and 9; and the measures were imposed in a manner that was inconsistent with Articles 11, 12, and 18. In June 2019, Tunisia and Morocco held consultations, which failed to resolve the dispute. On 19 September 2019, Tunisia requested the establishment of a panel. On 28 October 2019, the DSB established a panel. The panel proceedings are currently underway.

- As respondent -

The ACWL is assisting Colombia in Colombia - Measures Concerning the Distribution of Liquid Fuels (DS 575). On 9 January 2019, Venezuela requested consultations with Colombia with respect to certain measures imposed by Colombia governing the distribution of liquid fuels, including a series of distribution and licensing measures, and product surcharges, market access measures and pricing policies. Venezuela claimed that these measures appear to be inconsistent with some basic provisions of the GATT 1994, in particular Articles I:1, III:4, V:2, XI:1, and XXIV:12 of the GATT 1994. Thus far, the establishment of a panel has not been requested.
The ACWL is assisting Turkey in *Turkey - Additional Duties on Imports of Air Conditioning Machines from Thailand* (DS 573). On 5 December 2018, Thailand requested consultations with Turkey regarding an additional duty imposed by Turkey on imports of air conditioning machines from Thailand. Thailand argued that the measure at issue is inconsistent with Articles 8.2 and 12.3 of the Agreement on Safeguards and Articles I:1, II:1(a), II:1(b), XIX:2 and XIX:3 of the GATT 1994. Consultations failed to resolve the dispute between the parties. On 14 February 2019, Thailand requested the establishment of a panel, which was established by the DSB on 11 April 2019. On 28 June 2019, the Director-General of the WTO composed the panel. The panel process is currently underway.

**ONGOING DISPUTES**

- **As complainant** -

The ACWL is assisting Turkey in *United States – Certain Measures on Steel and Aluminium Products* (DS 564). On 15 August 2018, Turkey requested consultations on measures imposed by the United States affecting imports of steel and aluminium. Turkey raised concerns that the measures were inconsistent with the GATT 1994 on the grounds that, *inter alia*, they were not applied on a most-favoured-nation (MFN) basis, were inconsistent with the United States’ Schedule of Concessions, and were not applied in a uniform, impartial, and reasonable manner. Turkey also raised concerns that the measures were inconsistent with Article XIX of the GATT 1994 and the Agreement on Safeguards on the grounds that the United States had not complied with the requirements to impose a safeguard measure. Consultations failed to resolve the dispute. On 21 November 2018, upon request from Turkey, the DSB established a panel. On 25 January 2019, upon a request from Turkey, the Director-General composed the panel. The panel proceedings are currently underway.

The ACWL is assisting Turkey in *Morocco – Anti-Dumping Measures on Certain Hot-Rolled Steel from Turkey* (DS 513), in which Turkey challenged certain aspects of Morocco’s anti-dumping measures imposed on imports of hot-rolled steel products from Turkey, as inconsistent with various provisions of the Anti-Dumping Agreement. On 31 October 2018, the panel issued its report, in which it found that the
measures at issue were inconsistent with Articles 5.10, 6.8, 6.9, 3.1 and 3.4 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement and the GATT 1994. On 20 November 2018, Morocco appealed the panel report. On 4 December 2019, Morocco withdrew its notice of appeal, indicating that the measures had expired on 26 September 2019. Accordingly, on 10 December 2019, the Appellate Body issued its report, indicating that it did not address the substantive legal issues raised by Morocco in its appeal, and that, in light of Morocco’s withdrawal of the appeal, it had completed its work in the appeal.

The ACWL is assisting Chinese Taipei and Viet Nam as co-complainants before the panel and Viet Nam before the Appellate Body in Indonesia – Safeguard on Certain Iron or Steel Products (DS 490, DS 496). The co-complainants challenged Indonesia’s specific duty on imports of flat-rolled product of iron or non-alloy steel, which was applied as a “safeguard measure” under Indonesian law, as inconsistent with Article XIX:1(a) of the GATT 1994 and various provisions of the Agreement on Safeguards. The co-complainants also argued that the measure was inconsistent with the MFN principle of Article I:1 of the GATT 1994. The panel and the Appellate Body found that the specific duty was not a “safeguard measure” for purposes of Article XIX of the GATT 1994 and the Agreement on Safeguards, but that it was inconsistent with Article I:1 of the GATT 1994. The DSB adopted both reports on 27 August 2018. The reasonable period of time for implementation of these reports was set by the parties to expire on 27 March 2019. On 15 April 2019, Indonesia informed the DSB that it had withdrawn the measure that gave rise to the dispute.

The ACWL is assisting Panama as the complainant in Colombia – Measures Relating to the Importation of Textiles, Apparel and Footwear (DS 461). In this dispute, both parties requested Article 21.5 compliance panels to examine Colombia’s compliance measures. On 5 October 2018, the Article 21.5 panels circulated their report to the Members. They found that Colombia’s compliance measures were not inconsistent with the GATT 1994 or the Customs Valuation Agreement. On 20 November 2018, Panama notified its decision to appeal. Due to the problems in the Appellate Body, the appeal has not yet been completed.

The ACWL continued to act as co-counsel to Honduras as the complainant in Australia – Certain Measures Concerning Trademarks, Geographical Indications and Other Plain Packaging Requirements Applicable to Tobacco Products and Packaging (DS 435), in which Honduras is challenging certain Australian laws and regulations that impose trademark restrictions and other plain packaging requirements for tobacco products and packaging.

The ACWL also continued to act as co-counsel to the Dominican Republic as complainant in Australia – Certain Measures Concerning Trademarks, Geographical Indications and Other Plain Packaging Requirements Applicable to Tobacco Products and Packaging (DS 441), in which the Dominican Republic is challenging certain Australian laws and regulations that impose trademark restrictions and other plain packaging requirements for tobacco products and packaging. The Dominican Republic’s claims are similar to those of Honduras with respect to the same measures in DS 435 above.

On 28 June 2018, the panel circulated its report in these disputes. The panel rejected all of the claims brought by the co-complainants. Honduras and the Dominican Republic appealed the panel report on 19 July and 23 September 2018, respectively. The Appellate Body is expected to issue its report in the first half of 2020.

- As respondent -

The ACWL is assisting Peru in Peru – Anti-Dumping and Countervailing Measures on Biodiesel from Argentina (DS 572). On 29 November 2018, Argentina requested consultations on anti-dumping and countervailing
measures imposed by Peru on imports of biodiesel from Argentina. Argentina challenged various aspects of Peru’s anti-dumping measures as inconsistent with the Anti-Dumping Agreement and of the countervailing duty measures as inconsistent with the Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (the SCM Agreement). This dispute is still in the consultations phase.

The ACWL is assisting Turkey in Turkey – Additional Duties on Certain Products from the United States (DS 561). On 16 July 2018, the United States requested consultations on additional duties imposed by Turkey on certain products originating in the United States. The United States claimed that the measures appear to be inconsistent with the MFN clause and the concessions made by Turkey in its Schedule of Concessions. On 18 October 2018, the United States requested additional consultations based on an amendment by Turkey of the additional duty measure. On 28 January 2019, upon request from the United States, the DSB established a panel. On 28 February 2019, upon request from the United States, the Director-General composed the panel. The panel proceedings are currently underway.

The ACWL is assisting Pakistan in Pakistan – Anti-Dumping Measures on Biaxially Oriented Polypropylene Film from the United Arab Emirates (DS 538). In January 2018, the United Arab Emirates requested consultations on certain anti-dumping measures imposed by Pakistan on imports of biaxially oriented polypropylene (BOPP) film from the United Arab Emirates. The consultations covered both the original and the sunset review determinations. The United Arab Emirates claimed that the measures are inconsistent with various provisions of the Anti-Dumping Agreement and the GATT 1994. According to the United Arab Emirates, Pakistan’s investigating authority made several errors in its determinations and in the conduct of its investigation and the sunset review. Consultations did not resolve the dispute. On 28 October 2018, upon a request from the United Arab Emirates, the DSB established a panel. On 7 May 2019, the panel was composed based on the agreement on the parties. The panel proceedings are currently underway.

The ACWL is assisting Costa Rica in Costa Rica – Measures Concerning the Importation of Fresh Avocados from Mexico (DS 524). In March 2017, Mexico requested consultations on certain measures imposed by Costa Rica on the importation of avocados from Mexico, which Mexico considers to be inconsistent with various provisions of the SPS Agreement and of the GATT 1994. Consultations failed to resolve the dispute. On 22 November 2018, Mexico requested the establishment of a panel. The panel was established by the DSB on 18 December 2018. On 16 May 2019, the panel was composed based on the agreement on the parties. The panel proceedings are currently underway.
The ACWL is assisting Thailand in *Thailand – Subsidies Concerning Sugar* (DS 507), in which Brazil challenges certain aspects of Thailand’s support regime for its sugar industry as inconsistent with Articles 3.2, 3.3, 6.3, 8, 9.1 and 10.1 of the Agreement on Agriculture and Articles 3.1(a), 3.2, 5(c), and 6.3 of the SCM Agreement. Consultations began in June 2016 and are continuing.

The ACWL continued to act as co-counsel to Indonesia in the original panel proceedings in *Indonesia – Measures Concerning the Importation of Chicken Meat and Chicken Products* (DS 484), in which Brazil argued that certain measures imposed by Indonesia on the importation of chicken meat and other chicken products, including, *inter alia*, non-approval of health certificates and aspects of Indonesia’s import licensing regime for these products, were inconsistent with Article 8 and Annex C of the SPS Agreement; Article 4.2 of the Agreement on Agriculture; Articles 1.3, 3.2, 3.3 of the Import Licensing Agreement; and Articles III:4 and XI:1 of the GATT 1994. While the panel rejected most of Brazil’s claims, it also found a limited number of violations under the GATT 1994 and the Agreement on Agriculture. The reasonable period of time for implementation expired on 22 July 2018. On 27 July 2018, Brazil and Indonesia agreed on a sequencing agreement. On 13 June 2019, Brazil requested the establishment of a compliance panel with respect to Indonesia’s alleged failure to implement the DSB recommendations and rulings in this dispute. On 24 June 2019, the DSB established a compliance panel.

The ACWL continues to assist Thailand in *Thailand – Customs and Fiscal Measures on Cigarettes from the Philippines* (DS 371). In this dispute, there are overlapping proceedings under Article 21.5 of the DSU regarding Thailand’s implementation of the recommendations and rulings of the DSB. In the Philippines’ first recourse to Article 21.5, the panel issued its report on 12 November 2018, finding that Thailand had failed to bring itself into compliance, in that its measures were inconsistent with the GATT 1994 and the Customs Valuation Agreement. On 9 January 2019, Thailand notified the DSB of its decision to appeal to the Appellate Body certain issues of law and legal interpretations in the compliance panel report. In the Philippines’ second recourse to Article 21.5, the panel was established on 27 March 2018. The panel issued its report on 12 July 2019, finding that Thailand had failed to bring itself into compliance, in that a second set of measures were inconsistent with the Customs Valuation Agreement. On 9 September 2019, Thailand notified the DSB of its decision to appeal to the Appellate Body certain issues of law and legal interpretations in the second compliance panel report. The appeals in the two compliance proceedings are currently pending before the Appellate Body.
Support provided through external counsel

In 2019, Thailand continued to receive support through external counsel in Turkey - Additional Duties on Imports of Air Conditioning Machines from Thailand (DS 573) (described in more detail above).

To date, the ACWL has provided support through external counsel in eight WTO dispute settlement proceedings. These are listed in Appendix 1.

Survey of satisfaction

The ACWL regularly consults with the Ambassadors and other responsible officials of the governments that the ACWL is assisting in dispute settlement proceedings as to their satisfaction with the services provided by the ACWL. The details of the lawyer-client relationship relating to advocacy and litigation strategy must remain confidential. Nevertheless, the ACWL consistently receives praise and appreciation from the Members for its dedication, hard work, and most importantly for the very high-level quality of its performance. The users of the ACWL praised the ACWL for the high standard of its written submissions and oral interventions at hearings, as well as its promptness and responsiveness in addressing the needs of the governments. No delegation has expressed any dissatisfaction with the quality of the ACWL's legal advice and technical work on dispute settlement proceedings.
The ACWL provides training on WTO law through annual training courses, ad hoc seminars on WTO legal issues of general interest, country-specific seminars or workshops, a study group for women delegates, as well as the Secondment Programme for Trade Lawyers. As with the ACWL’s legal advice, the ACWL’s training services are provided free of charge to its developing country Members and the LDCs.

The ACWL’s annual training course runs from October to June each year. The course is open to delegates of developing country Members and LDCs that are based in Geneva. It consists of a weekly class held at the ACWL’s offices from 13:00 to 15:00 each Thursday. A light lunch is provided. The course is run on a three-year cycle. In the first year, the course covers the basic principles of WTO law; in the second year, the WTO agreements relating to trade remedies, trade in services, trade-related intellectual property rights, and other disciplines; and in the third year, the WTO dispute settlement procedures. The course includes a popular moot court exercise in which course participants take part in a simulated dispute settlement proceeding involving the legal issues addressed during the course. Participants that attend a required minimum number of sessions in a given year are awarded a Certificate of Training. To date, the ACWL has awarded 540 Certificates of Training to delegates from nearly all ACWL developing country Members and from two thirds of the LDCs with missions in Geneva.

In addition to its annual training course, the ACWL offers ad hoc seminars on significant panel or Appellate Body reports and other issues of legal significance. It also offers country-specific tailor-made seminars or workshops by videoconference or at its offices for visiting delegations from capitals at the request of its developing country Members and the LDCs. For reasons of budget and fairness, the ACWL can provide its training seminars on-site in capitals only where the requesting Member or LDC, or an outside sponsor, can cover the ACWL’s travel and accommodation expenses. The ACWL also continues to hold a study group for women delegates.
Institutional capacity is one of the major concerns for all LDCs and [us] in particular. We have been working very hard to formulate our laws and regulations to be in line with WTO commitments... We are grateful for the ACWL’s continued support.

- ACWL Member -

In 2005, the ACWL launched the Secondment Programme for Trade Lawyers, under which government lawyers from developing country Members and LDCs join the staff of the ACWL as paid trainees for a nine-month term starting in mid-September and ending in mid-June of the following year. The programme has been extremely successful and gives government lawyers from the ACWL’s developing country Members and the LDCs an opportunity to work with, and learn from, the ACWL’s lawyers on WTO legal issues and in dispute settlement proceedings. It has been funded by voluntary contributions made by developed country Members of the ACWL.

As described in the section on "Outreach" below, in accordance with the ACWL’s mandate to cooperate with the WTO in its training activities, the ACWL also continues to cooperate with the WTO and other organizations in training and capacity-building programmes for developing countries and LDCs. The ACWL appreciates its excellent cooperation with the WTO on these matters. In addition, the ACWL regularly cooperates with entities such as the IDB, ITC, and UNCTAD on training activities. The ACWL welcomes further opportunities to cooperate with these and other organizations.

■ Annual Training Courses

In June 2019, the ACWL completed its seventeenth annual training course, which focused on WTO dispute settlement procedures. The course included both a moot court exercise and an optional written examination. At the conclusion of the course, 38 of the 73 delegates that registered for the course had attended the required number of sessions and received a Certificate of Training.

In the moot court exercise, participants were divided into four teams representing the complainant, respondent, third party, and panel. The teams prepared written and oral submissions and a panel report on a simulated WTO dispute settlement proceeding. The exercise included a hearing held in one of the rooms used for panel hearings in dispute settlement proceedings at the WTO.

The ACWL also offered participants that had completed the course the opportunity to take an optional written exam at the end of the course. Out of the 34 delegates that chose to take the exam, 33 passed and received Certificates of Achievement.
In October 2019, the ACWL commenced its eighteenth annual training course, which focuses on Services, Intellectual Property, Trade Remedies and Other Disciplines. The course includes a moot court exercise and practical sessions applying the legal principles taught to hypothetical factual situations. The course will end in May 2020.

Survey of satisfaction

At the end of each year’s training course, the ACWL asks the participants to complete a questionnaire on the course. This feedback is helpful in maintaining and improving the quality of the ACWL’s training courses. In May 2019, all responding participants reported that the training course was either "highly satisfactory" or "very satisfactory". No respondent described the course as "satisfactory", "somewhat satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory". The chart on the next page shows the breakdown of responses to the survey by level of satisfaction.

Responding participants found the moot court exercise either "extremely helpful" or "very helpful" (86.5 per cent), and "helpful" (13.5 per cent). No participants found the moot court to be "somewhat helpful" or "not helpful".

Most participants stated that they had been able to apply what they learned in the training course in their daily work either "frequently" (54.5 per cent) or "sometimes" (27 per cent). Other participants indicated that they had applied what they had learned "once" (13.5 per cent), while another participant had "never applied" what he had learned. One participant said he used what he learned in the course to understand agreements. Another participant said that the session on Safeguards and Agriculture helped him to understand real issues being dealt with.

In their comments on the course, one participant said "the speakers are all very good at making difficult texts easy to understand". Another participant said "the ACWL’s training course provides a solid knowledge to those that do not know much about WTO Law and Jurisprudence". Another said that "since my participation in October 2018, my knowledge about WTO has notably progressed". Another said that "it is really helpful to understand the WTO Agreements book. I could not do it without having joined the ACWL course".

Survey of users’ satisfaction with the ACWL’s training course

- Highly satisfactory (79%)
- Very satisfactory (21%)
In addition to its annual training course, the ACWL offers *ad hoc* seminars at its offices on topical issues of WTO law and jurisprudence that are of particular interest to its developing country Members and the LDCs. These seminars are taught by the ACWL’s lawyers and normally follow the same format as the Thursday sessions of the annual training course, as described above. For example, in 2019, the ACWL continued its study group for women delegates and launched its thematic sessions for French-speaking delegates.

The ACWL held two sessions of the **study group for women delegates** on issues of WTO law in 2019. Together with the Commonwealth Small States Office (CSSO), the ACWL organised a study session to discuss the panel report in *Russia - Traffic in Transit* (DS 512). This report raises important systemic issues since it is the first WTO ruling regarding the "national security" exception in the GATT 1994. The group met again to discuss the Appellate Body Report in *Korea - Radionuclides* (Japan) (DS 495), which raises interesting questions regarding the proper interpretation and application of key provisions in the SPS Agreement.

The ACWL launched its **thematic sessions on WTO law in French** in 2019. The first session covered legal issues related to the current negotiations on e-commerce and was well received by the 17 francophone delegates present. The group discussed the existing WTO rules relevant to e-commerce, as well as the background to the current negotiations and the legal aspects of recent proposals put forward by Members.

The ACWL plans to continue these activities in 2020.

**Workshop in Indonesia**

In March 2019, the ACWL conducted a four-day training workshop in Yogyakarta, Indonesia, for over 70 Indonesian government officials. An ACWL team led by Deputy Director Cherise Valles conducted 22 modules, covering general WTO principles and
exceptions, the DSU, as well as the Agriculture, SPS, TBT and SCM Agreements. The modules combined lectures with case studies and practical exercises designed to help the participants understand complicated WTO rules and legal procedures of the dispute settlement mechanism. The participants reported a high overall satisfaction with the workshop, with seventy-five per cent of the participants saying that they would use what they learned very frequently or frequently in their work, while the remaining 25 per cent said they would use it occasionally. The workshop was funded by the Canada–Indonesia Trade and Private Sector Assistance (TPSA) project and the Indonesian government.

**Country-specific seminars**

Developing country Members and LDCs are increasingly availing of the ACWL's training services by requesting the ACWL to provide **country-specific tailor-made seminars or workshops** that are of particular interest to their officials. These sessions are available free of charge at the request of individual Members or LDCs. However, as the ACWL lacks funding to send its lawyers to capitals, these seminars and workshops are normally conducted at the ACWL's offices or by videoconference to capital-based officials.

In 2019, the ACWL provided 12 country-specific seminars at the request of eight different countries, including three LDCs. These covered a wide range of topics including: (i) WTO dispute settlement procedures; (ii) trade remedies; and (iii) intellectual property. Several of these courses were held over a one-week period, and one included a moot court in which the participants simulated several stages of a trade remedy dispute, from consultations to an Appellate Body hearing. These sessions enable capital- or Geneva-based officials to participate in the ACWL's training activities and to seek advice on the specific matters of WTO law on which they are working on a daily basis. On request, the ACWL will continue these sessions in 2020.

**Secondment Programme for Trade Lawyers**

To date, a total of 47 government lawyers from 18 different developing countries and ten different LDCs have participated in the Secondment Programme for Trade Lawyers. Most recently, Ms Koolanant Boonyasait (Thailand), Mr. Mulualem Getachew (Ethiopia), Mr. Sai Krishna Prasad Gopisetty (India), and Ms Silvia Mulhovo Scuzzarella (Mozambique) completed their secondments in June 2019 and returned to their positions in their governments. Ms Boonyasait returned to work at Thailand's Department of Trade Negotiations, where she provides legal advice on WTO law and regional trade matters. Mr. Getachew returned to his position in Ethiopia's Ministry of Foreign Affairs,
where his duties include working on aspects of Ethiopia's WTO accession. Mr. Prasad returned to India's Ministry of Commerce where he assists in India's WTO dispute settlement proceedings. Ms Mulhovo returned to her position in the Ministry of Economy and Finance in Mozambique, where she is focal point for the ratification and implementation of the African Continental Free Trade Area.

These lawyers described their experiences in the ACWL's Secondment Programme as follows:

- "My experience at the ACWL improved my exposure to WTO jurisprudence, understanding of WTO dispute settlement procedures, and the art of drafting. I also find that the drafting skills picked up by working with ACWL's experienced lawyers have saved a significant amount of time for me while also improving the drafting quality."

- "The relationships that were built with my secondment lawyer colleagues, the ACWL team and the delegates with whom we shared classes were truly special. I am grateful to the ACWL team for their mentorship and this opportunity to meet wonderful people."

- "Working as a seconded lawyer at the ACWL has added a lot to my career development."

- "Working alongside the experienced WTO lawyers at the ACWL was a truly valuable experience for me. The ACWL lawyers tried to get us involved as much as possible in preparing the dispute settlement cases so that we could have a glimpse of how the WTO's dispute settlement proceeding really works in the field. We also assisted them in preparing the legal opinions which enabled me to deepen my knowledge on WTO law and improve my legal drafting skills thanks to the feedbacks the lawyers diligently gave back on our drafts. The skills and knowledge I gained from the ACWL can be applied to my current work. The experience I have garnered from the ACWL is immense, eye-opening, and wide ranging. After 9 months of the Secondment Programme, I'm equipped with a tremendous understanding of WTO laws, procedures and research resources."

- "The ACWL is an environment where everybody loves to keep working, staying late after work hours to contribute more. I can now serve my country with the knowledge and skills I got from ACWL."

Developing country Members and LDCs nominated a total of 73 candidates for the fifteenth (2019-2020) cycle of the Programme. The ACWL interviewed 18 of these candidates by videoconference or telephone and selected 7 candidates that were invited to Geneva for a written exam and final interviews. The four successful candidates, Ms Shazia Bi Kurmoo (Mauritius), Mr. Marvin Ikondere (Uganda), Ms Laura Magaly Fernandez (Paraguay) and Mr. Andrés Valladares (Guatemala), are now working at the ACWL and will finish their secondments in June 2020. Their biographies are on the next page.
Ms Shazia Bi Kurmoo, from Mauritius, is a Trade Policy Analyst at the International Trade Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Regional Integration and International Trade. Her responsibilities include assisting in the definition and implementation of Mauritius’ trade policy; providing support in trade negotiations; acting as desk officer for the WTO Fisheries Subsidies negotiations as well as providing support in trade remedies matters. Her work involves also liaising with regional trade organisations, other ministries, and the private sector on trade policy issues. Ms Kurmoo holds a Bachelor of Laws from the University of Mauritius, as well as a Master’s Degree in International Relations Law and European Union Law from Université Paris Nanterre.

Mr. Marvin Ikondere, from Uganda, is a Lawyer and Legal Advisor at the Department of International Legal and Social Affairs, Trade Law Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. His responsibilities include drafting and vetting memoranda of understanding and international trade agreements; providing legal opinions and advising on the consistency of Uganda’s trade laws and obligations under international agreements; preparing for and advising on trade facilitation negotiations and the review of Uganda’s Trade Policy Review. Mr. Ikondere holds an LLM in International Treaty Law from Euclid University, Gambia and a Bachelor of Laws from Makerere University, Uganda.

Ms Laura Magaly Fernandez, from Paraguay, is a Lawyer at the Directorate of Industry Development from the Ministry of Industry and Trade. Her responsibilities include the review of trade-related laws and other normative provisions related to the industrial sector. She also represents the Ministry at meetings with the private sector to review and improve procedures relating to the importation and exportation of goods. Ms Fernandez holds a Bachelor of Laws from the National University of Asuncion, as well as a Master’s Degree in Taxation from the Higher Institute of Business and Taxation of Paraguay.

Mr. Andrés Valladares, from Guatemala, has served as a Legal Consultant at the National Program for Competitiveness, an official branch of the Ministry of Economy, since 2014. His responsibilities include promoting interinstitutional alliances between the public and private sectors to improve Guatemala’s competitiveness; providing documentation and developing specific procedures on business and trade to facilitate the exchange of information and to improve business opportunities in Guatemala. Mr. Valladares also works closely with the Fiscal Authority of Guatemala in order to reduce customs formalities and procedures that could affect the access to the Guatemalan market. Mr. Valladares has a Law Degree from the Universidad Rafael Landivar, Guatemala.
Many of the governments that use the ACWL's services frequently rotate their officials, both in their Missions in Geneva and in the departments responsible for international trade and legal matters. In these circumstances, even when it is fully busy, the ACWL is constantly seeking to ensure that the relevant developing country and LDC officials in both the Missions and capitals are fully aware of the services provided by the ACWL and how to access them.

To this end, the ACWL organises its own outreach activities and participates to the extent possible in seminars, conferences on international trade law issues, training programmes on WTO law and other events conducted by the WTO, other international organizations, and non-governmental organizations. These activities help to inform developing and least-developed government officials about the ACWL's services and provide an excellent opportunity for delegates from developing countries and LDCs to meet the ACWL's lawyers and to learn how best to take advantage of the ACWL's services. They also permit the ACWL to explain to civil society the role of developing countries and LDCs in the multilateral trading system, thus raising awareness of the ACWL and its activities.

The ACWL hosts regular information sessions for delegates from developing country Members and LDCs. The purpose of these sessions is to acquaint these delegates with the ACWL's services in an informal setting. The ACWL also routinely coordinates with the LDC Consultative Group and the African Group on ways in which the ACWL can respond to the legal needs of the LDCs.

The ACWL also cooperates with the WTO in its training activities. In 2019, the ACWL's lawyers made 13 presentations at WTO training courses, including the Introductory Trade Policy Course for LDCs, the Advanced Trade Policy Course, and advanced courses on the SPS Agreement and on dispute settlement. The ACWL also made several presentations at the WTO Public Forum, the WTO's largest annual outreach event. In addition to substantive issues of WTO law, these presentations explained the ACWL's activities and role in the multilateral trading system. These activities provide an excellent opportunity to introduce the ACWL and its lawyers to capital-based officials that cannot participate in the ACWL's training courses in Geneva. The ACWL appreciates these opportunities to collaborate with the WTO.
The Geneva Week events hosted by the WTO for developing countries and LDCs that do not have permanent representations in Geneva are a particularly valuable opportunity for the ACWL to introduce its services to visitors from the capitals of these developing countries and LDCs. During Geneva Week, the ACWL participates in the seminars provided to delegates and regularly hosts a luncheon and information session for the visiting delegates at its offices. For example, during the Geneva Week in May 2019, the ACWL hosted a lunch and offered presentations on its services in each of the three WTO official languages.

The ACWL is also an active supporter of the John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition (formerly ELSA Moot Court on WTO Law), a worldwide competition that enables law students around the world to learn WTO law and hone their litigation skills in a simulated WTO panel proceeding. In 2019, the ACWL supported the competition by providing lawyers to serve as judges for the African Round, the European Rounds and the Final Round of the competition. It also provided, together with the WTO, individual workshops for the coaches of the African Round of the competition via videoconference. In 2019, a team from Strathmore University, from Nairobi, Kenya, won the competition. The team was coached by Harrison Mbori of Strathmore and the ACWL’s Christian Vidal-León. The Strathmore team’s victory is all the more remarkable because it is also the first time that an African team has advanced to the knockout stages of the final round.

Finally, the ACWL also cooperates on a regular basis with other organizations, such as WTI, IDB, CIDS, CSSO, Policy Center for the New South, Center for WTO studies, European University Institute, African Academy of International Law Practice, and others, on developing and implementing outreach activities and training programmes relating to WTO law.

The ACWL welcomes invitations from these and other groups to participate in activities that help introduce its services to developing countries and LDCs. A full list of the seminars, conferences, presentations and other outreach activities in which the ACWL’s lawyers participated in 2019 is provided in Appendix 3.

The ACWL has always provided excellent legal advice for developing and least-developed countries, which undoubtedly has helped to strengthen their ability to negotiate and has enhanced a better implementation of trade rules.

- ACWL Member -
The ACWL’s developed country Members provide most of the funding for the operations of the ACWL through voluntary contributions. They are not, however, entitled to the services of the ACWL. They participate in the governance of the ACWL through the General Assembly. As of 31 December 2019, the ACWL had 11 developed country Members, the same as at the end of 2018. These countries are listed in Appendix 4.

The ACWL also recognizes the status of “Associate Member” and “Contributing Observer” for developed country WTO Members that wish to support the work of the ACWL but that have not yet become full Members of the ACWL. In 2017, Germany became the first Associate Member of the ACWL.

Developing countries

All developing country Members of the WTO and developing countries in the process of acceding to the WTO are, as such, entitled to join the ACWL. There were 21 original developing country Members of the ACWL, and 16 other developing countries have subsequently acceded to the ACWL. Latvia withdrew from the ACWL in 2004 upon joining the EU. Morocco, which had signed its Protocol of Accession in 2017, ratified the Protocol and completed the process of accession in June 2019. Therefore, the ACWL now has 36 developing country Members. Kazakhstan signed its Protocol of Accession on 13 December 2019 and is expected to complete its accession and become the 37th developing country Member of the ACWL in 2020.

The 36 developing country Members are listed in Appendix 4.

LDCs

Any country designated by the United Nations as an LDC is automatically entitled to the services of the ACWL, provided that it is a Member of the WTO or in the process of acceding to the WTO. Unlike developing countries, LDCs need not join the ACWL as Members or contribute to the ACWL’s Endowment Fund in order to acquire the right to use the ACWL’s services. As of 31 December 2019, there were 44 LDCs entitled to the services of the ACWL. These are listed in Appendix 5.

The ACWL’s geographical reach

As of 31 December 2019, the ACWL’s services were available to a total of 80 countries. These are the 36 developing country ACWL Members, the 36 LDCs that are Members of the WTO, and the 8 LDCs that are currently in the process of acceding to the WTO. In the map on the following page, the Members of the ACWL are indicated in green and yellow and the LDCs entitled to the services of the ACWL in brown. This map shows that almost half of these countries (40) are in Africa. The 40 African countries entitled to the services of the ACWL include 33 of the 43 Members of the African Group at the WTO and six LDCs that are in the process of acceding to the WTO. The other main geographical areas represented are Central and South America and Southeast Asia.
Almost half of the Members of the WTO are currently entitled to the services of the ACWL.

Developing country Members of the ACWL

Category A
Category B
Category C

36

LDCs Members of the WTO
LDCs in the process of acceding to the WTO

44
The chart below lists the 41 developing countries and one LDC that have been either a complainant or respondent in WTO dispute settlement proceedings since the ACWL was established in 2001 and the total number of disputes in which those countries have participated since 1995. Argentina, Brazil, Chile, China, Korea, and Mexico have significant experience in WTO dispute settlement proceedings and have not acceded to the ACWL. Of the remaining 35 developing countries that have participated as complainant or defendant in dispute settlement proceedings since 2001, only nine have not joined the ACWL. These are Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Bahrain, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Moldova, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and Ukraine. The other 26 developing countries have all joined the ACWL. Thus, the ACWL has attracted as Members developing countries that have become actively involved in WTO legal matters but lack legal capacity or experience in these matters. These are the very countries that the ACWL was intended to benefit.

Note: The columns and numbers in parentheses indicate the frequency with which the country has participated as a complainant or respondent in WTO dispute settlement proceedings as of 31 December 2019. Five other developing countries – Malaysia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Trinidad & Tobago, and Hong Kong, China participated in dispute settlement proceedings before the ACWL was established, but have not done so since. Of these five countries, both Hong Kong, China and Sri Lanka are Members of the ACWL.
The General Assembly consists of the representatives of all of the developed and developing country Members of the ACWL and of the LDCs entitled to the services of the ACWL. Its role is to evaluate the performance of the ACWL, elect the Management Board, and adopt regulations and the annual budgets proposed by the Management Board. The ACWL’s financial statements are audited by an external auditor (currently the National Audit Office of the United Kingdom) and are submitted to the General Assembly through the Management Board.

The General Assembly held two regular meetings, in July and December 2019. In 2019, Mr. Simon Farbenbloom (Australia) was replaced by Ms Patricia Holmes (Australia) to serve as Chairperson, and Mr. Marco Tulio Molina (Guatemala) served as Vice-Chairperson.

The Management Board takes the decisions necessary to ensure the efficient and effective operation of the ACWL. It functions independently of the General Assembly. The Management Board appoints the Executive Director in consultation with Members, prepares the annual budgets for adoption by the General Assembly, supervises the administration of the Endowment Fund, and proposes regulations on various matters for adoption by the General Assembly.

The Management Board consists of six persons who serve in their personal capacities and independently of their national affiliations. Under the Agreement Establishing the ACWL, the members of the Management Board are selected on the basis of their personal qualifications in the field of WTO law or international trade relations and development. Three are nominated by the developing country Members, two by the developed country Members and one by the LDCs. In addition, the Executive Director of the ACWL serves as an ex officio member. The Management Board held three regular meetings, in May, June and October 2019.

At the start of 2019, the Management Board consisted of:

- Dr. Stuart Robinson (Chairperson),
- H.E. Mr. Eduardo Ernesto Sperisen-Yurt (Vice-Chairperson),
- H.E. Mr. M. Shameem Ahsan
- H.E. Mr. Juan Carlos Gonzalez
- H.E. Mr. John M. Weekes, and
- H.E. Ms Irene Young

In April 2019, Ms Young was replaced by Dr. Cyris Chu. As of the end of 2019, the Management Board consisted of:

- Dr. Stuart Robinson (Chairperson),
- H.E. Mr. Eduardo Ernesto Sperisen-Yurt (Vice-Chairperson),
- H.E. Mr. M. Shameem Ahsan
- H.E. Mr. John M. Weekes, and
- Dr. Cyrus Chu
As of 31 December 2019, the ACWL’s staff consisted of the Executive Director, 11 other full-time lawyers, one senior office administrator, one office administrator and one assistant to the office administrators. The Executive Director, Mr. Niall Meagher, is responsible for managing the ACWL’s day-to-day operations, representing the ACWL externally, and reporting to the Management Board.

The Executive Director is assisted by the Deputy Directors, Mr. Leo Palma and Ms Cherise Valles. The other lawyers are, in alphabetical order: Mr. Jan Bohanes and Mr. Fernando Piérola (Senior Counsel); Ms Maria Alcover, Ms Leah Buencamino, Ms Kholofelo Kugler, Mr. Vitaliy Pogoretsky, Mr. Alejandro Sanchez, Mr. Christian Vidal-León and Ms Tatiana Yanguas (Counsel). Biographies of the lawyers are available in Appendix 6 and on the ACWL’s website. The ACWL’s office administrators are Ms Carol Lau (Senior) and Ms Pascale Colombo. The office administrators’ assistant is Ms Sandra Roethlisberger.

In addition, there are four junior lawyers currently participating in the Secondment Programme for Trade Lawyers: Ms Shazia Bi Kurmoo, Mr. Marvin Ikondere, Ms Laura Magaly Fernandez, and Mr. Andrés Valladares (see page 38 above).

To contact an individual ACWL staff member, please use the following standard email format: name.surname@acwl.ch.

Emails for the Executive Director should be addressed to Ms Carol Lau.
APPENDIX 1

WTO DISPUTES IN WHICH THE ACWL HAS PROVIDED SUPPORT

SUPPORT PROVIDED BY THE ACWL’s STAFF

- For Guatemala, as the complainant in India - Measures Concerning Sugar and Sugarcane (DS 581).
- For Tunisia, as the complainant in Morocco - Definitive Anti-Dumping Measures on School Exercise Books from Tunisia (DS 578).
- For Colombia, as the respondent in Colombia - Measures Concerning the Distribution of Liquid Fuels (DS 575).
- For Turkey as the respondent in Turkey - Additional Duties on Imports of Air Conditioning Machines from Thailand (DS 573).
- For Peru as the respondent in Peru - Anti-Dumping and Countervailing Measures on Biodiesel from Argentina (DS 572).
- For Turkey, as the complainant in United States - Certain Measures on Steel and Aluminium Products (DS 564).
- For Turkey, as the respondent in Turkey - Additional Duties on Certain Products from the United States (DS 561).
- For Tunisia, as the complainant in Morocco - Provisional Anti-Dumping Measures on School Exercise Books from Tunisia (DS 555).
- For Pakistan, as the respondent in Pakistan - Anti-Dumping Measures on Biaxially Oriented Polypropylene Film from the United Arab Emirates (DS 538).
- For Costa Rica, as the respondent in Costa Rica - Measures Concerning the Importation of Fresh Avocados from Mexico (DS 524).
- For Turkey, as the complainant in Morocco - Anti-Dumping Measures on Certain Hot-Rolled Steel from Turkey (DS 513).
- For Thailand, as the respondent in Thailand - Subsidies Concerning Sugar (DS 507).
- For Colombia, as the respondent in Colombia - Measures Concerning Imported Spirits (DS 502).
- For Pakistan, as the complainant in South Africa - Provisional Anti-Dumping Duties on Portland Cement from Pakistan (DS 500).
- For Viet Nam, as the complainant in Indonesia - Safeguard on Certain Iron or Steel Products (DS 496).
- For Thailand, as a third party in European Union - Measures Affecting Tariff Concessions on Certain Poultry Meat Products (DS 492).
- For Chinese Taipei, as the complainant in Indonesia - Safeguard on Certain Iron or Steel Products (DS 490).
- For Pakistan, as the complainant in European Union - Countervailing Measures on Certain Polyethylene Terephthalate from Pakistan (DS 486).
- For Indonesia, as the respondent in Indonesia - Measures Concerning the Importation of Chicken Meat and Chicken Products (DS 484).
- For Indonesia, as the respondent in Indonesia - Importation of Horticultural Products, Animals and Animal Products (DS 477, DS 478).
- For Indonesia, as the complainant in Pakistan - Anti-Dumping and Countervailing Duty Investig-
tions on Certain Paper Products from Indonesia (DS 470).

- For Panama, as the complainant in Colombia - Measures Relating to the Importation of Textiles, Apparel and Footwear (DS 461).

- For Guatemala, as the complainant in Peru - Additional Duty on Imports of Certain Agricultural Products (DS 457).

- For Panama, as the complainant in Argentina - Measures Relating to Trade in Goods and Services (DS 453).

- For Indonesia, as the complainant in European Union - Anti-Dumping Measures on Certain Fatty Alcohols from Indonesia (DS 442).

- For Honduras, as the complainant in Australia - Certain Measures Concerning Trademarks, Geographical Indications and Other Plain Packaging Requirements Applicable to Tobacco Products and Packaging (DS 435); and as co-counsel to the Dominican Republic as the complainant in Australia - Certain Measures Concerning Trademarks, Geographical Indications and Other Plain Packaging Requirements Applicable to Tobacco Products and Packaging (DS 441).

- For India, as the respondent in India - Measures Concerning the Importation of Certain Agricultural Products (DS 430).

- For Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras and El Salvador, as the complainants in Dominican Republic - Safeguard Measures on Imports of Polypropylene Bags and Tubular Fabric (DS 415, DS 416, DS 417, DS 418).

- For Peru, as the complainant in Argentina - Anti-Dumping Duties on Fasteners and Chains from Peru (DS 410).

- For Ecuador, as a Member that joined the consultations in European Union and a Member State - Seizure of Generic Drugs in Transit (DS 408, DS 409).

- For the Philippines, as the respondent in Philippines - Taxes on Distilled Spirits (DS 396, DS 403).

- For Guatemala, as the complainant in China - Grants, Loans and Other Incentives (DS 390).

- For Thailand, as the complainant in United States - Anti-Dumping Measures on Polyethylene Retail Carrier Bags from Thailand (DS 383).

- For Costa Rica, as a third party in European Communities - Tariff Treatment of Certain Information Technology Products (DS 375, DS 376, DS 377).

- For Indonesia, as the complainant in South Africa - Anti-Dumping Measures on Uncoated Woodfree Paper (DS 374).

- For Thailand, as the respondent in Thailand - Customs and Fiscal Measures on Cigarettes from the Philippines (DS 371).

- For Panama, as the complainant in Colombia - Indicative Prices and Restrictions on Ports of Entry (DS 366).

- For Colombia, as the complainant in European Communities - Regime for the Importation of Bananas (DS 361).

- For Colombia, as a third participant before the Appellate Body in European Communities - Regime for the Importation, Sale and Distribution of Bananas (Second Recourse to Article 21.5 of the DSU by Ecuador) (DS 27).

- For Thailand, as a third party in United States - Continued Existence and Application of Zeroing Methodology (DS 350).

- For Panama, as the complainant in Colombia - Customs Measures on Importation of Certain Goods from Panama (DS 348).

- For Thailand, as the complainant in United States - Measures Relating to Shrimp from Thailand (DS 343).

- For Chad, as a third party in United States - Subsidies on Upland Cotton: Recourse to Article 21.5 of the DSU by Brazil (DS 267).

- For Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador and Guatemala, as interested parties in European Communities - The ACP - EC Partnership Agreement (First and Second Recourse to Arbitration pursuant to the Decision of 14 November 2001) (WT/L/616, WT/L/625).

- For Guatemala, as the complainant in Mexico - Anti-Dumping Duties on Steel Pipes and Tubes from Guatemala (DS 331).

- For Pakistan, as the complainant in Egypt - Anti-Dumping Duties on Matches from Pakistan (DS 327).
• For Thailand, as the complainant in United States - Provisional Anti-Dumping Measures on Shrimp from Thailand (DS 324).
• For Thailand, as a third party in United States - Measures relating to Zeroing and Sunset Reviews (DS 322).
• For Indonesia, as the complainant in Korea - Anti-Dumping Duties on Imports of Certain Paper from Indonesia (DS 312).
• For Bangladesh, as the complainant in India - Anti-Dumping Measure on Batteries from Bangladesh (DS 306).
• For Honduras, as the complainant in Dominican Republic - Measures Affecting the Importation and Internal Sale of Cigarettes (DS 302).
• For Guatemala, as the complainant in Mexico - Certain Pricing Measures for Customs Valuation and Other Purposes (DS 298).
• For Thailand, as the complainant in European Communities - Customs Classification of Frozen Boneless Chicken Cuts (DS 286).
• For Nicaragua, as the complainant in Mexico - Certain Measures Preventing the Importation of Black Beans from Nicaragua (DS 284).
• For Thailand, as the complainant in European Communities - Export Subsidies on Sugar (DS 283).
• For the Philippines, as the complainant in Australia - Certain Measures Affecting the Importation of Fresh Pineapple (DS 271).
• For the Philippines, as the complainant in Australia - Certain Measures Affecting the Importation of Fresh Fruit and Vegetables (DS 270).
• For Thailand, as a third party in United States - Final Dumping Determination on Softwood Lumber from Canada (DS 264).
• For Paraguay, as a third party in European Communities - Conditions for the Granting of Tariff Preferences to Developing Countries (DS 246).
• For India, as the complainant in European Communities - Conditions for the Granting of Tariff Preferences to Developing Countries (DS 246).
• For India, as the complainant in United States - Rules of Origin for Textiles and Apparel Products (DS 243).
• For Ecuador, as the complainant in Turkey - Certain Import Procedures for Fresh Fruit (DS 237).
• For Peru, as the complainant in European Communities - Trade Description of Sardines (DS 231).
• For Pakistan, as the complainant in United States - Transitional Safeguard Measure on Combed Cotton Yarn from Pakistan (DS 192).
• For India, as the respondent in India - Measures Affecting the Automotive Sector (DS 146, DS 175).

SUPPORT PROVIDED THROUGH EXTERNAL LEGAL COUNSEL

• For Thailand, as the complainant in Turkey - Additional Duties on Imports of Air Conditioning Machines from Thailand (DS 573).
• For Colombia, as the respondent in Colombia - Measures Relating to the Importation of Textiles, Apparel and Footwear (DS 461).
• For Peru, as the respondent in Peru - Additional Duty on Imports of Certain Agricultural Products (DS 457).
• For the Dominican Republic, as the respondent in Dominican Republic - Safeguard Measures on Imports of Polypropylene Bags and Tubular Fabric (DS 415, DS 416, DS 417, DS 418).
• For Colombia, as the respondent in Colombia - Indicative Prices and Restrictions on Ports of Entry (DS 366).
• For Turkey, as the respondent in Turkey - Measures Affecting the Importation of Rice (DS 334).
• For the Dominican Republic, as the respondent in the Article 21.3(c) proceedings in Dominican Republic - Measures Affecting the Importation and Internal Sale of Cigarettes (DS 302).
• For Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Venezuela, as third parties in EC - Conditions for the Granting of Tariff Preferences to Developing Countries (DS 246).
APPENDIX 2

ROSTER OF EXTERNAL COUNSEL

LAW FIRMS

- Mr. Edmond McGovern
- Mr. Donald McRae
- Mr. Thomas Sebastian (Monckton Chambers)
- Mr. Greg Somers
APPENDIX 3

ACWL OUTREACH ACTIVITIES IN 2019

WTO TRAINING COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 March</td>
<td>WTO Roundtable Challenges in the Dispute Settlement System, Advanced Trade Policy Course, WTO, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 May</td>
<td>Legal Aspects of WTO Reform, WTO Introductory Trade Policy Course for LDCs, WTO, Geneva (in French)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 May</td>
<td>Presentation on the ACWL, 38th Geneva Week, ACWL, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 July</td>
<td>Moderator, E-Commerce + Accessibility – Experience in bridging the missing link, Aid for Trade Global Review 2019 Side Event (organised by Chinese Taipei), WTO, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 July</td>
<td>Roundtable on developing country participation in WTO dispute settlement, Advanced Trade Policy Course, WTO, Geneva (in French)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10 October</td>
<td>The Future of Trade from a Millennial and Regional (African) Perspective, Public Forum, WTO, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 October</td>
<td>Flexibilities for Developing Countries and Least-Developed Countries in the WTO, Public Forum, WTO, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 October</td>
<td>Moderator, Smart City Development and the World Trading System, (organized by Chinese Taipei), Public Forum, WTO, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 November</td>
<td>Presentation on the ACWL, Advanced SPS Course, WTO, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 December</td>
<td>Preparing a WTO case: identification of the issues, seeking evidence, evaluating the merits of the case, choice of forum, Advanced Dispute Settlement Course, WTO, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 December</td>
<td>Terms of Reference and Jurisdiction, Advanced Dispute Settlement Course, WTO, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 December</td>
<td>Representing the Complainant before panels, arbitrators and the Appellate Body, Advanced Dispute Settlement Course, WTO, Geneva</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CONFERENCES, SEMINARS, AND OTHER EVENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29 January</td>
<td>Workshop on Geneva International Trade Platform, Graduate Institute, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 February</td>
<td>How to ensure the independence and impartiality of WTO adjudicators (panellist), Conference on What Kind of Dispute Settlement for the WTO? organised by the World Trade Institute, WTO, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 February</td>
<td>How to balance prompt settlement with adequate settlement of disputes (panelist), Conference on What Kind of Dispute Settlement for the WTO? organised by the World Trade Institute, WTO, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-10 February</td>
<td>WTO Dispute Settlement System, Master in diplomacy and international public function, organised by the CEI International Affairs, Barcelona, Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 February</td>
<td>Panelist, John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition, 1st European Regional Round, Vienna, Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 February</td>
<td>Reception in memory of H.E. Ambassador Julio Lacarte-Muro, organised by the Permanent Mission of Uruguay to the WTO and the ACWL, in conjunction with the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), WTO, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 March</td>
<td>Remarks at the Working Breakfast to celebrate Women's International Day, organised by the Commonwealth Small States Office, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-16 March</td>
<td>Panelist, John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition, 2nd European Regional Round, Prague, Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 March</td>
<td>Speaker, Comments on WTO Modernization Proposals, organised by the Commonwealth Small States Office, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-16 April</td>
<td>Problems and challenges in the WTO multilateral trade system, at the Conference on Africa's Place in the WTO Dispute Settlement System: Experience, Challenges and Perspectives, organised by the Policy Center for the New South, Rabat, Morocco (in French)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-27 April</td>
<td>Panelist, John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition, African Regional Round, Nairobi, Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 May</td>
<td>Russia – Measures concerning Traffic in Transit (DS 512), ACWL Women's Study Group, ACWL, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 May</td>
<td>Panel session, Current Problems of the Multilateral Trading System at the Astana Economic Forum, organised by the Economic Research Institute (ERI), Astana, Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 May</td>
<td>Panelist on Trade and Development Issues, BIICL WTO Conference 2019, organised by BIICL, London, United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6 June</td>
<td>Panelists, Final Oral Round of the John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition, WTO, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 June</td>
<td>High Tea with the Finalists of the African Regional Round of the John H. Jackson Moot Court, ACWL, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-19 June</td>
<td>Module on trade in services, WTI-CWS Academy on WTO law, organised by the Center for WTO studies, Delhi, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9 July</td>
<td>China – Broiler Products (Article 21.5), Workshop on WTO Case Law of 2018, organised by the European University Institute, Florence, Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 October</td>
<td>A look to the horizon: where will trade and investment law, investment protection and investor-state dispute settlement be in 10/20 years? The London Conference on International Law, organised by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, London, UK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LECTURES AND PRESENTATIONS ON THE ACWL TO STUDENT GROUPS

25 January
- Factors affecting developing country participation in the WTO dispute settlement system / Presentation on the ACWL, Maastricht University, ACWL, Geneva

5 April
- Presentation on the ACWL, University of Lausanne, ACWL, Geneva

8 May
- Presentation on the ACWL, Amsterdam Law School, ACWL, Geneva

27 May
- Presentation on the ACWL, University of West Indies, ACWL, Geneva

6 June
- Presentation on the ACWL, Keele University, ACWL, Geneva

13 June
- Presentation on the ACWL, Queen’s University, ACWL, Geneva

19 June
- Presentation on the ACWL, American University Washington College of Law, ACWL, Geneva

25-26 October
- Arbitration as a Viable Option for Effective Dispute Resolution, World Trade Forum, organised by the World Trade Institute, Bern, Switzerland

26 October
- Revisiting Special & Differential Treatment for Developing Countries, World Trade Forum, organised by the World Trade Institute, Bern, Switzerland

20 November
- Operationalizing Art. 25 of the DSU as a temporary solution to the AB crisis: Opportunities and Challenges, CIDS Conference: Can we save the WTO Appellate Body (and Dispute Settlement) from a shipwreck, and how? organized by CIDS, Geneva

21 November
- The Rule of Law and the Role of Law in the WTO, World Trade Forum, organised by the World Trade Institute, Bern, Switzerland

26 November
- Presentation on the ACWL / Participation of Developing Countries in the WTO Dispute Settlement System and Current Challenges Facing the WTO Dispute Settlement System, WTO Delegation of the Netherlands Training Programme (NTP), ACWL, Geneva (in English and French)

27 November
- E-commerce: main legal issues, ACWL Thematic Sessions in French on WTO Law, ACWL, Geneva (in French)

27 – 28 November
- Workshop on WTO Dispute Settlement, organised by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and UNDP, Belarus

2 December
- Korea - Import Bans, and Testing and Certification Requirements for Radionuclides (DS 495), ACWL Women’s Study Group, ACWL, Geneva

9 December
- The Dispute Settlement at a Crossroads / How to Strengthen the Legal Capacity of African Countries in the WTO Dispute Settlement System, Conference on Africa and the WTO Dispute Settlement System, organised by the African Academy of International Law Practice, Paris, France (in French)
# APPENDIX 4

## MEMBERS OF THE ACWL

### MEMBERS ENTITLED TO THE SERVICES OF THE ACWL

(Dates of accession in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category A</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hong Kong, China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese Taipei (13 May 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United Arab Emirates (22 May 2016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category B</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oman (25 April 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mauritius (11 June 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turkey (17 August 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indonesia (28 April 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Viet Nam (25 September 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seychelles (27 March 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Africa (28 April 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morocco (13 June 2019)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category C</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honduras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paraguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jordan (20 January 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El Salvador (3 September 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sri Lanka (21 November 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Costa Rica (30 April 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cuba (3 November 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire (12 January 2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DEVELOPED COUNTRY MEMBERS / ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

(Dates of accession in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developed Country Members / Associate Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland (5 December 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia (28 July 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany (3 December 2017) (Associate Member)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## APPENDIX 5

### LDCs ENTITLED TO THE SERVICES OF THE ACWL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBERS OF THE WTO</th>
<th>36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao People's Democratic Republic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Republic of Tanzania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IN THE PROCESS OF ACCEDING TO THE WTO</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sao Tomé and Principe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 6

ACWL LAWYERS

Mr. Niall Meagher has been the Executive Director of the ACWL since July 2012. Before becoming Executive Director, Mr. Meagher had been Senior Counsel at the ACWL since 2004. Prior to joining the ACWL, Mr. Meagher was a partner in the international trade and dispute resolution practice of the law firm of Sidley Austin LLP. Mr. Meagher was born in Dublin, Ireland. He holds a Bachelor of Laws (LL.B.) from Trinity College, Dublin, and a Master of Laws (LL.M.) from the Law School of the University of Chicago.

Mr. Leo Palma has been Deputy Director since 2003. He joined the ACWL in 2001 as Senior Counsel. He was born in the Philippines. Before joining the ACWL, Mr. Palma was Attaché for WTO Legal Affairs, Philippine Mission in Geneva, holding such position since 1996. He is a graduate of the University of the Philippines, having obtained from that institution a B.S. degree in Business Administration (Accounting Major) in 1967, and an LL.B. degree in 1972.

Ms Cherise Valles has been Deputy Director since 2012. Before becoming Deputy Director, Ms Valles had been Senior Counsel at the ACWL. She joined the ACWL in 2001. Ms Valles was born in Bombay, India. Before joining the ACWL, Ms Valles was Of Counsel at the U.S. law firm of Sonnenschein (now Dentons). Previously, Ms Valles was a member of the Canadian Foreign Service. She has a Bachelor of Arts (Honours) in Political Science from McGill University, a Master of Arts in International Affairs from the Norman Paterson School of International Affairs at Carleton University, and a J.D. from the University of Ottawa.

Mr. Jan Bohanes has been Senior Counsel since 2014. He joined the ACWL in 2010. Mr. Bohanes is a Czech and Austrian national. He was a member of the Secretariat of the WTO’s Appellate Body from 2002 to 2006. He then worked for several years as associate attorney in the Geneva office of Sidley Austin LLP. He holds a law degree from the University of Vienna; a doctorate in European law from the University of Vienna; a Master of Laws (LL.M.) from Columbia University; as well as a Master of Arts (M.A.L.D.) degree in international relations from the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy.
Ms Kholofelo Kugler joined the ACWL as Counsel in 2015. Ms Kugler was born in Pretoria, South Africa. Prior to joining the ACWL, Ms Kugler worked as a research assistant on International Economic Law for Professor Markus Krajewski at the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, Germany. Previously, she worked as a junior associate at WTI Advisors in Geneva. She holds a Bachelor of Arts degree in Economics and International Politics from the University of South Africa, an LL.B. degree from the University of the Witwatersrand, as well as a Master degree in International Law and Economics from the University of Bern, Switzerland.

Ms Maria Alcover joined the ACWL as Counsel in 2013. Ms Alcover was born in Barcelona, Spain. Prior to joining the ACWL, Ms Alcover worked as a Legal Officer at the Appellate Body Secretariat of the WTO. She previously served as an intern at the Legal Aspects of Trade Policy Unit at the Directorate-General for Trade of the European Commission in Brussels. She holds a law degree and a Master of Laws degree (LL.M.) in International Economic Law and Policy from the University de Barcelona (IELPO Programme).

Ms Leah Buencamino has been Counsel at the ACWL since January 2018. Before becoming counsel, Ms Buencamino had been legal assistant at the ACWL since 2012. Ms Buencamino was born in Switzerland. Prior to joining the ACWL, she completed several temporary assignments for the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) and worked as an intern at the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). Ms Buencamino holds a Licence degree in International Relations from the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies in Geneva and a Master of Laws (LL.M.) (With Merit) from the Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights.

Ms Kholofelo Kugler joined the ACWL as Counsel in 2015. Ms Kugler was born in Pretoria, South Africa. Prior to joining the ACWL, Ms Kugler worked as a research assistant on International Economic Law for Professor Markus Krajewski at the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, Germany. Previously, she worked as a junior associate at WTI Advisors in Geneva. She holds a Bachelor of Arts degree in Economics and International Politics from the University of South Africa, an LL.B. degree from the University of the Witwatersrand, as well as a Master degree in International Law and Economics from the University of Bern, Switzerland.
Mr. Vitaliy Pogoretskyy joined the ACWL as Counsel in 2013. Mr. Pogoretskyy is a Ukrainian national. Prior to joining the ACWL, he worked as an intern and a dispute settlement lawyer at the Rules Division of the WTO. He previously worked as a junior lawyer in a Brussels-based law firm and as a civil servant of the Government of Ukraine. Mr. Pogoretskyy is Doctor in law from the University of Dundee (UK). He holds an LL.M. degree in International Commercial Arbitration Law from Stockholm University and a Master degree in International Law and Economics from the World Trade Institute (Bern, Switzerland). He obtained his law degree from the National Law Academy of Ukraine (Kharkov, Ukraine).

Mr. Alejandro Sánchez joined the ACWL as Counsel in 2010. Mr. Sánchez was born in Mexico. Prior to joining the ACWL, Mr. Sánchez served as legal advisor at the Office of the General Counsel for Trade Negotiations in the Ministry of Economy of Mexico. Before joining the Mexican government, he served as an intern at the Appellate Body of the WTO, the Geneva office of White & Case LLP and the Mission of Mexico to the WTO. Mr. Sánchez holds a law degree with honorary distinction from the Universidad Autónoma de Guadalajara and a Master of Laws degree (LL.M.) from McGill University.

Mr. Christian Vidal-León joined the ACWL as Counsel in May 2016. Mr. Vidal-León previously worked as a dispute settlement lawyer in both the Legal Affairs Division and the Appellate Body Secretariat of the World Trade Organization, as well as a legal officer in the Directorate-General for Trade of the European Commission. In addition, Mr. Vidal-León worked for a global consulting firm in Johannesburg, and assisted an arbitrator in a number of international investment tribunals. Mr. Vidal-León is a qualified lawyer in both Mexico and Spain. He holds an LL.M. in International Legal Studies from Georgetown University and a Masters of International Law and Economics from the University of Bern, in Switzerland.

Tatiana Yanguas Acosta joined the ACWL in October 2015. Ms Yanguas Acosta is a Colombian/Brazilian national. She was previously a China Programme Intern at the Accessions Division of the WTO, where she worked as Co-Secretary of several Working Parties and on the Post-Accessions Best Practices. She holds an LL.M. degree in International Trade and Investment Law (cum laude) from Maastricht University and an LL.B. in Law in Context with a specialisation in International Law from the Technische Universität Dresden.