

ISSN 2073-333X

*Международный научно-популярный журнал*

**Қазақстанның ғылымы мен өмірі**  
**Наука и жизнь Казахстана**  
*№4 (61) 2018*



ауыл шаруашылығы ғылымының докторы,  
профессор, Қазақстан Ғылым Академиясының академигі,  
Қазақстанның еңбек сіңірген қайраткері

**Рақымжан Елешев**

**Құрылтайшы:**  
«ҚҰҚЫҚТЫҚ МИССИЯ» ҚОҒАМДЫҚ ҚОРЫ  
ХАЛЫҚАРАЛЫҚ ҚАЗАҚСТАН КРИМИНОЛОГИЯЛЫҚ КЛУБЫ

**Учредитель:**  
ОБЩЕСТВЕННЫЙ ФОНД «ПРАВОВАЯ МИССИЯ»  
МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ КАЗАХСТАНСКИЙ КРИМИНОЛОГИЧЕСКИЙ КЛУБ

**Founder:**  
PUBLIC FOUNDATION «LEGAL MISSION»  
INTERNATIONAL KAZAKHSTAN CRIMINOLOGY CLUB

**ҚАЗАҚСТАННЫҢ ҒЫЛЫМЫ МЕН ӨМІРІ**  
**НАУКА И ЖИЗНЬ КАЗАХСТАНА**  
**SCIENCE AND LIFE OF KAZAKHSTAN**  
Халықаралық ғылыми-көпшілік журнал  
Международный научно-популярный журнал  
International popular-science journal

**№4(61) 2018**

**Заңтану – юриспруденция – law**

Бас редактор:  
«Қазақстанның еңбек сіңірген қайраткері»,  
з.ғ.д., профессор **Е.О. Алауханов**

**Астана 2018**

## МАЗМУНЫ

Рахымжан Елешұлы Елешев 80 жаста .....	7
КИЯНҒА ҚҰЛАШ СЕРМЕГЕН .....	11
ОЧЕРК О НАУЧНО-ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКОЙ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ ДОКТОРА ЮРИДИЧЕСКИХ НАУК, ПРОФЕССОРА ХАМЗИНА АМАНГЕЛЬДЫ ШАПИЕВИЧА .....	17
<b>ЗАНТАНУ</b>	
Накипов Б.И. АЛЬТЕРНАТИВНОЕ РАССМОТРЕНИЕ БИОТЕРРОРИЗМА В КАЧЕСТВЕ АКТА АГРЕССИИ .....	13
Дауешов Х.З. РЕШЕНИЕ ПРОБЛЕМ ПРОКУРОРСКОЙ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ В СФЕРЕ ПРОТИВОДЕЙСТВИЯ ПРЕСТУПНОСТИ И ИНЫМ ПРАВОНАРУШЕНИЯМ ПУТЕМ ВНЕДРЕНИЯ СОВРЕМЕННЫХ МЕТОДОВ УПРАВЛЕНИЯ .....	17
Кужабаева Г.Т. ОРГАНИЗАЦИЯ РАБОТЫ ПЕНИТЕНЦИАРНЫХ ПСИХОЛОГОВ В РАБОТЕ С ОСУЖДЕННЫМИ ЗА ТЕРРОРИСТИЧЕСКИЕ ПРЕСТУПЛЕНИЯ .....	19
Койшыбайұлы Қ., Апахаев Н.Ж., Тлеуов Т.М., Кульдинова С.К. ПРЯМЫЕ И КОСВЕННЫЕ НОРМЫ ДЕЙСТВИЯ. НАПРАВЛЕННЫЕ НА ЗАЩИТУ ПРАВ И ИНТЕРЕСОВ ПОТРЕБИТЕЛЕЙ СТРАХОВЫХ УСЛУГ .....	24
Алаева Г.Т., Джумабаева Қ.А. АВТОРЛЫҚ ПЕН ИНТЕЛЛЕКТУАЛДЫҚ МЕНШІКТІҢ ОБЪЕКТІЛЕРІНЕ ҚАТЫСТЫ АЙРЫҚША ҚҰҚЫҚТАРҒА МҰРАГЕРЛІК .....	31
Камбарова Н.Ш. ВЗАИМОСВЯЗЬ ПРИНЦИПА ДИСПОЗИТИВНОСТИ С ОТДЕЛЬНЫМИ ПРИНЦИПАМИ ГРАЖДАНСКОГО ПРОЦЕССА .....	35
Каженев Е.Е. ОТДЕЛЬНЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ БОРЬБЫ С УГОЛОВНЫМИ ПРАВОНАРУШЕНИЯМИ ПРОТИВ ПОРЯДКА УПРАВЛЕНИЯ .....	39
Кусаинова А.К., Омарова А.Б. ПОНЯТИЕ ЭЛЕКТРОННОГО ДОКУМЕНТА: ОСОБЕННОСТИ ОПРЕДЕЛЕНИЯ ПО ЗАКОНОДАТЕЛЬСТВУ РЕСПУБЛИКИ КАЗАХСТАН И СТРАН СНГ .....	44
Баянова Ә.Қ. ИСКЛЮЧИТЕЛЬНЫЕ ПРАВА ПРАВООБЛАДАТЕЛЕЙ ТОВАРНОГО ЗНАКА: ПОСЛЕДСТВИЯ ПРОИЗВОДСТВА КОНТРАФАКТНОЙ ПРОДУКЦИИ .....	50
Aikumbeckov N. THE ISSUES OF SURROGATE MOTHERHOOD IN THE CRIMINAL LAW .....	54
Нуртаева Г.Л. ЭНЕРГЕТИЧЕСКАЯ БЕЗОПАСНОСТЬ РЕСПУБЛИКИ КАЗАХСТАН .....	57
Кужабаева Г.Т. СИСТЕМА РАБОТЫ ОПЕРАТИВНО-РЕЖИМНЫХ СЛУЖБ ПЕНИТЕНЦИАРНОЙ СИСТЕМЫ В РАБОТЕ С ОСУЖДЕННЫМИ ЗА ТЕРРОРИСТИЧЕСКИЕ ПРЕСТУПЛЕНИЯ .....	62
Кегембаева Ж.А. СМЕРТНАЯ КАЗНЬ КАК ИСКЛЮЧИТЕЛЬНАЯ МЕРА НАКАЗАНИЯ В КАЗАХСТАНЕ .....	67

Джиембаев Р.К. ПРОТИВОДЕЙСТВИЕ КОРРУПЦИИ В ПОЛИЦИИ: ЗАРУБЕЖНЫЙ ОПЫТ И ВОЗМОЖНЫЕ ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ В РЕСПУБЛИКЕ КАЗАХСТАН .....	70
Жайлау Ж., И Динхэ К ВОПРОСУ О РОЛИ ГОСУДАРСТВА В ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ КИТАЙСКИХ ИНВЕСТИЦИОННЫХ КОМПАНИЙ ЗА РУБЕЖОМ .....	74
Шукан Алия ТҮРКИЯ МЕН ҚАЗАҚСТАН ЗАҢТАНУШЫЛАРЫНЫҢ ЕҢБЕКТЕРІНДЕГІ АҚПАРАТТЫҚ ТЕХНОЛОГИЯЛАР САЛАСЫНДАҒЫ ҚЫЛМЫСТАРҒА БАЙЛАНЫСТЫ ҚАРАСТЫРЫЛҒАН НЕГІЗГІ ТҮСІНІКТЕР МЕН ҰҒЫМДАРҒА ТАЛДАУ .....	79
Байкенжина К.А., Балгимбеков Д.У., Қаржасова Г.Б. АЛАЯҚТЫҚ ҚЫЛМЫСЫНЫҢ ОБЪЕКТИВТІК ЖӘНЕ СУБЪЕКТИВТІК БЕЛГІЛЕРІ .....	86
Vaimagambetova Z., Gabdulina A., Maulen A. PRACTICE OF DISPUTE SETTLEMENT WITHIN WTO .....	91
Жұмағұлов Т.Б., Шеримова Н.Ш. ҚР-НЫҢ СУ ҚАУІПСІЗДІГІ САЛАСЫНДАҒЫ ҚҰҚЫҚТЫҚ ҚАТЫНАСТАРДЫҢ ОБЪЕКТІЛЕРІ МЕН СУБЪЕКТІЛЕРІНІҢ ЕРЕКШЕЛІКТЕРІ .....	95
Сейтаева Ж.С. ЫНТЫМАҚТАСТЫҚ ҰЙЫМЫНЫҢ АДАМ САУДАСЫНА ҚАРСЫ КҮРЕС ЖӘНЕ ҚАУІПСІЗДІК ҚЫЗМЕТІ .....	99
Сагинбеков К.С., Ернншев К.А., Бауберикова А. ПРЕВЕНТИВНЫЕ МЕРЫ ПО ОБЕСПЕЧЕНИЮ МИРНОГО СОСУЩЕСТВОВАНИЯ И БЕЗОПАСНОГО УСЛОВИЯ ЖИЗНИ МНОГОНАЦИОНАЛЬНОГО НАСЕЛЕНИЯ КАЗАХСТАНА .....	102
Сактаганова И.С., Бексултанова Р.Т. ҚАЗАҚСТАН РЕСПУБЛИКАСЫНЫҢ АЗАМАТТЫҚ СОТ ӨНДІРІСІНДЕГІ ЖЕҢІЛДЕТІЛГЕН СОТ ӨНДІРІСІНІҢ МАҢЫЗЫ МЕН РӨЛІ .....	106
Нысанбекова Л.Б., Жақсылықова Ж. ЕАЭО ЕЛДЕРІ САЛЫҚ ЗАҢНАМАСЫНЫҢ КЕЙБІР ЕРЕЖЕЛЕРІНЕ САЛЫСТЫРМАЛЫ-ҚҰҚЫҚТЫҚ САРАПТАМА .....	109
Балгимбеков Д.У., Байкенжина К.А., Қаржасова Г. Б. ҚЫЛМЫС ЖАСАУҒА СЫБАЙЛАС ҚАТЫСУ ИНСТИТУТЫНЫҢ ТАРИХИ ДАМУ АСПЕКТІЛЕРІ .....	115
Тұрарбеков Д.К. ПРАВОСУБЪЕКТНОСТЬ МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫХ ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКИХ ОРГАНИЗАЦИЙ, ЭВОЛЮЦИЯ ИХ РАЗВИТИЯ .....	120
Тұрарбекова А.А. ЗАКОННЫЙ РЕЖИМ ИМУЩЕСТВА СУПРУГОВ .....	124
Батырбаев Н.М. ҚОРШАҒАН ОРТАНЫ ҚОРҒАУҒА БАЙЛАНЫСТЫ ЗАҢНАМАЛАРДАҒЫ АДАМДАРДЫҢ ЭКОЛОГИЯЛЫҚ ҚҰҚЫҚТАРЫНЫҢ КЕЙБІР МӘСЕЛЕЛЕРІ .....	127
Сабитаева А.К. СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ ПРАВСТВЕННОГО СОДЕРЖАНИЯ ПРАВОВОВЫХ ПРЕДПИСАНИЙ УПК КАЗАХСТАНА И РОССИИ О ПРОИЗВОДСТВЕ ПО УГОЛОВНОМУ ДЕЛУ В ОТНОШЕНИИ ЛИЦ, НАДЕЛЕННЫХ ОСОБЫМ СТАТУСОМ .....	131
Мәсәлімқызы М. ҚОҒАМҒА КЕЛТІРІЛГЕН ҚАУІПТІЛІК ДӘРЕЖЕСІНЕ БАЙЛАНЫСТЫ ҚЫЛМЫСТЫҚ ЖАЗАНЫ ЖЕҢІЛДЕТУ .....	134

**Baimagambetova Zulfiya**

PhD doctor, associate professor of International Law al-Farabi Kazakh National University,  
zula\_bai@mail.ru

**Gabdulina Ainash**

Master degree student of the 2<sup>nd</sup> course of International Law al-Farabi Kazakh National University

**Maulen Aidana**

Assistant of lecturer of International Law al-Farabi Kazakh National University, aidana\_1812@mail.ru

## **PRACTICE OF DISPUTE SETTLEMENT WITHIN WTO**

**Summary:** Settlement of the arising interstate disputes is one of the central pillars of multilateral trade system and a special contribution of the World Trade Organization to ensuring general stability of world economy. In this article the mechanism of dispute settlement, an order and ways of control of execution of decisions are examined; the analysis of disputes between participants is carried out that has important practical value for the Republic of Kazakhstan as a new member of the WTO.

**Keywords:** Dispute settlement body, arbitration group, dispute settlement, consultations.

**Резюме:** Урегулирование возникающих межгосударственных споров является одним из центральных столпов многосторонней торговой системы и особым вкладом Всемирной торговой организации в обеспечение общей стабильности мировой экономики. В этой статье рассматривается механизм разрешения споров, порядок и способы контроля исполнения решений, проводится анализ споров между участниками, что имеет важное практическое значение для Республики Казахстан как нового члена ВТО.

**Ключевые слова:** Орган урегулирования споров, арбитражная группа, урегулирование споров, консультации.

**Түйіндемe:** Қалыптасқан мемлекетаралық дауларды реттеу көп жақты сауда жүйесінің негізгі орталық бағдары мен Дүниежүзілік сауда ұйымының әлемдік экономиканың жалпы тұрақтылығына қосқан ерекше үлесі болып табылады. Бұл мақалада дауларды шешу тетігі, шешімдердің орындалуына мониторинг жүргізудің тәртібі мен әдістері, ДСҰ-ның жаңа мүшесі ретінде Қазақстан үшін үлкен практикалық маңызы бар, қатысушылар арасындағы дауларды талдау жүргізіледі.

**Түйін сөздер:** Дауларды шешу бойынша орган, төрелік топ, дауларды реттеу, кеңес беру.

### **Introduction**

The system of the dispute settlement of the World Trade Organization (further - the WTO) works more than 20 years. Its extensive practice includes approximately 300 reports of arbitration groups and Appellate body.

Need of creation of a dispute settlement system arose together with creation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) in 1947 [1]. The articles XXII "Consultations" and XXIII "Cancellation or reducing benefits" in GATT concerning settlement of matters of argument of the agreement laid the foundation of modern system of the dispute resolution. To the termination of the Uruguayan round, there were main lines of modern system of the dispute resolution: results of negotiations of the Tokyo round, the decisions passed on disputes and following them the rule of interpretation of agreements of GATT formed the basis of the Arrangement on the rules and procedures regulating the dispute resolution.

The basic principles are distinguished in a system of law of the WTO: the principle of non-discrimination, most-favored-nation principle (plays the greatest role in that, as for import and export), the principle of provision of a national treatment (matters for protection against the measures taken in the domestic market of the states). As scientists note, "development of the right of the WTO is on a first line of that way on which the international law should pass in general" [2].

As a result, within the WTO the system of the dispute resolution, single for all multilateral agreements of the WTO, consists of:

1. The first stage of dispute settlement are intergovernmental consultations which begin at the initiative of the party considering that its rights, interests are infringed on any of agreements of the WTO. If after 60 days the dispute isn't settled, any party can ask about creation of the special group of experts.

2. The group of experts (usually from 3 people) is created in personal quality of highly qualified specialists in a matter in issue. It considers representations and the argumentation of the parties, finds out applicability to a matter in issue of provisions of the relevant agreement, prepares the report with conclusions, the decision

and recommendations and not later than submits it within 6-month term Dispute Settlement Body (DSB). If the participating party of the WTO doesn't implement the recommendation of the group of experts, then suspension of action of the approved tariff concessions can be applied to it by other party of a dispute, compensation of the caused damage, etc. is requested. Solutions of a dispute and responsibility of party at fault based on the taken-out recommendations can be the following:

- to recognize recommendations, to take measures for violation liquidation;

- to pay compensation or to offer compensation;

- to request from DSP of powers and to perform counter-measures by, in particular, suspension of the approved customs concessions (as a result of it the rate of a rate for goods or the goods imported from the country violator increases or equivalent measures are taken if it is about service trade). Dispute Settlement Body within 60 days automatically accepts the report of the group of experts. The DSB functions are performed by the General Council of the WTO, specially gathering for consideration of disputes. DSB has huge rights on control (observation) of execution of recommendations of the group of experts. The decision, recommendations of the group of experts can be appellated by any party of a dispute. The dispute is considered to be solved only after a deviation from rules or their violation is eliminated.

Main objective of the procedure of dispute settlement within WTO is not pronouncement of the "judicial" decision and not compensation of damage to the state which addressed with the claim, and recovery of the broken balance of the rights and liabilities. Activities of DSB first of all are directed to rapprochement of line items of the parties and motivation to permission of a disputable situation during negotiations. The fact that DSB have no powers on imposition of sanctions concerning the states which aren't carrying out the made decisions is connected with it. Counter-measures which have no penal character can be entered only by the state which made the complaint, and such sanctions can be at any time cancelled. This mechanism completely considers the special nature of interstate trade relations.

4. Appellate Body is created by the solution of DSB as a part of 7 people acting in personal quality. The task of the Body is to give a legal treatment to the decision, recommendations of the group of experts from the point of view of their legitimacy, compliance to precedents and rules of the WTO. The decision according to Appellates is transferred to DSB [3].

The appellate body consists of the persons having acknowledged authority which proved the competence of area of the right, international trade and general questions falling within the scope of the covered agreements. The appellate body consists of seven arbitrators, but each case is examined by three arbitrators. Arbitrators are appointed to four-year term and can be appointed repeatedly to one term. They can't participate in consideration of any disputes which can lead to a conflict of interest directly or indirectly. For the purpose of ensuring the sequence of law-enforcement practice the arbitral panel considering a specific dispute before preparation of the final report holds informal consultations with other arbitrators who are members of Appellate body.

#### **Disputes within WTO**

"The dispute settlement system within the WTO is a crucial element in safety and predictability of world system of trade" - the text of the Arrangement on rules and procedures of dispute settlement says.

Appellate body, considering case "the USA – Shrimps", has carried out interpretation of the relevant provision of DRS and recognized the right of arbitration group to receive the materials from the individuals who aren't participating in business given by such persons on their own initiative. Thus, the Appellate body has rejected withdrawal of arbitration group that the arbitration group has the right "to request", but has no right "to obtain" information which hasn't been requested [4].

Within business of EU-Asbest the Appellate body has provided to Morocco as the party which isn't participating in business, the right to provide the materials concerning business [5].

Though Arrangement on dispute settlement is still based on the principles according to GATT 1947, the requirement of consensus for the statement of arbitration groups and adoption of reports is replaced with the principle of "the return consensus". According to this principle, the report of group or Appellate body is accepted if only DSB doesn't make the consensus decision on the return. In practice this principle guarantees automatic adoption of all reports of the WTO.

The vast majority of the disputes considered for all history of the GATT/the WTO treats the type "a".

In 1986 the EEC, Canada and Mexico made the complaint to actions of the USA because the USA in defiance of article III GATT entered tiered rates of gas taxes of national and import production. The USA claimed that increase in duties was insignificant, and the effect of such increase on trade was minimum or zero. According to the USA irrespective of whether entering of graduated tax rates contradicted the first offer of the article III:2 or isn't present, such insignificant distinction couldn't lead to cancellation and reducing the benefits following for EEC, Canada and Mexico from GATT. In response to it the arbitration group noted that within

the procedure of the dispute resolution GATT Contracting Parties repeatedly referred to the fact that the measures contradicting GATT don't render a harmful effect on trade and, respectively, don't lead to cancellation and reducing benefits. However in the history of GATT there was no precedent that the Contracting Party of GATT could confute successfully a presumption that the measure violating liabilities leads to cancellation and reducing benefits. The arbitration group noted that as Contracting Parties in an obvious form weren't determined concerning whether the presumption that illegal measures lead to cancellation or reducing benefits is, it is confutable, in practice this presumption is incontestable in the absence of the proof for benefit of opposite. The arbitration group also came to a conclusion that demonstration of the fact that the measure breaking provisions of the article III GATT doesn't render or renders insignificant effect on trade, isn't the sufficient evidence of the fact that the benefits resulting from this article aren't cancelled or aren't reduced even while such confutation in principle was authorized. This decision is essential for understanding of the concept of cancellation and reducing benefits [6].

Another interesting dispute which cornerstone the measure which isn't breaking provision GATT also was the dispute between the USA and EEC concerning import duties on seeds of oil-bearing crops. The USA addressed with the claim to actions of EEC in which they claimed that from EEC the tariff concession in the form of a zero rate on import of seeds of oil-bearing crops was provided, the EEC enacted the program of agricultural support. After adoption of this program it became more profitable to European producers to make seeds of oil-bearing crops, in comparison with what was earlier since the program provided subsidies. As a result - to receive benefits which the USA expected as a result of entering of a zero import duty, were reduced. In response to this EEC claimed that expectations about failure to provide subsidies can't be legal even after provision of a tariff concession because the articles III:8(b) and XVI:1 of GATT explicitly recognize the right to provision of subsidies [7].

The arbitration group didn't agree with such argumentation, having noted that a matter in issue are subsidies which completely protect producers from impact which imported goods can render, and thus don't allow a tariff concession to exert any impact on conditions of the competition between domestic and foreign goods. According to arbitration group, the main value of a tariff concession is that she guarantees the improved access to the market by means of creation of more favorable conditions for a price competition. Contracting parties hold negotiations with the purpose of receipt of such benefits. Therefore they shall be sure that they in case of negotiation about tariff concessions can be based on expectation that the price effect which will follow after receipt of a tariff concession won't be leveled.

The dispute "the EU - Bed linen" was the first in a series of the cases (in the others the defendant were the USA) calling into question practice of zeroing in case of calculation of a margin of dumping for establishment of anti-dumping measures. This practice which explicitly is not regulated by the Anti-dumping agreement of the WTO consisted, in effect, in equating with zero negative margin arising in case normal cost exceeded export price (in other words, the zero margin of dumping took place). It usually led to calculation of higher general margin of dumping than if instead of zero negative value was used. Zeroing can be applied within different methodologies and at different stages of the anti-dumping procedure, for example model and simple zeroing in initial anti-dumping investigation, and also periodic review, review in connection with change of carrier and review in connection with the termination of anti-dumping measures.

Canada submitted a claim to Korea in 2009 with the purpose to appeal against the beef import ban operating since 2003 from Canada imposed in connection with risk of infection with spongy encephalitis. In 2003 Korea was in the five of the export markets for the Canadian beef of which 0,3% of export were the share that constituted about 2,5 million US dollars. After entering of a prohibition Canada repeatedly tried to get access to the market of Korea, however it wasn't possible to prove compliance of the Canadian beef to standards of national system of health and phytosanitary control of Korea. Korea introduced a number of additional requirements in 2008 which Canada should execute to eliminate a running prohibition that was the cause for the appeal of Canada to Body for the dispute resolution of the WTO. The dispute was resolved before completion of the procedures by arbitration group on mutual consent of the parties – the government of Korea eliminated 8-year prohibition of import of the Canadian beef. Canada resumed deliveries of beef to Korea, however the previous level didn't manage to be reached – in 2012 was delivered beef on 30 thousand dollars of the USA, in 2013 – on 834. Thus, the gap of trade relations and the subsequent long-term lack of trade lead to the fact that the economic result of the won dispute can be obvious only in the long term when economic communication is reestablished and their further development will become possible [8].

In "the EU – Bananas" a number of the countries specified that since the beginning of action of GATT there was a practice of representation of interests of the parties by the state lawyers and experts that emphasizes interstate nature of the procedure. The Appellate body, however, noted that nothing in texts of agreements of the WTO, including the Agreement on WTO and DSB organization, and also Working procedures, and also

in regular rules of international law, and in practice of the dispute resolution international courts interferes with the member of the WTO independently to determine the persons addressing within oral hearings Appellate body however explained that it doesn't affect consideration of a dispute by arbitration group [9].

As we know, on July 27, 2015 in Geneva the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan N. Nazarbayev signed Protocol on the entry of Kazakhstan into the World Trade Organization. Negotiations lasted 19 years. Among many advantages of being a member of WTO it is necessary to distinguish the fact that Kazakhstan has been recognized as the country integrated into the world economy and also automatically receive most favored nation regime with all members of WTO. The great value can represent the mode of the WTO concerning trade disputes, especially in case of the anti-dumping trials applied export goods of Kazakhstan. WTO membership makes possible to solve trade and political disputes within procedures provided by this organization on more fair basis [10].

Today, Kazakhstan participates into 5 cases as a Third party, which gives an opportunity for better understanding of the procedure of dispute settlement within WTO.

### **Conclusion**

Nowadays, the mechanism of the dispute resolution of the WTO is one of key instruments of protection of national interests in the foreign markets within multilateral trade system. Permission of the trade conflicts at the multilateral level is a significant element of the external economic strategy of the states of members of the WTO and especially important for new participants that sets an example of China. The body for settlement of disputes of the WTO creates possibilities of the accounting of positions of various countries and search of the compromise solution, and each new dispute exerts impact on further formation of case practice of the WTO.

The main economic motive of initiation of a dispute at the multilateral level is the actual or potential damage of the state from the termination of commodity export to the country which entered the measure limiting trade. The purposes of the foreign trade strategy of the state directed to achievement of long-term economic benefits by expansion of export of priority industries, and also non-admissions of its discrimination in the foreign markets can act as other motives. A number of the disputes initiated in the WTO arose in the conditions of lack of real economic loss from action of a measure in view of insignificant export volumes. Considering in detail such cases, it is possible to conclude that participants of multilateral trade system challenge this or that practice for the purpose of creation of a precedent which will have horizontal influence on all sectors subsequently.

### **References**

1. *General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, 1994* [https://www.wto.org/english/docs\\_e/legal\\_e/06-gatt\\_e.htm](https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/06-gatt_e.htm)
2. Шумилов В.М. *Международное экономическое право, Учебное пособие. - М.: Международные отношения, 2014. - 287 с.*
3. *Improving WTO Dispute Settlement Procedures: Issues and Lessons from the Practice of Other International Courts and Tribunals / Friedl Weiss and Jochem Wiers, eds. London, 2000.*
4. Смятян А.С., *Международные торговые споры в ГАТТ/ВТО: избранные решения (1952 – 2005 гг.), М. 2006, С. 273.*
5. *European Communities — Measures Affecting Asbestos and Products Containing Asbestos* [https://www.wto.org/english/tratop\\_e/dispu\\_e/cases\\_e/ds135\\_e.htm](https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/cases_e/ds135_e.htm)
6. Доклад группы «United States - Taxes on Petroleum and Certain Imported Substances», *BISD 136*
7. *EEC - Payments and Subsidies Paid to Processors and Producers of Oilseeds and Related Animal-Feed Proteins, Supp. BISD 86, 1990.*
8. *Korea — Measures Affecting the Importation of Bovine Meat and Meat Products from Canada* [https://www.wto.org/english/tratop\\_e/dispu\\_e/cases\\_e/ds391\\_e.htm](https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/cases_e/ds391_e.htm)
9. Jackson J. H. and Grane P. *The Saga Continues: An Update on the Banana Dispute and its Procedural Offspring // Journal of International Economic Law (2001). С. 581-595*
10. *Статья KaznexInvest «Особенности и законодательные требования международных рынков», Астана, 2015* <http://export.gov.kz/storage/58/58962bc4a6b74ce19818922099d871fb.pdf>