

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1. INTRODUCTION.....	28
2. ARGUMENTS OF THE PARTICIPANTS AND THIRD PARTICIPANTS.....	34
2.1 Claims of error by Canada – Appellant.....	34
2.1.1 Article 2.1 of the TBT Agreement.....	34
2.1.2 Article 2.2 of the TBT Agreement.....	39
2.1.2.1 The Panel's analysis of the contribution of the EU Seal Regime to its objective.....	39
2.1.2.2 The Panel's analysis of the alternative measure.....	42
2.1.3 Article XX of the GATT 1994.....	46
2.1.3.1 Scope of Article XX(a).....	46
2.1.3.2 The Panel's analysis of "necessity".....	49
2.1.3.3 The Panel's analysis under the chapeau of Article XX.....	51
2.2 Claims of error by Norway – Appellant.....	53
2.2.1 Article 2.2 of the TBT Agreement.....	53
2.2.1.1 The Panel's identification of the objective of the EU Seal Regime.....	53
2.2.1.2 The Panel's analysis of the contribution of the EU Seal Regime to its objective.....	60
2.2.1.3 The Panel's analysis of the alternative measure.....	66
2.2.1.4 Request for completion of the analysis.....	69
2.2.2 Article XX of the GATT 1994.....	70
2.2.2.1 Aspects of the measure to be justified under Article XX(a).....	70
2.2.2.2 The Panel's analysis of "necessity".....	73
2.2.2.3 The Panel's analysis under the chapeau of Article XX.....	75

Products. Apart from the case title, the Panel referred throughout its Reports to the responding party in these disputes as the European Union or the EU. We follow this practice in these Reports.

² In DS401 only.

2.3	Arguments of the European Union – Appellee	77
2.3.1	Article 2.1 of the TBT Agreement	77
2.3.2	Article 2.2 of the TBT Agreement	81
2.3.2.1	The Panel's identification of the objective of the EU Seal Regime	81
2.3.2.2	The Panel's analysis of the contribution of the EU Seal Regime to its objective	84
2.3.2.3	The Panel's analysis of the alternative measure.....	89
2.3.3	Article XX of the GATT 1994	92
2.3.3.1	Aspects of the measure to be justified under Article XX(a)	92
2.3.3.2	Scope of Article XX(a)	95
2.3.3.3	The Panel's analysis of "necessity"	97
2.3.3.4	The Panel's analysis under the chapeau of Article XX	98
2.4	Claims of error by the European Union – Other appellant.....	100
2.4.1	Annex 1.1 to the TBT Agreement.....	100
2.4.2	Article 2.1 of the TBT Agreement	103
2.4.2.1	Claims under Article 11 of the DSU	106
2.4.3	Article I:1 and Article III:4 of the GATT 1994	112
2.4.4	Article XX of the GATT 1994	115
2.4.4.1	The Panel's analysis under the chapeau of Article XX.....	115
2.4.4.2	The Panel's analysis under Article XX(b).....	116
2.5	Arguments of Canada – Appellee.....	118
2.5.1	Annex 1.1 to the TBT Agreement.....	118
2.5.2	Article 2.1 of the TBT Agreement	120
2.5.3	Article I:1 and Article III:4 of the GATT 1994	126
2.5.4	Article XX of the GATT 1994	130
2.5.4.1	The Panel's analysis under the chapeau of Article XX.....	130
2.5.4.2	The Panel's analysis under Article XX(b).....	130
2.5.5	Non-violation nullification or impairment in the sense of Article XXIII:1(b) of the GATT 1994	132
2.6	Arguments of Norway – Appellee.....	132
2.6.1	Annex 1.1 to the TBT Agreement.....	132
2.6.2	Article I:1 and Article III:4 of the GATT 1994	135

 Reports of the Appellate Body

2.6.3	Article XX of the GATT 1994.....	138
2.6.3.1	The Panel's analysis under the chapeau of Article XX.....	139
2.6.3.2	The Panel's analysis under Article XX(b).....	143
2.6.4	Non-violation nullification or impairment in the sense of Article XXIII:1(b) of the GATT 1994.....	145
2.7	Arguments of the third participants.....	145
2.7.1	Ecuador.....	145
2.7.2	Iceland.....	146
2.7.3	Japan.....	148
2.7.4	Mexico.....	152
2.7.5	Namibia.....	154
2.7.6	United States.....	154
3.	ISSUES RAISED IN THESE APPEALS.....	158
4.	BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW OF THE MEASURE AT ISSUE.....	160
5.	ANALYSIS OF THE APPELLATE BODY.....	166
5.1	Legal Characterization of the EU Seal Regime – Annex 1.1 to the TBT Agreement.....	166
5.1.1	Introduction.....	166
5.1.2	Interpretation of Annex 1.1 to the TBT Agreement.....	169
5.1.3	Whether the EU Seal Regime constitutes a technical regulation.....	172
5.1.3.1	Overview of the EU Seal Regime.....	172
5.1.3.2	Preliminary remarks.....	173
5.1.3.3	Whether the EU Seal Regime lays down product characteristics including the applicable administrative provisions.....	175
5.1.3.4	Completing the legal analysis.....	189
5.1.4	Overall conclusion.....	193
5.2	Article I:1 and Article III:4 of the GATT 1994.....	193
5.2.1	The Panel's findings.....	194
5.2.2	The legal standards of the obligations under Article I:1 and Article III:4 of the GATT 1994.....	195
5.2.3	Article I:1 of the GATT 1994.....	197
5.2.4	Article III:4 of the GATT 1994.....	201
5.3	Article XX of the GATT 1994.....	213
5.3.1	The objective of the EU Seal Regime.....	213

		EC - Seal Products
	5.3.1.1	The Panel's findings 214
	5.3.1.2	Identification of the objective pursued by the EU Seal Regime 217
	5.3.2	Article XX(a) of the GATT 1994..... 228
	5.3.2.1	The Panel's findings on Article XX(a) 231
	5.3.2.2	The Panel's analysis of the aspects of the EU Seal Regime to be justified under Article XX(a)..... 235
	5.3.2.3	The Panel's analysis of the protection of public morals under Article XX(a)..... 239
	5.3.2.4	The Panel's analysis of the contribution of the EU Seal Regime to the objective..... 244
	5.3.2.5	The Panel's analysis of the reasonable availability of the alternative measure..... 271
	5.3.2.6	Conclusion..... 284
	5.3.3	The chapeau of Article XX of the GATT 1994 285
	5.3.3.1	Interpretation of the chapeau of Article XX of the GATT 1994 286
	5.3.3.2	Canada's and Norway's claims on appeal regarding the Panel's reasoning under the chapeau of Article XX of the GATT 1994..... 291
	5.3.3.3	Whether the EU Seal Regime meets the requirements of the chapeau of Article XX of the GATT 1994 295
6.		FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE APPELLATE BODY REPORT WT/DS400/AB/R..... CAN-308
6.		FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE APPELLATE BODY REPORT WT/DS401/AB/R..... NOR-311
	ANNEX 1 313
	ANNEX 2 316
	ANNEX 3 323
	ANNEX 4 330
	ANNEX 5 334