

## Index

- absence of unlawfulness, liability in 78–80, 148–9, 172
  - application of liability regime to situation of retaliation victims 159–71, 189–95
  - actual and certain damage 161
  - damage not being justified by general economic interest 169–71
  - special damage 167–9
  - unusual damage 161–7
- critical evaluation 154–9
- effect of principle on political scope for manoeuvre 193
- EU system of legal protection and judicial remedies 191–2
- FIAMM et al.* case 148, 149, 150–4, 159, 161, 162, 165, 167, 169, 170, 189–91
- good governance and use of discretionary powers 194–5
- accountability 197
- actual damage 161
- administration, proper 138, 140
- annulment of measures 6, 37, 39, 47, 49, 74, 97, 99, 139, 176
- association agreements 88
  
- bananas, trade in 13–19, 174
  
- Canada
  - EU ban on hormones in meat and meat products and 9, 10, 11, 12, 13
  - position of individuals in WTO law 183–4, 186
- carousel 168
- case law *see* jurisprudence of the EU
- causation
  - liability for unlawful conduct and causal link 57, 69, 71, 81, 121–4
- certain damage 161
- certainty, legal 132, 140
  
- compensation claims 39, 42, 44, 45, 46, 49, 58–71, 100, 119, 124, 137
- breach of international law 58–64, 179
- conditions for EU liability developed by EU courts 50–8
  - causal link 57, 69, 71, 81, 121–4
  - conferral of rights 56–7, 68–71, 81, 114–19, 179
  - damage 57, 69, 71, 81, 119–21
  - sufficiently serious breach of law 51–6, 64–5, 81, 179
- consistency with principle of Member State liability 76–8
- different aim of action 75–6
- discretion and its limits 65–7
- EU and WTO laws as two separate legal orders and no right to compensation 175–80
- EU courts and international law 62–4
- EU membership in international legal regimes and 67–8
- grounds 81
- insufficient competence to breach international law 65–7
- liability *see* liability for unlawful conduct
- nature of infringed rule 68–71
- need for full judicial protection 74–5
- relevance of *Francovich* decision 76–7
- relevance of *Köbler* decision 77–8
- sufficiently serious breach of law 64–5, 81, 112–14, 179
- suggestion of new approach 72–8
- competence norm, breach of 110–25
  - conferral of rights 114–19
  - sufficiently serious breach 112–14
- conferral of rights 56–7, 68–71, 81, 114–19, 179
- consistent interpretation principle 110–25
  - conferral of rights 114–19
  - sufficiently serious breach 112–14

- cooperation agreements 88
- countermeasures 166
  - see also* retaliation
- criminal offences 132
- damage
  - actual and certain damage 161
  - gravity of 167
  - liability for unlawful conduct and 57, 69, 71, 81, 119–21
  - not justified by general economic interest 169–71
  - special damage 167–9
  - unusual damage 161–7
    - inherent versus exogenous risk 163–6
    - sectoral versus market risk 162–3
- damages 37, 39, 47–9
  - see also* compensation claims
- democracy 194
- direct effect 95
  - EU law 45, 69, 71
  - WTO law 82, 84, 85, 87, 91, 92, 93, 96, 101, 102, 103, 104, 112, 116, 177, 182, 184
    - exceptional direct effect of WTO primary law 105–10
- discretion granted to EU institutions 39, 97, 112, 113, 124, 187
  - discretion and its limits 65–7
  - EU membership in international legal regimes and 67–8
  - good governance and use of discretionary powers 194–5
  - insufficient competence to breach international law 65–7
- discrimination 57
  - right to non-discrimination 140, 146–7
- Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU) 7, 86, 106
- disputes *see* international trade disputes
- economic activities, right to pursue 140, 141–3
- Ecuador
  - EU preferential trade in bananas and 13, 14, 16, 17, 18
- European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) 127, 199
- European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) 94
- European Free Trade Area (EFTA) 95
- European Union (EU) 42
  - ban on hormones in meat and meat products 8–13, 174
  - compensation for successful claim *see* compensation claims
  - consistent interpretation principle 110–25
    - conferral of rights 114–19
    - sufficiently serious breach 112–14
  - constitutional law and retaliation victims 187–95
  - EU and WTO laws as two separate legal orders and no right to compensation 175–80
  - as global actor 195–9
  - human rights and 37, 39, 127, 130, 132, 137, 197, 198, 199
  - infringement of EU general principles 126–8, 147, 148–9, 187–9
    - actual and certain damage 161
    - application of liability regime to situation of retaliation victims 159–71, 189–95
    - critical evaluation 154–9
    - damage not justified by general economic interest 169–71
    - effect of external dimension of EU conduct on applicability of general principles of EU law 128–37
    - effect of external dimension of EU conduct on scope of general principles of EU law 138–40
    - existence of liability principle in absence of unlawfulness under EU law 149, 172, 189–95
    - FIAMM et al.* case 131–30, 134, 136, 141, 142, 143, 148, 149, 150–4, 159, 161, 162, 165, 167, 169, 170, 177, 187–91
    - general principles, role of in international trade disputes 134
    - Intertanko* case 130, 188
    - Kadi* case 132–3, 134, 136, 137, 188
    - prevailing international legal obligations 136–7
    - principle of legitimate expectations 138, 140, 143–6
    - right to non-discrimination 140, 146–7
    - right to property and principle to pursuit of economic activity 140, 141–3
    - scope of general principles of EU law invoked by retaliation victims 140–7, 188
    - special damage 167–9
    - unusual damage 161–7
    - vertical relationship between EU and traders 134–6
  - international trade disputes *see* international trade disputes
  - jurisprudence 19–20
    - case law on effect of WTO law as benchmark for validity of EU measures 20–30
    - courts' approach with regard to GATT 22

- European Union (EU) (cont.)  
 courts' approach with regard to WTO Agreements 22–30  
 implementation principle 25–6  
 liability cases 30–3, 37  
 review in light of DSB rulings 27–30  
 review in light of mixed agreements 26  
 review in light of primary WTO law 22–5  
 legal discretion granted to EU  
 institutions 39, 97, 112, 113, 124, 187  
 discretion and its limits 65–7  
 EU membership in international legal regimes and 67–8  
 good governance and use of discretionary powers 194–5  
 insufficient competence to breach international law 65–7  
 nature of infringed rule 68–71  
 liability for infringements of WTO law 37, 42  
 liability for unlawful conduct *see* liability for unlawful conduct  
 as member of WTO 7  
 obligations under international law 60, 100, 111, 136–7  
 obligations under WTO law 89, 97, 114  
 political scope for manoeuvre 193  
 preferential trade in bananas 13–19, 174  
 relationship with WTO 7  
 review of EU conduct 37–42  
 exogenous risk 163–6  
 expectations, legitimate 138, 140, 143–6
- France  
 liability in absence of unlawfulness 157, 160  
 freedom to pursue economic activities 140, 141–3
- General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) 7, 22, 185
- General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) 7
- Germany  
 liability in absence of unlawfulness 158  
 governance 194–5  
 grace periods, breach of WTO law after expiry of 98–104, 124  
 gravity of damage 167
- Guatemala  
 EU preferential trade in bananas and 14
- Honduras  
 EU preferential trade in bananas and 14  
 hormones in meat and meat products 8–13  
 human rights  
 EU and 37, 39, 127, 130, 132, 137, 197, 198, 199
- implementation principle 25–6, 105–10  
*Bananas* case 107–9  
*Hormones* case 109–10
- infringement of EU general principles 126–8, 147, 148–9, 187–9  
 effect of external dimension of EU conduct on applicability of general principles of EU law 128–37  
*FIAMM et al.* case 131–30, 134, 136, 141, 142, 143, 148, 149, 150–4, 159, 161, 162, 165, 167, 169, 170, 177, 187–91  
 general principles' role in international trade disputes 134  
*Intertanko* case 130, 188  
*Kadi* case 132–3, 134, 136, 137, 188  
 prevailing international legal obligations 136–7  
 vertical relationship between EU and traders 134–6  
 effect of external dimension of EU conduct on scope of general principles of EU law 138–40  
 existence of liability principle in absence of unlawfulness under EU law 149, 172  
 actual and certain damage 161  
 application of liability regime to situation of retaliation victims 159–71, 189–95  
 critical evaluation 154–9  
 damage not justified by general economic interest 169–71  
 effect of principle on political scope for manoeuvre 193  
 EU system of legal protection and judicial remedies 191–2  
*FIAMM et al.* case 148, 149, 150–4, 159, 161, 162, 165, 167, 169, 170, 189–91  
 good governance and use of discretionary powers 194–5  
 special damage 167–9  
 unusual damage 161–7  
 scope of general principles of EU law invoked by retaliation victims 140–7, 188  
 principle of legitimate expectations 138, 140, 143–6  
 right to non-discrimination 140, 146–7  
 right to property and principle to pursuit of economic activity 140, 141–3
- inherent risk 163–6  
 insurance 165  
 intellectual property  
 Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) Agreement 24  
 International Court of Justice 94  
 international law 196–9

- compensation for breach 58–71, 179
  - breach of international law 58–64
  - consistency with principle of Member State liability 76–8
  - different aim of action 75–6
  - discretion and its limits 65–7
  - EU courts and international law 62–4
  - EU obligations under international law 60, 100
  - grounds 81
  - need for full judicial protection 74–5
  - relevance of *Francovich* decision 76–7
  - relevance of *Köbler* decision 77–8
  - suggestion of new approach 72–8
  - obligations under 60, 100, 111, 136–7
- international trade disputes 6, 7–8, 42, 43
  - Bananas* case 13–19, 30–1, 34, 94, 96, 98, 174
  - implementation principle in 107–9
  - compensation claims *see* compensation claims
  - EU law general principles' role in 134
  - prevailing international legal obligations 136–7
  - vertical relationship between EU and traders 134–6
  - Hormones* case 8–13, 31, 94, 95, 98, 174
  - implementation principle in 109–10
  - liability *see* liability for unlawful conduct
  - position of individuals in WTO law 173–86
  - EU and WTO laws as two separate legal orders and no right to compensation 175–80
  - international comparison 180–6
  - review of EU conduct 37–42
- interpretation, consistent 110–25
  - conferral of rights 114–19
  - sufficiently serious breach 112–14
- Japan
  - position of individuals in WTO law 184–6
- jurisprudence of EU 19–20
  - case law on effect of WTO law as benchmark for validity of EU measures 20–30
  - courts' approach with regard to GATT 22
  - courts' approach with regard to WTO Agreements 22–30
  - implementation principle 25–6
  - liability cases 30–3, 37
  - review in light of DSB rulings 27–30
  - review in light of mixed agreements 26
  - review in light of primary WTO law 22–5
- legal certainty 132, 140
- legal discretion *see* discretion granted to EU institutions
- legitimate expectations 138, 140, 143–6
- liability for unlawful conduct 42, 44–5, 80, 81
  - background 45–7
  - breach of WTO law 82–3
    - breach after expiry of grace period 98–104, 124
    - breach before dispute is brought before DSB 89–93
    - breach identified by DSB 93–8
    - breach of primary WTO law 83–105
    - corollary breach of competence norm because of principle of consistent interpretation 110–25
    - current reasoning of EU courts 84–5
    - implementation principle 105–10
  - compensation for breach of international law 58–71, 179
  - breach of international law 58–64
  - conferral of rights 114–19
  - consistency with principle of Member State liability 76–8
  - different aim of action 75–6
  - discretion and its limits 65–7
  - EU courts and international law 62–4
  - EU membership in international legal regimes and 67–8
  - EU obligations under international law 60, 100
  - grounds 81
  - insufficient competence to breach international law 65–7
  - nature of infringed rule 68–71
  - need for full judicial protection 74–5
  - relevance of *Francovich* decision 76–7
  - relevance of *Köbler* decision 77–8
  - sufficiently serious breach of law 64–5, 81, 112–14, 179
  - suggestion of new approach 72–8
  - conditions for EU liability developed by EU courts 50–8
  - causal link 57, 69, 71, 81, 121–4
  - conferral of rights 56–7, 68–71, 81, 114–19, 179
  - damage 57, 69, 71, 81, 119–21
  - sufficiently serious breach of law 51–6, 64–5, 81, 179
  - independence and complementarity of legal actions in EU legal order 47–9
  - liability cases 30–3, 37
    - Bananas* case 30–1, 34
    - brought by retaliation victims 34–7
    - Hormones* case 31
  - liability due to infringement of EU general principles 126–8, 147, 148–9, 187–9
  - effect of external dimension of EU conduct on applicability of general principles of EU law 128–37

- liability for unlawful conduct (cont.)
  - effect of external dimension of EU
    - conduct on scope of general principles of EU law 138–40
    - FIAMM et al.* case 131–30, 134, 136, 141, 142, 143, 148, 149, 150–4, 159, 161, 162, 165, 167, 169, 170, 177, 187–91
    - general principles, role of in international trade disputes 134
    - Intertanko* case 130, 188
    - Kadi* case 132–3, 134, 136, 137, 188
    - prevailing international legal obligations 136–7
    - principle of legitimate expectations 138, 140, 143–6
    - right to non-discrimination 140, 146–7
    - right to property and principle to pursuit of economic activity 140, 141–3
    - scope of general principles of EU law invoked by retaliation victims 140–7, 188
    - vertical relationship between EU and traders 134–6
  - liability in absence of unlawfulness 78–80, 148–9, 172, 189–95
    - actual and certain damage 161
    - application of liability regime to situation of retaliation victims 159–71, 189–95
    - critical evaluation 154–9
    - damage not justified by general economic interest 169–71
    - effect of principle on political scope for manoeuvre 193
    - EU system of legal protection and judicial remedies 191–2
    - FIAMM et al.* case 148, 149, 150–4, 159, 161, 162, 165, 167, 169, 170, 189–91
    - good governance and use of discretionary powers 194–5
    - special damage 167–9
    - unusual damage 161–7
    - wording of article and leeway for EU courts 50
  - Lomé Convention 13
  - marine pollution 131
  - market risk 162–3
  - Mexico
    - EU preferential trade in bananas and 14
  - Nicaragua
    - EU preferential trade in bananas and 17
  - no-fault liability 42
    - see also* absence of unlawfulness, liability in
  - non-discrimination, right to 140, 146–7
  - Panama
    - EU preferential trade in bananas and 17
    - partnership agreements 88
    - political scope for manoeuvre 193
    - preferential trade in bananas 13–19, 174
    - proper administration principle 138, 140
    - property rights 140, 141–3
      - Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) Agreement 24
    - proportionality principle 140, 142
  - remedies 138
    - see also* compensation claims; damages
  - retaliation 7, 74, 100, 111, 117, 122
    - application of liability regime in absence of unlawfulness to situation of retaliation victims 159–71, 189–95
      - actual and certain damage 161
      - damage not justified by general economic interest 169–71
      - special damage 167–9
      - unusual damage 161–7
    - EU ban on hormones in meat and meat products and 10
    - EU constitutional law and retaliation victims 187–95
    - EU liability for infringements of WTO law 37, 42
    - EU preferential trade in bananas and 14–16
    - liability cases brought by retaliation victims 34–7
    - position of individuals in WTO law 173–86
      - EU and WTO laws as two separate legal orders and no right to compensation 175–80
      - international comparison 180–6
  - risk
    - inherent versus exogenous risk 163–6
    - sectoral versus market risk 162–3
  - rule of law 74, 128, 138, 140
  - Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS) Agreement 7
    - EU ban on hormones in meat and meat products and 9
  - scope for manoeuvre 101
  - sectoral risk 162–3
  - Spain
    - liability in absence of unlawfulness 158
    - special damage 167–9
    - subsidiarity principle 66
    - sufficiently serious breach of law 51–6, 64–5, 81, 112–14, 179
    - supremacy of EU law 45

- Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) Agreement 7
- terrorism 132
- trade, right to 140, 141–3
- trade disputes *see* international trade disputes
- Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) Agreement 24
  
- United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea 115, 131, 132
- United States of America (USA) 123
  - EU ban on hormones in meat and meat products and 8, 10, 11, 12, 13
  - EU preferential trade in bananas and 13, 14–16, 17, 18
  - position of individuals in WTO law 180–3, 186
- unlawful conduct, liability for *see* liability for unlawful conduct
- unusual damage 161–7
  - inherent versus exogenous risk 163–6
  - sectoral versus market risk 162–3
  
- vertical relationship between EU and traders 134–6
  
- World Trade Organization (WTO)
  - Agreement 7, 91
  - breach of WTO law
    - breach after expiry of grace period 98–104, 124
  - countermeasures 166
  - see also* retaliation
  - direct effect of WTO law 82, 84, 85, 87, 91, 92, 93, 96, 101, 102, 103, 104, 112, 116, 177, 182, 184
  - exceptional direct effect of WTO primary law 105–10
  
- Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) 6
- disputes in *see* international trade disputes
- EU as member of 7
- EU case law on effect of WTO law as benchmark for validity of EU measures 20–30
  - courts' approach with regard to GATT 22
  - courts' approach with regard to WTO Agreements 22–30
  - implementation principle 25–6
  - liability cases 30–3, 37
  - review in light of DSB rulings 27–30
  - review in light of mixed agreements 26
  - review in light of primary WTO law 22–5
- EU liability for infringements of WTO law 37, 42
- obligations under WTO law 89, 97, 114
- position of individuals in WTO law 173–86
  - EU and WTO laws as two separate legal orders and no right to compensation 175–80
  - international comparison 180–6
- relationship with EU 7
- unlawful conduct in breach of WTO law 82–3
  - breach before dispute is brought before DSB 89–93
  - breach identified by DSB 93–8
  - breach of primary WTO law 83–105
  - corollary breach of competence norm because of principle of consistent interpretation 110–25
  - current reasoning of EU courts 84–5
  - implementation principle 105–10