

## Reports of the Appellate Body

---

Norway, *Third Participant*  
 Saudi Arabia, *Third Participant*  
 Separate Customs Territory of Taiwan,  
 Penghu, Kinmen and Matsu, *Third  
 Participant*  
 Turkey, *Third Participant*<sup>2</sup>  
 United States, *Third Participant*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1. INTRODUCTION.....	28
2. ARGUMENTS OF THE PARTICIPANTS AND THIRD PARTICIPANTS.....	43
2.1 Claims of error by Canada – Appellant.....	43
2.1.1 Article III:8(a) of the GATT 1994.....	43
2.1.2 Article 11 of the DSU – "Commercial resale".....	46
2.2 Arguments of Japan – Appellee.....	50
2.2.1 Article III:8(a) of the GATT 1994.....	50
2.2.2 Article 11 of the DSU – "Commercial resale".....	51
2.3 Arguments of the European Union – Appellee.....	54
2.3.1 Article III:8(a) of the GATT 1994.....	54
2.3.2 Article 11 of the DSU – "Commercial resale".....	56
2.4 Claims of error by Japan – Other appellant.....	61
2.4.1 The order in which the Panel dealt with Japan's claims under the SCM Agreement and its claims under the TRIMs Agreement and the GATT 1994.....	61
2.4.2 Claims under Article III:8(a) of the GATT 1994.....	63
2.4.2.1 The Panel's finding that the FIT Programme and Contracts involve "procurement by governmental agencies of products purchased".....	63
2.4.2.2 The Panel's interpretation of the word "for" in term "for governmental purposes".....	64

---

<sup>1</sup> In DS412 only.

<sup>2</sup> In DS426 only.

## Canada - Renewable Energy / Canada - Feed-in Tariff Program

2.4.2.3	The Panel's interpretation and application of the term "with a view to commercial resale" .....	65
2.4.3	The Panel's decision to exercise judicial economy with respect to Japan's "stand-alone" claim under Article III:4 of the GATT 1994 .....	66
2.4.4	Claims under the SCM Agreement .....	69
2.4.4.1	Article 1.1(a) – "Financial contribution" or "income or price support" .....	69
2.4.4.2	Article 1.1(b) – "Benefit" .....	72
2.4.4.3	Article 11 of the DSU – "Benefit" .....	76
2.5	Claims of error by the European Union – Other appellant .....	78
2.5.1	The relationship between the TRIMs Agreement and Article III:4 of the GATT 1994 .....	78
2.5.2	Claims under Article III:8(a) of the GATT 1994 .....	80
2.5.2.1	The Panel's finding that the domestic content requirements "govern" procurement of electricity .....	80
2.5.2.2	The Panel's interpretation of the term "governmental purposes" .....	82
2.5.3	Claims under the SCM Agreement .....	84
2.5.3.1	Article 1.1(b) – "Benefit" .....	84
2.5.3.2	Article 11 of the DSU – "Benefit" .....	88
2.6	Arguments of Canada – Appellee .....	90
2.6.1	The order in which the Panel dealt with Japan's claims under the SCM Agreement and its claims under the TRIMs Agreement and the GATT 1994 .....	90
2.6.2	The relationship between the TRIMs Agreement and Article III:4 of the GATT 1994 .....	90
2.6.3	Claims under Article III:8(a) of the GATT 1994 .....	92
2.6.3.1	The Panel's finding that the FIT Programme and Contracts involve "procurement by governmental agencies of products purchased" .....	92
2.6.3.2	The Panel's finding that the domestic content requirements "govern" the procurement of electricity .....	93
2.6.3.3	The Panel's interpretation of the term "governmental purposes" .....	94

## Reports of the Appellate Body

2.6.3.4	The Panel's interpretation of the word "for" in the term "for governmental purposes".....	94
2.6.3.5	The Panel's interpretation of the term "with a view to commercial resale".....	95
2.6.3.6	Canada's request for completion of the analysis.....	97
2.6.4	The Panel's decision to exercise judicial economy with respect to Japan's "stand-alone" claim under Article III:4 of the GATT 1994 .....	98
2.6.5	Claims under the SCM Agreement .....	99
2.6.5.1	Article 1.1(a) – "Financial contribution" or "income or price support" .....	99
2.6.5.2	Article 1.1(b) – "Benefit".....	101
2.6.5.3	Article 11 of the DSU – "Benefit" .....	104
2.7	Arguments of the third participants.....	106
2.7.1	Australia.....	106
2.7.2	Brazil.....	107
2.7.3	China.....	109
2.7.4	India .....	110
2.7.5	Norway .....	111
2.7.6	Saudi Arabia .....	111
2.7.7	Turkey.....	112
2.7.8	United States.....	112
3.	ISSUES RAISED IN THIS APPEAL .....	116
4.	BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW OF THE MEASURES AT ISSUE.....	118
4.1	Electricity networks .....	118
4.2	Ontario's electricity market .....	121
4.3	The FIT Programme.....	128
5.	ANALYSIS OF THE APPELLATE BODY.....	131
5.1	The order in which the Panel dealt with Japan's claims under the SCM Agreement and its claims under the TRIMs Agreement and the GATT 1994 .....	131
5.2	The applicability of Article III:8(a) of the GATT 1994 to measures falling under Article 2.2 of the TRIMs Agreement and the Illustrative List annexed thereto .....	134
5.2.1	The Panel's findings.....	134
5.2.2	Claims and arguments on appeal .....	136

## Canada - Renewable Energy / Canada - Feed-in Tariff Program

5.2.3	Is Article III:8(a) of the GATT 1994 applicable to measures falling within the scope of Article 2.2 of the TRIMs Agreement and the Illustrative List annexed thereto? .....	137
5.3	Article III:8(a) of the GATT 1994.....	143
5.3.1	The Panel's findings .....	143
5.3.2	Claims and arguments on appeal.....	147
5.3.3	Interpretation of Article III:8(a) of the GATT 1994 .....	150
5.3.4	Application of Article III:8(a) of the GATT 1994 to the facts of these disputes.....	159
5.4	Did the Panel properly exercise judicial economy when it declined to make a finding under Japan's "stand-alone" claim under Article III:4 of the GATT 1994? .....	162
5.5	Claims under the SCM Agreement.....	169
5.5.1	Article 1.1(a) – "Financial contribution" or "income or price support".....	169
5.5.1.1	The Panel's findings .....	169
5.5.1.2	Whether the Panel erred in finding that the FIT Programme and Contracts are government "purchases [of] goods" under Article 1.1(a)(1)(iii) of the SCM Agreement.....	172
5.5.1.3	Did the Panel err in exercising judicial economy with respect to the allegations that the measures at issue constitute "income or price support"?.....	181
5.5.2	Article 1.1(b) – "Benefit" .....	183
5.5.2.1	The Panel's findings .....	185
5.5.2.2	Whether the Panel erred in finding that the European Union and Japan failed to establish that the challenged measures confer a benefit within the meaning of Article 1.1(b) of the SCM Agreement.....	188
5.5.2.2.1	The legal standard for the determination of benefit under Article 1.1(b) of the SCM Agreement.....	188
5.5.2.2.2	The relevant market.....	190
5.5.2.2.3	Identification of a benefit benchmark for electricity	

---

 Reports of the Appellate Body
 

---

	produced from windpower and solar PV technologies.....	195
5.5.2.2.4	The Panel's benefit benchmark analysis.....	198
5.5.2.2.5	Conclusions under Article 1.1(b) of the SCM Agreement.....	204
5.5.2.3	Whether the Panel acted inconsistently with Article 11 of the DSU in finding that the European Union and Japan failed to establish that the challenged measures confer a benefit within the meaning of Article 1.1(b) of the SCM Agreement .....	207
5.5.2.4	Completion of the analysis.....	208
6.	FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE APPELLATE BODY REPORT WT/DS412/AB/R.....	JAP-217
6.	FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE APPELLATE BODY REPORT WT/DS426/AB/R.....	EU-220
ANNEX 1	.....	222
ANNEX 2	.....	224
ANNEX 3	.....	229
ANNEX 4	.....	233