

UNITED STATES – CERTAIN MEASURES ON STEEL AND ALUMINUM PRODUCTS
(DS556)

**INTEGRATED EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

June 25, 2021

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF U.S. FIRST WRITTEN SUBMISSION

1. At issue in this dispute is the sovereign right of a state to take action to protect its essential security in the manner it considers necessary. WTO Members did not relinquish this inherent right in joining the WTO. To the contrary, this right is reflected in Article XXI(b) of the GATT 1994, and WTO Members have not agreed to subject the exercise of this right to legal review.

2. Section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (Section 232) allows the United States to adjust imports of an article based on a finding that such imports threaten to impair U.S. national security. On April 19 and 26, 2017, the United States initiated investigations under Section 232 into imports of steel and aluminum, respectively. In connection with these investigations, United States solicited written comments from interested parties and held public hearings. The United States summarized its findings from these investigations in written reports, and released these reports to the public. On March 8, 2018, the United States acted pursuant to Section 232 and imposed tariffs on certain steel and aluminum imports, effective beginning on March 23, 2018. The United States also established a process to permit product-specific exclusions from the Section 232 tariffs, based on, among other factors, the national security implications of those imports.

A. The Text Of GATT 1994 Article XXI(b) In Its Context, And In The Light Of The Agreement’s Object And Purpose, Establishes That The Exception Is Self-Judging

3. The text of GATT 1994 Article XXI(b), in its context and in the light of the agreement’s object and purpose, establishes that the exception is self-judging. As this text provides “[n]othing” in the GATT 1994 shall be construed to prevent a WTO Member from taking “any action” which “it considers necessary” for the protection of its essential security interests. This text establishes that (1) “nothing” in the GATT 1994 prevents a Member from taking any action needed to protect an essential security interest, and (2) the action necessary for the protection of its essential security interests is that which the Member “considers necessary” for such protection.

4. The self-judging nature of GATT 1994 Article XXI(b) is demonstrated by that provision’s reference to actions that the Member “considers necessary” for the protection of its essential security interests. The ordinary meaning of “considers” is “[r]egard in a certain light or aspect; look upon as” or “think or take to be.” Under Article XXI(b), the relevant “light” or “aspect” in which to regard the action is whether that action is necessary for the protection of the acting Member’s essential security interests. Thus, reading the clause together, the ordinary meaning of the text indicates it is the Member (“which it”) that must regard (“consider[.]”) the action as having the aspect of being necessary for the protection of that Member’s essential security interests. The French and Spanish texts of Article XXI(b) confirm the self-judging nature of this provision. Specifically, use of the subjunctive in Spanish (“estime”) and the future with an implied subjunctive mood in French (“estimera”) support the view that the action taken reflects the beliefs of the WTO Member, rather than an assertion of objective fact that could be subject to debate.

5. The ordinary meaning of the terms in the phrase “its essential security interests,” also supports the self-judging nature of Article XXI. The word “interest” is defined as “[t]he relation of being involved or concerned as regards potential detriment or (esp.) advantage.” The term “security” refers to “[t]he condition of being protected from or not exposed to danger.” The definitions of “essential” include “[t]hat is such in the absolute or highest sense” and “[a]ffecting the essence of anything; significant, important.”

6. And it is “its” essential security interests – the Member’s in question – that the action is taken for the protection of. Therefore, it is the judgment of the Member that is relevant. Each WTO Member must determine whether certain action involves “its interests,” that is, potential detriments or advantages from the perspective of that Member. Each WTO Member likewise must determine whether a situation implicates its “security” interests (not being exposed to danger), and whether the interests at stake are “essential,” that is, significant or important, in the absolute or highest sense. By their very nature, these questions are political and can only be answered by the Member in question, based on its specific and unique circumstances, and its own perception of those circumstances. No WTO Member or WTO panel can substitute its views for those of a Member on such matters.

7. The text of subparagraphs (i) to (iii) of Article XXI(b) also supports the self-judging nature of this provision. The first element of this text that is notable is the lack of any conjunction to separate the three subparagraphs. The subparagraphs are not separated by the coordinating conjunction “or”, to demonstrate alternatives, or the conjunction “and”, to suggest cumulative situations. Accordingly, each subparagraph must be considered for its relation to the chapeau of Article XXI(b).

8. Subparagraphs (i) and (ii) of Article XXI(b) both begin with the phrase “relating to” and directly follow the phrase “essential security interests” in the chapeau of paragraph (b). The most natural reading of this construction is that subparagraphs (i) and (ii) modify the phrase “essential security interests” and thus illustrate the types of “essential security interests” that Members considered could lead to action under Article XXI(b). Subparagraphs (i) and (ii) do not limit a Member’s essential security interests exclusively to those interests. First, the chapeau of Article XXI(b) (as noted) reserves to the Member the judgment of what “its interests” are, including whether they are relating to one of the enumerated interests. Second, subparagraph (iii) reflects no explication (and therefore cannot be understood to reflect a limitation) on a Member’s essential security interests. Rather, as with subparagraphs (i) and (ii), the essential security interests are those determined by the Member taking the action.

9. Subparagraph (iii) begins with temporal language: “*taken in time of war or other emergency in international relations.*” The phrase “taken in time of” echoes the reference to “taking any action” in the chapeau of Article XXI (b), and it is actions that are “taken”, not interests. Thus, the temporal circumstance in subparagraph (iii) modifies the word “action,” rather than the phrase “essential security interests.” Accordingly, Article XXI(b)(iii) reflects a Member’s right to take action it considers necessary for the protection of its essential security interests *when* that action is taken in time of war or other emergency in international relations. Nor does the text of Article XXI(b)(iii) require that the emergency in international relations or

war directly involve the acting Member, reflecting again that the action taken for the protection of its essential security interests is that which the Member judges necessary.

10. Subparagraphs (i) to (iii) of Article XXI(b) thus reflect that Members wished to set out certain types of “essential security interests” and a temporal circumstance that Members considered could lead to action under Article XXI(b). A Member taking action pursuant to Article XXI(b) would consider its action to be necessary for the protection of the interests identified in subparagraphs (i) and (ii) or to be taken in time of war or other emergency in international relations. In this way, the subparagraphs guide a Member’s exercise of its rights under this provision while reserving to the Member the judgment whether particular action is necessary to protect its essential security interests.

11. The context of Article XXI(b) also supports this understanding. First, the phrase “which it considers necessary” is present in Article XXI(a) and XXI(b), but not in Article XXI(c). The selective use of this phrase highlights that, under Article XXI(a) and XXI(b), it is the judgment of the Member that controls. The Panel should recognize and give meaning to such deliberate use of the phrase “which it considers” in Article XXI(b), and not reduce these words to inutility. Second, the context provided by Article XX supports the understanding that Article XXI(b) is self-judging. Specifically, Article XX sets out “general exceptions,” and a number of subparagraphs of Article XX relate to whether an action is “necessary” for some listed objective. For example, Article XX(a), (b), and (d), respectively, provide exceptions for certain measures “*necessary* to protect public morals,” “*necessary* to protect human, animal or plant life or health,” and “*necessary* to secure compliance with laws or regulations which are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Agreement” (emphases added). Unlike Article XXI(b), however, none of the Article XX subparagraphs use the phrase “which it considers” to introduce the word “necessary.” Furthermore, Article XX includes a chapeau which subjects a measure qualifying as “necessary” to a further requirement of, essentially, non-discrimination. Notably, such a qualification, which requires review of a Member’s action, is absent from Article XXI.

12. Third, a number of provisions of the GATT 1994 and other WTO agreements refer to action that a Member “considers” appropriate or necessary, and—as in Article XXI(b)—this language signals that a particular judgment resides with that Member. For example, under Article 18.7 of the Agreement on Agriculture, “[a]ny Member” may bring to the attention of the Committee on Agriculture “any measure which it considers ought to have been notified by another Member.” Similarly, Article III(5) of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) permits “[a]ny Member” to notify the Council for Trade in Services of any measure taken by another Member which “it considers affects” the operation of GATS. In other provisions of the GATT 1994 or other WTO agreements, however, certain judgments are left for determination by a panel, the Appellate Body, or a WTO committee. Under DSU Art. 12.9, for example, “[w]hen the panel considers” that it cannot issue its report within a certain period of time, the panel must provide certain information to the DSB. Under Article 4(1) of the Agreement on Rules of Origin, the Committee on Rules of Origin may request work from the Technical Committee on Rules of Origin “as it considers appropriate” for the furtherance of the objectives of that agreement.

13. Fourth, by way of contrast, and further context, in at least two WTO provisions the judgment of a Member is expressly subject to review through dispute settlement. Specifically, DSU Article 26.1 permits the institution of non-violation complaints, subject to special requirements, including that the panel or Appellate Body agree with the judgment of the complaining party. As DSU Article 26.1 states, a non-violation complaint may be instituted, “[w]here and to the extent that such party considers *and* a panel or the Appellate Body determines” that a particular measure does not conflict with a WTO agreement, among other requirements. Thus, in this provision, Members explicitly agreed that it is not sufficient that “[a] party considers” a non-violation situation to exist, and accordingly, a non-violation complaint is subject to the additional check that “a panel or the Appellate Body determines that” a non-violation situation is present. A similar limitation—that a “party considers and a panel determines that”—was agreed in DSU Article 26.2 for complaints of the kind described in GATT 1994 Article XXIII:1(c).

14. The context provided by DSU Articles 26.1 and 26.2 is highly instructive. No such review of a Member’s judgment is set out in Article XXI(b), which permits a Member to take action “which it [a Member] considers necessary for the protection of its essential security interests.” Accordingly, the context of Article XXI(b) demonstrates that Members did not agree to subject a Member’s essential security judgments to review by a WTO panel.

15. The object and purpose of the GATT 1994 also establishes that Article XXI(b) is self-judging. The object and purpose of the GATT 1994 is set out in the agreement’s Preamble. That Preamble provides, among other things, that the GATT 1994 set forth “reciprocal and mutually advantageous arrangements directed to the substantial reduction of tariffs and other barriers to trade.” Particularly with these references to arrangements that are “mutually advantageous” and tariff reductions that are “substantial” (rather than complete), the contracting parties (now Members) acknowledged that the GATT contained both obligations and exceptions, including the essential security exceptions at Article XXI. The self-judging nature of Article XXI is further established by a subsequent agreement between the parties regarding the interpretation of the treaty or the application of its provisions in the context of the *United States Export Measures* dispute between the United States and Czechoslovakia.

B. Supplementary Means of Interpretation, Including Negotiating History, Confirm The Self-Judging Nature of GATT 1994 Article XXI(b)

16. While not necessary in this dispute, supplementary means of interpretation, including negotiating history, confirms that GATT 1994 Article XXI(b) is self-judging. The drafting history of GATT 1994 XXI(b) dates back to negotiations to establish the International Trade Organization of the United Nations (ITO). In 1946, the United States proposed a draft charter for the ITO, which included the following two exceptions provisions:

Article 32 (General Exceptions to Chapter IV):

Nothing in Chapter IV of this Charter shall be construed to prevent the adoption or enforcement by any Member of measures

....

(e) in time of war or other emergency in international relations, relating to the protection of the essential security interests of a Member.

Article 49.2 (Exceptions to Provisions Relating to Intergovernmental Commodity Agreements):

None of the foregoing provisions of Chapter VI is to be interpreted as applying to agreements relating to fissionable materials; to the traffic in arms, ammunition and implements of war and to such traffic in other goods and materials as is carried on for the purpose of supplying a military establishment; or, in time of war or other emergency in international relations, to the protection of the essential security interests of a Member.

17. The United States asserted at the time that Article 32(e) “afforded complete opportunity for the adoption of all measures regarded as necessary for the protection of national interests” in a time of war or a national emergency. As originally drafted, however, neither exceptions provision was explicitly self-judging. These provisions lacked the key phrase that appears in the current text of GATT 1994 Article XXI(b) regarding action by a Member that “it considers necessary for” the protection of its essential security interests. In addition, the essential security exception set out in Article 32 of the ITO draft charter was one of twelve exceptions, several of which later formed the basis for the general exceptions at GATT 1994 Article XX.

18. In March 1947, the same exceptions text was proposed as both GATT Article XX and Article 37 the ITO draft charter, in Chapter V, which related to “[g]eneral commercial policy.” The chapeau of this proposed text and a number of the subparagraphs are identical to what would become GATT 1994 Article XX. With its proviso, the chapeau contemplated panel review so that the exceptions would not be applied to discriminate unfairly. The subparagraphs corresponding to essential security were included in this proposed text, together with other exceptions, and thus were subject to the proviso in the chapeau, like these other exceptions. This structure suggests that, at that time, not all drafters may have viewed the essential security exception in subparagraph (e) as self-judging.

19. In May 1947, the United States proposed removing, *inter alia*, subparagraph (e) from the ITO draft charter exceptions provision quoted above. In the U.S. proposal, item (e) would be included in a new article, to be inserted at an “appropriate” place at the end of the ITO draft charter, so that these exceptions would apply to the whole charter. The United States also proposed that the new article would begin by stating “[n]othing in this Charter shall be construed to prevent the adoption or enforcement by any Member of measures,” including those relating to the protection of essential security interests. Thereafter, the United States proposed the addition of a new chapter, entitled “Miscellaneous” at the end of the ITO draft charter, and that the proposed exceptions to the charter as a whole be included in this new chapter. The United States also suggested additional text to this exceptions provision, to make the self-judging nature of these exceptions explicit. Under this U.S. proposal, the draft exceptions provision stated:

Nothing in this Charter shall be construed to require any Member to furnish any information the disclosure of which *it considers contrary* to its essential security

interests, or to prevent any Member from taking any action which *it may consider to be necessary* to such interests:

- a) Relating to fissionable materials or their source materials;
- b) Relating to the traffic in arms, ammunition and implements of war and to such traffic in other goods and materials as is carried on for the purpose of supplying a military establishment;
- c) In time of war or other emergency in international relations, relating to the protection of its essential security interests;

20. The text now referenced what a Member considered to be necessary, explicitly indicating that this provision could be invoked based on a Member's own judgment. Moreover, this reference was included only for national security issues, including actions which a Member may consider necessary for the protection of its essential security interests. The drafting history thus shows that a deliberate textual distinction was drawn between the self-judging nature of exceptions pertaining to essential security and exceptions related to other interests that, unlike the security-based exceptions referenced above, were retained as part of the "[g]eneral commercial policy" chapter of the ITO draft charter.

21. Regarding the exception's scope, at a July 1947 meeting of the ITO negotiating committee, the delegate from The Netherlands requested clarification on the meaning of a Member's "essential security interests," and suggested that this reference could represent "a very big loophole" in the ITO charter. The U.S. delegate responded that the exception would not "permit anything under the sun," but suggested that there must be some latitude for security measures. The U.S. delegate further observed that in situations such as times of war, "no one would question the need of a Member, or the right of a Member, to take action relating to its security interests and to determine for itself—which I think we cannot deny—what its security interests are."

22. In those discussions the Chairman made a statement "in defence of the text," and recalled the context of the essential security exception as part of the ITO charter. As the Chairman observed, when the ITO was in operation "the atmosphere inside the ITO will be the only efficient guarantee against abuses of the kind" raised by The Netherlands delegate. That is, the parties would serve to police each other's use of the essential security through a culture of self-restraint. During the same July 1947 meeting, the Chairman asked whether the drafters agreed that actions taken pursuant to the essential security exception "should not provide for any possibility of redress." In response, the U.S. delegate observed that such actions "could not be challenged in the sense that it could not be claimed that the Member was violating the Charter." The United States acknowledged, however, that a member affected by such actions "would have the right to seek redress of some kind" under Article 35(2) of the ITO charter.

23. At that time, Article 35(2) provided for the possibility of consultations concerning the application of any measure, "whether or not it conflicts with the terms of this Charter," which had "the effect of nullifying or impairing any object" of the ITO charter. If the parties were

unable to resolve the matter, it could be referred to the ITO, which in turn could make recommendations, including the suspension of obligations or concessions. In response to the explanation from the U.S. delegate, including the right to seek redress for non-violation under Article 35(2), the Australian delegate lifted a reservation on the essential security exception at this July 1947 meeting. The delegate from Australia stated that, as the exception was “so wide in its coverage”—particularly the “which it may consider to be necessary” language—Australia’s agreement was done with the assurance that “a Member’s rights under Article 35(2) will not be impinged upon.” This exchange demonstrates that the drafters of the text that became GATT 1994 Article XXI(b) understood that essential security measures could not be challenged as violating obligations in the underlying agreement. Nevertheless, an ITO member affected by essential security measures could claim that its expected benefits under the charter had been nullified or impaired, as set forth at Article 35(2) of the ITO Charter draft current in July 1947. As applied to the WTO context, this discussion indicates essential security measures cannot be found by a panel to breach the GATT 1994 or other WTO agreements, although Members may request that a panel review whether its benefits have been nullified or impaired by the essential security measure and, if so, to assess the level of that nullification or impairment.

24. This understanding of the relationship between essential security measures and nullification or impairment procedures is further confirmed by discussions of the ITO Charter that occurred in early 1948. For example, after “extensive discussions,” a Working Party of representatives from Australia, India, Mexico, and the United States decided to retain the draft charter’s non-violation nullification or impairment provision. The Working Party noted that the provision “would apply to the situation of action taken by a Member” to protect its essential security interests. The explanation of the Working Party is worth reading in full:

Such action, for example, in the interest of national security in time of war or other international emergency *would be entirely consistent with the Charter*, but might nevertheless result in the nullification or impairment of benefits accruing to other Members. Such other Members should, under those circumstances, have the right to bring the matter before the Organization, *not on the ground that the measure taken was inconsistent* with the Charter, but on the ground that the measure so taken effectively nullified benefits accruing to the complaining Member.

25. Members of a sub-committee on the ITO Charter’s dispute settlement chapter expressed similar views. Thereafter, the essential security exception in the ITO draft charter was revised based on suggestions from the United Kingdom. The UK representative opined that with these revisions, the Charter “would neither permit, nor condemn, nor pass any judgment whatever on, unilateral economic sanctions.” After the UK’s revisions were accepted, a representative of India—when discussing nullification or impairment claims as a remedy for essential security measures—“expressed some doubt” about whether “the bona fides of an action allegedly coming within [the essential security exception] could be questioned.” In early 1948, negotiators also declined to adopt a UK proposal that would have amended the essential security provision to state that nullification or impairment procedures were the appropriate recourse for members affected by essential security measures by other members. As the United States noted at the time, such a reference to nullification or impairment in the essential security provision was “unnecessary” in light of the existing text.

26. In its analysis of the negotiating history of Article XXI(b), the *Russia – Traffic in Transit* panel referred at length to internal documents of the U.S. delegation to the GATT negotiations. Specifically, in addition to considering published documents associated with the negotiating history of Article XXI(b), that panel considered a study that discusses internal documents of the U.S. delegation. In particular, the panel report recounts at some length this study’s discussion of an internal U.S. delegation meeting of July 4, 1947. The panel used these documents as negotiating history to confirm the panel’s interpretation that it had the authority to review a Member’s invocation of its essential security interests. The Panel in *Russia – Traffic in Transit* erred in relying on such material because it is not “negotiating history” within the meaning of the Vienna Convention. It is concerning that the panel would commit such an elementary error in interpretive approach. Even putting aside this interpretative error, the panel also misunderstood and mischaracterized the U.S. discussions to which it referred. These internal U.S. deliberations—when considered as a whole and in context—further confirm that Article XXI(b) is self-judging.

27. The self-judging nature of Article XXI(b) is also supported by views repeatedly expressed by GATT contracting parties (now Members) in connection with prior invocations of their essential security interests.

C. The *Russia – Traffic In Transit* Panel Erred In Deciding It Had Authority To Review A Responding Party’s Invocation Of Article XXI.

28. The panel in *Russia – Traffic in Transit* erred when it decided that it had authority to review multiple aspects of a responding party’s invocation of Article XXI. That panel’s interpretation of Article XXI is not consistent with the customary rules of interpretation set forth in the Vienna Convention. In addition to being inconsistent with the ordinary meaning of the terms of Article XXI, the panel failed to interpret that provision as a whole. In fact, the panel appears to have reached its conclusion regarding the reviewability of Article XXI a mere four paragraphs after beginning its analysis – based not on “the mere meaning of the words and the grammatical construction of the provision,” but on what it termed the “logical structure of the provision.”

29. Furthermore, in its examination of the negotiating history of the treaty, the *Russia – Traffic in Transit* panel misconstrued certain statements by negotiating parties and relied on materials not properly considered part of the negotiating history. These errors reveal the panel’s analysis as deeply flawed and suggest a results-driven approach not in line with the responsibility bestowed on the panelists by WTO Members through the DSU.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE U.S. OPENING STATEMENT AT THE FIRST
SUBSTANTIVE MEETING OF THE PANEL**

A. The Plain Meaning of the Text of GATT 1994 Article XXI(b) Establishes That The Exception Is Self-Judging

30. The text of Article XXI(b) establishes that Article XXI(b) is self-judging. The chapeau of Article XXI(b) provides that “[n]othing in this Agreement shall be construed to prevent any contracting party from taking any action which it considers necessary for the protection of its

essential security interests.” “[C]onsider[.]” means “[r]egards in a certain light or aspect; look upon as.” Here, the relevant “light” or “aspect” in which a Member should regard the action is whether that action is necessary for protection of the acting Member’s essential security interests. Whether the Member “regards” the actions in this light is a subjective question.

31. The text also specifies that it is “*its* essential security interests”—the Member’s in question—that the action is taken for the protection of. In identifying such security interests, therefore, it is the judgment of the Member that is relevant. Only a Member can determine for itself what comprises its essential security interests, including “relating to fissionable materials” under Article XXI(b)(i) or “relating to the traffic in arms, ammunition and implements of war” under Article XXI(b)(ii).

32. Fundamentally, Article XXI(b) is about a Member taking an action “which it considers necessary”. The relative clause that follows the word “action” describes the circumstances which the Member should “consider” to be present when it takes such an “action”. The clause begins with “which it considers necessary” and ends at the end of each subparagraph. All of the elements in the text, including each subparagraph ending, are therefore part of a single relative clause, and they are left to the determination of the Member. For instance, under Article XXI(b)(i), what is relevant is the Member’s appreciation of its essential security interests relating to fissionable materials or the materials from which they are derived, and what is necessary for the protection of those interests. If individual elements of that clause were subject to review, it would no longer authorize the action that the *Member* considers necessary – it would be the action that some other evaluator (here, the Panel) considers necessary.

33. The text and grammatical structure of subparagraphs (i) to (iii) of Article XXI(b) also support the self-judging nature of this provision. These subparagraphs lack any conjunction—an “and” or an “or”—to specify their relationship to each other. This indicates that each subparagraph must be considered for its relation to the chapeau of Article XXI(b). The first two subparagraphs each relate to the kinds of interests for which the Member may consider its action necessary to protect. Those subparagraphs provide that a Member may take any action it considers necessary for the protection of its essential security interests “relating to fissionable materials or the materials from which they are derived,” and its essential security interests “relating to the traffic in arms, ammunition and implements of war and to such traffic in other goods and materials as is carried on directly or indirectly for the purpose of supplying for military establishment.” The final subparagraph does not speak to the nature of the security interests, but provides a temporal limitation related to the action taken. That subparagraph provides that a Member may take any action which it considers necessary for the protection of its essential security interests “taken in time of war or other emergency in international relations.”

34. The subparagraphs thus form an integral part of the provision in that they complete the sentence begun in the chapeau, establishing three circumstances in which a Member may act. An invocation of Article XXI(b) indicates that a Member considers that any or all of the three circumstances described in the subparagraphs are present. In this way, the subparagraphs guide a Member’s exercise of its rights under this provision.

B. The Context of Article XXI(b) Supports an Understanding of that Provision as Self-Judging

35. The self-judging nature of Article XXI(b) is also supported by the context of its terms. Article XXI(a) and Article XXI(c) provide the immediate context in which to view the ordinary meaning of the text of Article XXI(b). Article XXI(a) states that “[n]othing in this Agreement shall be construed . . . to require any contracting party to furnish any information the disclosure of which it considers contrary to its essential security interests.” With this language, Article XXI(a) specifically provides that a Member need not provide any information—to a WTO panel or to other WTO Members—regarding essential security measures or the Member’s underlying security interests. This provision both recognizes the highly sensitive nature of a Member’s essential security interests and reveals the deference the drafters intended to give to Members when exercising their rights under Article XXI. That a Member may not be required to disclose information it considers contrary to its interests supports the interpretation a Member’s invocation of Article XXI(b) was not intended to be reviewable against some legal standard.

36. Furthermore, the phrase “which it considers” is present in Articles XXI(a) and XXI(b), but not in Article XXI(c), which provides that Members may not be prevented from “taking any action in pursuance of” its UN obligations for the maintenance of international peace and security. Thus, the self-judging clause “which it considers” was omitted from Article XXI(c), which relates to action in pursuance of certain UN obligations, which may or may not implicate its essential security interests. That is, when a Member assesses that its essential security interests are at issue, as in Articles XXI(a) and XXI(b), the text provides that it is the judgment of the acting Member that controls.

37. The U.S. interpretation is further supported by the context provided in Article XX. Specifically, Article XX sets out “general exceptions,” and a number of subparagraphs of Article XX relate to whether an action is “necessary” for some listed objective. Unlike Article XXI(b), however, none of the Article XX subparagraphs use the phrase “which it considers” to introduce the word “necessary.” Therefore, WTO Members, as well as panels and the Appellate Body, have consistently understood the text to impose a “necessity test” for measures with respect to which a general exception of this kind is invoked. The textual distinction between Article XX and Article XXI is a fundamental one, and confirms that the drafters considered many interests to be important enough that deviations from a Member’s WTO obligations may be appropriate. Only in the case of essential security interests, however, was the authority to deviate drafted to permit any action a Member considers necessary for the protection of the interests at stake.

C. Because Article XXI Applies, The Rules On Safeguards Are Not Relevant, And In Any Event Article XXI Could Serve As A Defense To Alleged Breaches Of The Agreement On Safeguards

38. The complainant has challenged the U.S. security measures under Article XIX and under several provisions of the Agreement on Safeguards. The measures at issue are not safeguards and therefore the Agreement on Safeguards does not apply. Pursuant to Article 11.1(c), once a Member invokes Article XXI(b), the Agreement on Safeguards is not applicable. In any event, Article XXI makes clear that the security exceptions, including the essential security exception,

apply to the entire agreement. Specifically, Article XXI begins with the clause “Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed.” The provision does not contain any qualification to this threshold clause; nor does Article XIX of the GATT 1994 indicate that the security exceptions do not apply to rights and obligations in that article. Furthermore, the Agreement on Safeguards contains 14 references to the GATT 1994. Such language establishes an express, textual link between the GATT 1994 and obligations under the Agreement on Safeguards. This language also confirms that, in any event, Article XXI(b) would be a defense not only to claims raised under the GATT 1994 but also to claims under the Agreement on Safeguards.

D. In Light Of The Self-Judging Nature Of GATT 1994 Article XXI, The Sole Finding The Panel May Make Consistent With Its Terms Of Reference Under DSU Article 7.1 Is To Note The Invocation Of Article XXI

39. In light of the self-judging nature of Article XXI, the sole finding that the panel may make – consistent with its terms of reference and the DSU – is to note the U.S. invocation of Article XXI. This is the only finding the panel can make consistent with the DSU. Under DSU Article 7.1, the Panel’s terms of reference call on the Panel to examine the matter referred to the DSB and “to make such findings as will assist the DSB in making the recommendations or in giving the rulings provided for in [the covered agreements].” The Panel has two functions: (1) to “examine” the matter – that is, to “[i]nvestigate the nature, condition or qualities of (something) by close inspection or tests” ; and (2) to “make such findings as will assist the DSB in making the recommendations or in giving the rulings provided for” in the covered agreement.

40. This dual function of panels is confirmed in DSU Article 11, which states that the “function of panels” is to make “an objective assessment of the matter before it” and “such other findings as will assist the DSB in making the recommendations or in giving the rulings provided for in the covered agreements.” As DSU Article 19.1 provides, these “recommendations” are issued “[w]here a panel or the Appellate Body concludes that a measure is inconsistent with a covered agreement” and are recommendations “that the Member concerned bring the measure into conformity with the agreement.” DSU Article 19.2 clarifies that “in their findings and recommendations, the panel and Appellate Body cannot add to or diminish the rights and obligations provided in the covered agreement.”

41. To clarify, the United States does not argue that the Panel should not make an objective assessment of the matter. The Panel should absolutely make an objective assessment of the matter – to examine the matter and to assess the self-judging nature of Article XXI. However, the Panel’s ability to make an objective assessment does not convert every element of the Article XXI(b) text into a legal standard against which a measure is to be judged by a panel. The plain text of Article XXI(b) does not call for testing of the Member’s measure against a legal standard. Instead, the text of GATT 1994 Article XXI(b) establishes that it is for a responding Member to consider whether the actions it has taken are necessary for the protection of its own essential security interests. Consistent with the text of that provision, a panel may not second-guess a Member’s consideration.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF U.S. RESPONSES TO THE PANEL’S FIRST SET OF QUESTIONS

Excerpt from U.S. Response to the Panel Question 20”

42. The ordinary meaning of the terms in Article 11.1(c) can be understood as “measures [that a Member has] tried to do, succeeded in doing or caused to continue in accordance with provisions of the GATT 1994 other than Article XIX.” The ordinary meaning of these terms establishes that Article 11.1(c) is triggered – and the Agreement on Safeguards “does not apply” – when a Member acts (by seeking, taking or maintaining a measure) pursuant to a provision of the GATT 1994 other than Article XIX. With these terms, Article 11.1(c) directs the Panel to the other GATT 1994 provision pursuant to which the measure in question was sought, taken, or maintained. Here, the United States has expressly invoked a provision of GATT 1994 other than Article XIX – namely, Article XXI. This is clear from U.S. statements in these proceedings, as well as in numerous U.S. statements in WTO committees. Accordingly, Article 11.1(c) establishes that the Agreement on Safeguards “does not apply.”

43. The French and Spanish texts of the Agreement on Safeguards support this interpretation of Article 11.1(c). In the French text, the first verb in the series (“cherchera à prendre”) is explicitly an attempt to carry out the second verb in the series (“prendra”). Thus, consistent with the English text, the ordinary meaning of the French text of Article 11.1(c) provides that the Agreement on Safeguards “does not apply” when a Member *attempts* or *tries* to *take* a measure pursuant to a provision of the GATT 1994 other than Article XIX, or when the Member is successful in taking such a measure or causes such a measure to continue. The Spanish text also confirms this point. In the Spanish text, as in the French, the first verb in the series (“trate de adoptar”) is explicitly an attempt to carry out the second verb in the series (“adopte”). This text makes clear that Article 11.1(c) is triggered when a Member *attempts* to *take* a measure pursuant to a provision of the GATT 1994 other than Article XIX, or when the Member is successful in taking such a measure or causes such a measure to continue.

44. Under Article 11.1(c), the Agreement on Safeguards “does not apply” when a Member has attempted or tried to take a measure in accordance with provisions of the GATT 1994 other than Article XIX, or when the Member has succeeded in taking such a measure or caused such a measure to continue. Here, the United States has attempted to take – and succeeded in taking – the challenged measures in accordance with Article XXI of the GATT 1994, and accordingly under Article 11.1(c) the Agreement on Safeguards “does not apply.”

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF U.S. SECOND WRITTEN SUBMISSION

A. Ordinary Meaning of Article XXI(b) Establishes that Article XXI(b) is Self-Judging

45. The self-judging nature of Article XXI(b) of GATT 1994 is established by the text of that provision, in its context, and in the light of the treaty’s object and purpose.

46. Switzerland’s argument that the term “considers” only qualifies the “necessity” of the Member’s action under Article XXI(b) is unsupported by the text and grammatical structure of Article XXI. Switzerland argues that “whether a certain interest qualifies as an ‘essential security interest’ is an objective question that must be assessed by a panel” and “whether or not a

measure is taken ‘for the protection’ of a Member’s essential security interests is also an objective element that is subject to review by a panel.” Similarly, Switzerland argues that the phrase “which it considers” does not qualify the three subparagraphs, explaining that the subparagraphs are part of a separate clause and only relate to the word “action”.

47. Switzerland’s argument artificially separates the terms in the single relative clause, which begins with the phrase “which it considers necessary” and ends at the end of each subparagraph. The clause follows the word “action” and describes the situation which the Member “considers” to be present when it takes such an “action”. Because the relative clause describing the action begins with “which it considers”, the other elements of this clause are committed to the judgment of the Member taking the action.

48. Switzerland’s interpretation also ignores the ordinary meaning of the text. Switzerland states that “the relative clause which starts with ‘which it considers necessary’ ends with ‘the protection of its essential security interests’.” However, in Article XXI(b), the phrase “which it considers necessary” is followed by the word “for”. The relevant inquiry is not simply whether a Member considers any action “necessary”. Instead, it is whether a Member considers the action “necessary *for*” a purpose – namely, the protection of its essential security interests relating to subject matters in subparagraph endings (i) and (ii), or for the protection of its essential security interests in the temporal circumstance provided for in subparagraph ending (iii). Artificially separating the words “which it considers necessary” from the language that immediately follows and continues the clause – for the protection of – would erroneously interpret certain terms of Article XXI(b) in isolation.

49. Switzerland’s argument that the word “considers” does not qualify the terms in the subparagraph endings is also inconsistent with the overall grammatical structure of the provision. This argument appears to rely in part on the complainant’s erroneous view that all three subparagraph endings modify the term “action”. Under the ordinary meaning of the English text of Article XXI(b), the subparagraph endings (i) and (ii) modify the phrase “essential security interests”; each relate to the kinds of interests for which the Member may consider its action necessary to protect. In this way, the subparagraph endings (i) and (ii) indicate the types of essential security interests to be implicated by the action taken. This is because, under English grammar rules, a participial phrase, which functions as an adjective, normally follows the word it modifies or is otherwise placed as closely as possible to the word it modifies.

50. The final subparagraph ending provides that a Member may take any action which it considers necessary for the protection of its essential security interests “taken in time of war or other emergency in international relations.” It does not speak to the nature of the security interests, but provides a temporal limitation related to the action taken. The drafters departed from typical English usage in placing the modifier next to “its essential security interests” as opposed to “action.” However, this departure does not mean that subparagraphs (i) and (ii) should be read in a manner that is inconsistent with English grammar rules. The subparagraphs of Article XXI(b) are *not* connected by a conjunction, such as “and” or “or”, that would suggest they modify the same term in the chapeau.

B. Responding Member Need Not Identify a Specific Subparagraph of Article XXI(b) to Invoke Its Right to Take Measures for the Protection of Its Essential Security Interests

51. Switzerland suggests that the U.S. invocation of Article XXI(b) fails because United States has not identified “a specific subparagraph of Article XX(b) on which it relies as part of its defence”. However, Article XXI(b) does not require a responding Member to invoke a specific subparagraph of the provision to invoke that Member’s right to take any action which it considers necessary for the protection of its essential security interests.

52. Neither is there any text in Article XXI(b) that imposes a requirement to furnish reasons for or explanations of an action for which Article XXI(b) is invoked. This understanding is supported by the text of Article XXI(a), which confirms that Members are not required “to furnish any information the disclosure of which it considers contrary to its essential security interests.” It may be that a Member invoking Article XXI(b) nonetheless chooses to make information available to other Members. Indeed, the United States did make plentiful information available in relation to its challenged measures. While such publicly available information could be understood to relate most naturally to the circumstances described in Article XXI(b)(iii), the text of Article XXI does not require a responding Member to provide details relating to its invocation of Article XXI, including by identifying a specific subparagraph.

C. Contrary to Complainant’s Arguments, The Terms Of Article XXI(b)(iii) Support a Finding That Article XXI(b) Is Self-Judging

53. Relying on the flawed analysis of the panel in *Russia – Traffic in Transit*, Switzerland argues that “the existence of an emergency in international relations is an objective state of affairs, [and] the determination of whether the action was ‘taken in time of’ an ‘emergency in international relations’ under subparagraph (iii) of Article XXI(b) is that of an objective fact, subject to objective determination”.

54. Switzerland also takes a narrow view of the phrase “other emergency in international relations,” and notes that, in construing Article XXI(b)(iii), the *Russia Traffic in Transit* panel concluded that “the interests arising from the matters addressed by subparagraphs (i) and (ii), like the interests that arise from a situation of war ‘are all defence and military interests, as well as maintenance of law and public order interests’”.

55. Like the panel in *Russia – Traffic in Transit*, Switzerland is wrong that “the existence of an emergency in international relations is an objective state of affairs,” and that a panel must be able to determine, as a matter of objective fact, “whether the action was ‘taken in time of’ an ‘emergency in international relations’ under subparagraph (iii) of Article XXI(b)”. To the contrary, the text of subparagraph ending (iii) supports the interpretation that the applicability of Article XXI(b)(iii), like all of Article XXI(b), is self-judging.

56. The term “emergency” can be defined as “a serious, unexpected, and often dangerous situation requiring action.” In addition to being modified by the phrase “which it considers,” whether a certain situation is “serious, unexpected, and . . . dangerous” is, also by nature, a subjective determination that involves consideration of numerous factors that will vary from Member to Member. Similarly, Members may vary – based on their own unique circumstances

– in their determinations of whether they consider that a particular situation “requires action.” Just as a panel cannot determine – without substituting its judgment for that of the Member – which are the essential security interests of a Member, a panel cannot determine – without substituting its own judgment for that of the Member – whether a Member considers its action to be taking place “in time of war or other emergency in international relations.”

57. Furthermore, Switzerland misconstrues the role of context in the interpretative exercise when it attempts to read into subparagraph (iii) the terms of the other two subparagraphs. Particularly in light of the absence of any conjunction between the subparagraphs of Article XXI(b), Switzerland’s reliance on subparagraphs (i) and (ii) to construe subparagraph (iii) makes little sense. Indeed, a Member may consider a variety of “security interests” to be “essential” even if they are not strictly “all defence and military interests, as well as maintenance of law and public order interests”. A prominent example is cybersecurity which, is recognized by numerous WTO Members – including Switzerland – as an essential security interest, the protection of which is fundamental to a sovereign state’s rights and responsibilities.

58. Furthermore, the term “security” is broad, such that a number of WTO Members appear to include a variety of considerations – including economic considerations – in their understanding of what constitutes “security.” Switzerland’s proposed construction of Article XXI(b)(iii) – based on subparagraphs (i) and (ii) and the erroneous analysis of the *Russia – Traffic in Transit* panel – would exclude from Article XXI(b)(iii) actions that a Member considered necessary to protect such interests unless those interests were “defence and military interests, as well as maintenance of law and public order interests.” Such a narrow construction of Article XXI(b)(iii) is not consistent with the ordinary meaning of the terms of that provision, or with Switzerland’s own understanding of what comprises a country’s security interests.

D. Supplementary Means of Interpretation – Including Uruguay Round Negotiating History – Confirm that Actions Under Article XXI are not Subject to Review

59. Although not necessary in this dispute, supplementary means of interpretation – including negotiating history of the Uruguay Round – confirms that Article XXI(b) is self-judging. First, Uruguay Round drafters retained the text of Article XXI(b) – unchanged and in its entirety – when that provision was incorporated into the GATT 1994. Uruguay Round drafters also incorporated security exceptions with the same self-judging terms into GATS and TRIPS. In addition, Uruguay Round negotiators of the DSU discussed the reviewability of Article XXI, and decided not to include in the DSU specific terms that would have diverged from the longstanding understanding that actions taken pursuant to Article XXI are not reviewable. These decisions by Uruguay Round negotiators are notable, particularly in light of the alternative approaches to security exceptions that had been incorporated into other treaties between 1947 and 1994.

60. The drafting history of Article XXI(b) dates back to negotiations to establish the International Trade Organization of the United Nations (ITO). Numerous statements by the drafters of the text that became Article XXI(b) confirm that negotiators intended for this provision to be self-judging by the acting Member, and that the appropriate remedy for such measures is a non-violation, nullification or impairment claim. The complainant’s arguments fail because the interpretive value of the negotiating history of Article XXI is not diminished merely

because negotiations took place in 1947. On the contrary, the text of Article XXI was retained – unchanged and in its entirety – when incorporated into the GATT 1994; moreover, statements by the original negotiators of Article XXI were publicly available for decades before the Uruguay Round negotiators made the specific decision to retain Article XXI in the GATT 1994.

61. Furthermore, with knowledge of the statements by the original negotiators of the terms of Article XXI, Uruguay Round negotiators also decided to incorporate security exceptions with the same self-judging terms in GATS and TRIPS. That is, in addition to retaining this language in the GATT 1994, all of which remained unchanged, Uruguay Round negotiators also chose to retain the original GATT 1947 language in new covered agreements, the language of which was drafted at that time. Had Uruguay Round negotiators disagreed with their predecessors regarding the proper interpretation of this language, it seems surprising that they would have repeated that language verbatim in two other agreements concluded during that round. In addition, Uruguay Round negotiators of the DSU also discussed the reviewability of Article XXI, and decided not to include in the DSU specific terms that would have diverged from the longstanding understanding that actions taken pursuant to Article XXI are not reviewable.

62. These decisions by the Uruguay Round negotiators are striking, particularly considering that some trade agreements negotiated between 1947 and the Uruguay Round, including agreements negotiated by GATT contracting parties, had in fact developed security exceptions that differed in important ways from the GATT 1947. That Uruguay Round negotiators also decided not to follow the approach of these intervening trade agreements, however – neither in the GATT 1994, nor in GATS or TRIPS, nor in the DSU – reflects that the Uruguay Round negotiators, by retaining the unchanged text of Article XXI, did not intend to depart from their predecessors regarding the interpretation of Article XXI. These intentions of the drafters – including the Uruguay Round drafters – must be given effect in this dispute.

E. Article 33 of the VCLT Supports Adopting an Interpretation that Best Reconciles the English, Spanish and French versions of Article XXI(b)

63. The ordinary meaning of the English text of Article XXI(b) establishes that the provision is self-judging. The interpretation that emerges based on the ordinary meaning of the text of the subparagraphs in the English and French language versions, however, is not fully supported by the Spanish text of the subparagraphs. Specifically, the Spanish text of the three subparagraphs indicates that they must be read to modify the term “actions” in the chapeau of Article XXI(b); whereas the ordinary meaning of subparagraphs (i) and (ii) in the English and French versions is most naturally read to modify the term “interests” in the chapeau. Thus, the meaning that best reconciles the texts, having regard to the object and purpose of the treaty, must be adopted under Article 33 of the VCLT.

64. Reconciling the texts leads to the interpretation that all of the subparagraphs modify the terms “any action which it considers” in the chapeau, because this reading is consistent with the Spanish text, and also – while less in line with rules of grammar and conventions – permitted by the English and French texts. This reading of the text of the subparagraphs does not alter the plain meaning of the chapeau or the overall structure of Article XXI(b), however. The terms of the provision still form a single relative clause that begins in the chapeau and ends with each

subparagraph, and therefore the phrase “which it considers” still modifies the entirety of the chapeau and the subparagraph endings. Therefore, reconciling the three authentic texts leads to the same fundamental meaning the United States has presented, committing the determination of whether an action is necessary for the protection of a Member’s essential security interests in the relevant circumstances to the judgment of that Member alone.

F. The Measures at Issue are Not Safeguards Measures and the Agreement on Safeguards Does Not Apply

65. Article XIX of GATT 1994 establishes a right for a Member to deviate from its WTO obligations under certain conditions. In order to exercise that right to apply a safeguard measure, a Member must comply with those conditions precedent set out in Article XIX. One of those key conditions precedent is that the Member has invoked Article XIX as the legal basis for its measure by providing notice in writing and affording affected Members an opportunity to consult. The measures at issue in this dispute are not safeguard measures because the United States has not invoked Article XIX as the legal basis for this measure; instead, the United States has (explicitly and repeatedly) invoked Article XXI. Accordingly, the safeguards disciplines of the GATT 1994 and Agreement on Safeguards do not apply.

66. Interpreting Article XIX according to the customary rules of interpretation makes clear that invocation is a fundamental, condition precedent for a Member’s exercise of its right to take action under that provision and for the application of safeguards rules to that action. The text of Article XIX, including the title of that provision and each paragraph, leads to the conclusion that notice is a condition precedent to taking action under Article XIX. The context of Article XIX also supports this interpretation, and reveals that numerous other WTO provisions contemplate a Member exercising a right through invocation and contain structural similarities to Article XIX. The object and purpose of the GATT 1994 also supports that invocation is a condition precedent for a Member’s exercise of its right to take action under Article XIX.

67. That invocation is a precondition for a Member’s exercise of its right to take action under Article XIX and to the consequent application of safeguards rules to that action is also confirmed by the Working Party’s report in *US – Fur Felt Hats*. As the Working Party explained, the notification requirement of Article XIX is one of the “conditions” that qualifies the exercise “of the right to suspend an obligation or to withdraw or modify a concession” under Article XIX. Supplementary means of interpretation, including the drafting history of Article XIX of the GATT 1994, confirm that notice under Article XIX:2 is a fundamental, condition precedent to a Member’s exercise of its right to take action under Article XIX and the application of safeguards disciplines. The predecessor to Article XIX included an invocation requirement as originally drafted. Although removal of this requirement was discussed as the ITO and GATT 1947 negotiations proceeded, the drafters ultimately decided to retain it.

68. The Agreement on Safeguards, which provides context for Article XIX of the GATT 1994, also supports that invocation of Article XIX through written notice is a condition precedent to a Member’s exercise of its right to take action under Article XIX. Article 11.1(c) supports this conclusion because a Member cannot seek, take, or maintain a measure “pursuant to” Article XIX without invoking that provision as set forth in Article XIX:2. In addition,

contrary to the complainant's assertions, Article 11.1(c), establishes that a Member may decide to seek, take, or maintain a measure pursuant to other provisions of the GATT 1994, such as Article XXI, and in such a case, the Agreement on Safeguards does not apply.

69. The requirement of invocation as a condition precedent to taking action under Article XIX is also supported by other provisions of the Agreement on Safeguards. These conclusions are supported by the object and purpose of the Agreement on Safeguards, as set forth in its Preamble, to clarify and reinforce the obligations of Article XIX of the GATT 1994, including its notice requirement. Although not necessary in this dispute, the Panel may have recourse to supplementary means of interpretation, including the drafting history of Articles 1 and 11. The drafting history of these provisions confirms that the invocation is a condition precedent to a Member's exercise of its right to take action under Article XIX, and a Member's ability to seek, take, or maintain safeguards measures does not constrain its ability to take such action pursuant to Article XXI.

70. In particular, in preparing the text that became Article 1 and Article 11.1, Uruguay Round drafters abandoned their early attempts to include a definition for what would constitute safeguard measures, and instead included only a reference to the provisions of Article XIX. This decision by the Uruguay Round drafters confirms that it is the terms of Article XIX – including its invocation requirement – that define what constitutes safeguard measures under the Agreement on Safeguards and under Article XIX. Furthermore, Uruguay Round drafters also abandoned their early proposals that could have been seen as limiting Members' ability to take action pursuant to provisions of the GATT 1994 other than Article XIX. This decision by drafters confirms that nothing in the Agreement on Safeguards constrains a Member's ability to take action pursuant to Article XXI.

G. The Panel Should Begin Its Analysis By Addressing the United States' Invocation of Article XXI

71. The DSU does not specify the order of analysis that a panel must adopt, and instead leaves this matter up to the Panel's determination. Whatever the Panel's *internal* ordering of its analysis, in light of the U.S. invocation of Article XXI(b) and the self-judging nature of that provision, the sole *finding* that the Panel may make in its report – consistent with its terms of reference and the DSU – is to note its understanding of Article XXI and that the United States has invoked Article XXI. Accordingly, the Panel should begin by addressing the United States' invocation of GATT 1994 Article XXI(b).

72. It is not correct to argue that the Panel must first determine whether the measures challenged breach the GATT 1994 or the Agreement on Safeguards before assessing the U.S. invocation of Article XXI. This is because Article XXI is a defense to claims under both the Agreement on Safeguards and the GATT 1994, and the United States has invoked Article XXI as to *all* aspects of *all* the measures challenged. Thus, if the Panel determines that Article XXI(b) is self-judging, consistent with the text, or that Article XXI in any event applies under another interpretation, there would be no need to review any of the complainant's claims.

73. Nor does characterizing Article XXI as an “affirmative defense” or an “exception” require the Panel to begin its analysis with the complainant’s claims. The DSU does not use these terms, and instead calls on the Panel to interpret Article XXI in accordance with customary rules of interpretation. Even where it is claimed that Article XXI is not a defense to claims under the Agreement on Safeguards – which the United States disagrees with – addressing Article XXI first also leads to the conclusion under Article 11.1(c) that the Agreement on Safeguards is not applicable to the challenged measures. This is because Article 11.1(c) makes clear that that agreement “does not apply” to a measure sought, taken, or maintained pursuant to Article XXI, such as the measures at issue in this dispute.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE U.S. RESPONSES TO THE PANEL’S ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS TO THE PARTIES

Excerpt from U.S. Response to the Panel Question 92(b)

74. The ordinary meaning of the phrase “other emergency in international relations” in Article XXI(b)(iii) is broad. Definitions of “emergency” include “[a] situation, esp. of danger or conflict, that arises unexpectedly and requires urgent attention.” A broad understanding of the term “emergency” in Article XXI(b)(iii) is supported by the context provided by other provisions of the GATT 1994 and other covered agreements. The phrase “international relations” can be understood as referring to a broad range of matters. The term “relations” can be defined as “[t]he various ways by which a country, State, etc., maintains political or economic contact with another,” while the term “international” can be defined as “[e]xisting, occurring, or carried on between nations; pertaining to relations, communications, travel, etc., between nations.” With these definitions in mind, an “other emergency in international relations” can be understood as referring to a situation of danger or conflict, concerning political or economic contact occurring between nations, which arises unexpectedly and requires urgent attention.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE U.S. OPENING STATEMENT AT THE PANEL’S VIDEOCONFERENCE WITH THE PARTIES

75. To arrive at a different understanding of Article XXI(b), the panel in *Russia – Traffic in Transit* ignored the ordinary meaning of Article XXI(b) and read into Article XXI(b)(iii) the terms of the security exceptions of other treaties. Although it acknowledged that the text of Article XXI(b) could be read so that ““which it considers’ qualifies the determinations in the three enumerated subparagraphs,” the *Russia – Traffic in Transit* panel gave this plain meaning no interpretive weight. Instead, based on what it termed (without explanation) the “logical structure of the provision,” the panel concluded that subparagraph endings (i) to (iii) qualify and limit Members’ discretion to take essential security measures, and that, “for action to fall within the scope of Article XXI(b), it must objectively be found to meet the requirements in one of the enumerated subparagraphs of that provision.”

76. Further, rather than relying on the ordinary meaning of “its essential security interests” and “in time of war or other emergency in international relations” in Article XXI(b)(iii), the panel effectively read into that text references to “the event of serious internal disturbances affecting the maintenance of law and order” and “war or serious international tension constituting a threat of war” – language that appears in the Treaty on the Functioning of the

European Union (TFEU) and Agreement on the European Economic Area (EEA) but *not* in the GATT 1994. Such language, however, is not part of the text of Article XXI(b)(iii), and such a narrow construction of Article XXI(b)(iii) is not consistent with the ordinary meaning of the terms of that provision. The complainant urges this Panel to replicate these same errors—an effort that should be rejected.

77. The complainant’s suggestion that the principle of “good faith” requires a Panel to review whether a Member has acted in good faith in invoking Article XXI is also misguided and is inconsistent with the ordinary meaning of Article XXI. Such a reading would rewrite Article XXI(b) to insert the text, and impose the requirements, of the chapeau of Article XX. The chapeau of Article XX sets out additional requirements for a measure falling within a general exception set out in the subparagraphs – that a measure shall not be applied in a manner which constitutes a means of “arbitrary or unjustifiable discrimination” or a “disguised restriction on international trade,” both of which concepts aim to address applying a measure inconsistently with good faith. The complainant is effectively asking the Panel to read into Article XXI text that is not there; doing so is inconsistent with the customary rules of interpretation and the complainant’s approach should be rejected.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE U.S. CLOSING STATEMENT AT THE PANEL’S VIDEOCONFERENCE WITH THE PARTIES

A. Complainant’s Approach to Defining Safeguard Measures Under Article XIX Would Lead to Absurd Results

78. Let us put into perspective the matter before the Panel. Under WTO and GATT rules, duties must be applied on an MFN basis (under Article I:1) and maintained within bound levels (under Article II:1). Quotas are generally prohibited (under Article XI:1). If a Member, like the United States here, wishes to deviate from these basic obligations, it must have a valid basis to do so. Many such bases exist in the WTO Agreements. Let’s take duties. A Member may deviate from the obligations of Articles I and II by imposing non-MFN duties in excess of its bound commitment levels if those duties are applied consistent with Article VI and the attendant obligations in the AD Agreement or the SCM Agreement; or consistent with Article XIX and the Agreement on Safeguards. All three rights allow a Member to impose duties to protect its domestic industry from the effects of imports.

79. And, of course, a Member may justify what might otherwise constitute WTO-inconsistent behavior if it satisfies the requirements of any general exceptions (under Article XX) or security exceptions (under Article XXI). This is the case here, for example, where the United States has taken its action pursuant to Article XXI for the protection of its essential security interests. But because each of these bases exists for a Member to justify a deviation from its obligations, any such deviation would not be supported by *all* of them. Rather, only one basis is needed.

80. Complainant has argued that the United States has not availed itself of its Article XXI rights, but instead has imposed a safeguard duty under Article XIX. As far as the United States is aware, never before in WTO dispute settlement has a complainant attempted to impose on a respondent its defense. For while complainant argues that the Agreement on Safeguards is not a defense but a set of obligations, there is no question that Article XIX and the Agreement on Safeguards set out obligations that must be met *in the event a Member wishes to deviate from its*

tariff obligations. Were it permissible to impose any duty a Member wished, none of us would be here as no rights or obligations would be at stake.

81. So, the United States has imposed duties on certain steel and aluminum products on a non-MFN basis and in excess of the levels set out in its WTO Goods Schedule. It has done so to counter the effects of imports of these products on its own domestic industry. Complainants suggest these facts are sufficient for the Panel to find that, notwithstanding the intention, statements or actions of the United States, the duties constitute a safeguard, but a safeguard not complying with the requirements of Article XIX or the Agreement on Safeguards because, among other things, the affected products were not being imported into the United States in such increased quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers of like or directly competitive products.

82. The United States does not contend that its measures were applied consistent with the Agreement on Safeguards. The measures were applied pursuant to Article XXI and not Article XIX. Nor does the United States contend that the duties were applied consistently with the AD Agreement or the SCM Agreement. But complainant does not suggest that the Panel make findings of inconsistency under these other articles.

83. Why the Agreement on Safeguards – but not the AD or SCM Agreement, or Article XX? Complainant has suggested that the United States is trying to act with impunity through its arguments in this dispute. Such arguments misstate the underlying events, however, and only disguise the complainant’s own self-serving motives in bringing this dispute. If the Panel were to adopt complainant’s approach, any Member could effectively declare – unilaterally – that another Member’s border measures were safeguard measures pursuant to Article XIX, simply by arguing that the duties comply with the Appellate Body’s incomplete “constituent features.” The Appellate Body’s findings mimic the language of Article XIX and the Agreement on Safeguards, which makes sense, as they were addressing a situation in which a Member *had* claimed to take a safeguard measure. But according to complainant’s arguments, the test can be satisfied by showing that respondent’s measure: (1) breaches one of its GATT concessions, and (2) is designed to prevent or remedy injury to the Member’s domestic industry. Complainant is not arguing that the U.S. measure is a safeguard because the injury to the domestic industry is in fact serious, or that it is in fact caused or threatened by increased imports. Rather, it is the complainant itself that is attributing this “design” to the U.S. measure.

84. Complainant’s approach leads to absurd results because it would permit almost any border measure – including as countermeasures under Article 22.2 of the DSU – to be deemed safeguard measures by other Members or a panel, and allow other Members to assert a right to rebalance. The absurdity of this result highlights the importance of the acting Member’s identification or invocation of the legal basis for the deviation from its obligations. If no basis is proffered, then the Member simply breaches its obligations. In the case of countermeasures, the basis is a grant – upon request – of legal authority to suspend concessions from the DSB. And in the case of Article XIX, that basis is the invocation of Article XIX through providing notice to Members and the meeting of certain conditions. As explained, Article XIX makes clear that invocation through notice is a fundamental, condition precedent for a Member’s exercise of its right to take action under Article XIX and the application of safeguards rules to that action. This interpretation is clear from the ordinary meaning of the text of Article XIX, in its context, and is confirmed by the negotiating history of both Article XIX and the Agreement on Safeguards.

85. Apart from this misconstruction of Article XIX, complainant’s approach also risks serious consequences to the WTO. In arguing that a Member has authority to impose rebalancing duties in response to any duty a complainant deems designed to prevent or remedy injury, complainant does not pursue this dispute to obtain the right to suspend concessions under DSU Article 22. Complainant contends that it already has that right under the guise of “rebalancing.” Therefore, complainant’s only objective in bringing this dispute can be to have the Panel pronounce on the validity of the U.S. security measures.

86. To take a step back, the measures challenged are on steel and aluminum (key sources for military vehicles, weapons, and systems for critical national infrastructure) that the United States has taken for national security purposes. The complainant urges the Panel to review these security measures and conclude that the United States could not have considered them necessary for the protection of its essential security interests and taken in time of “war or other emergency in international relations.” The complainant urges the Panel to conclude that security measures cannot have the goal or the effect of protecting an industry, even an industry that is vital to our national security and whose decline threatens to impair our national security. Although complainant purports to appeal to your common sense, complainant’s approach is not only inconsistent with the text of Articles XIX and XXI, but also defies common sense. Adopting complainant’s approach would lead to the proliferation of disputes, such as this one, which ask WTO panels to adjudicate the types of security actions that have always been taken, but which have not previously been subject to WTO disputes. The WTO was created with a focus on economic and trade issues, and not to seek to resolve sensitive issues of national security and foreign policy which are fundamental to a sovereign State’s rights and responsibilities. Such dispute settlement actions are not necessary, not productive, and only diminish the WTO’s credibility.

87. The United States is well aware of its WTO obligations, including its right to impose a safeguard duty and how to provide the requisite notice and opportunity for consultation. Similarly, the United States has imposed numerous antidumping and countervailing duties all pursuant to the rights provided under Article VI and the AD and SCM Agreements. As the United States has made clear, however, the measures at issue are not safeguard measures (or AD or CVD measures), but are security measures taken pursuant to Article XXI. The United States has acknowledged the consequences of invoking Article XXI, including that other Members may take reciprocal actions or seek other actions under the DSU, including a non-violation claim. These consequences provide recourse to affected Members, but without adjudicating essential security issues in dispute settlement. This approach properly respects the balance of rights and obligations agreed to by the Members, and reflects the text of Article XIX and Article XXI(b) as interpreted in accordance with the customary rules. Consistent with the text of Article XXI and the Panel’s terms of reference under DSU Article 7.1, and past GATT practice, the Panel should decline complainant’s invitation to make findings where none would assist the parties in the settlement of their dispute.

B. Complainant Misconstrues the U.S. Arguments Regarding Other WTO Agreement Provisions Requiring Invocation

88. The United States has described numerous other WTO provisions that – like Article XIX – contemplate a Member exercising a right through invocation and that contain structural

features that are similar to Article XIX. In response, Switzerland attempted to diminish the interpretive value of the provisions cited by the United States by suggesting that only WTO agreement provisions that relate to the same subject matters as Article XIX could provide “context” relevant to an interpretation of Article XIX, and referred to the TBT Agreement as providing relevant context. Switzerland’s argument comes to nothing, however, because the customary rules of interpretation do not limit what context is relevant as Switzerland suggests. In addition, Switzerland contradicted its own argument by suggesting TBT measures were more similar to suspension, withdrawal or modification under Article XIX than modification of schedules under Article XXVIII.

89. By discussing these provisions, the United States does not argue that notification requirements are prerequisites in every instance. Rather, the United States observed the numerous provisions of the covered agreements that, like Article XIX, grant Members the right to take particular action when certain conditions are met – should the acting Member invoke its right to do so. Such provisions are relevant context demonstrating that granting Members the right to take particular action when certain conditions are met – should the acting Member invoke its right to do so – is an ordinary part of the WTO Agreement.

90. Switzerland is mistaken when it suggests that Article 12.8 supports its view. The Agreement on Safeguards has elaborated procedural requirements to expand the scope of information a Member provides to other Members regarding that invocation and proposed action. A Member that does not provide information consistent with the elaborated notification requirements would breach these procedural obligations, but this does not mean that the notification obligations in Article 12 subsume the requirement to give notice in writing under Article XIX:2 of proposed action. In addition, Switzerland’s argument is not supported by the text of Article 12.8, which refers to counternotifications regarding “any measures or actions *dealt with in this Agreement.*” As these words make clear, this provision relates only to notifications that Members are required to make by the Agreement on Safeguards and would not permit a Member to notify the Committee on Safeguards of another Member’s invocation pursuant to Article XIX:2.

C. Article 11.1(c) Establishes that the Agreement on Safeguards Does Not Apply to the Measures At Issue

91. Under Article 11.1(c), the Agreement on Safeguards “does not apply to measures sought, taken or maintained by a Member pursuant to provisions of GATT 1994 other than Article XIX.” Here, the United States has attempted to take – and succeeded in taking – the measures at issue in accordance with Article XXI; accordingly the Agreement on Safeguards “does not apply.” This result is consistent with Article 11.1(a). The United States is not seeking or taking action “as set forth in Article XIX”; therefore, the action need not conform with the provisions of Article XIX applied in accordance with the Agreement on Safeguards.

92. Citing Article 11.1(a) – but diverging from its text – Switzerland suggests that “all safeguard measures are subject to the safeguard disciplines and, if non-compliant, are prohibited.” Switzerland has previously suggested – incorrectly – that measures that “present[] the two constituent features of a safeguard measure” “cannot become excluded from the scope of application of the Agreement on safeguards by virtue of Article 11.1(c)” because such measures are not measures “sought, taken or maintained pursuant to provisions of GATT 1994 *other than*

Article XIX.” Article 11.1(a) does not support Switzerland’s argument, and Article 11.1(c) contradicts it. Article 11.1(c)’s reference to “this Agreement” establishes that nothing in the Agreement on Safeguards, including Article 11.1(a), applies to measures that are sought, taken, or maintained by a Member pursuant to provisions of the GATT 1994 other than Article XIX.

93. Switzerland’s argument also ignores the potential overlap in the scope of measures covered by both the Agreement on Safeguards and Article XXI, and that a Member could take any number of actions in response to what it might consider economic emergencies, such as raising its ordinary customs duty. Whether the Agreement on Safeguards, Article XXI, or another provision applies will depend on the legal basis pursuant to which the Member takes the action. Article 11.1(a) provides that when a Member takes or seeks emergency action on imports “as set forth in Article XIX”, it must comply with Article XIX and the Agreement on Safeguards. However, a Member may take what might be called “emergency action” under a number of provisions, including Article XXI. Article 11.1(a) of the Agreement on Safeguards does not limit a Member’s choice of action. As provided in Article 11.1(c), when a Member has “sought, taken or maintained” actions pursuant to provisions of the GATT 1994 or the WTO Agreement other than Article XIX, the Agreement on Safeguards – including Article 11.1(a) – “does not apply”.

94. A number of different measures might involve features of a safeguard measure, or be said to have what some might call a safeguard objective. If the Member has not chosen to act under Article XIX, any safeguard objective the measure might be thought to have does not have independent relevance to the rights and obligations implicated by that measure. The negotiators of the Agreement on Safeguards shared this understanding.

D. Complainant Misconstrues the Words “Suspend,” “Modify,” and “Withdraw” in Article XIX of the GATT 1994

95. The Panel asked the Parties to consider the words “suspend,” “modify,” and “withdraw” and their relationship to other parts of Article XIX. As the United States explained, these terms describe what a Member is permitted to do in relation to its WTO commitments if it meets the conditions of Article XIX and the Agreement on Safeguards. Under Article XIX, Members have the right – but not an obligation – to apply a safeguard, subject to certain requirements

96. In its response, Switzerland incorrectly suggested that suspension, withdrawal, or modification are legal actions *taken by a Member*. Whether an obligation is suspended, withdrawn, or modified is an incidental legal characterization that attaches if a Member is seeking to take action pursuant to Article XIX and has complied with the conditions set forth in Article XIX and the Agreement on Safeguards. A measure does not itself suspend an obligation or withdraw or modify a concession; instead, a Member must claim an obligation is suspended (or a concession is withdrawn or modified) to justify taking particular action. If the Member does not make such a claim, the Member would simply breach another commitment, unless it has another basis to take the action. In relation to the measures at issue, the United States has explicitly and repeatedly invoked Article XXI. No obligation or concession may supersede the right to take action under that provision, as the text of Article XXI confirms. Accordingly, in taking action under Section 232, the United States has acted consistently with its existing rights under the covered agreements, and has not “suspended in whole or in part a GATT obligation or withdrawn or modified a GATT concession” within the meaning of Article XIX.

E. Complainant Failed to Meet the Requirements Under Article 6.2 of the DSU

97. Switzerland argues that the Panel may examine issues concerning its terms of reference on its own initiative, but also suggests that, in determining whether Switzerland has satisfied Article 6.2, the Panel should give weight to whether the United States has been prejudiced by potential failings of its panel request. However, prejudice to respondent (or a perceived lack thereof by the complainant) has no bearing on whether the complainant has satisfied the requirements of Article 6.2, and what “matter” is before the Panel under Article 7.1. In any event, Switzerland fails to support its claim that the United States was not prejudiced.

98. In arguing that it has fulfilled the requirements of Article 6.2 with respect to the seeking and/or conclusion of country exemption agreements, Switzerland argues that DSU Article 6.2 only obligates the complainant to identify the specific measures at issue and that it does not obligate a complainant to identify specific aspects of the challenged measures in its panel request. In this way, Switzerland draws an artificial distinction between the “measures at issue” and “specific aspects” of those measures, and suggests that the seeking and/or conclusion of exemption agreements is merely an “aspect” of the measures at issue. This artificial distinction does not change the requirements of Article 6.2. If the measure a complainant seeks to challenge is not set out in a single legal instrument but consists of multiple elements or components – or “aspects” to use Switzerland’s word – then identifying the precise scope and content of the measure may require a description of the measure and the various elements or components (or aspects) which the complainant considers to comprise the measure it challenges. In this way, the composite measure Switzerland seeks to challenge is similar to an unwritten measure.

99. Switzerland also attempts to bolster its argument that the seeking and/or conclusion of additional country exemption agreements falls within the Panel’s terms of reference by noting that its panel request lists Proclamation 9705 among the relevant “instruments” and quoting certain language from that proclamation. Where a legal instrument sets out numerous different actions by a Member, however, merely naming the instrument in a panel request, without more (for example, without specifying the potential action of concern), may not be sufficient to identify the “specific measure at issue.” Switzerland did not point to the language in question of Proclamation 9705 in its panel request, and it cannot now cure that defect.

F. The United States Has Properly Invoked Article XXI(b), Including Article XXI(b)(iii), And Has Substantiated This Defense Even Under Complainant’s Interpretation.

100. Even on the complainant’s understanding of Article XXI(b) as *not* self-judging, the United States as the Member invoking Article XXI(b) has chosen to make information available to other Members that would satisfy the complaining party’s approach. From the beginning of the proceedings, the United States has submitted as exhibits the U.S. Department of Commerce reports, in which the U.S. Secretary of Commerce found that steel and aluminum articles are being imported into the United States in such quantities and under such circumstances as to threaten to impair the national security of the United States. The United States also specifically pointed to the circumstances described in Article XXI(b)(iii) in its opening statement for the first substantive meeting of the panel. Any suggestion that there was a delay in invoking Article XXI(b)(iii) and providing relevant evidence is without merit. The record before the Panel demonstrates that the United States considers the measures at issue to be necessary for the protection of its essential security interests and taken “in time of war or other emergency in international relations.”

101. Therefore, even were the Panel to analyze the U.S. measures under the complaining party’s approach, the Panel should find that the United States has invoked Article XXI; the Panel should find the United States has provided information that it considers the measure necessary for the protection of its essential security interests; the Panel should find that the United States has provided information that it considers the measure taken “in time of war or other emergency in international relations”, the circumstance in Article XXI(b)(iii); and the Panel should find that this extensive information certainly meets any requirement of “good faith”.

102. Switzerland claims that the U.S. interpretation of “its essential security interests” and an “emergency in international relations” is “excessively broad” and “unsubstantiated”. Switzerland refers to the flawed interpretation of an “emergency in international relations” adopted by the panel in *Russia - Traffic in Transit*. However, that panel’s narrow construction of Article XXI(b)(iii) is not consistent with the ordinary meaning of the terms of that provision. Based on the ordinary meaning of the text, “emergency in international relations” can be understood as a situation of danger or conflict, concerning political or economic contact occurring between nations, which arises unexpectedly and requires urgent attention.

103. The record clearly supports that the United States considered the measures in question necessary for the protection of its essential security interests, and considered that there existed at that time an emergency in international relations.

104. First, in 2017, it emerged that global efforts to address the crises would be insufficient. Second, in 2017, steel imports in the United States rapidly increased while global excess capacity continued to increase. While the DOC steel report noted that the excess capacity crisis is a global problem and that steel-producing nations have committed to “work together on possible solutions,” the report observed the limits of the global efforts, including the work of the Global Forum on Steel Excess Capacity. Therefore, what the DOC steel report conveys is that the United States was at a crucial point—without immediate action, the steel industry could suffer damages that may be difficult to reverse and reach a point where it cannot maintain or increase production to address national emergencies. This conclusion is also supported by statements at the G20 Global Steel Forum on Steel Excess Capacity.

105. Thus, even under Switzerland’s interpretation of Article XXI(b) as not self-judging, there is an abundance of information that supports the U.S. consideration that the challenged actions are “necessary for the protection of its essential security interests” and “taken in time of war or other emergency in international relations.”

106. Any allegation that the United States has not acted in good faith in invoking Article XXI(b) is also without merit. President Trump’s decision to impose the challenged measures – in response to the Secretary of Commerce’s findings that steel and aluminum imports threaten to impair the national security – is consistent with the actions of his predecessors and reflects the continuation of the U.S. national security policy.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF U.S. COMMENTS ON THE COMPLAINANT’S STATEMENTS AT THE PANEL’S VIDEOCONFERENCE WITH THE PARTIES

A. Complainant Fails to Undermine the U.S. Interpretation of Article XXI(b) as Self-Judging

107. In its closing statement, Switzerland notes that “its exports of steel and aluminum into the United States mostly consist of highly specialized, niche products, that do not contribute to the global problem of overcapacity and that only account for a minor fraction of the total U.S. imports of such products.” Switzerland concludes, “It is therefore extremely difficult to conceive how Swiss imports of steel and aluminum products could threaten to impair the national security of the United States.” Switzerland’s statements are misdirected, however.

108. By invoking Article XXI(b), the United States has indicated that it considers the challenged action to be “necessary for the protection of its essential security actions” in the circumstances set out in Article XXI(b).

109. Switzerland appears to disagree with the U.S. consideration that the challenged action is necessary for the protection of its essential security interests, and implies that the Panel should review the necessity of the measures at issue. However, Switzerland thus far has agreed with the United States that the phrase “which it considers” qualifies “necessary” and has stated that “a certain degree of discretion” should be granted to the invoking Member’s “necessity” determination.

110. Switzerland is in effect asking the Panel to substitute its own judgment for that of a responding Member on matters of essential security. Specifically, Switzerland is urging the Panel to disagree with the Secretary’s national security findings, and the President’s determination as to how to address the national security threat. Switzerland also suggests that the Panel may, for example, determine that Swiss steel and aluminum imports do not threaten the U.S. national security, while Chinese or Turkish steel and aluminum imports do. The type of review that Switzerland urges this Panel to undertake has no basis in the text of Article XXI, the DSU, or the WTO dispute settlement system, and risks serious consequences to the WTO.

B. Complainant’s Arguments Would Effectively Remove Article 11.1(c) from the Agreement on Safeguards

111. Switzerland incorrectly suggested that the United States is attempting to “opt out” of the safeguards disciplines “simply by omitting to ‘invoke’ its right to take a safeguard measure.” Switzerland also repeated its erroneous assertion that “Article XXI of the GATT is not available as a defence for measures that are inconsistent with Article XIX of the GATT and the Agreement on Safeguards.” Switzerland’s arguments are not consistent with the text of Article XIX or Article XXI, and would effectively remove Article 11.1(c) from the Agreement on Safeguards. Article XIX establishes a Member’s right (but not obligation) under certain conditions to deviate from its WTO obligations and apply a safeguard measure. A key condition precedent to the exercise of that right is that the Member has invoked Article XIX as the legal basis for its measure by providing notice in writing and affording affected Members an opportunity to consult. Without satisfying that condition precedent, the Member may not rely on Article XIX as a release from the “control” of its WTO obligations. The United States has *not* invoked Article XIX as the legal basis for the measures at issue; instead, the United States has invoked Article XXI. Accordingly, the measures at issue are not safeguards measures, and the safeguards disciplines of the GATT 1994 and Agreement on Safeguards do not apply.

112. This result is confirmed by Article 11.1(c). Here, the United States has sought, taken, and maintained the challenged measures pursuant to Article XXI of the GATT 1994.

Accordingly, under Article 11.1(c), the Agreement on Safeguards “does not apply.” This result is also consistent with the text of Article XXI. Specifically, the words “Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed to prevent...” in Article XXI include Article XIX, and – as Article 11.1(c) confirms – Members did not restrict their rights to take action under other provisions of the GATT 1994 when they concluded the Agreement on Safeguards.

C. Complainant Ignores the Potential Overlap Between Measures Potentially Covered by the Agreement on Safeguards and Article XXI

113. Switzerland suggested – without support – that “economic emergency” measures are covered by Article XIX, and not by Article XXI. However, Switzerland ignores that there is potential overlap in the scope of measures covered by the Agreement on Safeguards and Article XXI, and that a Member could take any number of actions in response to what it might consider economic emergencies, such as raising its ordinary customs duty. Whether the Agreement on Safeguards, Article XXI, or another provision applies will therefore depend on the legal basis pursuant to which the Member takes the action. Switzerland’s argument is also inconsistent with the ordinary meaning of the phrase “its essential security interests” under Article XXI. The ordinary meaning of “security” is broad and could encompass what one might refer to as economic security. Nothing in Article XXI(b) would prevent a Member from considering interests of this type to be “essential.” And where a Member does so consider, those interests would be “its essential security interests” under Article XXI(b). Consistent with this understanding of what may constitute “essential security interests” under Article XXI(b), a number of WTO Members appear to include economic considerations in their own assessment of their security interests for purposes of domestic law and policy, and do not strictly separate what might be regarded as “economic security” from other “types” of security. Thus, Switzerland’s suggestion that “economic emergency” measures are covered only by Article XIX – and not by Article XXI – is not supported by the text of either Article XIX or Article XXI, and in fact is refuted by the text of Article XXI, Article 11.1(c) of the Agreement on Safeguards, and by the actions of numerous WTO Members.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF U.S. COMMENTS ON THE COMPLAINANT’S
COMMENTS ON U.S. STATEMENTS AT THE PANEL’S VIDEOCONFERENCE WITH
THE PARTIES**

A. Complainant’s Arguments Misperceive the Role of a WTO Panel under the DSU

114. Switzerland misperceives both the U.S. arguments in this dispute and the proper role of a WTO panel when it states that “while a Member may decide to take for instance an SPS measure, or a safeguard measure, the legal characterisation of that measure under WTO law is not determined by that Member’s intention and must be objectively assessed based on the features of that measure.” Switzerland makes a similarly misguided argument in its discussion of Article XIX and Article XXI, stating that “[w]hether a measure falls within the scope of Article XIX or Article XXI of the GATT 1994 must be objectively assessed based on the features of that measure and bearing in mind the different nature of Article XIX, which provides conditional right to impose safeguard measures, and Article XXI, which constitutes an affirmative defence and thus may be invoked to justify measures inconsistent with other provisions of the GATT.” Switzerland’s assertions are not supported by the ordinary meaning of

Article XIX or Article XXI, and reveal Switzerland’s misunderstanding of the U.S. arguments in this dispute and the role of a panel as set out in the DSU.

115. As an initial matter, the term “affirmative defense” is not a legal term reflected in the DSU or any other covered agreement. Whether Switzerland, another Member, or an adjudicator would characterize the Article XIX or Article XXI (or neither provision, or both provisions) as affirmative defenses does not affect the interpretation of these provisions. The DSU calls on the Panel to interpret each provision cited in the dispute in accordance with customary rules of interpretation of public international law. Switzerland’s argument also ignores that both Article XXI and Article XIX (and other provisions) provide bases on which a Member may be permitted to deviate from its WTO obligations and impose tariffs, for example.

116. When considering alleged breaches of affirmative obligations in the WTO agreements, a panel may determine whether a particular measure falls within the scope of measures that are subject to the obligations claimed to have been breached. When a Member wishes to *deviate* from its WTO obligations, it is for that Member to determine the basis on which it will seek to deviate. If a measure is sought, taken, or maintained pursuant to the exercise of a right under one such basis for deviation from WTO obligations (as the United States has done here, pursuant to Article XXI), there is no reason for a Member to *also* seek, take, or maintain that measure pursuant to a right provided by another provision (such as pursuant to Article XIX, the release that the complainant attempts to assign to the United States in this dispute). If a Member has failed to comply with the requirements of the provision pursuant to which it is seeking to deviate from its WTO obligations, the Member simply breaches its underlying obligation. A panel does not – to use Switzerland’s words – attempt to assess “[w]hether a measure falls within the scope of Article XIX or Article XXI” – to determine whether there might be a separate basis on which a Member may be permitted to deviate from its WTO obligations.

117. A number of different measures might involve features of a safeguard measure, or be said to have what some might call a safeguard objective. If the Member has not chosen to act under Article XIX, any safeguard objective the measure might be thought to have does not have independent relevance to the rights and obligations implicated by that measure. Switzerland’s attempt to link its argument to DSU Article 11 does not change this result, as the Panel’s function of making “an objective assessment of the matter before it” does not call on the Panel to assign to a responding Member a basis for a deviation from its obligations that the Member is not attempting to employ. In fact, the text of Article XXI refutes Switzerland’s suggestion that the Panel must assess “[w]hether a measure falls within the scope of Article XIX or Article XXI”. Specifically, the words “Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed to prevent...” in Article XXI includes Article XIX, and – as Article 11.1(c) confirms – Members did not restrict their rights to take action under other provisions of the GATT 1994 when they concluded the Agreement on Safeguards.

B. Contrary to Complainant’s Arguments, Article 12.8 Does Not Support Complainant’s Position

118. Switzerland continues to argue that the counter-notification provision at Article 12.8 of the Agreement on Safeguards undermines the U.S. interpretation of Article XIX as requiring invocation because – according to Switzerland – the phrase “‘any measures or actions dealt with in this Agreement’ within the meaning of Article 12.8 are safeguard measures, i.e. ‘measures

provided for in Article XIX of GATT 1994’, as per Article 1 of the Agreement on Safeguards.” Switzerland ignores, however that the reference in Article 1 to “measures provided for in Article XIX of the GATT 1994” includes a reference to Article XIX:2 and its requirement that a Member “shall give notice in writing” of action pursuant to Article XIX:1 “[b]efore” taking that action so that Members may engage in consultation. In fact, the drafters of the Agreement on Safeguards made a specific decision to refer to Article XIX in its entirety at Article 1 of the Agreement on Safeguards, rather than referring to certain characteristics of safeguard measures.

C. Switzerland’s Comparison of GATT 1994 Article XIX:2 and TBT Agreement Article 2.9.2 is Inapt

119. Switzerland asserts that the notification requirement at Article 2.9.2 of the TBT Agreement “constitutes more relevant context for interpreting Article XIX of the GATT 1994 than the provisions cited by the United States because, like Article XIX, it relates to domestic measures that may be taken by a WTO Member.” Switzerland does not explain why it believes Article XIX and the TBT Agreement “relate[] to domestic measures,” but – according to Switzerland – the provisions discussed by the United States in its Second Written Submission at Section IV.A.2 do not. Regardless, the WTO Agreement does not support Switzerland’s proffered distinction, and in fact numerous WTO provisions – including Article XIX – relate to action on both the domestic-level and the WTO-level.

120. Switzerland’s assertions about the relevance of the TBT Agreement also fail to acknowledge that the TBT Agreement defines the types of measures that are subject to its obligations, and that these definitions do *not* contain terms similar to Article XIX:2, which requires that a Member “shall give notice in writing” of action pursuant to Article XIX:1 “[b]efore” taking that action so that Members may engage in consultation. The Agreement on Safeguards, by contrast, specifically does not purport to define “safeguard measures,” and instead refers to “measures provided for in Article XIX” (Article 1) and “emergency action on imports of particular products as set forth in Article XIX” (Article 11.1(a)). Thus, these references confirm that it is the text of Article XIX – including its requirement of invocation through notice and an opportunity to consult – that determines what constitutes a “safeguard measure” within the meaning of Article XIX and the Agreement on Safeguards.