

# Index

---

- accountability 70–71, 74, 87–8, 119, 227
  - democratic 32, 71
- accuracy 109, 160, 171, 196
- activism, judicial 93–4
- adjudicative efficiency 89, 97
- adjudicative legitimacy 34, 90–91, 94–6, 118–23, 150–51, 153, 219
- administrative decisions 6, 10, 13–14, 19, 70, 185
- administrative law 6, 8, 13, 18, 20, 26, 70
  - principles 13, 16, 63, 88, 154
- allocation of power 44, 68, 70, 73, 84, 88, 154
- alternative standard of review models 68–87
  - constitutionalization and harmonization 83–6
  - de novo* review 6, 50–54, 58–9, 79–81, 143, 164–6, 179–82
  - deference based on margin of appreciation/policy space 86–7
  - deliberation test 72–5, 88, 121–2, 153
  - flexible standard 81–3
  - reasonable regulator test 3, 75–9, 99, 122, 128–9, 153
  - sovereignty perspective and Chevron analogy 68–72
- Anti-Dumping Agreement 2, 31–2, 45–7, 156–69, 171–2, 175–6, 180–82
  - application of new standard 163–9
  - Art 17.6 1–2, 45–6, 59–65, 115, 123–5, 161–9, 179–80
  - and new general standard of review 123–5
  - comparison of new standard with current standard 179–80
  - key concepts and obligations 158–60
  - standard of review 59–64
- Appellate Body 47–59, 61–6, 102–19, 134–6, 142–6, 166–70, 179–83
- appreciation, margin of 5, 23, 59, 86–7, 123, 204
- arbitrary and capricious standard 16–17
- as applied claims 29, 158
- as such claims 29, 142, 158
- assessment 19, 25, 29, 35, 50, 60, 62
  - of facts 29, 52, 56, 114, 143, 151, 157
  - objective *see* objective assessment
  - subjective 109, 141
- Australia 12–13, 18, 55–6, 135
  - standard of review 13–15
- autonomy, regulatory 76, 195–6
- basic obligations 202, 205, 208
- Brazil 206, 212
- Button, C. 3, 5, 16, 18, 23, 62, 75–8
- Canada 25, 54, 57, 104, 111, 181, 186
- Cass, D. 34, 83–4, 133–4
- causation 9, 157, 168, 175, 178
- checklist approach 173, 178
- Chevron doctrine 18, 63, 70–71, 125
- China 56–7, 104, 176, 206
- codification 16
- coherent reasoning 55, 86, 197, 210
- competence 25, 118, 131–2
- competencies 1–2, 9, 18, 129, 131–2, 141–2, 220
  - jurisdictional 84, 129–30, 132, 134–9, 142–3, 145, 215
- competent authorities 53–4, 58, 135–6, 176
- compliance 8, 53–4, 67, 80–81, 94–5, 123–4, 133–4
- comprehensive review 101, 108–12, 114, 124–5, 139, 207, 215
  - tests 103, 108–11, 120, 213
- conditions precedent 137, 206

- conformity 10, 40–41, 50, 60, 87, 94, 113–14
  - assessment procedures 199–200
- consistency 9, 70, 99, 109, 112–13, 141, 216–17
  - of approach 33, 83
- constitutionalism 67
- constitutionalization 34, 73, 83–4, 133–4, 146–7, 151
- consultations 38, 40–41, 106, 161, 171, 176, 190
- control 73, 105, 108, 130–32
- correctness test 13, 196, 210
- countervailing duties 56–7, 104, 156, 169–73, 178, 182, 207
- countervailing measures 45–6, 74, 157, 159, 169–70, 172–3
- Croley, S. 3, 32, 44, 46–8, 63, 68–72, 88–9
- current objective assessment test 2, 66, 82, 118, 125
- customary rules of public international law 60–61, 63, 92–3, 113, 115, 123, 148–9
- de novo* review 6, 50–54, 58–9, 79–81, 143, 164–6, 179–82
- deference 15–16, 32–3, 61–4, 67–72, 87–9, 164–7, 220–3
  - based on margin of appreciation/policy space 86–7
  - Chevron-style 70–71
  - degree of 12, 16, 18, 25–6, 86–8, 154, 219–21
  - total 6–7, 29, 51, 61, 76, 84, 87
- deferential reasonableness 77, 134
- degree of deference 12, 16, 18, 25–6, 86–8, 154, 219–21
- deliberation test 72–5, 88, 121–2, 153
- democratic accountability 32, 71
- differential treatment 225
- discretion 14, 19, 21–3, 52, 57, 63, 109–10
- discrimination 42, 205–6
- disguised restrictions 189, 192, 194, 206
- dispute settlement objectives 91–4, 219
- Dispute Settlement Understanding, Art 11 49–54, 57–8, 62–4, 110–13, 134–5, 152–3, 213–14
- division of jurisdictional competencies 135–6, 139, 149, 203, 226
- Doha Round of negotiations 122, 223, 225, 227
- domestic agencies 27, 32, 59, 62, 110–12, 147
- domestic legal systems 2, 9–10, 24, 30, 33, 112, 218
- domestic processes 29, 130, 138, 140–2, 165, 169, 204
- domestic regulation 29, 77, 177, 196
- due process 7, 12, 97–8, 109–11, 118–19, 176–7, 183
- dumping 32, 42–3, 142, 158–60, 163, 167–8, 179
  - margins 64, 93, 160, 167–8
- duties, anti-dumping 43, 45, 156, 158–60
- economic analysis 22–3, 175
- effectiveness 23, 48, 64, 71, 94, 100–101, 150
  - principle of 64, 150
- efficiency 25–6, 32, 70–71, 87–8, 96–8, 120, 127
  - adjudicative 89, 97
  - procedural 90, 97–8
- Ehlermann, C.-D. 3, 63, 81–3, 101, 139, 203, 219
- enforcement 28, 38–9, 75, 87, 93, 117, 189
- errors
  - of law 1, 19
  - manifest 19, 21–2
- establishment of facts 9, 49, 61–2, 113, 123, 162, 179
  - proper 61, 167
- European Court of Justice 20–23
- European Union/Communities 20–23, 49–50, 55, 64, 77–8, 134, 172
- evaluation 60–63, 76, 79, 123–4, 141, 162, 164
  - unbiased and objective 61–2
- evidence
  - expert 59, 81, 104, 106, 141, 196
  - scientific 50, 55, 75–7, 86, 189, 196–8, 209–10
  - substantial 16–17
  - sufficient 16, 101, 103–4, 107–9, 114, 120, 123–5

- expert evidence 59, 81, 104, 106, 141, 196
- expertise 9, 70–71, 88, 96–8, 120, 132, 147–8
- experts 55, 77, 97, 104, 107, 190, 196–7
- exporters 159–60, 169–70, 172, 174, 176
- facts
  - assessment of 29, 52, 56, 114, 143, 151, 157
  - establishment of 9, 49, 61–2, 113, 123, 162, 179
  - interpretation of 114, 157
  - relevant 29, 53, 107–8
  - standard of review of *see* standard of review of facts
- factual conclusions 8–9, 59–60, 157
- factual record 61–2, 81, 103–5, 108, 110, 139, 167
- fairness 14, 17, 160, 226
  - procedural 17, 96, 98, 120, 219
- flexible standard of review 81–3
- formal processes 82, 139, 141, 194
- formalities 81, 139, 203, 205
- France 18–20, 198, 217
  - law 18–19, 131
  - standard of review 18–20
- Franck, T.M. 95–6
- freedom, complete 43, 140, 190, 207
- function of panels 50, 56, 191, 208
- GATT 1947 31, 37–44, 47, 76, 133, 205
  - panel decisions 42–4
    - Tokyo Round 39–42, 169
- GATT 1994 47, 76–7, 185–7, 194–5, 204, 205–9, 212–13
  - application of new standard 207–9
  - comparison of new standard with current standard 212–13
  - key concepts and obligations 205–7
- general principles 7, 10, 15, 150, 161, 205
- general standard of review modification 127–54
  - application of specific standard 130–45
  - justification for specific standard 145–53
  - method of construction of specific standard 138–43
  - threshold test 130–38
  - treatment of facts and law 143–5
  - new *see* new general standard of review
- Germany 198
- Goh, G. 67, 193, 213
- good faith 30, 50, 52, 61, 111, 115–16, 141–2
- governance 13, 34, 73, 96, 146, 224, 227
- Greece 20, 198
- harmonization 83, 85, 196, 199, 201, 203–4, 223–4
  - positive 85, 208
- health 28, 56, 73, 76–7, 85–6, 187–90, 199–200
  - human 75, 77, 196, 200, 218
  - protection of 90, 208
- Heaton, D. 118, 150
- Heiskanen, V. 85–6
- high degree of deference 16, 25, 42, 217, 222
- history 10, 26, 35, 40, 217–18
- Horlick, G. 45, 60, 63, 78, 163, 180
- Howse, R. 25, 73, 91, 102, 146–7, 151, 152
- Hudec, R.E. 39–40, 43–4, 92, 120
- human health 75, 77, 196, 200, 218
- human rights 5, 20, 23, 224
- ICSID 12, 24, 225
- identification of principles for development of WTO standard of review 87–99
  - development of appropriate procedures 96–9
  - ensuring adjudicative legitimacy 94–6
  - relevant principles 90–91
- implementation 21, 42, 46–7, 69, 71, 78, 86
- imports 42, 57, 80, 158, 168, 174–5, 177–8
- inconsistency 36, 46, 112
- informal processes 28, 39
- inherent jurisdiction 117–18, 148, 150, 153, 162, 216

- initiation 160, 167, 171, 179  
 injury 79–80, 157, 163, 167–71, 173, 175, 178–9  
     material 42–3, 163, 168, 175, 178  
     serious 9, 42, 57, 174–5, 178  
 institutional sensitivity 69, 146–7, 151  
 intensity of review 4, 6, 8, 12, 63, 178, 195  
 intermediate standards 7, 146  
 International Court of Justice 12, 24, 26, 132, 148, 217  
 interpretations  
     permissible 60–61, 63–4, 125, 165, 168–9  
     reasonable 45, 63, 78  
 intrusion 13, 29, 51, 61, 81, 164, 168  
 intrusiveness 26–7  
 Italy 19, 21, 198  
  
 Jackson, J.H. 3, 32, 37–8, 44, 46–8, 68–72, 88–9  
 Japan 64, 149, 180–82, 190, 193–4, 196, 212–13  
 judicial activism 93–4  
 judicial economy 121, 225  
 judicial review 10–11, 13–15, 24, 26, 70, 73  
 jurisdiction, inherent 117–18, 148, 150, 153, 162, 216  
 jurisdictional competencies 84, 129–30, 132, 134–9, 142–3, 145, 215  
     allocation 130, 138, 192  
     delineation 133, 142, 146, 212, 221  
     division 135–6, 139, 149, 203, 226  
 jurisprudence 20, 48, 82, 91, 93, 201  
     *see also precedent*  
  
 Korea 57, 143, 180–82, 204–6, 212  
 legal basis  
     for development of new general standard 115–18  
     for specific standard of review 148–50  
 legitimacy 2–3, 72, 86, 88–92, 94–6, 151–2, 214–15  
     adjudicative 34, 90–91, 94–6, 118–23, 150–51, 153, 219  
     crisis 73, 95  
     legitimate objectives 200–203  
 Lockhart, N. 3, 63, 81–3, 101, 139, 203, 219  
 Luxembourg 19, 198  
  
 Maastricht Treaty 20–21  
 McNelis, N. 21–2, 218  
 manifest error 19, 21–2  
 margin of appreciation 5, 23, 59, 86–7, 123, 204  
 Marrakesh Agreement 44, 48, 93, 133, 155, 205  
 Mavroidis, P.C. 48, 116, 149, 158–60, 169, 175, 208  
 mediating principles 69, 88, 98  
 member measures 120, 129, 154, 172, 208  
 member sovereignty *see* sovereignty  
 merits review 6, 14, 19  
 Messerlin, P.A. 158–60, 169, 172, 175  
 methodologies 4, 17–18, 33–4, 52, 60, 128, 160  
 Mexico 25, 62–3, 144–5, 149, 158, 167, 201  
 misrepresentation 50, 52  
 misuse of powers 21–2  
 Mitchell, A.D. 9, 12, 98, 111, 118, 150, 162  
 mixed questions 9, 144, 157–8  
 most favoured nation treatment 85, 188, 205  
 multilateral track 169–72  
  
 NAFTA 12, 25–6, 91, 152, 225  
 national level 58, 82, 106, 137, 163, 169, 207–8  
 national sovereignty *see* sovereignty  
 national treatment 32, 85, 188, 200, 202–3, 205  
 natural justice 7, 12, 52  
 negative consensus 31, 45, 84, 95  
 new general standard of review 100–26  
     application  
         to non-trade remedies 185–213  
         to trade remedies 155–84  
     and Art 17.6 DSU 123–5  
     assessment against major standard of review principles 118–21  
     assessment against other standards of review 121–3

- justification for 114–25
- legal basis for development 115–18
- requirement to conduct
  - comprehensive review 108–12
- requirement to examine all available and sufficient evidence 103–8
- treatment of facts and law 112–14
- Nicolaidis, K. 146–7, 151
- non-deferential standard 18, 33, 144, 213
- non-discrimination 85, 146–7, 196
- non-trade remedies 35, 140, 177, 187, 189, 213, 220–21
  - application of new standard of review 185–213
  - comparison of new standard with current standard 209–13
  - GATT 1994 *see* GATT 1994
  - SPS Agreement *see* SPS Agreement
  - TBT Agreement *see* TBT Agreement
  - uniformity of standard of review 187–8
- objective assessment 49–52, 57–8, 65–6, 75–6, 82–4, 110–15, 152–3
  - current 2, 66, 82, 118, 125
  - test 65–6, 75–6, 82–3, 101–2, 110–15, 121, 152–3
  - objective evaluation, unbiased and 49, 61–2
- objective sufficiency 62, 179
- objectives, legitimate 200–203
- Oesch, M. 2–3, 5, 23, 41, 45–6, 67, 179–80
- overreaching 2, 146, 186
- panels 40–69, 92–115, 133–49, 164–8, 177–87, 190–98, 207–18
  - competency 144, 147
  - discretion 69, 109, 112
  - function/role 50, 56, 191, 208
  - review process 103, 107, 109, 122, 127–8
  - review task 50, 122, 146, 204
- permissible interpretations 60–61, 63–4, 125, 165, 168–9
- Petersmann, E.-U. 37, 45, 78, 163
- plant life 86, 187–9, 193, 200, 206
- policy space 77, 86–7
- positive harmonization 85, 208
- powers
  - allocation of 44, 68, 70, 73, 84, 88, 154
  - separation of 10, 15, 22
- precautionary principle 77, 190
- precedent 48, 216 *see also* jurisprudence
- predictability 28–9, 83, 92–3, 101–2, 117, 119, 151
- primacy 82, 130, 161, 165
- procedural efficiency 90, 97–8
- procedural fairness 17, 96, 98, 120, 219
- proper establishment of facts 61, 167
- proportionality 8, 13, 19, 23, 154
- public international law 12, 24, 60–61, 92, 115, 131, 148
  - customary rules 60–61, 63, 92–3, 113, 115, 123, 148–9
- purposive approach 115, 148
- rational relationship 86, 123, 186, 191, 195, 204, 210
  - test 87, 193, 210, 215
- rationality 165, 196, 210, 216
- reasonable interpretation 45, 63, 78
- reasonable regulator test 3, 75–9, 99, 122, 128–9, 153
- reasonableness 7, 13, 16–17, 46, 76–9, 122, 134
  - deferential 77, 134
- reasoning, coherent 55, 86, 197, 210
- record, factual 61–2, 81, 103–5, 108, 110, 139, 167
- regulator, reasonable 3, 75–9, 99, 122, 128–9, 153
- regulatory autonomy 76, 195–6
- regulatory intention 195–6, 204, 208, 221
- relevant facts 29, 53, 107–8
- risk assessments 49–50, 55–6, 86, 189–95, 197–8, 202–4, 209–11
- Safeguards Agreement 2, 9, 32, 57, 154–5, 174–8, 183
  - application of new standard 177–8
  - comparison of new standard with current standard 182–3
  - key concepts and obligations 174–7
- safety 73, 188, 190, 195–6, 199–200, 218

- sanitary and phytosanitary measures *see* SPS Agreement
- scientific evidence 50, 55, 75–7, 86, 189, 196–8, 209–10
- scientific justification 76–7, 191–2, 211
- scientific uncertainty 76
- SCM Agreement 2, 58, 65, 133, 154–7, 169–77, 180–2
- application of new standard 171–4
- comparison of new standard with current standard 180–82
- key concepts and obligations 169–71
- security 28–9, 83, 92, 101–2, 117, 119, 151
- sensitivities 67, 69, 153, 211
- institutional 69, 146–7, 151
- separation of powers 10, 15, 22
- serious injury 9, 42, 57, 174–5, 178
- sliding scale 185, 194, 217
- sovereignty 28, 30, 74, 80–81, 88, 94–5, 131
- perspective 68–72
- Spamann, H. 3, 7, 51, 56, 79–80, 89, 146–7
- specific standard of review 164, 186, 222–3
- application of 130–45
- comparison against other standards of review 152–3
- general arguments for and against 146–8
- justification against standard of review principles 150–52
- justification for 145–53
- legal basis for 148–50
- method of construction 138–43
- SPS Agreement 49, 55–6, 74–5, 134–7, 201–2, 207–11, 220–22
- application of new standard 191–8
- comparison of new standard with current standard 209–10
- key concepts and obligations 188–91
- stakeholders 72–3, 121, 127
- standard of review
- alternative models *see* alternative standard of review models
- application in WTO 27–33
- institutional considerations and limitations 30–31
- relevancy, definitions and application 27–9
- usefulness of domestic law analogy 32–3
- assessment against major principles 118–21
- assessment of other legal systems 25–6
- Australia 13–15
- definition 4–6
- development of WTO standard 36–65
- anti-dumping standard 59–64
- decisions prior to *EC-Hormones* 47–9
- EC-Hormones* 49–52
- identification of principles for *see* identification of principles for development of WTO standard of review
- post-*EC-Hormones* 52–9
- European Court of Justice 20–23
- flexible 81–3
- France 18–20
- general *see* general standard of review
- international dispute settlement bodies 24–5
- new general standard *see* new general standard of review
- of facts 8–10, 19, 29, 41–2, 53, 60, 164–5
- of law 8–10, 49, 63, 85, 113
- other relevant jurisdictions 12–26
- rationales for 10–12
- specific *see* specific standard of review
- test 36, 52, 67, 223
- types 6–8
- United States 15–18
- state sovereignty *see* sovereignty
- subjective assessments 109, 141
- subsequent practice 38, 48, 116, 149
- subsidiarity 87, 146–7, 150–51, 154, 224
- subsidies and countervailing measures *see* SCM Agreement
- substantial evidence 16–17
- substantive obligations 81, 117, 119, 122, 136–7, 153, 202–3

- sufficiency 104, 108, 167  
 objective 62, 179  
 sufficient evidence 16, 101, 103, 103–9,  
 114, 120, 123–5
- TBT Agreement 76–7, 136–7, 185–7,  
 199–204, 207–9, 211–13, 220–22  
 application of new standard 201–4  
 comparison of new standard with  
 current standard 211–12  
 key concepts and obligations  
 199–201  
 technical barriers *see* TBT Agreement  
 textual approach 78, 115, 134, 226  
 threshold test 130–38, 153  
 Tokyo Round 39–42, 169  
 total deference 6–7, 29, 51, 61, 76, 84,  
 87
- trade remedies 2–3, 35, 58–9, 78–83,  
 105–6, 135–7, 219–21  
 application of new standard of review  
 155–84  
 comparison of new standard with  
 current standard 179–83  
 factual and legal issues in review  
 157–8  
 Safeguards Agreement *see*  
 Safeguards Agreement  
 SCM Agreement *see* SCM  
 Agreement
- trade remedies, Anti-Dumping  
 Agreement *see* Anti-Dumping  
 Agreement
- treaty interpretation 64, 67, 78, 91–2,  
 114, 116, 148–51 *see also* Vienna  
 Convention on the Law of  
 Treaties
- TRIPS Agreement 85, 127, 224  
 two-stage test 100–101, 124, 128, 155
- unbiased and objective evaluation 49,  
 61–2
- uniformity 145, 147, 187, 200, 226
- unilateral track 169–70, 172
- United States 15, 17–18, 25–6, 31–2,  
 40, 42–7, 217–18  
 standard of review 15–18
- unreasonableness 13–14 *see also*  
 reasonableness
- Uruguay Round 28, 31, 36, 44–7,  
 59–60, 64, 78  
 outcomes 77, 92, 114, 117
- validity 13, 27, 75, 177, 195
- Vienna Convention on the Law of  
 Treaties 30–31, 61, 63–4,  
 113–16, 125, 148–9, 165–6
- Voon, T.S. 9–10, 28, 109, 127, 144
- Waincymer, J. 7, 9, 27, 92, 97, 112, 123
- Wauters, J.M. 158–60, 169, 172, 175
- wilful distortion 50, 52
- Yanovich, A. 9–10, 28, 109, 127, 144
- zeroing 48, 54–5, 57, 64, 93, 142,  
 168–9
- Zleptnig, S. 3, 5, 72–4

