

*Saudi Arabia – Measures Concerning the Protection of Intellectual  
Property Rights*

**(DS567)**

**THIRD PARTY EXECUTIVE SUMMARY  
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

**August 2, 2019**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE U.S. THIRD PARTY SUBMISSION****I. TRIPS ARTICLE 73(B), WHICH MIRRORS ARTICLE XXI(B) OF GATT 1994, IS SELF-JUDGING**

1. Article 73(b) of TRIPS mirrors Article XXI(b) of the GATT 1994, and the text of both provisions, in its context, establishes that these exceptions are self-judging. As both provisions state, “nothing” in the agreement 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 agreement 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.

2. The French and Spanish texts of Article 73(b) likewise 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.

3. The context of TRIPS Article 73(b) also supports this understanding. First, the phrase “which it considers necessary” is present in TRIPS Article 73(a) and 73(b), but not in 73(c). The selective use of this phrase highlights that, under Article 73(a) and 73(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 73(b), and not reduce these words to inutility.

4. Second, the context provided by GATT 1994 Article XX supports the understanding that TRIPS Article 73(b)—like GATT Article XXI(b)—is self-judging. GATT 1994 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 TRIPS Article 73(b) and GATT 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 TRIPS Article 73 and GATT 1994 Article XXI.

5. 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, GATS Article III(5) 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. Numerous other provisions of WTO agreements include similar language and thereby vest particular considerations with a WTO Member, a panel, the Appellate Body, or another entity. As in TRIPS Article 73(b), the text of such provisions makes clear that the judgment of whether a situation arises is left to the discretion of the named actor.

6. By way of contrast, and further context, in at least two WTO provisions the judgment of the named actor is expressly subject to review through dispute settlement. DSU Article 26.1 permits the institution of non-violation complaints, subject to requirements including that the panel or Appellate Body agree with the judgment of the complaining party. 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). This context is highly instructive. No such review of a Member’s judgment is set out in TRIPS Article 73(b). Accordingly, Members did not agree to subject a Member’s essential security judgment to review by a WTO panel.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE U.S. ORAL STATEMENT**

### **I. Proper Interpretation Of TRIPS Article 73(b)**

7. Under DSU Article 3.2, a panel is to apply customary rules of interpretation of public international law to the text of the covered agreements; these rules establish that TRIPS Article 73(b) is self-judging. That is, each WTO Member has the right to determine, for itself, what it considers necessary for the protection of its own essential security interests.

8. TRIPS Article 73(b) mirrors GATT 1994 Article XXI(b). The text and context of TRIPS Article 73(b) supports an understanding that the provision is self-judging. First, in the chapeau, the ordinary meaning of the terms “it considers” establishes the self-judging nature of this provision. The word “consider[.]” means “[r]egard in a certain light or aspect; look upon as.” Under Article 73(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.

9. Second, 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.

10. Third, the text of subparagraphs (i) to (iii) of Article 73(b) also supports the self-judging nature of this provision. As an initial matter, these subparagraphs lack any conjunction – such as the cumulating conjunction “and,” or the coordinating conjunction “or” – to specify their relationship to each other. The absence of any conjunction here suggests that each of the subparagraphs (i) to (iii) must be considered for its relation to the chapeau of Article 73(b).

11. Subparagraphs (i) and (ii) – which discuss fissionable materials and traffic in arms, respectively – both begin with the phrase “relating to” and directly follow the phrase “essential security interests.” Subparagraphs (i) and (ii) thus illustrate the types of “essential security interests” that Members considered could lead to action under Article 73(b).

12. Subparagraph (iii) of Article 73(b), by contrast, begins with temporal language “taken in time of.” This language echoes the reference to “taking any action” in the chapeau of Article 73(b), as it is *actions* that are “taken,” and not interests. Thus, the temporal circumstance in subparagraph (iii) modifies the word “action,” rather than the phrase “essential security interests.” Accordingly Article 73(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.

13. Subparagraphs (i) to (iii) of Article 73(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 73(b). A Member taking action pursuant to Article 73(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 as set forth in subparagraph (iii). In this way, the subparagraphs (i) to (iii) guide a Member’s exercise of its rights under Article 73(b) while reserving to the Member the judgment whether particular action is necessary to protect its essential security interests.

14. This interpretation of Article 73(b) is also established by the subsequent agreement of the parties in the context of the *United States Export Measures* dispute between the United States and Czechoslovakia.

15. In brief, in that dispute Czechoslovakia requested the CONTRACTING PARTIES to find that certain U.S. actions were inconsistent with the GATT 1947. In discussing the decision to be made in the following GATT Council meeting, the Chairman opined that the question of whether U.S. measures conformed to GATT Article I “was not appropriately put” because the United States had defended its actions under the essential security exception, which “embodied exceptions” to Article I. As the Chairman stated, the question before the contracting parties was whether the United States “had failed to carry out its obligations” under the GATT 1947. With only Czechoslovakia dissenting, the CONTRACTING PARTIES found that the United States had not failed to carry out its obligations under the GATT.

16. Thus, this subsequent agreement taken into account with the ordinary meaning of the terms of Article 73(b) confirms that, under customary rules of interpretation, TRIPS Article 73(b) leaves to each WTO Member to determine, for itself, what it considers necessary for the protection of its own essential security interests, and to take action accordingly.

## II. Negotiating History Of TRIPS Article 73(b)

17. The negotiating history of the essential security exception confirms that (1) essential security matters are within the judgment of the acting government, and (2) a non-violation, nullification or impairment claim – as opposed to a claimed breach of underlying obligations – is

the appropriate redress for a Member affected by an essential security action. The United States also described these points in its written submission.

18. TRIPS Article 73 mirrors GATT 1994 Article XXI, and the drafting history of these provisions dates back to negotiations to establish the International Trade Organization of the United Nations (“ITO”), which proceeded alongside the GATT 1947 negotiations. In 1946, the United States proposed a draft charter for the ITO, which included exceptions provisions that related to, among other things, measures taken “in time of war or other emergency in international relations, relating to the protection of the essential security interests of a Member.”

19. As the United States asserted at that time – in 1946 – these exceptions “afforded complete opportunity for the adoption of all measures regarded as necessary for the protection of national interests in time of war or a national emergency.” In 1947, the text that became TRIPS Article 73 was revised to separate the essential security exception from the “commercial” exceptions that became GATT 1994 Article XX, and to place the essential security exception at the end of the ITO Charter, so that it was broadly applicable. In addition, the essential security exception was revised to insert the pivotal “it considers” language, which explicitly indicates the self-judging nature of this provision. As the negotiators stated in November 1947, the essential security exception would permit members to do “whatever they think necessary” to protect their essential security interests relating to the circumstances presented in that provision.

20. Negotiators also explicitly discussed that essential security actions would not be reviewable for consistency with the underlying agreement, and that the appropriate redress for a country affected by such actions would be a non-violation, nullification or impairment claim. For example, at a July 1947 meeting, the representative of Australia withdrew an objection to the essential security provision after receiving assurance that a member affected by essential security actions would have redress pursuant to a non-violation, nullification or impairment claim.

21. And in early 1948, 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 because this provision “would apply to the situation of action taken by a Member” to protect its essential security interests. As this Working Party concluded, essential security actions “would be entirely consistent with the Charter, but might nevertheless result in the nullification or impairment of benefits accruing to other Members.” The Working Party concluded that “[s]uch 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.”

### **III. Errors In The *Russia – Traffic in Transit* Panel’s Report**

22. The panel in *Russia – Traffic in Transit* found that it had authority to review multiple aspects of a responding party’s invocation of the essential security provision at Article XXI of the GATT 1994. That panel’s analysis is flawed for numerous reasons.

23. First, the panel failed to apply customary rules of interpretation. The panel acknowledged that the phrase “which it considers” in the chapeau “can be read to qualify . . . the

determination of the matters described in the three subparagraphs of Article XXI(b).” The panel gave no interpretive weight to this plain meaning, however. Instead, that panel based its conclusion on what it termed the “logical structure” of the provision. The panel provided no explanation of what it considered to be the “logical structure” of the provision, nor did the panel explain how, consistent with customary rules of interpretation, the “logical structure” of a provision could operate to alter the ordinary meaning of its terms.

24. Second, after reaching an initial conclusion based on the “logical structure” of the essential security exception – in only a few short paragraphs – the panel proceeded to examine “a similar logical query,” that is “whether the subject-matter of each of the enumerated subparagraphs of Article XXI(b) lends itself to purely subjective discretionary determination.” Without explanation, the panel stated that it would “focus on” subparagraph (iii) and determine whether “given their nature, the evaluation of these circumstances *can be left* wholly to the discretion of the Member invoking the provision, or is designed to be conducted objectively, by a dispute settlement panel.”

25. Again, that panel did not indicate the basis on which this “logical query” could lead to a correct interpretation of Article XXI. The panel also left unexplained why, despite the ordinary meaning of the text of Article XXI – including the key phrase “it considers necessary” – the result of this inquiry could reveal that the evaluation of this provision is “designed to be conducted objectively.” In fact, the text of Article XXI(a) undermines both the premise and the conclusion of the panel’s query. As that provision states “[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.” Thus, under Article XXI(a), a Member need not provide any information – to a WTO panel or other Members – regarding essential security actions or the Member’s underlying security interests.

26. Third, the panel erred in its interpretation of the negotiating history of the essential security exception. Among other problems in this analysis, the panel misconstrued certain statements made during the Article XXI negotiations, including Australia’s July 1947 comments regarding the withdrawal of its objection to the essential security exception. Specifically, the panel failed to identify the article to which Australia referred in those comments, not as a general dispute settlement provision of the GATT 1947, but as the article providing for non-violation nullification or impairment claims.

27. In addition, the panel failed to address other pertinent negotiating history, particularly the numerous explicit statements that confirm that the essential security exception is self-judging and that appropriate redress was considered by the negotiators to be a non-violation, nullification or impairment claim, not a claim that a Member has breached its trade obligations.

28. Essential security provisions, such as Article XXI of the GATT 1994 and TRIPS Article 73, concern matters of the utmost importance to sovereign nations. With respect to such matters, the drafters – the representatives of those sovereign nations – must be respected. As even the *Russia – Traffic in Transit* panel understood, the meaning and grammatical construction of the provision “can be read” to vest in each Member the sole determination of what “*it considers necessary* for the protection of *its essential security interests*.” Had that panel conducted its analysis consistent with customary rules of interpretation, this is the meaning of the essential

security exception that the panel would have discerned. It would risk grave damage to the WTO and its dispute settlement system were panels to attempt to needlessly second guess the decision by any WTO Member to take action it considers necessary for the protection of its essential security interests.

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE U.S. RESPONSES TO PANEL QUESTIONS TO THIRD PARTIES**

29. Response to Question 1: The Panel should begin its analysis by addressing Saudi Arabia’s invocation of TRIPS Article 73(b). This order of analysis is consistent with the Panel’s terms of reference and the function of panels as set forth in the DSU.

30. Under DSU Article 7.1, the standard terms of reference – which were used in this dispute – call on the Panel “[t]o examine . . . the matter referred to the DSB” by the claimant, 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.” As this text establishes, 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.

31. DSU Article 11 confirms this dual function of panels, and similarly provides that the function of panels is to “make an objective assessment of the matter” before it, and “make 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.”

32. The text of TRIPS Article 73(b), however, establishes that it is for a responding Member to determine 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 determination. Accordingly, when a respondent has invoked its essential security interests under Article 73(b) as to a measure challenged before the DSB, a panel may make no findings that will assist the DSB in making recommendations or giving rulings as to a complaining Member’s claims, within the meaning of DSU Articles 7.1 and 11.

33. This result is consistent with DSU Article 19.1 and 19.2 because an essential security measure cannot be found by a panel or the Appellate Body to be inconsistent with a covered agreement, and because it would diminish the “right” of a Member to take action it considers necessary for the protection of its essential security interests for a panel or the Appellate Body to purport to find such action inconsistent with a covered agreement.

34. If the Panel finds that Saudi Arabia has invoked Article 73(b) as to the measures challenged, the Panel should limit the findings in its report to a recognition that Saudi Arabia has invoked its essential security interests.