

<b>1</b>	<b>RULE 20</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Text of Rule 20	1
1.2	Rule 20(2)(d): Notice of Appeal - " statement of the nature of appeal"	2
1.2.1	The purpose of Rule 20(2)(d)	2
1.2.2	The distinction between claims and arguments	2
1.2.3	The consequence of failing to meet requirements of Rule 20(2)(d)	3
1.2.3.1	General rule: claim of error excluded from scope of appeal	3
1.2.3.2	Some exceptions	5
1.2.3.2.1	Claim of error relating to jurisdiction / terms of reference	5
1.2.3.2.2	Filing of clarifications, further particulars, or supplementary or amended Notices of Appeal	5
1.2.3.2.3	Absence of prejudice resulting from formal deficiencies	6
1.2.4	Potential deficiencies in a Notice of Appeal	6
1.2.4.1	Use of 'for example'	6
1.2.4.2	Failu(1)-83r2	



arguments as contemplated by Rule 20 of the *Working Procedures*. Bearing this distinction in mind, we do *not* agree with Argentina that Chile's arguments regarding the order of analysis chosen by the Panel amount to a separate 'allegation of error' that Chile *should have*—or *could have*—included in its Notice of Appeal. In fact, we do not see, nor has Argentina explained, what *separate* 'allegation of error' could have been made, or what legal basis for such 'allegation of error' there could have been. Rather than making a separate 'allegation of error', Chile has, in our view, simply set out a *legal argument* in support of the issues it raised on appeal relating to Article 4.2 of the *Agreement on Agriculture* and Article II:1(b) of the GATT 1994. <sup>4 5</sup>

4. In *US – Countervailing Measures on Certain EC Products*, the Appellate Body contrasted the requirements of Rule 20(2)(d), regarding the Notice of Appeal, with the requirements of Rule 21(2): *US – Countervailing Measures on Certain EC Products*, paras. 105–106 (WT/DS461/AB/R).

7. In *US – Offset Act (Byrd Amendment)*, the Appellate Body stated that "if an appellee has not received sufficient notice in the Notice of Appeal that a particular claim will be advanced by the appellant, that claim normally will be excluded from the appeal".<sup>9</sup>

8. In *EC – Bananas III (Article 21.5 – Ecuador II) / EC – Bananas III (Article 21.5 – US)*, the Appellate Body observed that Rule 20(2)(d) "does not stipulate what consequences flow from a failure to meet its requirements", and stated that in "assessing the potential consequences", we are mindful of the due process function that this Rule fulfills.<sup>10</sup> In that case, the Appellate Body ultimately found that certain defects in the Notice of Appeal did "not give rise to procedural











