



# PRACTISING VIRTUE

Inside International Arbitration

---

Edited by David D. Caron, Stephan W. Schill,  
Abby Cohen Smutny, Epaminontas E. Triantafilou

OXFORD

## PRACTISING VIRTUE



# Practising Virtue

*Inside International Arbitration*

Edited by

DAVID D CARON

STEPHAN W SCHILL

ABBY COHEN SMUTNY

EPAMINONTAS E TRIANTAFILOU

OXFORD  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,  
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.  
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,  
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of  
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© The several contributors 2015

The moral rights of the authors have been asserted

First Edition published in 2015

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in  
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the  
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted  
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics  
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the  
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the  
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form  
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Crown copyright material is reproduced under Class Licence  
Number C01P0000148 with the permission of OPSI  
and the Queen's Printer for Scotland

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press  
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data  
Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2015953134

ISBN 978-0-19-873980-7

Printed and bound by  
CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CR0 4YY

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and  
for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials  
contained in any third party website referenced in this work.

## *Preface*

This book is dedicated to The Honorable Charles Nelson Brower in celebration of his 80th birthday. It assembles essays written as a token of friendship on various aspects of international arbitration, the field on which Charles' bold, original, and insightful reasoning and writing has had a profound influence over the past decades. The book is a tribute both to an exceptional international lawyer and to an extraordinary human being who, as mentor, friend, and colleague, leads by example and inspires peers and generations of younger lawyers in their commitment to advance the conduct of international affairs on the basis of the international rule of law.

Today, Charles N Brower is perhaps best known as one of the world's leading, most in-demand, international arbitrators. Yet, his contributions to international law and practice are much richer and varied, encompassing the public and private spheres, practice and academia. In private practice, as an associate and then partner of the law firm of White & Case, Charles N Brower became an accomplished advocate, based first in New York, handling federal and state court litigation throughout the United States, and later as a founding member of the firm's Washington, DC office, where he specialized in handling disputes involving states and state entities. Increasingly, his practice focused on international arbitration, investor-state disputes, and specifically ICSID arbitration, serving as counsel in numerous precedent-setting cases in the field of international investment law. He also appeared in several cases before the International Court of Justice and other international bodies, such as the United Nations Compensation Commission.

In public service, Charles N Brower has held several high positions within the US State Department, as Assistant Legal Adviser for European Affairs, as Deputy Legal Adviser and then as Acting Legal Adviser, the chief lawyer of the Department and principal international lawyer for the US Government. During his tenure at the State Department, among other things, he presided over the signing of the Quadripartite Agreement on Berlin and worked on the conclusion of several important trade agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union. He also served as Deputy Special Counsellor to the President of the United States during the Reagan Administration, as Judge ad hoc on the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, and most recently as Judge ad hoc on the International Court of Justice.

In 1983, Charles N Brower was first appointed to the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal, where he continues to serve to this day. Over his many years on the Tribunal, Judge Brower has had a deep impact on the development of international investment law and on the clarification of the rules relating to the expropriation of alien property in particular. His clear and incisive decisions, particularly in regard to issues relating to compensation and the valuation of property, are recognized as some of the most important in the field.

Charles N Brower also has been a leader in the legal community, making contributions to numerous international institutions, including by serving as President of the American Society of International Law, Chairman of the Institute for Transnational

Arbitration, member of the Executive Council of the International Law Association, Chair of the International Law Section of the American Bar Association, as well as member of the American Bar Association's House of Delegates and Board of Governors.

Last but not least, Charles N Brower has long been a thought-leader in the field of international dispute resolution. He is the author of dozens of scholarly works, including the leading book on the jurisprudence of the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal, which was awarded the Certificate of Merit of the American Society of International Law. He has been a Visiting Fellow at Cambridge University (Jesus College and the Lauterpacht Research Centre for International Law), and was selected as John A Ewald, Jr Distinguished Visiting Professor at the University of Virginia School of Law. He also lectured at The Hague Academy of International Law; the Max-Planck-Institut für ausländisches öffentliches Recht und Völkerrecht, Heidelberg; the Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn; Yale Law School; Duke University School of Law; City University, Hong Kong; Leiden University; Harvard Law School; University of Mississippi School of Law and the Croft Institute for International Studies, University of Mississippi; University of Baltimore School of Law; the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy; Florida State University College of Law; George Washington University School of Law; and Villanova University School of Law.

As a consequence of his unwavering involvement in international law and dispute resolution, the American Society of International Law, in 2009, awarded Charles N Brower, as one of the few practitioners ever, the Manley O Hudson Medal for outstanding contributions to scholarship and achievement in international law. Since then, he has received numerous further awards, including the Pat Murphy Award for exceptional civic contributions and extraordinary professional achievements in international arbitration by the Institute for Transnational Arbitration of the Center for American and International Law, a Lifetime Achievement Award bestowed by the Section of International Law of the American Bar Association, and the Stefan A Riesenfeld Memorial Award in recognition of outstanding achievements and contributions in the field of international law presented by the University of California Berkeley School of Law and the Berkeley Journal of International Law.

But beyond all formal merits, for the editors of this volume, and for the many others who have had the pleasure of working with him, Charles N Brower has been first and foremost a mentor, teacher, and friend, constantly fostering and inspiring commitment to the highest standards of scholarship and professionalism in the service of the rule of law. We hope that this work lives up to these standards and serves both as a lasting tribute to Charles N Brower's impact on international arbitration and a heartfelt hurrah to celebrate his birthday.

David D Caron  
Stephan W Schill  
Abby Cohen Smutny  
Epaminontas E Triantafilou

*London, Amsterdam/Heidelberg, Washington, DC*  
*January 2015*

## *Acknowledgments*

In preparing the manuscript and finalizing its many contributions, we are grateful for having been able to count on many helpful hands.

Special thanks are above all due to the many current and former law clerks of The Honorable Charles N Brower who have helped in editing the contributions for content and form. These are Sadie Blanchard, Michael Daly, Alexandra Goetz-Charlier, Paula Henin, Shashank Kumar, Sarah Melikian, and Charles B Rosenberg. At the Max Planck Institute for Comparative Public Law and International Law in Heidelberg Nadine Berger, Felix Boos, Vladislav Djanic, Raphael Schäfer, and Katrine Tvede helped with editing and complementing references and preparing the tables of cases and legislation.

Stephan W Schill would like to acknowledge support in editing this book by a European Research Council Starting Grant on ‘Transnational Private-Public Arbitration as Global Regulatory Governance: Charting and Codifying the Lex Mercatoria Publica’ (LexMercPub, Grant agreement no 313355) during his tenure both at the Max Planck Institute for Comparative Public Law and International Law in Heidelberg and the University of Amsterdam.

Finally, our thanks are due to Merel Alstein and Emma Endean of Oxford University Press for the support during the commissioning and publishing process, as well as to three anonymous peer reviewers for their helpful feedback on the original book proposal.





# Contents

<i>Table of Cases</i>	<i>xiii</i>
<i>Table of Treaties, Legislation, and Related Instruments</i>	<i>xxvii</i>
<i>List of Contributors</i>	<i>xliii</i>

Practising Virtue: An Introduction	1
<i>David D Caron, Stephan W Schill, Abby Cohen Smutny, and Epaminontas E Triantafilou</i>	

## I. INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION AS PART OF THE TRANSNATIONAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

1. The Transnational Protection of Private Rights: Issues, Challenges, and Possible Solutions	17
<i>Sundaresh Menon</i>	
2. The Changing World of International Arbitration	45
<i>Alan Redfern</i>	
3. International Commercial Arbitration and Investment Treaty Arbitration: Analogies and Differences	52
<i>Piero Bernardini</i>	
4. International Jurisprudence, Global Governance, and Global Administrative Law	69
<i>Eduardo Zuleta</i>	
5. The Culture of Arbitration and the Defence of Arbitral Legitimacy	97
<i>James H Carter</i>	
6. Conceptions of Legitimacy of International Arbitration	106
<i>Stephan W Schill</i>	

## II. HISTORY AND SOCIOLOGY OF INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION

7. The Historical Keystone to International Arbitration: The Party-Appointed Arbitrator—From Miami to Geneva	127
<i>V V Veeder</i>	
8. ‘Black’s Bank’ and the Settlement of Investment Disputes	150
<i>Antonio R Parra</i>	
9. Judge Sir Hersch Lauterpacht’s Report on the Revision of the Statute of the International Court of Justice	158
<i>Stephen M Schwebel</i>	

10. Jurisdictional Errors: A Critique of  
the *North American Dredging Company* Case  
*Oscar M Garibaldi* 167
11. Sociology of International Arbitration  
*Emmanuel Gaillard* 187
12. From Law Professor to International Adjudicator: The WTO Appellate  
Body and ICSID Arbitration Compared, a Personal Account  
*Giorgio Sacerdoti* 204
13. The Advocate in the Transnational Justice System  
*Donald Francis Donovan* 215

### III. AUTHORITY OF INTERNATIONAL ARBITRAL TRIBUNALS AND ITS LIMITS

14. Pre-Arbitration Procedural Requirements: 'A Dismal Swamp'  
*Gary Born and Marija Šćekić* 227
15. At What Time Must Jurisdiction Exist?  
*Christoph Schreuer* 264
16. Local Remedies in International Treaties: A Stocktaking  
*Rudolf Dolzer* 280
17. Investor-State Tribunals and National Courts: A Harmony of Spheres?  
*L Yves Fortier* 292
18. Should International Commercial Arbitrators Declare  
a Law Unconstitutional?  
*Horacio A Grigera Naón* 308
19. The Enforceability of Legislative Stabilization Clauses  
*Joseph E Neuhaus* 318
20. Non-Payment of Advances on Costs: No Pay, Can Play?  
*Neil Kaplan* 330
21. Document Production and Legal Privilege  
in International Commercial Arbitration  
*Julian D M Lew* 347
22. Fair and Equitable Treatment of Witnesses in International Arbitration—  
Some Emerging Principles  
*David A R Williams QC and Anna Kirk* 357

### IV. REASONING AND DECISION-MAKING IN THE ARBITRAL PROCESS

23. Regulating Opacity: Shaping How Tribunals Think  
*David D Caron* 379
24. The Development of Legal Argument in Arbitration: Law as  
an Afterthought—Is It Time to Recalibrate Our Approach?  
*Judith A E Gill* 398

25. Babel and BITs: Divergence Analysis and Authentication in the Unusual Decision of <i>Kiliç v Turkmenistan Mahnoush H Arsanjani and W Michael Reisman</i>	407
26. Reporting from the Arbitral Shop-Floor: Treaty Interpretation in Practice <i>Kaj Hobér</i>	425
27. Judge Brower and the Vienna Convention Rules of Treaty Interpretation <i>Stanimir A Alexandrov</i>	434
28. Contemporaneity and Its Limits in Treaty Interpretation <i>Epaminontas E Triantafylou</i>	449
29. Deliberations of Arbitrators <i>Richard M Mosk</i>	486
30. Charles Brower's Problem with 100%—Dissenting Opinions by Party-Appointed Arbitrators in Investment Arbitration <i>Albert Jan van den Berg</i>	504
31. How to Draft Enforceable Awards under the Model Law <i>Michael Hwang SC and Joshua Lim</i>	514

## V. STUDIES IN INVESTMENT TREATY ARBITRATION

32. The Deal with BITs: What the Parties Thought They Would Get, What They Thought They Were Giving Up to Get It, and What They Got <i>O Thomas Johnson</i>	543
33. Reflections on 'Most Favoured Nation' Clauses in Bilateral Investment Treaties <i>Christopher Greenwood</i>	556
34. The Non-Disputing State Party in Investment Arbitration: An Interested Player or the Third Man Out? <i>Loretta Malintoppi and Hussein Haeri</i>	565
35. Time in International Law and Arbitration: The Chess Clock No Longer Works <i>Francisco Orrego Vicuña</i>	584
36. Challenges to Arbitrators in ICSID Arbitration <i>James Crawford</i>	596
37. 'Pure' Issue Conflicts in Investment Treaty Arbitration <i>Gavan Griffith and Daniel Kalderimis</i>	607
38. Compensation Due in the Event of an Unlawful Expropriation: The 'Simple Scheme' Presented by <i>Chorzów Factory</i> and Its Relevance to Investment Treaty Disputes <i>Abby Cohen Smutny</i>	626
39. Future Damages in Investment Arbitration—a Tribunal with a Crystal Ball? <i>Hans van Houtte and Bridie McAsey</i>	642
40. Allocation of Costs in Recent ICSID Awards <i>Arthur W Rovine</i>	658

41. The Two Annulment Decisions in <i>Amco Asia</i> and ‘Non-Application’ of Applicable Law by ICSID Tribunals <i>Carolyn B Lamm, Eckhard R Hellbeck, and David P Riesenberg</i>	689
42. Of Wit, Wisdom, and Balance in International Law: Reflections on the Tokyo Resolution of the Institut de Droit International <i>Pierre-Marie Dupuy and Julie Maupin</i>	706
<i>Index</i>	723

# Table of Cases

## I. PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE

### Contentious Cases

<i>Case of the SS Lotus (France v Turkey)</i> Judgment, 7 September 1927, PCIJ Series A, No 10.....	468–9, 485
<i>Electricity Company of Sofia and Bulgaria (Belgium v Bulgaria)</i> Judgment, 4 April 1939, PCIJ Series A/B, No 77.....	264
<i>Factory at Chorzów (Germany v Poland) (Jurisdiction)</i> Judgment, 26 July 1927, PCIJ Series A, No 9.....	630
<i>Factory at Chorzów (Germany v Poland) (Merits)</i> Judgment, 13 September 1928, PCIJ Series A, No 17.....	13, 68, 303, 626–7, 631–5, 637, 639, 641, 648, 663, 666, 677
<i>Legal Status of Eastern Greenland (Denmark v Norway)</i> Judgment, 5 April 1933, PCIJ Series A/B No 53.....	444
<i>Mavrommatis Palestine Concessions (Greece v Britain)</i> Judgment, 30 August 1924, PCIJ Series A, No 2.....	251, 253, 271–3, 408–9
<i>Phosphates in Morocco (Italy v France)</i> Judgment, 14 June 1938, PCIJ Series A/B, No 74....	264, 288
<i>SS ‘Wimbledon’ (United Kingdom, France, Italy and Japan v Germany)</i> Judgment, 17 August 1923, PCIJ Series A, No 1.....	96

### Advisory Opinions

<i>Article 3, Paragraph 2 of the Treaty of Lausanne (Frontier between Turkey and Iraq)</i> Advisory Opinion, 21 November 1925, PCIJ Series B, No 12.....	462
---	-----

## II. INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

### Contentious Cases

<i>Aegean Sea Continental Shelf Case (Greece v Turkey)</i> Judgment, 19 December 1978, ICJ Reports 1978, 3.....	460, 464, 467–8, 484–5
<i>Anglo-Iranian Oil Company Case (United Kingdom v Iran)</i> Judgment, 22 July 1952, ICJ Reports 1952, 93.....	162, 559–60
<i>Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Bosnia and Herzegovina v Serbia and Montenegro) (Merits)</i> Judgment, 26 February 2007, ICJ Reports 2007, 43.....	452
<i>Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Bosnia and Herzegovina v Yugoslavia) Preliminary Objections, Judgment, 11 July 1996, ICJ Reports 1996, 595.....</i>	271–2
<i>Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Croatia v Serbia) Preliminary Objections, Judgment, 18 November 2008, ICJ Reports 2008, 412.....</i>	251, 272–3
<i>Application of the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination (Georgia v Russian Federation) Preliminary Objections, Judgment, 1 April 2011, ICJ Reports 2011, 70.....</i>	237, 244, 254, 272, 274
<i>Application of the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination (Georgia v Russian Federation) Preliminary Objections, Joint Dissenting Opinion of President Owada, Judges Simma, Abraham and Donoghue and Judge ad hoc Gaja, ICJ Reports 2011, 142.....</i>	237, 273–4
<i>Barcelona Traction, Light and Power Company, Ltd (Belgium v Spain)</i> Judgment, 5 February 1970, ICJ Reports 1970, 3.....	565

<i>Border and Transborder Armed Actions (Nicaragua v Honduras)</i> Jurisdiction and Admissibility, Judgment, 20 December 1988, ICJ Reports 1988, 69 .....	266
<i>Ahmadou Sadio Diallo (Republic of Guinea v Democratic Republic of Congo)</i> Preliminary Objections, Judgment, 24 May 2007, ICJ Reports 2007, 582 .....	288
<i>Arbitral Award Made by the King of Spain on 23 December 1906 (Honduras v Nicaragua)</i> Judgment, 18 November 1960, ICJ Reports 1960, 192 .....	705
<i>Arbitral Award of 31 July 1989 (Guinea-Bissau v Senegal)</i> Judgment, 12 November 1991, ICJ Reports 1991, 53 .....	392, 501
<i>Arrest Warrant of 11 April 2000 (Democratic Republic of Congo v Belgium)</i> Judgment, 14 February 2002, ICJ Reports 2002, 1 .....	244, 267
<i>Avena and Other Mexican Nationals (Mexico v United States)</i> Judgment, 31 March 2004, ICJ Reports 2004, 128. ....	221–2
<i>Certain Property (Liechtenstein v Germany)</i> Judgment, 10 February 2005, ICJ Reports 2005, 6. ....	264
<i>Corfu Channel (United Kingdom v Albania) (Merits)</i> Judgment, 9 April 1949, ICJ Reports 1949, 18. ....	372
<i>Dispute Regarding Navigational and Related Rights (Costa Rica v Nicaragua)</i> Judgment, 13 July 2009, ICJ Reports 2009, 213 .....	460, 466–8, 472, 484
<i>Dispute regarding Navigational and Related Rights (Costa Rica v Nicaragua)</i> Separate Opinion of Judge Skotnikov, 13 July 2009, ICJ Reports 2009, 283. ....	467
<i>Fisheries (United Kingdom v Norway)</i> Judgment, 18 December 1951, ICJ Rep 1951, 116 .....	179
<i>Interhandel (Switzerland v United States)</i> Preliminary Objections, Judgment, 21 March 1959, ICJ Reports 1959, 6. ....	286, 288
<i>Kasikili/Sedudu Island (Botswana v Namibia)</i> Judgment, 13 December 1999, ICJ Reports 1999, 1045. ....	464, 483–4, 567
<i>LaGrand (Germany v United States) (Merits)</i> Judgment, 27 June 2001, ICJ Reports 2001, 466. ....	164, 217, 410
<i>Land and Maritime Boundary between Cameroon and Nigeria (Cameroon v Nigeria)</i> Preliminary Objections, Judgment, 11 June 1998, ICJ Reports 1998, 275 .....	71
<i>Maritime Delimitation and Territorial Questions between Qatar and Bahrain (Qatar v Bahrain) (Merits)</i> , Separate Opinion of Judge ad hoc Fortier, 16 March 2001, ICJ Reports 2001, 451 .....	370
<i>Nottebohm (Liechtenstein v Guatemala)</i> Preliminary Objections, Judgment, 18 November 1953, ICJ Reports 1953, 111. ....	158, 266–7
<i>Oil Platforms (Islamic Republic of Iran v United States of America)</i> Preliminary Objection, Judgment, 12 December 1996, ICJ Reports 1996, 803 .....	435
<i>Questions of Interpretation and Application of the 1971 Montreal Convention Arising from the Aerial Incident at Lockerbie (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya v United States of America)</i> Preliminary Objections, Judgment, 27 February 1998, ICJ Reports 1998, 115 .....	266–7
<i>Right of Passage over Indian Territory (Portugal v India)</i> Judgment, 12 April 1960, ICJ Reports 1960, 6 .....	71, 264, 266–7
<i>Rights of Nationals of the United States of America in Morocco (France v United States of America)</i> Judgment, 27 August 1952, ICJ Reports 1952, 176. ....	451, 460–2, 467
<i>Sovereignty over Pulau Ligitan and Pulau Sipadan (Indonesia v Malaysia)</i> Judgment, 17 December 2002, ICJ Reports 2002, 625 .....	567
<i>Temple of Preah Vihear (Cambodia v Thailand) (Merits)</i> Judgment, 15 June 1962, ICJ Reports 1962, 6 .....	462, 464
<i>Territorial Dispute (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya v Chad)</i> Judgment, 3 February 1994, ICJ Reports 1994, 6 .....	452
<i>Vienna Convention on Consular Relations (Paraguay v United States)</i> Provisional Measures Order, 9 April 1998, ICJ Reports 1998, 248 .....	217

**Advisory Opinions**

<i>Conditions of Admission of a State to the United Nations (Article 4 of Charter)</i> Advisory Opinion, 28 May 1948, ICJ Reports 1948, 57 . . . . .	410
<i>Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South-West Africa)</i> Advisory Opinion, 21 June 1971, ICJ Reports 1971, 16. . . . .	469–70
<i>Legal Consequences of the Construction of a Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory</i> Advisory Opinion, 9 July 2004, ICJ Reports 2004, 136 . . . . .	435

**III. INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL FOR THE LAW OF THE SEA**

<i>The MOX Plant Case (Ireland v United Kingdom)</i> Order on Provisional Measures, 3 December 2001. . . . .	572
--	-----

**IV. GATT/WTO DISPUTE SETTLEMENT BODY**

<i>Japan—Taxes on Alcoholic Beverages II</i> WT/DS8/AB/R, Report of the Appellate Body, 1 November 1996 . . . . .	435
<i>United States—Final Anti-Dumping Measures on Stainless Steel from Mexico</i> WT/DS344/AB/R, Report of the Appellate Body, 30 April 2008 . . . . .	71, 211

**V. EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND EUROPEAN COMMISSION OF HUMAN RIGHTS**

Decisions of the European Court of Human Rights are available through the HUDOC database at <<http://hudoc.echr.coe.int/>>.

<i>Brumarescu v Romania (Merits)</i> Judgment, 28 October 1999, ECHR 1999-VII. . . . .	635
<i>Brumarescu v Romania (Just Satisfaction)</i> Judgment, 23 January 2001, ECHR 2001-I. . . . .	635
<i>De Becker v Belgium</i> Decision, 9 June 1958, Application No 214/56, 2 YECHR 214 . . . . .	593
<i>James and others v United Kingdom</i> Judgment, 21 February 1986, Application No 8793/79, ECHR Series A, No 98 . . . . .	636
<i>Lithgow and others v United Kingdom</i> Judgment, 8 July 1986, Application Nos 9006/80, 9262/81, 9263/81, 9265/81, 9266/81, 9313/81, and 9405/81, ECHR Series A, No 102 . . . . .	636
<i>Papamichalopoulos and others v Greece (Just Satisfaction)</i> Judgment, 31 October 1995, Application No 14556/89. . . . .	635
<i>Papamichalopoulos and others v Greece (Merits)</i> Judgment, 24 June 1993, Application No 14556/89. . . . .	635

**VI. INTER-AMERICAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS**

Decisions of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights are available through the Court's search engine available via <<http://www.corteidh.or.cr/>>.

<i>Catañenda Gutman v The United States of Mexico</i> Preliminary Objections, Merits, Reparations and Costs, Judgment, 6 August 2008, IACHR Series C, No 184 . . . . .	83, 88–9
<i>Salvador Chiriboga v Ecuador</i> Preliminary Objection and Merits, Judgment, 6 May 2008, IACHR Series C, No 179. . . . .	83–4

**VII. EUROPEAN COURT OF JUSTICE**

<i>AM &amp; S Europe Ltd v Commission</i> (Case 155/79) Judgment, 18 May 1982 [1982] ECR 1575 . . . . .	349
<i>Polydor Ltd v Harlequin Record Shops Ltd</i> (Case 270/80) Judgment, 9 February 1982 [1982] ECR 329 . . . . .	558



## VIII. IRAN-UNITED STATES CLAIMS TRIBUNAL

<i>Amoco International Finance Corporation v Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran</i> , Award, 14 July 1987, 15 Iran-US CTR 189 .....	68, 626, 631, 634, 638
<i>Avco Corporation v Iran Aircraft Industries et al</i> , Award No 377–261–3, 18 July 1988, 19 Iran-US CTR 200 .....	393
<i>Economy Forms Corporation v The Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran et al</i> , Award, 13 June 1983, 3 Iran-US CTR 42 .....	500–1
<i>Frederica Lincoln Riahi v The Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran</i> , Decision No DEC 133-485-1, 17 November 2004, 38 Iran-US CTR 19 .....	362, 372
<i>Dallal v Islamic Republic of Iran et al</i> , Award No 53–149–1, 10 June 1983, 3 Iran-US CTR 10 .....	394
<i>Henry Morris v The Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran</i> , Decision No 26-200-1, 16 September 1983, 3 Iran-US CTR 364 .....	502
<i>ITT Industries, Inc v The Islamic Republic of Iran and the Organisation of Nationalised Industries of Iran</i> , Concurring Opinion of Judge Aldrich, 26 May 1983, 2 Iran-US CTR 348 .....	383, 494
<i>Oil Field of Texas Inc v The Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran et al</i> , Award No 258-43-1, 8 October 1986, 12 Iran-US CTR 308 .....	288
<i>Phillips Petroleum Company Iran v The Islamic Republic of Iran</i> , Award No 425-39-2, 29 June 1989, 21 Iran-US CTR 79 .....	626–7
<i>Raygo Wagner Equipment Company v Star Line Iran Company</i> , Award No 20-17-3, 10 January 1983, 1 Iran-US CTR 411 .....	496
<i>Rexnord Inc v The Islamic Republic of Iran</i> , Award No 21-132-3, 10 January 1983, 2 Iran-US CTR 6 .....	496
<i>Sedco Inc v National Iran Oil Company</i> , Separate Opinion of Judge Brower, 27 March 1986, 10 Iran-US CTR 189 .....	628, 634
<i>The United States of America, Federal Reserve Bank of New York v The Islamic Republic of Iran, Bank Markazi</i> , Case No A/28, Statement of the President, 21 December 2000 .....	385
<i>Ultrasystems Inc v The Islamic Republic of Iran</i> , Concurring Opinion of Judge Richard M Mosk, No 27-84-3, 4 March 1983, 2 Iran-US CTR 114 .....	494
<i>Unidyne Corporation v Islamic Republic of Iran</i> , Case No 368, Award No 551-368-3, 10 November 1993, 29 Iran-US CTR 310 .....	394–5
<i>United States v The Islamic Republic of Iran</i> , Case No B36, Award No 574-B36-2, 3 December 1996, 33 Iran-US CTR 56 .....	502

## IX. ARBITRAL AWARDS AND DECISIONS BY CLAIMS COMMISSIONS

In addition to any source indicated below, most investment treaty awards are available via the Investment Treaty Arbitration website at <<http://italaw.com/>> or via the Investment Claims website at <<http://www.investmentclaims.com/>>.

## Permanent Court of Arbitration

<i>Abyei Arbitration (The Government of Sudan v The Sudan People's Liberation Movement/ Army)</i> Final Award, 22 July 2009, 48 ILM 1258 .....	344, 691, 700, 704–5
<i>CC/Devas (Mauritius) Ltd &amp; others v India</i> , PCA Case No 2013-09, Decision on the Respondent's Challenge to the Hon Marc Lalonde as Presiding Arbitrator and Prof Francisco Orrego Vicuña as Co-Arbitrator, 30 September 2013 .....	599, 610, 619–20
<i>Chevron Corporation (USA) and Texaco Petroleum Company (USA) v The Republic of Ecuador</i> , PCA Case No 2007-2 (UNCITRAL), Partial Award on the Merits, 30 March 2010 .....	192, 293, 300–3, 306–7, 581
<i>Delimitation of the Border (Eritrea-Ethiopia)</i> Decision, 13 April 2002, 15 RIAA 83 .....	459, 462, 465, 467, 483

<i>Dispute Concerning Access to Information under Article 9 of the OSPAR Convention</i> (Ireland v United Kingdom) Final Award, 2 July 2003, 42 ILM 1118 .....	572
<i>HICEE BV v The Slovak Republic</i> , PCA Case No 2009-11 (UNCITRAL), Partial Award, 23 May 2011 .....	708
<i>ICS Inspection &amp; Control Services Ltd (United Kingdom) v The Republic of Argentina</i> , PCA Case No 2010-9, Award on Jurisdiction, 10 February 2012 .....	244, 479–80
<i>Perenco Ecuador Ltd v The Republic of Ecuador</i> , PCA Case No IR-2009/1, Decision on Challenge of Arbitrator, 8 December 2009 .....	615, 618–19, 623
<i>The Ambatielos Claim (Greece v United Kingdom)</i> Award of the Arbitration Commission, 6 March 1956, 12 RIAA 83 .....	470–1, 485
<i>The Grisbådarna Case (Norway v Sweden)</i> Award, 23 October 1909, 11 RIAA 153 .....	451, 457, 463, 483
<i>The Iron Rhine Arbitration (Belgium v Netherlands)</i> Award, 24 May 2005, 18 RIAA 35 .....	454, 458–60, 464, 468, 475, 482
<i>The Island of Palmas Case (or Miangas) (United States of America v The Netherlands)</i> Award, 4 April 1928 2 UNRIAA 829 .....	455–9, 482, 590
<i>The North Atlantic Coast Fisheries Case (United States of America and Great Britain)</i> Award, 7 September 1910, 11 RIAA 167 .....	451, 457, 463–4, 467, 484
<i>The Orinoco Steamship Company Case (United States v Venezuela)</i> Award, 25 October 1910, 11 UNRIAA 227 .....	704

## ICSID

<i>Abaclat &amp; others v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/07/5, Decision on Jurisdiction and Admissibility, 4 August 2011 .....	235
<i>Abaclat &amp; others v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/07/05, Dissenting Opinion of Arbitrator Georges Abi-Saab, 28 October 2011 .....	68
<i>ABCI Investments NV v La République Tunisienne</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/04/12, Décision sur la Compétence, 18 February 2011 .....	595
<i>ADC Affiliate Ltd and ADC &amp; ADMC Management Ltd v The Republic of Hungary</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/03/16, Award of the Tribunal, 2 October 2006 .....	640, 644, 658, 661, 676–7
<i>ADF Group Inc v The United States of America</i> , ICSID Case No ARB(AF)/00/1 (NAFTA), Award, 9 January 2003, 6 ICSID Rep 470 .....	78, 569
<i>AES Corporation v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/02/17, Decision on Jurisdiction, 26 April 2001 .....	58–9
<i>AES Summit Generation Ltd and AES-Tisza Erőmű Kft v The Republic of Hungary</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/07/22 (ECT), Award, 23 September 2010 .....	578, 683
<i>African Holdings v Democratic Republic of Congo</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/05/21, Award, 29 July 2008 .....	364
<i>AGIP Company SpA v The Government of the Popular Republic of the Congo</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/77/1, Award, 30 November 1979 .....	319
<i>Aguas del Tunari SA v The Republic of Bolivia</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/02/3, Decision on Respondent's Objection to Jurisdiction, 21 October 2005 .....	435, 510, 570–1, 574
<i>Alasdair Ross Anderson et al v The Republic of Costa Rica</i> , ICSID Case No ARB(AF)/07/3, Award, 19 May 2010 .....	670
<i>Alpha Projektholding GmbH v Ukraine</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/07/16, Decision on Respondent's Proposal to Disqualify Arbitrator Dr Yoram Turbowicz, 19 March 2010 .....	602–4, 682
<i>Ambiente Ufficio SpA v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/08/9, Decision on Jurisdiction and Admissibility, 8 February 2013 .....	237
<i>Amco Asia Corporation et al v The Republic of Indonesia</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/81/1, Decision on the Proposal to Disqualify an Arbitrator, 24 June 1982 .....	600

<i>Amco Asia Corporation, Pan American Development Ltd, PT Amco Indonesia v The Republic of Indonesia</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/81/1, Decision on Jurisdiction, 25 September 1983, 1 ICSID Rep 403 .....	267
<i>Amco Asia Corporation and others v Republic of Indonesia</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/81/1, Award, 20 November 1984, 1 ICSID Reports 413 .....	81, 281, 694
<i>Amco Asia Corporation, Pan American Development Ltd, PT Amco Indonesia v The Republic of Indonesia</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/81/1, Annulment Decision, 16 May 1986, 1 ICSID Rep 509 .....	14, 689–92, 694–8, 700, 705
<i>Amco Asia Corporation, Pan American Development Ltd, PT Amco Indonesia v The Republic of Indonesia</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/81/1, Award, 5 June 1990 .....	636–7
<i>Amco Asia Corporation, Pan American Development Ltd, PT Amco Indonesia v The Republic of Indonesia</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/81/1, Annulment Decision, 3 December 1992, 9 ICSID Rep 9 .....	14, 689–92, 696–7, 699–700, 705
<i>American Manufacturing &amp; Trading Inc v The Republic of Zaire</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/93/1, Award, 10 February 1997 .....	507
<i>Antoine Goetz et Consorts v The Republic of Burundi</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/95/3, Decision on Liability, 2 September 1998 .....	643, 654
<i>Antoine Goetz et Consorts v The Republic of Burundi</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/95/3, Award, 10 February 1999 .....	267
<i>Archer Daniels Midland Company and Tate &amp; Lyle Ingredients Americas, Inc v The United Mexican States</i> , ICSID Case No ARB(AF)/04/5, Award, 21 November 2007 .....	647, 674
<i>Asian Agricultural Products Ltd v The Republic of Sri Lanka</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/87/3, Award, 27 June 1990 .....	678
<i>ATA Construction, Industrial and Trading Company v The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/08/2, Award, 18 May 2010 .....	293, 297, 682
<i>Autopista Concesionada de Venezuela, CA v The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/00/5, Award, 23 September 2003 .....	645, 647
<i>Azpetrol International Holdings BV, Azpetrol Group BV and Azpetrol Oil Services Group BV v The Republic of Azerbaijan</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/06/15, Award, 8 September 2009 .....	658, 669
<i>Azurix Corporation v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/01/12, Award, 14 July 2006 .....	82, 684
<i>Azurix Corporation v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/01/12, Annulment Decision, 1 September 2009 .....	690, 696, 705
<i>Bayindir Insaat Turizm Ticaret Ve Sanayi AS v The Islamic Republic of Pakistan</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/03/29, Decision on Jurisdiction, 14 November 2005 .....	235, 267, 275
<i>Bayview Irrigation District and others v The United Mexican States</i> , ICSID Case No ARB(AF)/05/01 Award, 19 June 2007 .....	669
<i>Bernhard von Pezold and others v Republic of Zimbabwe</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/10/15, Directions Concerning Claimant's Application for Provisional Measures, 12 June 2012 ...	360–1
<i>Biwater Gauff (Tanzania) Ltd v United Republic of Tanzania</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/05/22, Procedural Order No 3, 29 September 2006 .....	64
<i>Biwater Gauff (Tanzania) Ltd v The United Republic of Tanzania</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/05/22, Procedural Order No 5, 2 February 2007 .....	194
<i>Biwater Gauff (Tanzania) Ltd v The United Republic of Tanzania</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/05/22, Award, 24 July 2008 .....	235, 275, 573, 580, 640, 684
<i>Blue Bank International &amp; Trust (Barbados) Ltd v The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/12/20, Decision on the Parties' Proposals to Disqualify a Majority of the Tribunal, 12 November 2013 .....	409, 609–10
<i>Bosh International Inc v Ukraine</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/08/11, Award, 25 October 2012 .....	671
<i>Brandes Investments Partners LP v The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/08/3, Award, 2 August 2011 .....	613

<i>Burlington Resources Inc v The Republic of Ecuador &amp; Petro Ecuador</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/08/5, Decision on Jurisdiction, 2 June 2010 .....	59, 237, 245
<i>Burlington Resources Inc v The Republic of Ecuador</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/08/5, Decision on the Proposal for Disqualification of Professor Francisco Orrego Vicuña, 13 December 2013 .....	610, 624
<i>Caratube International Oil Company v The Republic of Kazakhstan</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/08/12, Award, 5 June 2012 .....	679
<i>Caravelí Cotaruse Transmisora de Energía SAC v Republic of Peru</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/11/9, Award, 15 April 2013. ....	396
<i>Cargill Inc v The United Mexican States</i> , ICSID Case No ARB(AF)/05/02, Award, 18 September 2009 .....	679
<i>CDC Group Plc v The Republic of the Seychelles</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/02/14, Annulment Decision, 29 June 2005 .....	690, 696–7, 705
<i>Cementownia ‘Nowa Huta’ SA v The Republic of Turkey</i> , ICSID Case No ARB(AF)/06/02, Award, 17 September 2009 .....	680–1
<i>Ceskoslovenska Obchodni Banka AS v The Slovak Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/97/4, Decision on Jurisdiction, 24 May 1999 .....	268
<i>Ceskoslovenska Obchodni Banka AS v The Slovak Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/97/4, Award, 29 December 2004 .....	659, 676
<i>Churchill Mining plc and Planet Mining Pty Ltd v The Republic of Indonesia</i> , ICSID Case Nos ARB/12/14 and 12/40, Decision on Jurisdiction, 24 February 2014 .....	72
<i>CMS Gas Transmission Company v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/01/8, Award, 12 May 2005 .....	610, 616, 715
<i>Compañía de Aguas del Aconquija SA and Vivendi Universal SA v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/97/3, Award, 21 November 2000 .....	182, 280
<i>Compañía de Aguas del Aconquija SA and Vivendi Universal SA v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/97/3, Decision on the Challenge to the President of the Committee, 3 October 2001 .....	597–8, 600, 603, 605
<i>Compañía de Aguas del Aconquija SA and Vivendi Universal SA v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/97/3, Decision on Annulment, 3 July 2002, 41 ILM 1135 (2002) .....	280–1, 291, 591–2
<i>Compañía de Aguas del Aconquija SA and Vivendi Universal SA v The Argentine Republic</i> (formerly <i>Compañía de Aguas del Aconquija SA and Compagnie Générale des Eaux v The Argentine Republic</i> ), ICSID Case No ARB/97/3, Decision on Jurisdiction, 14 November 2005 .....	268–9
<i>Compañía de Aguas del Aconquija SA and Vivendi Universal SA v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/97/3, Award, 20 August 2007 .....	268, 611–12, 640
<i>ConocoPhillips Company Petrozuata BV et al v The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/07/30, Decision on the Proposal to Disqualify L Yves Fortier QC, Arbitrator, 27 February 2012 .....	602
<i>Continental Casualty Company v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/03/9, Annulment Decision, 16 September 2011 .....	690, 696, 705
<i>Daimler Financial Services AG v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/05/1, Dissenting Opinion of Judge Charles N Brower, 15 August 2012 .....	11, 68, 168, 434, 443–6, 479–80
<i>Daimler Financial Services AG v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/05/1, Award, 22 August 2012 .....	442–3, 445, 474, 476–9, 556, 658, 675, 707–8, 714, 718
<i>Desert Line Projects LLC v The Republic of Yemen</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/05/17, Award, 6 February 2008 .....	677
<i>Deutsche Bank AG v The Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/09/02, Award, 31 October 2012 .....	681
<i>Duke Energy Electroquil Partners &amp; Electroquil SA v The Republic of Ecuador</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/04/19, Award, 18 August 2008 .....	59, 180, 682

<i>Duke Energy International Peru Investments No 1 Ltd v The Republic of Peru</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/03/28, Annulment Decision, 1 March 2011 .....	597
<i>EDF International SA, SAUR International SA and León Participaciones Argentinas SA v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/03/23, Challenge Decision Regarding Professor Gabrielle Kaufmann-Kohler, 25 June 2008 .....	599–600
<i>EDF (Services) Ltd v Romania</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/05/13, Award, 8 October 2009 .....	364, 661, 664–6, 676–7
<i>El Paso Energy International Company v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/03/15, Decision on Jurisdiction, 27 April 2006 .....	59, 269
<i>Electrabel SA v The Republic of Hungary</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/07/19, Decision on Proposal to Disqualify an Arbitrator, 25 February 2008 .....	612
<i>Electrabel SA v The Republic of Hungary</i> , ICSID Case No ARB 07/19 (ECT), Decision on Jurisdiction, Applicable Law and Liability, 30 November 2012 .....	578
<i>Emilio Agustín Maffezini v The Kingdom of Spain</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/97/7, Decision on Jurisdiction, 25 January 2000 .....	242, 265, 616
<i>Emilio Agustín Maffezini v The Kingdom of Spain</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/97/7, Award, 13 November 2000 .....	556, 562, 616
<i>Empresas Lucchetti SA and Lucchetti Peru SA v The Republic of Peru</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/03/4, Award, 7 February 2005 .....	265, 299, 581
<i>Enron Corporation and Ponderosa Assets LP v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/01/3, Award, 22 May 2007 .....	128, 269–70, 610, 616, 620, 682
<i>Enron Creditors Recovery Corporation and Ponderosa Assets LP v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/01/3, Annulment Decision, 30 July 2010 .....	690, 696, 698–9, 705, 715
<i>Enron Corporation and Ponderosa Assets, LP v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/01/3, Decision on Jurisdiction, 14 January 2004 .....	237, 592, 643
<i>Fedax NV v The Republic of Venezuela</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/96/3, Decision of the Tribunal on Objections to Jurisdiction, 11 July 1997 .....	591
<i>Fireman's Fund Insurance Company v The United Mexican States</i> , ICSID Case No ARB(AF)/0201, Award, 17 July 2006 .....	673–4
<i>Gas Natural SDG SA v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/03/10, Decision of the Tribunal on Preliminary Questions of Jurisdiction, 17 June 2005 .....	571
<i>GEA Group AG v Ukraine</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/05/16, Award, 31 March 2011 .....	679
<i>Gemplus SA, SLP SA, Gemplus Industrial SA de CV v The United Mexican States</i> , ICSID Case Nos ARB(AF)/04/3–4, Award, 16 June 2010 .....	677
<i>Generation Ukraine Inc v Ukraine</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/00/9, Award, 16 September 2003 .....	282–3, 285–6
<i>Getma International et al v The Republic of Equatorial Guinea</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/11/29, Decision on the Proposal for Disqualification of Arbitrator Bernardo M Cremades, 28 June 2012 .....	602–3
<i>Global Trading Resource Corporation and Globex International Inc v Ukraine</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/09/11, Award, 1 December 2010 .....	670
<i>Helnan International Hotels A/S v The Arab Republic of Egypt</i> , ICSID Case No ARB 05/19, Decision of the ad hoc Committee, 14 June 2010 .....	283, 286–7, 289–91
<i>Helnan International Hotels A/S v The Arab Republic of Egypt</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/05/19, Decision of the Tribunal on Objection to Jurisdiction, 17 October 2006 .....	265, 590
<i>Helnan International Hotels A/S v The Arab Republic of Egypt</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/05/19, Award, 3 July 2008 .....	285–6, 510, 674–5
<i>Hochtief AG v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/07/31, Decision on Jurisdiction, 24 October 2011 .....	237, 245, 556, 708
<i>Hrvatska Elektroprivreda, dd v The Republic of Slovenia</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/05/24, Decision on the Treaty Interpretation Issue, 12 June 2009 .....	708



<i>Hrvatska Elektroprivreda, dd v The Republic of Slovenia</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/05/24, Tribunal's Ruling Regarding the Participation of David Mildon QC in Further Stages of the Proceedings, 6 May 2008 .....	371, 600, 604–5
<i>Iberdrola Energía SA v The Republic of Guatemala</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/09/5, Award, 17 August 2012 .....	678
<i>Impregilo SpA v The Islamic Republic of Pakistan</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/03/3, Decision on Jurisdiction, 22 April 2005 .....	180, 589, 590
<i>Impregilo SpA v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/07/17, Award, 21 June 2011 .....	247, 277, 289, 658, 675, 708
<i>Inceysa Vallisoletana SL v The Republic of El Salvador</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/03/26, Award, 2 August 2006 .....	575, 680
<i>Ioan Micula, Viorel Micula SC European Food SA SC Starmill SRL and SC Multipack SRL v Romania</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/05/20, Award, 11 December 2013 .....	651–2
<i>Ioannis Kardassopoulos v The Republic of Georgia</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/05/18, Decision on Jurisdiction, 6 July 2007 .....	585–7
<i>Ioannis Kardassopoulos v The Republic of Georgia</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/05/18, Award, 3 March 2010 .....	587–8, 677
<i>Jan de Nul NV and Dredging International NV v The Arab Republic of Egypt</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/04/13, Award, 6 November 2008 .....	684
<i>Jan de Nul NV and Dredging International NV v The Arab Republic of Egypt</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/04/13, Decision on Jurisdiction, 16 June 2006 .....	265
<i>Joseph Charles Lemire v Ukraine</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/06/18, Award, 28 March 2011 ....	644, 649
<i>Kılıç İnşaat İthalat İhracat Sanayi ve Ticaret Anonim Şirketi v Turkmenistan</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/10/1, Award, 2 July 2013 .....	237, 244, 278
<i>Kılıç İnşaat İthalat İhracat Sanayi Ve Ticaret Anonim Şirketi v Turkmenistan</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/10/1, Decision on Article VII.2 of the Turkey-Turkmenistan Bilateral Investment Treaty, 7 May 2012 .....	10, 412–16, 419–24
<i>Kılıç İnşaat İthalat İhracat Sanayi ve Ticaret Anonim Şirketi v Turkmenistan</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/10/1, Separate Opinion of Professor William W Park, 20 May 2013 .....	278
<i>Klöckner Industrie-Anlagen GmbH and others v The United Republic of Cameroon and Société Camerounaise des Engrais</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/81/2, Annulment Decision, 3 May 1985, 2 ICSID Rep 95 .....	690–1, 693–4, 698
<i>Klöckner Industrie-Anlagen GmbH and others v The United Republic of Cameroon and Société Camerounaise des Engrais</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/81/2, Annulment Decision, 17 May 1990, 14 ICSID Rep 101 .....	691, 695–6
<i>Klöckner Industrie-Anlagen GmbH and others v The United Republic of Cameroon and Société Camerounaise des Engrais</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/81/2, Award (21 October 1983), 2 ICSID Rep 40 .....	511, 693
<i>KT Asia Investment Group BV v The Republic of Kazakhstan</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/09/08, Award, 17 October 2013 .....	672–3
<i>LG&amp;E Energy Corporation, LG&amp;E Capital Corporation, and LG&amp;E International Inc v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/02/1, Award, 25 July 2007 .....	620, 643, 646–7, 653, 674
<i>LG&amp;E Energy Corporation, LG&amp;E Capital Corporation, and LG&amp;E International Inc v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/02/1, Decision on Liability, 3 October 2006 .....	82, 128
<i>Libananco Holdings Company Ltd v The Republic of Turkey</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/06/8, Decision on Preliminary Issues, 23 June 2008 .....	359, 361
<i>Libananco Holdings Company Ltd v The Republic of Turkey</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/06/8, Award, 2 September 2011 .....	678
<i>Liberian Eastern Timber Corporation (LETCO) v The Government of the Republic of Liberia</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/83/2, Decision on Jurisdiction, 24 October 1984, 2 ICSID Reports 351 .....	267

<i>Liberian Eastern Timber Corporation (LETCO) v The Government of the Republic of Liberia</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/83/2, Award, 31 March 1986, 2 ICSID Reports 370 .....	374
<i>Loewen Group Inc and Raymond L Loewen v United States of America</i> , ICSID Case No ARB(AF)/98/3, Award, 26 June 2003. ....	30, 129, 130–2, 270
<i>Malicorp Ltd v The Arab Republic of Egypt</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/08/18, Annulment Decision, 3 July 2013. ....	698
<i>Maritime International Nominees Establishment v The Republic of Guinea</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/84/4, Annulment Decision, 22 December 1989, 4 ICSID Rep 79. ....	695
<i>MCI Power Group LC and New Turbine, Inc v The Republic of Ecuador</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/03/6, Award, 31 July 2007 .....	589–90, 682
<i>Malaysian Historical Salvors, SDN, BHD v The Government of Malaysia</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/05/10, Award on Jurisdiction, 17 May 2007 .....	669
<i>Malaysian Historical Salvors, SDN, BHD v The Government of Malaysia</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/05/10, Decision on the Application for Annulment, 16 April 2009 .....	573
<i>Marvin Roy Feldman Karpa v The United Mexican States</i> , ICSID Case No ARB(AF)/99/1 (NAFTA), Interim Decision on Preliminary Jurisdictional Issues, 6 December 2000 .....	589–90, 593–4
<i>Marvin Roy Feldman Karpa v The United Mexican States</i> , ICSID Case No ARB(AF)/99/1 (NAFTA), Award, 16 December 2002 .....	80, 282
<i>Metalclad Corporation v The United Mexican States</i> , ICSID Case No ARB(AF)/97/1, Award, 30 August 2000 .....	645, 647
<i>Metal-Tech v Uzbekistan</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/10/3, Award, 4 October 2013 .....	364–5, 686
<i>Middle East Cement Shipping and Handling Co SA v The Arab Republic of Egypt</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/99/6, Award, 12 April 2002 .....	81, 281–3
<i>Mihaly International Corporation v The Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/00/2, Award, 15 March 2002. ....	592
<i>Millicom International Operations BV and Sentel GSM SA v The Republic of Senegal</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/08/20, Decision on Jurisdiction, 16 July 2010 .....	10, 426–31, 433
<i>Mobil Investments Canada Inc and Murphy Oil Corporation v Canada</i> , ICSID Case No ARB(AF)/07/4, Decision on Liability and Principles of Quantum, 22 May 2012. ....	642, 645–6, 648, 653
<i>Mondev International Ltd v The United States of America</i> , ICSID Case No ARB(AF)/99/2 (NAFTA), Award, 11 October 2002, 6 ICSID Reports 192 .....	78, 567, 589–90, 594
<i>Mr Franck Charles Arif v The Republic of Moldova</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/11/23, Award, 8 April 2013 .....	672
<i>MTD Equity Sdn Bhd and MTD Chile SA v The Republic of Chile</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/01/7, Annulment Decision, 21 March 2007 .....	690–1, 696–7, 705
<i>MTD Equity Sdn Bhd and MTD Chile SA v The Republic of Chile</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/01/7, Award, 25 May 2004 .....	78–9, 82
<i>Murphy Exploration &amp; Production Company International v The Republic of Ecuador</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/08/4, Award on Jurisdiction, 15 December 2010. ....	237, 245, 683
<i>Nations Energy Corporation, Electric Machinery Enterprises Inc, and Jamie Jurado v The Republic of Panama</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/06/19, Challenge to Dr Stanimir A Alexandrov (on the Annulment Committee), 7 September 2011. ....	600–1
<i>Noble Energy Inc &amp; Machalapower Cia Ltda v The Republic of Ecuador &amp; Consejo Nacional de Electricidad</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/05/12, Decision on Jurisdiction, 5 March 2008. ....	59
<i>Noble Ventures Inc v Romania</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/01/11, Award, 12 October 2005 .....	439, 573
<i>Occidental Petroleum Corporation and others v Ecuador</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/06/11, Decision on Provisional Measures, 17 August 2007. ....	637
<i>Occidental Petroleum Corporation and others v The Republic of Ecuador</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/06/11, Decision on Jurisdiction, 9 September 2008. ....	235
<i>Occidental Petroleum Corporation and others v The Republic of Ecuador</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/06/11, Award, 5 October 2012. ....	640, 675

<i>Okon Pankki Oyj, VTB Bank (Deutschland) AG and Sampo Bank plc v The Republic of Estonia</i> (formerly <i>OKO Osuuspankki Keskuspankki Oyj and others v The Republic of Estonia</i> ), ICSID Case No ARB/04/6, Award, 19 November 2007.....	679
<i>Ömer Dede and Serdar Elhüseyni v Romania</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/10/22, Award, 5 September 2013 .....	277, 673
<i>OPIC Karimum Corporation v The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/10/14, Award, 28 May 2013 .....	683
<i>OPIC Karimum Corporation v The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/10/14, Decision on the Proposal to Disqualify Arbitrator Professor Philippe Sands, 5 May 2011 .....	601–2
<i>Parkerings-Compagniet AS v The Republic of Lithuania</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/05/8, Award, 11 September 2007 .....	284–5, 324, 671–2
<i>Philip Morris Brands Sàrl, Philip Morris Products SA and Abal Hermanos SA v The Oriental Republic of Uruguay</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/10/7, Decision on Jurisdiction, 2 July 2013 .....	113, 230, 238, 242–3, 245, 250–1, 254, 276–7, 643
<i>Piero Foresti, Laura de Carli and others v The Republic of South Africa</i> , ICSID Case No ARB(AF)/07/01, Award, 4 August 2010 .....	658, 677–8, 681
<i>Participaciones Inversiones Portuarias Sàrl v The Gabonese Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/08/17, Decision on Proposal to Disqualify an Arbitrator, 12 November 2009 .....	612
<i>Plama Consortium Ltd v The Republic of Bulgaria</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/03/24, Award, 27 August 2008 .....	688
<i>Plama Consortium Ltd v The Republic of Bulgaria</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/03/24, Decision on Jurisdiction, 8 February 2005 .....	440, 556, 616
<i>PSEG Global Inc, The North American Coal Corporation, and Konya Ingin Elektrik Üretim ve Ticaret Ltd Sirketi v The Republic of Turkey</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/02/05, Award, 19 January 2007 .....	678–9
<i>Railroad Development Corporation v The Republic of Guatemala</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/07/23, Award, 29 June 2012 .....	670
<i>Railroad Development Corporation v The Republic of Guatemala</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/07/23, Second Decision on Jurisdiction, 18 May 2010 .....	265
<i>Renée Rose Levy de Levi v The Republic of Peru</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/10/17, Award, 26 February 2014 .....	673
<i>Repsol v The Republic of Ecuador</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/01/10, Decision on Annulment, 8 January 2007 .....	374
<i>Repsol SA &amp; another v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/12/38, Decision on the Proposal for Disqualification of the Majority of the Tribunal, 13 December 2013 .....	610
<i>Robert Azinian, Kenneth Davitian &amp; Ellen Baca v The United Mexican States</i> , ICSID Case No ARB(AF)/97/2, Award, 1 November 1999 .....	66, 183
<i>Rompetrol Group NV v Romania</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/06/3, Award, 6 May 2013 .....	686
<i>Rompetrol Group NV v Romania</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/06/3, Decision on Jurisdiction, 18 April 2008 .....	265
<i>Rompetrol Group NV v Romania</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/06/3, Decision on the Participation of a Counsel, 14 January 2010 .....	605
<i>Ron Fuchs v The Republic of Georgia</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/07/15, Award, 3 March 2010 .....	588
<i>RSM Production Corporation v Saint Lucia</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/12/10, Decision on Provisional Measures, 12 December 2013 .....	341
<i>Rumeli Telekom AS &amp; Telsim Mobil Telekomunikasyon Hizmetleri AS v The Republic of Kazakhstan</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/05/16, Award, 29 July 2008 .....	318–19, 321, 420–1, 687
<i>Saba Fakes v The Republic of Turkey</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/07/20, Award, 14 July 2010 .....	59
<i>Saba Fakes v The Republic of Turkey</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/07/20, Decision on Proposal to Disqualify an Arbitrator, 26 April 2008 .....	612
<i>Saipem SpA v The People's Republic of Bangladesh</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/05/7, Award, 30 June 2009 .....	30, 280, 293–7, 300, 682



<i>Saipem SpA v The People's Republic of Bangladesh</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/055/07, Decision on Jurisdiction and Recommendation on Provisional Measure, 21 March 2007 .....	59
<i>Saipem SpA v The People's Republic of Bangladesh</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/05/07, Decision on Proposal to Disqualify an Arbitrator, 11 October 2005 .....	615, 617
<i>Salini Costruttori SpA and Italstrade SpA v The Kingdom of Morocco</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/00/4, Decision on Jurisdiction, 23 July 2001, 42 ILM 609 .....	237, 717
<i>Salini Costruttori SpA and Italstrade SpA v The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/00/4, Decision on Jurisdiction, 9 November 2004. ....	589
<i>Salini Costruttori SpA and Italstrade SpA v The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/00/4, Award, 31 January 2006. ....	508
<i>Sempra Energy International v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/02/16, Annulment Decision, 29 June 2010 .....	690, 698–9
<i>Sempra Energy International v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/02/16, Award, 28 September 2007 .....	571, 610, 616, 682, 715
<i>Sempra Energy International v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/02/16, Decision on Objections to Jurisdiction 11 May 2005 .....	569
<i>SGS Société Générale de Surveillance SA v The Republic of the Philippines</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/02/6, Decision of the Tribunal on Objections to Jurisdiction, 29 January 2004. ....	510, 590
<i>SGS Société Générale de Surveillance SA v The Islamic Republic of Pakistan</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/01/13, Decision of the Tribunal on Objections to Jurisdiction, 6 August 2003 .....	235, 274–5, 576
<i>SGS Société Générale de Surveillance SA v The Islamic Republic of Pakistan</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/01/13, Decision on Claimant's Proposal to Disqualify Arbitrator, 19 December 2002. ....	598
<i>SGS Société Générale de Surveillance SA v The Republic of Paraguay</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/07/29, Award, 10 February 2012 .....	510, 671
<i>Siemens AG v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/02/8, Award, 6 February 2007. ....	82, 509, 567, 640, 658, 674
<i>Siemens AG v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/02/8, Decision on Jurisdiction, 3 August 2004. ....	556
<i>Sistem Mühendislik İnşaat Sanayi ve Ticaret AŞ v The Kyrgyz Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB(AF)/06/01, Award, 9 September 2009 .....	676
<i>Sistem Mühendislik İnşaat Sanayi ve Ticaret AŞ v The Kyrgyz Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB(AF)/06/1, Decision on Jurisdiction, 13 September 2007 .....	421–2
<i>Spyridon Roussalis v Romania</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/06/1, Award, 7 December 2011 .....	235, 679
<i>Suez, Sociedad General de Aguas de Barcelona SA &amp; InterAguas Servicios Integrales del Agua SA v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/03/17, Decision on Liability, 30 July 2010 .....	59, 596
<i>Suez, Sociedad General de Aguas de Barcelona SA and Vivendi Universal SA v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/03/19, Decision on a Second Proposal for the Disqualification of a Member of the Arbitral Tribunal, 12 May 2008 .....	599
<i>Suez, Sociedad General de Aguas de Barcelona SA and Vivendi Universal SA v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/03/19, Decision on the Proposal for the Disqualification of a Member of the Arbitral Tribunal, 22 October 2007 .....	596, 598, 611–12, 614
<i>Suez, Sociedad General de Aguas de Barcelona, SA and Vivendi Universal, SA v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/03/19, Order in Response to a Petition for Transparency and Participation as Amicus Curiae, 19 May 2005 .....	580
<i>Suez, Sociedad General de Aguas de Barcelona, SA and Vivendi Universal, SA v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/03/19, Order in Response to a Petition by Five Non-Governmental Organizations for Permission to Make an Amicus Curiae Submission, 12 February 2007 .....	194

<i>Swisslion DOO Skopje v The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/09/16, Award, 6 July 2012. ....	680
<i>Tanzania Electric Supply Company v Independent Power Tanzania Ltd</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/98/8, Award, 12 July 2001. ....	669
<i>Técnicas Medioambientales Tecmed, SA v The United Mexican States</i> , ICSID Case No ARB(AF)/00/2, Award, 29 May 2003. ....	77, 79, 82, 589, 591, 645
<i>Teinver SA, Transportes de Cercanías SA and Autobuses Urbanos del Sur SA v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/09/1, Decision on Jurisdiction, 21 December 2012. ....	230, 251, 253, 270, 276
<i>Telefónica SA v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/03/20, Decision of the Tribunal on Objections to Jurisdiction, 25 May 2006. ....	204, 245
<i>Telenor v Hungary</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/04/15, Award, 13 September 2006. ....	374, 688
<i>Tidewater Inc v The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/10/5, Decision on Claimant's Proposal to Disqualify Arbitrator Professor Brigitte Stern, 23 December 2010. ....	602, 604, 612–14, 618–19, 621
<i>Tradex Hellas SA v The Republic of Albania</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/94/2, Decision on Jurisdiction, 24 December 1996, 14 ICSID Review—FILJ 161. ....	274
<i>TSA Spectrum de Argentina SA v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/05/5, Award, 19 December 2008. ....	250–1, 276, 682
<i>Tulip Real Estate Investment &amp; Development Netherlands BV v The Republic of Turkey</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/11/28, Decision on Bifurcated Jurisdictional Issue, 5 March 2013. ....	237
<i>Tza Yap Shum v The Republic of Peru</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/07/6, Decision on Jurisdiction and Competence, 19 June 2009. ....	510
<i>Universal Compression International Holdings SLU v The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/10/9, Decision on the Proposal to Disqualify Arbitrators Prof Brigitte Stern and Prof Guido Santiago Tawil, 20 May 2011. ....	601, 613–14
<i>Urbaser SA &amp; another v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/07/26, Decision on Claimant's Proposal to Disqualify Arbitrator Professor Campbell McLachlan, 12 August 2010. ....	616–17, 619, 623
<i>Urbaser SA &amp; Consorcio de Aguas Bilbao Biskaia, Bilbao Biskaia Ur Partzuergoa v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/07/26, Decision on Jurisdiction, 19 December 2012. ....	237, 476
<i>Vacuum Salt Products Ltd v The Government of the Republic of Ghana</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/92/1, Award, 16 February 1994. ....	658, 669
<i>Vannessa Ventures Ltd v The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela</i> , ICSID Case No ARB(AF)/04/6, Award, 16 January 2013. ....	658, 675
<i>Victor Pey Casado and President Allende Foundation v The Republic of Chile</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/98/2, Award, 8 May 2008. ....	374
<i>Victor Pey Casado and President Allende Foundation v The Republic of Chile</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/98/2, Decision on Provisional Measures, 25 September 2001. ....	574–5
<i>Waguih Elie George Siag &amp; Clorinda Vecchi v The Arab Republic of Egypt</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/05/15, Award, 1 June 2009. ....	373, 640, 676
<i>Waste Management Inc v The United Mexican States</i> , ICSID Case No ARB(AF)/00/3, Final Award, 30 April 2004. ....	79, 262, 284–5
<i>Waste Management Inc v The United Mexican States</i> , ICSID Case No ARB(AF)/98/2, Dissenting Opinion of Keith Highet, 8 May 2000. ....	244
<i>Wena Hotels Ltd v The Arab Republic of Egypt</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/98/4, Award, 8 December 2000. ....	508, 645
<i>Western NIS Enterprise Fund v Ukraine</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/04/1, Order, 16 March 2006. ....	277
<i>Wintershall AG v The Argentine Republic</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/04/14, Award, 8 December 2008. ....	243, 245, 247, 277, 474–6, 556, 670
<i>World Duty Free v Kenya</i> , ICSID Case No ARB/00/7, Award, 4 October 2006, 46 ILM 339. ....	364

## UNCITRAL arbitrations

<i>Alps Finance and Trade AG v The Slovak Republic</i> , UNCITRAL, Award, 5 March 2011 .....	235, 275
<i>Austrian Airlines v The Slovak Republic</i> , UNCITRAL, Final Award, 9 October 2009 .....	59, 708
<i>Austrian Airlines v The Slovak Republic</i> , UNCITRAL, Separate Opinion of Charles N Brower, 9 October 2009 .....	11, 434–44, 446
<i>AWG Group v The Argentine Republic</i> , UNCITRAL, Separate Opinion of Arbitrator Pedro Nikken, 30 July 2010 .....	718
<i>BG Group Plc v The Argentine Republic</i> , UNCITRAL, Final Award, 24 December 2007 .....	235, 620
<i>Canadian Cattlemen for Fair Trade v The United States of America</i> , UNCITRAL (NAFTA), Award on Jurisdiction, 28 January 2008 .....	568
<i>Canfor Corporation v The United States; Terminal Forest Products Ltd v The United States; Terminal Forest Products Ltd v The United States</i> , UNCITRAL, Order of the Consolidation Tribunal, 7 September 2005 .....	614, 617
<i>Chemtura Corporation v The Government of Canada</i> , UNCITRAL, Award, 2 August 2010 .....	59, 114
<i>CME Czech Republic BV v The Czech Republic</i> , UNCITRAL, Final Award, 14 March 2003 .....	511, 570
<i>CME Czech Republic BV v The Czech Republic</i> , UNCITRAL, Partial Award, 13 September 2001 .....	34
<i>EnCana Corporation v The Republic of Ecuador</i> , LCIA Case No UN3481 (UNCITRAL), Award, 3 February 2006 .....	269, 284
<i>EnCana Corporation v The Republic of Ecuador</i> , LCIA Case No UN3481 (UNCITRAL), Partial Dissenting Opinion Arbitrator Grigera Naón, 30 December 2005 .....	284, 288
<i>Ethyl Corporation v The Government of Canada</i> , UNCITRAL (NAFTA), Award on Jurisdiction, 24 June 1998, 38 ILM 708 .....	235
<i>Glamis Gold Ltd v United States of America</i> , UNCITRAL (NAFTA), Award, 8 June 2009 .....	594, 683
<i>Grand River Enterprises Six Nations, Ltd et al v United States of America</i> , UNCITRAL (NAFTA), Award, 12 January 2011 .....	653, 672
<i>Grand River Enterprises Six Nations, Ltd et al v United States of America</i> , UNCITRAL (NAFTA), Decision on Objections to Jurisdiction, 20 July 2006 .....	594
<i>Hensham Talaat M Al-Warraq v Republic of Indonesia</i> , UNCITRAL, Award on Respondent's Preliminary Objections to Jurisdiction and Admissibility of the Claims, 21 June 2012 .....	474, 480–2, 485
<i>Himpurna California Energy Ltd v Perusahaan Listrik Negara</i> , UNCITRAL, Final Award, 4 May 1999, XXV YCA 13, 2000 .....	253, 364–6, 648
<i>Himpurna California Energy Ltd v Republic of Indonesia</i> , UNCITRAL, Interim Award, 26 September 1999, XXV YCA 109, 2000 .....	370, 374, 382
<i>International Thunderbird Gaming Corporation v The United Mexican States</i> , UNCITRAL (NAFTA), Award, 26 January 2006 .....	658, 661, 666, 673
<i>International Thunderbird Gaming Corporation v The United Mexican States</i> , UNCITRAL (NAFTA), Separate Opinion of Thomas Wälde, 1 December 2005 .....	68, 511, 623, 658, 664–5
<i>Lauder v The Czech Republic</i> , UNCITRAL, Final Award, 3 September 2001 .....	33–4
<i>Link-Trading Joint Stock Company v Republic of Moldova</i> , UNCITRAL, Award on Jurisdiction, 16 February 2001 .....	235
<i>Merrill &amp; Ring Forestry LP v Canada</i> , UNCITRAL (NAFTA), Award, 31 March 2010 .....	593–4, 649, 683
<i>Methanex Corporation v The United States of America</i> , UNCITRAL (NAFTA), Decision of the Tribunal on Petition from Third Parties to Intervene as Amici Curiae, 15 January 2001 .....	194, 575–6, 578
<i>Methanex Corporation v The United States of America</i> , UNCITRAL (NAFTA), Final Award of the Tribunal on Jurisdiction and Merits, 3 August 2005 .....	80, 359, 574
<i>Methanex Corporation v The United States of America</i> , UNCITRAL (NAFTA), Partial Award, 7 August 2002 .....	656

<i>National Grid Plc v The Argentine Republic</i> , UNCITRAL, Decision on Jurisdiction, 20 June 2006.....	269
<i>Pope &amp; Talbot Inc v The Government of Canada</i> , UNCITRAL (NAFTA), Award in Respect of Damages, 31 May 2002.....	568–9
<i>SD Myers Inc v The Government of Canada</i> , UNCITRAL (NAFTA), Award, 30 December 2002 .....	666
<i>SD Myers Inc v The Government of Canada</i> , UNCITRAL (NAFTA), First Partial Award, 13 November 2000 .....	78
<i>Société Générale v The Dominican Republic</i> , UNCITRAL, LCIA Case No UN 7927, Preliminary Objections to Jurisdiction, 19 September 2008. ....	588–93
<i>United Parcel Service of America Inc v The Government of Canada</i> , UNCITRAL (NAFTA), Award, 24 May 2007, 46 ILM 919 .....	653, 682
<i>United Parcel Service of America Inc v The Government of Canada</i> , UNCITRAL (NAFTA), Decision of the Tribunal on Petitions for Intervention and Participation as Amici Curiae, 17 October 2001 .....	576, 578
<i>White Industries Australia Ltd v The Republic of India</i> , UNCITRAL, Final Award, 30 November 2011.....	30–1, 293, 304–7

### ICC arbitrations

ICC Case No 5622 (Hilmarton), Final Award of 1988, XIX YCA 105, 1994 .....	364
ICC Case No 6320, Final Award, 1992 .....	310–13, 315–17
ICC Case No 10169, Procedural Order No 1, 1999, unpublished .....	336
ICC Case No 10256, Interim Award, 12 August 2000, 14(1) ICC Ct Bull 87 (2003).....	234
ICC Case No 10526, Partial Award, undated 2000, (2001) <i>Journal du Droit</i> <i>International</i> 1182.....	336
ICC Case No 10671, Partial Award, 27 March 2001, (2001) <i>ASA Bulletin</i> 288.....	336
ICC Case No 11330, Partial Award, 17 June 2002 .....	336, 345
ICC Case No 11490, Final Award, undated, (2012) XXXVII YB Comm Arb 30 .....	234, 249, 253
ICC Case No 12491, Partial Award, 1 June 2004, (2006) <i>ASA Bulletin</i> 281 .....	336–38
ICC Case No 12739, Award, 2004 (unreported) .....	236, 248
ICC Case No 12895, Procedural Order, undated 2006 .....	333–4, 336, 339
ICC Case No 13139, Partial Award, undated 2005, (2010) <i>Journal du Droit</i> <i>International</i> 1418.....	336, 345
ICC Case No 13853, undated.....	336–7
ICC Case No 4145, Second Interim Award, Award, (1987) XII YCA 97 .....	365
ICC Case No 6149, Final Award, 1990, (1995) XX YB Comm Arb 41 (1995) .....	253
ICC Case No 6276, Partial Award, 29 January 1990, (2003) 14(1) ICC Ct Bull 76 (2003) .....	229, 236, 239, 253
ICC Case No 6535, Award, 1992 .....	229
ICC Case No 7422, Interim Award, 28 June 1996 .....	253
ICC Case No 8445, Final Award, 1996, (2001) XXVI YB Comm Arb 167.....	234, 254
ICC Case No 8486, Award, (1999) XXIV YCA 172 .....	374
ICC Case No 9812, Final Award, (2009) 20(2) ICC Ct Bull 69.....	236, 239, 248
ICC Case No 9977, Final Award, 22 June 1999, (2003) 14(1) ICC Ct Bull 84.....	229, 236
ICC Case No 17050, Interim Award, 12 November 2010, (2011) <i>ASA Bulletin</i> 634.....	337, 345
<i>Westinghouse v The Philippines</i> , ICC Case No 6401, Award, 19 December 1991, (1992) 7 Mealey's Int'l Arb Rep 31 .....	364

### SCC arbitrations

<i>Licensor and Buyer v Manufacturer</i> , SCC Interim Award, 17 July 1992, (1997) XXII YB Comm Arb 197 .....	234
<i>Mohammad Ammar Al-Bahloul v The Republic of Tajikistan</i> , SCC Case No V064/2008, Partial Award on Jurisdiction and Liability, 2 September 2009 .....	235

<i>Nykomb Synergetics Technology Holding AB v Republic of Latvia</i> , SCC Case No 118/2001, Award, 16 December 2003. ....	281
<i>Renta 4 SVSA, Ahorro Corporación Emergentes FI, Ahorro Corporación Eurofondo FI, Rovime Inversiones SICAV SA, Quasar de Valores SICAV SA, Orgor de Valores SICAV SA, GBI 9000 SICAV SA v The Russian Federation</i> , SCC No 24/2007, Award on Preliminary Objections, 20 March 2009. ....	440–2, 447, 511, 556, 558, 562, 708, 712
<i>Renta 4 SVSA et al v The Russian Federation</i> , SCC Case No 024/2007, Separate Opinion of Charles N Brower, 20 March 2009. ....	11, 434, 439–41, 445–8
<i>RosInvestCo UK Ltd v The Russian Federation</i> , SCC Case No V079/2005, Award on Jurisdiction, 1 October 2007. ....	507
SCC Case No 113/2007, Separate Award (undated), (2008(1)) SIAR 137. ....	337
<i>Sedelmayer v The Russian Federation</i> , SCC Case, Award, 7 July 1998. ....	235
<i>Vladimir Berschader and Moise Berschader v The Russian Federation</i> , SCC Case No 080/2004, Separate Opinion of Professor Todd Weiler, 7 April 2006. ....	510
<b>Other arbitrations</b>	
<i>Alabama Claims of the United States of America against Great Britain</i> , Award, 14 September 1872, 29 UNRIAA 125. ....	6, 47, 132–6, 141–3, 147, 149
<i>Antoine Biloune, Marine Drive Complex Ltd v Ghana Invs v The Government of Ghana</i> , Award, 27 October 1989 19 YB Comm Arb 14 (1994). ....	253
<i>Award in Hamburg Chamber of Commerce</i> , 14 July 2006 [2007] SchiedsVZ 55. ....	258
<i>Empresa Nacional de Telecomunicaciones (Telecom, En Liquidación) v IBM de Colombia SA</i> , Award, 17 November 2004. ....	250
<i>Flegenheimer Case</i> , Decision No 182, Italy-US Conciliation Commission, 10 September 1958, 14 RIAA 327. ....	472–4
<i>Floyd Landis v USADA</i> , CAS 2007/A/1394, Arbitral Award, 30 June 2008. ....	365–6, 370
<i>Government of the State of Kuwait v American Independent Oil Co (AMINOIL)</i> , Ad Hoc Award, 24 March 1982, 21 ILM 976. ....	92–3, 319, 325–6
<i>Illinois Central Railroad Company (USA) v The United Mexican States</i> , Decision, Mexico-US General Claims Commission, 21 March 1926, 4 RIAA 21. ....	172, 174, 183–4
<i>In re City of Tokyo 5 Per Cent Loan of 1912—Plan for Resumption of Payment of Principal and Interest on the French Tranche of the Loan</i> , Award, 1 April 1960, 29 ILR 11. ....	153
<i>Libyan American Oil Company (LIAMCO) v The Government of the Libyan Arab Republic</i> , Award, 12 April 1977, 20 ILM 1. ....	319–20, 322–3
<i>North American Dredging Company of Texas (USA) v The United Mexican States</i> , Mexico-USA General Claims Commission, Decision, 31 March 1926, 4 RIAA 26. ....	6, 168–74, 176–86
<i>Radio Corporation of America (RCA) v China</i> , Award, 13 April 1935 (1936) 30 Am J Int'l L 535. ....	319, 323
<i>Revere Copper and Brass, Inc v Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC)</i> , Award, 24 August 1978, 17 ILM 1321. ....	319–20, 325–6
<i>Sapphire International Petroleum Ltd v National Iranian Oil Company</i> , Award, 15 March 1967, 35 ILR 136. ....	90–1, 319–20
<i>Saudi Arabia v Arabian American Oil Co (ARAMCO)</i> , Decision, 23 August 1958, 27 ILR 117. ....	92, 319, 321–2
<i>Texaco Overseas Petroleum Company (TOPCO) v The Government of the Libyan Arab Republic</i> , Award on the Merits, 19 January 1977, 17 ILM 1. ....	319–20, 633
<i>Texas Overseas Petroleum Company and California Asiatic Oil Company v The Government of the Libyan Arab Republic</i> , Ad Hoc Award, 19 January 1977, 17 ILM 3 (1978). ....	91–2
<i>The Italian Republic v The Republic of Cuba</i> , Ad Hoc State-State Arbitration, Final Award, 1 January 2008. ....	580



<i>The Republic of Ecuador v The United States of America</i> , Expert Opinion with Respect to Jurisdiction of Professor W Michael Reisman, 24 April 2012.....	581
<i>Trail Smelter (United States v Canada)</i> , Decision, 16 April 1938, 3 UNRIAA 1911.....	640
<i>Trail Smelter (United States v Canada)</i> , Decision, 11 March 1941, 3 UNRIAA 1938.....	640, 704
<i>United States Anti-Doping Agency v Floyd Landis</i> , American Arbitration Association No 30 190 00847 06, North American Court of Arbitration for Sport Panel, Award, 20 September 2007.....	361
<i>United States-Germany Mixed Claims Commission</i> , Administrative Decision No II, 7 UNRIAA 23.....	640

## X. NATIONAL COURTS

### Australia

<i>Aiton Australia Pty Ltd v Transfield Pty Ltd</i> [1999] 153 FLR 236.....	236
<i>Brookhollow Pty Ltd v R&amp;R Consultants Pty Ltd</i> [2006] NSWSC 1.....	523–4
<i>Ebner v Official Trustee in Bankruptcy</i> [2000] 25 CLR 337.....	609
<i>Elizabeth Chong Pty Ltd v Brown</i> [2011] FMCA 565.....	232, 253
<i>Esso Australia Resources Ltd and others v The Honorable Sidney James Plowman (Minister for Energy and Minerals) and others</i> [1995] HCA 19.....	61
<i>Hooper Bailie Associated Ltd v Natcon Group Pty Ltd</i> [1992] 28 NSWLR 194.....	238, 248
<i>Johnson v Johnson</i> [2000] HCA 48.....	609
<i>Michael Wilson &amp; Partners Ltd v Nicholls</i> [2011] 244 CLR 427.....	609
<i>Peter Schwartz (Overseas) Pty Ltd v Morton</i> [2003] VSC 144.....	529
<i>Recyclers of Australia Pty Ltd v Hettinga Equip Inc</i> [2000] 175 ALR 725.....	261
<i>United Group Rail Services Ltd v Rail Corporation New South Wales</i> [2009] NSWCA 177.....	240
<i>Vakuata v Kelly</i> [1989] HCA 44, [1989] 167 CLR 568.....	624
<i>Westport Insurance Corporation v Gordian Runoff Ltd</i> [2011] HCA 37.....	529

### Canada

<i>BC Navigation SA v Canpotex Shipping Services Ltd</i> [1987] 16 FTR 79.....	260
<i>Burlington Northern Railroad Company v Canadian National Railway</i> [1997] 1 SCR 5.....	258
<i>Committee for Justice and Liberty v National Energy Board</i> [1978] 1 SCR 369.....	609
<i>Dolling-Baker v Merret &amp; another</i> [1990] CA 1 WLR 1205, [1991] 2 All ER 890.....	62
<i>Krutov v Vancouver Hockey Club Ltd</i> [1991] BCJ No 2654.....	258
<i>Meridian Gold Holdings II Cayman Ltd v Southwestern Gold (Bermuda) Ltd</i> [2013] CarswellOnt 226.....	526
<i>OEMSDF Inc v Europe Israel Ltd</i> [1999] OJ No 3594.....	260
<i>R v S</i> [1997] 3 SCR 484.....	620
<i>Thyssen Canada Ltd v Mariana</i> [2000] 3 FC 398.....	249
<i>Valente v The Queen</i> [1985] 2 SCR 673.....	609
<i>Wewaykum Indian Band v Canada</i> [2003] 2 SCR 259.....	609

### Colombia

Constitutional Court Ruling C-242 (2006).....	94
Constitutional Court Ruling C-320 (2006).....	94
Superior Tribunal of Bogotá, Judgment, 21 April 2014.....	86–8

### France

Cour de Cassation, <i>Brunet v Artige</i> , 15 January 1992 [1992] Rev Arb 646.....	231
Cour de Cassation, <i>Ets Raymond Gosset v Carapelli</i> , 7 May 1963 [1964] 91 JDI 82.....	193
Cour de Cassation, <i>Société Polyclinique des Fleurs v Peyrin</i> , 6 July 2000 [2001] Rev Arb 749.....	237, 248
Cour de Cassation, <i>Société Hilmarion Ltd v Société OTV</i> , 23 March 1994 [1994] Rev Arb 327.....	116

Cour de Cassation, <i>Société PT Putrabali Adyamulia v Société Rena Holding et Société Mnogitua Est Epices</i> , 29 June 2007 [2007] Rev Arb 507 .....	116, 193
Paris Cour d'Appel, <i>Société National Company for Fishing and Marketing 'NAFIMCO' v Société Foster Wheeler Trading Company AG</i> , 22 January 2004 [2004] Rev Arb 647 .....	62
Paris Cour d'Appel, <i>M Cohen v Société Total Outremer SA</i> , Case No 09/08191, Judgment, 27 May 2010 .....	519
Paris Cour d'Appel, <i>Société Nihon Plast Company v Société Takata-Petri Aktiengesellschaft</i> , Judgment, 4 March 2004 [2005] Rev Arb 143 .....	237, 248, 258
<i>Société Repalin (22 April 1981)</i> , Gazette du Palais II 584 (1981) .....	496
<b>Germany</b>	
BGH, VIII ZR 344/97, 18 November 1998, NJW 1999, 647 .....	237
BGH, XII ZR 165/06, 29 October 2008, NJW-RR 2009, 637 .....	237
Oberlandesgericht Düsseldorf, 17 U 103/95, 17 November 1995, RIW 1996, 239 .....	261
Oberlandesgericht München, 23 U 6310/88, 7 April 1989, RIW 1990, 585 .....	261
<b>Hong Kong</b>	
<i>Astel-Peiniger Joint Venture v Argos Engineering &amp; Heavy Industries Company Ltd</i> [1994] HKCFI 276 .....	249
<i>China Merchant Heavy Industry Company Ltd v JGC Corporation</i> [2001] HKCA 248 .....	252
<i>Fai Tak Engineering Company Ltd v Sui Chong Construction &amp; Engineering Company Ltd</i> [2009] HKDC 141 .....	249
<i>Hercules Data Comm Company Ltd v Koywa Communications Ltd</i> [2001] HKCFI 71 .....	249
<i>Pacific China Holdings Ltd v Grand Pacific Holdings Ltd</i> [2011] HKCFI 424 .....	530
<i>Pacific China Holdings Ltd v Grand Pacific Holdings Ltd</i> [2012] HKCA 200 .....	530, 532
<i>Pacific China Holdings Ltd v Grand Pacific Holdings Ltd</i> [2013] HKCFA 13 .....	530
<i>Tommy CP Sze &amp; Company v Li &amp; Fung (Trading) Ltd</i> [2002] HKCFI 682 .....	252
<i>Westco Airconditioning Ltd v Sui Chong Construction &amp; Engineering Company Ltd</i> [1998] HKCFI 946 .....	262
<b>India</b>	
<i>Novartis AG v Union of India and others</i> , Supreme Court, Civil Appeal No 2706-2716 of 2013, 1 April 2013 .....	21
<i>Venture Global Engineering v Satyam Computer Services Ltd</i> , Supreme Court, AIR 2008 SC 1061 .....	701
<b>Ireland</b>	
<i>Euro Petroleum Trading Ltd v Transpetroleum International Ltd</i> [2002] Int'l Arb L Rev N-1 ....	236
<b>Japan</b>	
<i>X v Y</i> , Judgment, 22 June 2011, 2116 Hanrei Jiho 64 .....	235
<b>The Netherlands</b>	
<i>The Republic of Ghana v Telekom Malaysia</i> , Challenge No 13/2004, Petition No HA/RK/2004.667, Decision of the District Court of The Hague, 18 October 2004 .....	607
<b>New Zealand</b>	
<i>Adams v Walsh</i> [1963] NZLR 158 .....	375
<i>Bristol Myers v Beecham</i> [1978] FSR 553 .....	22
<i>Saxmere Company Ltd v Wool Board Disestablishment Company Ltd</i> [2009] NZSC 122, [2010] 1 NZLR 76 .....	609
<b>The Philippines</b>	
<i>Philippines No 2, Luzon Hydro Corporation v Hon Rommel O Baybay</i> , Court of Appeals, Manila, Special Former Fourth Division, 29 November 2006, CA-GR SP No 94318 .....	343

<i>RCBC Capital Corporation v Banco de Oro Unibank, Inc</i> , Philippines Supreme Court, First Division, 10 December 2012, GR Nos 196171/199238.....	342
---	-----

## Russia

A56-63115/2009, Arbitration Court of St Petersburg, Decision, 11 December 2009.....	346
<i>Swiss Cargill International SA v Russian CJSC Neftekhimeksport</i> , Russian Supreme Court, Case No 5-Г02-23, 2002 .....	258

## Singapore

<i>AKM v AKN and others</i> [2014] SGHC 148 .....	522, 524
<i>Aloe Vera of America, Inc v Asianic Food (S) Pte Ltd</i> [2006] 3 SLR 174 .....	261
<i>BLB v BLC</i> [2013] SGHC 196 .....	518–21
<i>BLC v BLB</i> [2014] SGCA 40 .....	518–22
<i>CRW Joint Operation v PT Perusahaan Gas Negara (Persero) TBK</i> [2011] 4 SLR 305 .....	526
<i>Front Row Investment Holdings (Singapore) Pte Ltd v Daimler South East Asia Pte Ltd</i> [2010] SGHC 80.....	519
<i>HSBC Institutional Trust Services (Singapore) Ltd v Toshin Development Singapore Pte</i> <i>Ltd</i> [2012] SGCA 48 .....	241
<i>International Research Corporation plc v Lufthansa Systems Asia Pac Pte Ltd</i> [2012] SGHC 226.....	239, 248
<i>Kempinski Hotels SA v PT Prima International Development</i> [2011] 4 SLR 633.....	521
<i>L W Infrastructure Pte Ltd v Lim Chin San Contractors Pte Ltd</i> [2013] 1 SLR 125.....	535
<i>Pacific Recreation Pte Ltd v S Y Technology Inc</i> [2008] 2 SLR(R) 491 .....	519
<i>PT First Media TBK (formerly known as PT Broadband Multimedia TBK) v Astro</i> <i>Nusantara International BV</i> [2014] 1 SLR 372.....	27
<i>PT Perusahaan Gas Negara (Persero) TBK v CRW Joint Operation</i> [2011] SGCA 33.....	229, 526
<i>PT Prima International Development v Kempinski Hotels SA</i> [2012] 4 SLR 98.....	528, 538
<i>Re Shankar Alan v Anant Kulkarni</i> [2007] 1 SLR(R) 85 .....	609
<i>SEF Construction Pte Ltd v Skoy Connected Pte Ltd</i> [2010] 1 SLR 733 .....	523–4
<i>Soh Bee Teng &amp; Company Pte Ltd v Fairmount Development Pte Ltd</i> [2007] 3 SLR(R) 86 .....	521, 527
<i>Sui Southern Gas Company Ltd v Habibullah Coastal Power Company (Pte) Ltd</i> [2010] 3 SLR 1 .....	701
<i>Thong Ah Fat v Public Prosecutor</i> [2012] 1 SLR 676.....	516, 525, 529
<i>TMM Division Maritima SA de CV v Pacific Richfield Marine Pte Ltd</i> [2013] SGHC 186.....	516, 522, 525–6, 529
<i>Westacre Investments Inc v The State-Owned Company Yugoimport SDPR (also known as</i> <i>Jugoimport-SDPR)</i> [2009] 2 SLR(R) 166 .....	43

## Spain

<i>Catleiva SL v Herseca Inmobiliaria SL</i> , STSJ CV 3915/2012, Judgment, 8 May 2012.....	236
---	-----

## Sweden

<i>Bulgarian Foreign Trade Bank Ltd v Al Trade Finance Inc</i> [2000] Supreme Court, (2001) Revue de l'Arbitrage 821, 827 and (2001) XXVI ICCA Yb Comm Arb 291 .....	62
---	----

## Switzerland

<i>Decision 108 Ia</i> 197, Swiss Federal Supreme Court, 10 May 1982 .....	336
<i>Decision 4P.173/2003</i> , Swiss Federal Supreme Court, 8 December 2003 .....	346
<i>Judgment</i> , 16 May 2011, 29 ASA Bull 643 (Swiss Federal Tribunal) .....	249
<i>Judgment</i> , 5 December 2008, 27 ASA Bull 762 (Swiss Federal Tribunal).....	261
<i>Judgment</i> , 6 June 2007, 26 ASA Bull 87 (Swiss Federal Tribunal).....	232
<i>Judgment</i> , 7 July 2014, 4A_124/2014 (Swiss Federal Tribunal) .....	237, 261
<i>Judgment</i> , 15 March 1999, 20 ASA Bull 373 (Kassationsgericht Zürich).....	249
<i>X v Union Cycliste Internationale (UCI)</i> , Judgment, 18 June 2012, 4A_488/2011 (Swiss Federal Tribunal) .....	237



**Uganda**

*Fulgensius Mungereza v Africa Central*, Judgment, 15 January 2004 [2004] UGSC 9 . . . . . 262

**United Arab Emirates**

*Judgment*, 16 September 2008 [2010] Rev Arb 354 (Dubai Cassation Ct) . . . . . 237, 248

**United Kingdom**

*Ascot Commodities NV v Olam International Ltd* [2002] CLC 277 . . . . . 526

*ASM Shipping Ltd of India v TTMI Ltd of England* [2005] EWHC 2238 (Comm) [2006]

1 Lloyd's Rep 375 . . . . . 608

*Bremer Handelsgesellschaft mbH v Westzucker GmbH (No 2)* [1981] 2 Lloyd's Rep

130 (CA) . . . . . 516, 529

*Browne v Dunn* [1893] 6 R 67 (HL) . . . . . 366–8

*Cable & Wireless plc v IBM United Kingdom Ltd* [2002] 2 All ER (Comm)

1041 (QB) . . . . . 238, 248, 262

*Cable & Wireless plc v IBM* [2002] EWHC 2059 . . . . . 233

*Cadogan Maritime Inc v Turner Shipping Inc* [2013] EWHC 138 (Comm) . . . . . 536–9

*Cameroon Airlines v Transnet Ltd* [2004] EWHC 1829 . . . . . 389

*Coulson v Disborough* [1894] 2 QBD 316 . . . . . 363

*Courtney & Fairbairn Ltd v Tolaini Bros (Hotels) Ltd* [1975] 1 WLR 297 . . . . . 231

*Dallah Real Estate and Tourism Holding Company v Ministry of Religious Affairs of the*

*Government of Pakistan* [2011] 1 AC 763 . . . . . 27, 35, 43

*Emirates Trading Agency LLC v Prime Mineral Exports Private Ltd* [2014] WLR(D) 293,

[2014] EWHC 2104 (Comm) . . . . . 232, 240–1

*English v Emery Reimbold & Strick Ltd* [2002] 1 WLR 2409 2417 . . . . . 516

*Fiona Trust and Holding Corporation and others v Yuri Privalov and others* [2006]

EWHC 2583 (Comm) . . . . . 193

*Fiona Trust and Holding Corporation and others v Yuri Privalov and others* [2007]

EWCA Civ 2 . . . . . 193

*Flannery and another v Halifax Estate Agencies Ltd* [2000] 1 WLR 377, 382 . . . . . 516

*Halifax Fin Services Ltd v Intuitive Sys Ltd* [1999] 1 All ER 303 . . . . . 231

*Hillas & Company Ltd v Arcos Ltd* [1932] All ER 494 (HL) . . . . . 240

*HMV UK v Propinvest Friar Ltd Partnership* [2011] EWCA Civ 1708 . . . . . 702

*Holloway v Chancery Mead Ltd* [2007] EWHC 2495 (TCC) . . . . . 233

*International Tank & Pipe SAK v Kuwait Aviation Fuelling* [1975] QB 224 . . . . . 261

*Itex Shipping PTE Ltd v China Ocean Shipping Company, The 'Jing Hong Hai'* [1989] 2

Lloyd's Rep 522 (QB) . . . . . 231

*The King v Sussex Justices, Ex parte McCarthy* [1924] 1 KB 256, 259 . . . . . 609

*The Montrose Peerage Case* [1853] 1 Macq HL Cas 401 . . . . . 450

*Lesotho Highlands Development Authority v Impregilo SpA and others* [2005] UKHL 43 . . . . . 702

*Locabail (UK) Ltd v Bayfield Properties Ltd* [2000] 2 WLR 870 (CA) . . . . . 618–19

*Losinjaska Plovidba Brodarstovo DD v Valfracht Maritime Company Ltd (The Lipa)* [2001]

2 Lloyd's Rep 17 . . . . . 702

*Pace Shipping Company Ltd v Churchgate Nigeria Ltd* [2010] 1 Lloyd's Rep 183 . . . . . 390

*Porter v Magill* [2002] 2 AC 357 . . . . . 605, 609

*Premium Nafta Products Ltd (20th Defendant) and others (Respondents) v Fili Shipping*

*Company Ltd (14th Claimant) and others (Appellants)* [2007] EWCA Civ 20 . . . . . 193

*Regina v Gough* [1993] AC 646 . . . . . 609

*Reliance Industries Ltd v Enron Oil and Gas India Ltd* [2002] 1 Lloyd's Rep 645 . . . . . 702

*Sharpe v Wakefield* [1888] 22 QBD 239 . . . . . 450

*Sulamerica CIA Nacional de Seguros SA and others v Enesa Engenharia SA—Enesa*

[2012] EWHC 42 (Comm), affirmed [2012] EWCA Civ 638 . . . . . 231

*Surefire Systems Ltd v Guardian ECL Ltd* [2005] EWHC 1860 (TCC) . . . . . 702

*Wah (aka Tang) v Grant Thornton International Ltd* [2012] EWHC 3198 (Ch) . . . . . 231, 233

<i>Walford v Miles</i> [1992] 2 AC 128 (HL) .....	232
<i>Wells v Wells</i> [1998] 3 WLR 329 .....	650

### United States of America

<i>424 W 33rd St, LLC v Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc</i> , 911 NYS2d 46 (NY App Div 2010) .....	248–9
<i>Abex Inc v Koll Real Estate Group, Inc</i> , WL 728827 (Del Ch 1994) .....	254
<i>Abi Jaoudi &amp; Azar Trading Corporation v CIGNA Worldwide Insurance Company</i> , 391 Fed Appx 173 (3rd Cir 2010) .....	220
<i>Affymax Inc v Ortho-McNeil-Janssen Pharma Inc</i> , 660 F3d 281, 284–5 (7th Cir 2011) .....	703
<i>Air Line Pilots Association International v Trans States Airlines LLC</i> , 638 F3d 572, 578 (8th Cir 2011) .....	703
<i>Am Silk Mills Corporation v Meinhard Commercial Corporation</i> , 315 NYS2d 144 (NY App Div 1970) .....	247
<i>AMF Inc v Brunswick Corporation</i> , 621 F Supp 456 (SDNY 1985) .....	233
<i>Arco Alaska Inc v Superior Court</i> , 168 Cal App 3d 139 (1985) .....	494
<i>Artie Shaw Presents Inc v Snyder</i> , 362 NYS2d 158 (NY App Div 1974) .....	493
<i>Astir Compania Naviera SA v Petoleo Brasileiro SA</i> , 295 NYS2d 168 (NY App Div 1968) .....	493
<i>Ballard v Illinois Cent RR Company</i> , 338 F Supp 2d 712 (SD Miss 2004) .....	255
<i>Bank of Pennsylvania v Commonwealth</i> , 19 Penn State 151 .....	69
<i>Belke v Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner &amp; Smith, Inc</i> , 693 F2d 1023 (11th Cir 1982) .....	255
<i>Belmont Construction, Inc v Lyondell Petrochem Company</i> , 896 SW2d 352 (Tex App 1995) .....	238, 248
<i>BG Group plc v The Argentine Republic</i> , 134 SCt 1198 (2014) .....	29, 254, 256–8, 260
<i>Biller v Toyota Motor Corporation</i> , 668 F3d 655 (9th Cir 2012) .....	703–4
<i>Board of County Commissioners of Neosho County v Central Air Conditioning Company</i> , 683 P2d 1282 (Kan 1984) .....	496
<i>Bradley v Allstate Insurance Company</i> , 348 NW2d 51 (Mich App 1984) .....	486, 493
<i>Branch v Phillips Petroleum Company v Equal Employment Opportunity Commission</i> , 638 F2d 873 (5th Cir 1981) .....	382
<i>Brown v Allen</i> , 344 US 443 (1953) .....	621
<i>Candid Productions, Inc v International Skating Union</i> , 530 F Supp 1330 (SDNY 1982) .....	230, 232
<i>Chromalloy Aeroservices v Arab Republic of Egypt</i> , 939 F Supp 907 (DDC 1996) .....	116
<i>Citigroup Global Markets Inc v Bacon</i> , 562 F3d 349 (5th Cir 2009) .....	703
<i>Coffee Beanery Ltd v WW LLC</i> , 300 F App'x 415 (6th Cir 2008) .....	703
<i>Collins v DR Horton, Inc</i> , 505 F3d 874 (9th Cir 2007) .....	704
<i>Commonwealth Coatings Corporation v Continental Casualty Company</i> , 393 US 145 (1968) .....	609
<i>Compagnie des Bauxites de Guinee v Hammermills Inc</i> , WL 122712 (DDC 1992) .....	533–4
<i>Consolidated Edison Company of NY v Cruz Construction Corporation</i> , 685 NYS2d 683 (NY App Div 1999) .....	238, 247, 249
<i>Contship Container Lines Ltd v PPG Industries Inc</i> , WL 1948807 (SDNY 2003) .....	61
<i>Cooper v Aaron</i> , 358 US 1 (1958) .....	311
<i>Copeland v Baskin Robbins USA</i> , 96 Cal App 4th 1251 (Cal Ct App 2002) .....	231
<i>Cosmotek Mumessillik ve Ticaret Ltd Sirkketi v Cosmotek USA, Inc</i> , 942 F Supp 757 (D Conn 1996) .....	254
<i>CPConstruction Pioneers Baugesellschaft Anstalt v Government of the Republic of Ghana</i> , 578 F Supp 2d 50 (DDC 2008) .....	221
<i>Cumberland &amp; York Distribution v Coors Brewing Company</i> , WL 193323 (D Me 2002) .....	253–4
<i>De Valk Lincoln Mercury, Inc v Ford Motor Company</i> , 811 F2d 326 (7th Cir 1987) .....	248
<i>Del E Webb Construction v Richardson Hospital Authority</i> , 823 F2d 145 (5th Cir 1987) .....	255

<i>Dialysis Access Ctr, LLC v RMS Lifeline, Inc</i> , 638 F3d 367 (1st Cir 2011) .....	255
<i>Fingerhut Business Services Inc v Etoys Inc</i> , WL 1640075 (D Minn 2001) .....	488
<i>First Options of Chicago Inc v Kaplan</i> , 514 US 938, 942 (1995) .....	258, 703
<i>Fluor Enters v Solutia</i> , 147 F Supp 2d 648 (SD Tex 2001) .....	232–3, 238
<i>Frazier v CitiFinancial Corporation</i> , 604 F3d 1313 (11th Cir 2010) .....	703
<i>Glass v Kidder Peabody &amp; Company</i> , 114 F3d 446 (4th Cir 1997) .....	260
<i>Goeller v Liberty Mutual Insurance Company</i> , 568 A2d 176 (Pa 1990) .....	493
<i>Gone to the Beach LLC v Choicepoint Services, Inc</i> , 514 F Supp 2d 1048 (WD Tenn 2007) .....	260
<i>Green Tree Fin Corporation v Bazzle</i> , 539 US 444 (2003) .....	258
<i>Hall Street. Hall Street Associates, LLC v Mattel, Inc</i> , 552 US 5762 (2008) .....	312, 703–4
<i>HIM Portland LLC v DeVito Builders, Inc</i> , 317 F3d 41 (1st Cir 2003) .....	233, 248–9, 256
<i>Howsam v Dean Witter Reynolds, Inc</i> , 537 US 79 (2002) .....	255–8, 260
<i>In re Eimco Corporation</i> , 163 NYS2d 273 (NY 1957) .....	249
<i>In re Enforcement of Subpoena</i> , 972 NE2d 1022 (Mass 2012) .....	487
<i>In re Jack Kent Cooke Inc &amp; Saatchi &amp; Saatchi North America</i> , 635 NYS2d 611 (NY App Div 1995) .....	238, 247, 249
<i>In re Maxwell Communication Corporation</i> , 170 BR 800 (Bankr SDNY 1994), affirmed 186 BR 807 (SDNY 1995) .....	42
<i>In the Matter of the Arbitration of Certain Controversies between Fromer Foods, Inc and Edelstein Foods Inc</i> , 181 NYS2d 352 (NY Supr Ct 1958) .....	496
<i>In the Matter of the Petitioner of Fertilizantes Fosfatados Maxicanos SA</i> , 751 F Supp 467 (SDNY 1990) .....	493
<i>International Association of Machinists v General Electric Company</i> , 865 F2d 902 (7th Cir 1989) .....	256
<i>Iran Aircraft Industries v Avco Corporation</i> , 980 F2d 141 (2nd Cir 1992) .....	394
<i>Johnson Controls Inc v Edman Controls Inc</i> , 712 F3d 1021 (7th Cir 2013) .....	703
<i>Jilly Film Enters v Home Box Office Inc</i> , 593 F Supp 515 (SDNY 1984) .....	232
<i>John Wiley &amp; Sons Inc v Livingston</i> , 376 US 543 (1964) .....	255, 258
<i>Johnson v California</i> , 545 US 162 (2005) .....	487
<i>Kemiron Atlantic, Inc v Aguakem International, Inc</i> , 290 F3d 1287 (11th Cir 2002) .....	238, 248, 256
<i>Kiran M Dewan v Walia</i> , 544 F App'x 240 (4th Cir 2013) .....	704
<i>Lakeland Fire District v E Area Gen, Contractors Inc</i> , 791 NYS2d 594 (NY App Div 2005) .....	247
<i>Langlais v Pennmont Benefit Sers Inc</i> , WL 2450752 (3rd Cir 2013) .....	258
<i>Lawrence E Jaffee Pension Plan v Household International, Inc</i> , WL 1821968 (D Colo 2004) .....	61
<i>Louis Dreyfus Corporation v Cook Industries, Inc</i> , 505 F Supp 4 (SDNY 1980) .....	260
<i>Marbury v Madison</i> , 5 US 137 (1803) .....	76, 311
<i>Marie v Allied Home Mortgage Corporation</i> , 402 F3d 1 (1st Cir 2005) .....	255
<i>Medellín v Texas</i> , 552 US 491 (2010) .....	221–2
<i>Melvin P Windsor, Inc v Mayflower Savings &amp; Loan Association</i> , 278 A2d 547 (NJ Super AD 1971) .....	493
<i>Miller &amp; Company v China National Minerals Import &amp; Export Corporation</i> , WL 171268 (ND Ill 1991) .....	255
<i>Mitsubishi Motors Corporation v Soler Chrysler-Plymouth, Inc</i> , 473 US 614 (1985) .....	260
<i>Mocca Lounge, Inc v Misak</i> , 94 AD2d 761 (NY App Div 1983) .....	232, 241
<i>Nemariam v Federal Dem Repulic of Ethiopia</i> , 315 F3d 390 (DC Cir 2003) .....	220
<i>Nemariam v Federal Dem Repulic of Ethiopia</i> , 491 F3d 470 (DC Cir 2007) .....	220
<i>NY Plaza Building Company v Oppenheim, Appel, Dixon &amp; Company</i> , 479 NYS2d 217 (NY App Div 1984) .....	247
<i>New Avex, Inc v Socata Aircraft, Inc</i> , WL 1998193 (SDNY 2002) .....	255
<i>Ozornoor v T-Mobile USA, Inc</i> , 459 F App'x 502 (6th Cir 2012) .....	703
<i>Paine Webber, Inc v Bybyk</i> , 81 F3d 1193 (2nd Cir 1996) .....	255

<i>Paine Webber, Inc v Elahi</i> , 87 F3d 589 (1st Cir 1996) .....	255
<i>People v Bradford</i> , 154 Cal App 4th 1390 (2008) .....	486
<i>People v Collins</i> , 232 P3d 32 (Cal 2010) .....	487
<i>People v Johnson</i> , 136 P3d 804 (Cal 2006) .....	487
<i>People v Williams</i> , 21 P3d 1209 (Cal 2001) .....	487
<i>Perez v Lemarroy</i> , 592 F Supp 2d 924 (SD Tex 2008) .....	253
<i>Polesky v GEICO Insurance Company</i> , 661 NYS2d 639 (NY App Div 1997) .....	247
<i>PTA-FLA, Inc v ZTE USA, Inc</i> , WL 4549280 (DSC 2011) .....	255
<i>PTA-FLA, Inc v ZTE USA, Inc</i> , WL 5024647 (MD Fla 2011) .....	255
<i>Richie Company LLP v Lyndon Insurance Group Inc</i> , WL 1640039 (D Minn 2001) .....	231
<i>Rintin Corporation, SA v Domar, Ltd</i> , 374 F Supp 2d 1165 (SD Fla 2005) .....	258
<i>Rockland County v Primiano Constr Company</i> , 431 NYS2d 478 (NY App Div 1980) .....	247
<i>Schlessinger v Rosenfeld, Meyer &amp; Sussman</i> , 40 Cal App 4th 1096 (1995) .....	491–2
<i>Schoffman v Cent States Diversified, Inc</i> , 69 F3d 215 (8th Cir 1995) .....	231
<i>Shearson Lehman Hutton, Inc v Wagoner</i> , 944 F2d 114 (2nd Cir 1991) .....	260
<i>Sidarma Societa Italiana di Armamento SpA v Holt Marine Industries, Inc</i> , 515 F Supp 1302 (SDNY 1981) .....	494
<i>Silverstein Properties, Inc v Paine, Webber, Jackson &amp; Curtis, Inc</i> , 480 NYS2d 724 (NY App Div 1984) .....	238, 249
<i>Silverstein Properties, Inc v Paine, Webber, Jackson &amp; Curtis, Inc</i> , 65 NY2d 785 (NY 1985) .....	238, 247, 249
<i>Smith Barney v Luckie</i> , 85 NY2d 193 (NY 1995) .....	260
<i>Southland Corporation v Keating</i> , 465 US 1 (1984) .....	253
<i>Stolt-Nielsen SA et al v Animalfeeds Corporation</i> , No 08-1198, 2010 US LEXIS 3672, 27 April 2010 .....	404
<i>Stolt-Nielsen SA v Animalfeeds International Corporation</i> , Dissenting Opinion of Justice Ruth B Ginsburg, 130 SCt 1758 (2010) .....	661
<i>Sucher v 26 Realty Associations</i> , 554 NYS2d 717 (NY App Div 1990) .....	247
<i>Taxation with Representation Fund v IRS</i> , 646 F2d 666 (DC Cir 1981) .....	382
<i>TCo Metals, LLC v Dempsey Pipe &amp; Supply Inc</i> , 592 F3d 329 (2nd Cir 2010) .....	703
<i>The Argentine Republic v BG Group plc</i> , 715 F Supp 2d 108 (DDC 2010) .....	620
<i>The Argentine Republic v BG Group Plc</i> , 665 F3d 1363 (DC Cir 2012) .....	237, 243, 256
<i>Town Cove Jersey City Urban Renewal, Inc v Procida Construction Corporation</i> , WL 337293 (SDNY 1996) .....	256
<i>Trafalgar Shipping Company v International Milling Company</i> , 401 F2d 568 (2nd Cir 1968) .....	260
<i>Unis Group, Inc v Compagnie Fin de CIC et de L'Union Européenne</i> , WL 487427 (SDNY 2001) .....	255
<i>United Steelworkers of America v St Gobain Ceramics &amp; Plastics, Inc</i> , WL 2827583 (6th Cir 2007) .....	255
<i>University Mednet v Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Ohio</i> , 710 NE2d 279 (Ohio App 1997) .....	493
<i>Vertner v TAC Ams, Inc</i> , WL 2495559 (WD Wash 2007) .....	255
<i>VRG Linhas Aéreas SA v MatlinPatterson Global Opportunities Partners II LP</i> , 717 F3d 322 (2nd Cir 2013) .....	220
<i>Wachovia Sec LLC v Brand</i> , 671 F3d 472 (4th Cir 2012) .....	703
<i>Walia v Kiran M Dewan</i> , 134 S Ct 1788 (2014) .....	704
<i>Weekley Homes, Inc v Jennings</i> , 936 SW2d 16 (Tex App 1996) .....	238, 248
<i>Wells Fargo Advisors LLC v Watts</i> , 540 F App'x 229 (4th Cir 2013) .....	703
<i>White v Kampner</i> , 641 A2d 1381 (Conn 1994) .....	232, 238



# *Table of Treaties, Legislation, and Related Instruments*

## I. MULTILATERAL TREATIES

Agreement for the Promotion, Protection and Guarantee of Investments among Member States of the Organisation of the Islamic Conference, signed 5 June 1981, entered into force 23 September 1986 . . . . .	481	Union, signed 26 May 1997, OJ C 195, 26 June 1997. . . . .	417
Agreement for the Prosecution and Punishment of Major War Criminals of the European Axis, and Charter of the International Military Tribunal of 1945, entered into force 8 August 1945, 82 UNTS 280. . . . .	417	Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, adopted 29 July 1899, entered into force 4 September 1900 . . . . .	344
Agreement of the International Monetary Fund, adopted on 22 July 1944, entered into force 27 December 1945 as amended effective 3 March 2011 . . . . .	417	Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, adopted 18 October 1907, entered into force 26 January 1910. . . . .	149, 344
Articles of Agreement of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, adopted 22 July 1944, entered into force 27 December 1945, 2 UNTS 134. . . . .	150–1	Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic, opened for signature 22 September 1992, as amended on 24 July 1998, updated 14 November 2000, 2354 UNTS 67. . . . .	417
Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, signed 9 September 1886 as amended 28 September 1979. . . . .	418	Convention for the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States, opened for signature 18 March 1965, entered into force 14 October 1966, 575 UNTS 159. . . . .	.8, 13–14, 28, 34, 48, 52–4, 58, 65, 67, 147, 156, 219, 230, 245–7, 250, 265, 267–9, 281, 283, 286–91, 307, 388, 409, 426, 433, 553, 567, 573–4, 577–8, 580, 582, 596–7, 599, 600, 602–5, 609–10, 616, 643, 655–6, 669, 676, 689, 691–4, 697, 699, 700, 710
Budapest Treaty on the International Recognition of the Deposit of Microorganisms for the Purposes of Patent Procedure, signed 28 April 1977, amended 26 September 1980 . . . . .	417	Convention on Choice of Court Agreements, adopted 30 June 2005 (not yet in force). . . . .	36, 37
Charter of the United Nations, signed 26 June 1945, entered into force 24 October 1945, 1 UNTS 16. . . . .	17, 159, 164, 221, 266, 407, 410	Dominican Republic—Central America—United States Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA), signed 5 August 2004. . . . .	40
Convention Drawn up on the Basis of Article K.3(2)(c) of the Treaty on European Union on the Fight against Corruption Involving Officials of the European Communities or Officials of Member States of the European		Energy Charter Treaty (Annex I of the Final Act of the European Energy Charter Conference), signed 17 December 1991, entered into force 16 April 1998, 2080 UNTS 95, 34 ILM 360 . . . . .	13, 52–53, 425, 428, 431, 587–8

European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, adopted 4 November 1950, entered into force 3 September 1953, 213 UNTS 222 . . . . .	636–7	Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, amended by the Treaty of Lisbon, signed 13 December 2007, entered into force on 1 December 2009, OJ C 326, 26 October 2012 . . . . .	206
European Convention on International Commercial Arbitration, opened for signature 21 April 1961, entered into force 7 January 1964, 484 UNTS 349 . . . . .	417	United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods, adopted 11 April 1980, entered into force 1 January 1988, 1489 UNTS 3 . . . . .	212
Final Act of the Bretton Woods Conference, 22 July 1944 . . . . .	150	Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, adopted 23 May 1969, entered into force 27 January 1980, 1155 UNTS 331 . . . . .	10–11, 67, 209, 262, 407, 409–10, 414, 418–24, 427–8, 430–43, 445–54, 458–9, 465–6, 469, 473, 475, 481, 483, 510, 558, 566–7, 569–74, 584, 588, 590, 592, 622, 712, 718
New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, opened for signature 10 June 1958, entered into force 7 June 1959, 330 UNTS 40 . . . . .	24, 27, 35–6, 48, 121, 211–12, 218–19, 261, 267, 295–6, 299, 300, 305, 345, 417–18, 514, 519, 534–5, 655, 700	WTO Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes, adopted 15 April 1994, entered into force 1 January 1995, 1869 UNTS 401 . . . . .	205, 207, 213
Nice Agreement Concerning the International Classification of Goods and Services for the Purposes of the Registration of Marks, signed 15 June 1957 . . . . .	417		
North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), signed 17 December 1992, entered into force 1 January 1994, 32 ILM 296 and 612 . . . . .	30, 52–3, 64, 77, 90, 129–32, 147, 270, 284, 543, 547–8, 550, 566, 568–70, 574–6, 578, 593–4, 614, 642, 645–6, 648, 653, 655–7, 664, 666, 672		
Patent Cooperation Treaty of 1970, signed 19 June 1970, entered into force 1 April 2002 . . . . .	418		
Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, signed 17 July 1998, entered into force 1 July 2002, 2187 UNTS 90 . . . . .	416		
Statute of the International Court of Justice, opened for signature 26 June 1945, entered into force 24 October 1945, 1 UNTS 993 . . . . .	58, 66–7, 70–4, 160, 162, 164–5, 181, 206, 217, 264, 272, 384, 560, 692, 698		
Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, signed 16 December 1920, as amended 14 September 1929, 6 LNTS 380 . . .	181, 264		

## II. BILATERAL TREATIES

The texts of most bilateral investment treaties can be found at <<http://investmentpolicyhub.unctad.org/IIA>>.

Accord Relatif à l'Encouragement et la Protection des Investissements entre le Royaume des Pays-Bas et la République du Sénégal, signed on 3 August 1979, entered into force on 5 May 1981 . . . . .	426, 429, 430
Agreement between Australia and the Lao People's Democratic Republic on the Reciprocal Promotion and Protection of Investments, signed 6 April 1994, entered into force 8 April 1995 . . . . .	643
Agreement between the Government of the Argentine Republic and the Kingdom of Spain for the Promotion and Reciprocal Protection of Investments, signed 3 October 1991, entered into force 28 September 1992 . . . . .	265, 276, 580



<p>Agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of the People's Republic of China for the Promotion and Reciprocal Protection of Investments, signed 9 September 2012, entered into force 1 October 2014. .... 713</p> <p>Agreement between the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Government of the Republic of Côte d'Ivoire on the Promotion and Protection of Investments, signed 30 September 2002, entered into force 1 October 2014. .... 229</p> <p>Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Finland and the Government of the State of Qatar on the Promotion and Protection of Investments, signed 12 November 2001, entered into force 8 May 2003. .... 643</p> <p>Agreement between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United Mexican States for the Promotion and Reciprocal Protection of Investment, signed 12 May 2006, entered into force 25 July 2007 ..... 643</p> <p>Agreement between the Swiss Confederation and the Oriental Republic of Uruguay on the Reciprocal Promotion and Protection on Investments, signed 7 October 1988, entered into force 22 April 1991 ..... 242, 276</p> <p>Confederated Independent States Treaty (United States and USSR), signed 1 June 1964, entered into force 12 July 1968, 19 UST 5018 ..... 417</p> <p>Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA), signed 26 September 2014 (not yet in force) ..... 32, 34, 40, 554, 713, 716–17</p> <p>General Claims Convention (United States of America and United Mexican States), signed on 8 September 1923, entered into force on 1 March 1924, 4 UST 4441 ..... 169–70, 172–5, 177, 183–6</p>	<p>Johnson-Clarendon Treaty (United States of America and United Kingdom), signed 14 January 1869 ... 135</p> <p>Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation Treaty (United States of America and Taiwan), signed 4 November 1946, entered into force 30 November 1948 ..... 418</p> <p>Treaty between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Albania Concerning the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment, signed 11 January 1995, entered into force 4 February 1998. .... 627</p> <p>Treaty of Washington (United States of America and United Kingdom), signed 8 May 1871 ..... 132, 134–6, 141–5, 147</p> <p>United States—Singapore Free Trade Agreement, signed 15 January 2003, entered into force 1 January 2004. .... 32, 570</p> <h3 style="text-align: center;">III. OTHER INTERNATIONAL INSTRUMENTS AND MODEL TREATIES</h3> <p>Articles on Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts, 2001, International Law Commission, Official Records of the General Assembly, UN GAOR, 56th Sess, Supp No 10, 43, UN Doc A/56/10 (2001) ..... 30, 456, 589, 628–31, 634, 637–8, 640–1, 698</p> <p>Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, UNGA Res 3281 (XXXIX), 15 January 1974, GAOR 29th Sess, Supp 31, 50, UN Doc A/9631 ..... 543, 551</p> <p>Code of Professional Conduct for Defense Counsel Appearing before the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, adopted 12 June 1997, IT/125 REV. 3, as amended effective 22 July 2009 .... 362–3</p> <p>Declaration of the Government of the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria Concerning the Settlement of Claims by the</p>
---	--



Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran, 19 January 1981 .....	48	25 June 2010, UN GA Res 65/22, UN GAOR, 65th Sess, Supp No 17, UN Doc A/65/17 .....	48, 65, 147, 334, 350, 386, 391, 393, 578, 600, 609, 656, 659, 672
Draft Convention on Transparency in Treaty Based Investor-State Arbitration, considered at the UNCITRAL 44th Session in New York, 7–25 July 2014 .....	64	United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL), Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration, adopted 21 June 1985, amended 7 July 2006, UN GA Res 61/33, UN GAOR, 61st Sess, Supp No 17, UN Doc A/61/10 .....	24, 48, 61, 147, 350, 389, 418, 490–1, 500, 514–15, 517, 519–23, 528, 536, 699–701
French Model BIT 2006 .....	643	United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL), Model Law on International Commercial Conciliation, adopted 24 June 2002, UN GA Res 57/18, UN GAOR, 57th Sess, Supp No 17, UN Doc A/57/17 .....	236, 239
German Model BIT 2008 .....	643	United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL), Rules on Transparency in Treaty-based Investor-State Arbitration, effective 1 April 2014 .....	64, 202, 579
Harvard Draft Convention on the Law of Treaties [1935] 29 AJIL Supp 938 .....	409, 436–7, 457	United States Model BIT 2004 .....	40, 383, 553–5, 570
ICSID Administrative and Financial Regulations, ICSID/15/Rev.1, 1 January 2013 .....	64, 341	United States Model BIT 2012 .....	544, 554–5, 642, 660, 713
ICSID Rules of Procedure for Arbitration Proceedings, ICSID/15/Rev.1, 1 January 2013 .....	32, 63–4, 67, 193, 208, 341–2, 384, 396, 400, 426, 490, 499, 577–8, 603–5, 609, 669–71	WTO Appellate Body Working Procedures for Appellate Review, 16 August 2010, Doc WT/AB/WP/6 .....	213
Italian Model BIT 2003 .....	643		
Norwegian Model BIT 2007 .....	642		
Permanent Court of Arbitration Financial Assistance Fund for Settlement of International Disputes, Terms of Reference and Guidelines .....	343–4		
Rules of Procedure and Evidence of the International Criminal Court, ICC-ASP/1/3 (Part II-A), 9 August 2002 .....	416–17		
Rules of the International Court of Justice, adopted on 14 April 1978, entered into force 1 July 1978 ....	66		
UNIDROIT Principles for International Commercial Contracts, adopted 9–11 May 2011 ....	323		
United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL), Arbitration Rules, adopted 28 April 1976, UN GA Res 31/98, UN GAOR, 31st Sess, Supp No 17, UN Doc A/31/17 .....	48, 53–5, 57, 147, 370, 386, 390, 490, 570, 578, 599, 603–4		
United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL), Arbitration Rules as revised in 2010, adopted			

#### IV. ARBITRATION RULES

ABA Model Code of Judicial Conduct 2007 .....	494
American Arbitration Association Rules of 2009 .....	63, 350–1
Arbitration Rules of the Court of Arbitration of the Official Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Madrid (Arbitration Court of Madrid) .....	359
Arbitration Rules of the Associazione Italiana per l'Arbitrato, effective 1 January 2008 .....	63

Arbitration Rules of the China International Economic and Trade Arbitration Commission, effective 1 May 2005 . . . . .	63	IBA Rules of Ethics for International Arbitrators, adopted in 1987 . . . . .	357, 384, 600
Arbitration Rules of the German Institution of Arbitration, effective 1 July 1998 . . . . .	63	IBA Rules on the Taking of Evidence in International Arbitration, issued in 1999, revised on 29 May 2010 . . . . .	122, 195, 349, 357, 368, 372, 399
Arbitration Rules of the International Chamber of Commerce, effective 1 January 1988 . . . . .	335, 534–5	International Dispute Resolution Procedures of the International Centre for Dispute Resolution, effective 1 June 2014 . . . . .	350, 384
Arbitration Rules of the International Chamber of Commerce, effective 1 January 1998 . . . . .	63, 337, 386	Swiss Rules of International Arbitration, in effect 1 January 2004 . . . . .	63
Arbitration Rules of the International Chamber of Commerce, entered into force on 1 January 2012 . . . . .	53–55, 57, 63, 65, 332–4, 337, 345, 350, 373, 391, 493, 496, 499, 501–2, 515–16, 528, 533, 660	Swiss Rules of International Arbitration, in effect 1 June 2012 . . . . .	359, 490–1, 499
Arbitration Rules of the London Court of International Arbitration, effective 1 January 1998 . . . . .	53, 55, 62–3, 340, 656		
Arbitration Rules of the London Court of International Arbitration, effective 1 October 2014 . . . . .	38–9, 53, 55, 62–3, 65, 350, 358, 384, 490, 494, 499		
Arbitration Rules of the Singapore International Arbitration Centre, effective 7 May 2007 . . . . .	63, 341		
Arbitration Rules of the Singapore International Arbitration Centre, effective 1 April 2013 . . . . .	340–1, 656		
Arbitration Rules of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), effective 1 October 2002 . . . . .	63		
Arbitration Rules of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), effective 1 June 2014 . . . . .	490		
IBA Guidelines on Conflicts of Interest in International Arbitration, approved by the Council of the International Bar Association, 22 May 2004 . . . . .	122, 195, 600, 602, 608–9, 613–14, 617–18		
IBA Guidelines on Party Representation in International Arbitration, 25 May 2013 . . . . .	122, 195, 371, 358, 362, 371, 405		

## V. NATIONAL LAWS

### Albania

Albanian Law on Foreign Investment 1993 . . . . .	262
--	-----

### Bangladesh

Bangladeshi Arbitration Act 1940 . . . . .	293, 295–6
---	------------

### Chile

Foreign Investment Statute, Decree Law No 600 1974 . . . . .	319
---	-----

### Colombia

Colombian Constitution 1991 . . . . .	85, 88–9, 94, 250
Decree 2591/91 . . . . .	85
Decree 570/2014 . . . . .	86–7

### France

French Arbitration Law, Decree of 13 January 2011 . . . . .	62, 359, 384
French Code of Civil Procedure 1973 . . . . .	384

### Italy

Italian Code for the Protection of Personal Data, Legislative Decree of 30 June 2003 . . . . .	62
--	----

### Jordan

Jordanian Arbitration Law 2001 . . . . .	297–300
--	---------

<b>Kuwait</b>	Californian Constitution 1879 . . . . . 488, 496
Law No 8/2001 . . . . . 323, 327	Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 1938 as amended effective 1 December 2014 . . . . . 355, 659
<b>Mexico</b>	Revised Uniform Arbitration Act 2000 . . . . . 61, 260
Constitución Política de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos 1857 . . . . . 175	US Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act 2002, 19 USC §§ 3803–3805 . . . . . 40, 555
<b>Singapore</b>	United States Federal Arbitration Act 1925, 9 USC §1 et seq . . . . . 61, 255–7, 260, 700, 702–3
Singapore International Arbitration Act, Cap 143A, 2002 Rev Ed . . . . . 514, 519	New York Civil Practice Law and Rules 2006 . . . . . 260
<b>United Kingdom</b>	
Civil Procedure Rules (England and Wales) 1998 . . . . . 355	
English Arbitration Act 1996 . . . . . 349, 404, 499, 659, 665, 700, 702	
<b>United States of America</b>	
California Code of Civil Procedure 1872 . . . . 490	
California Code of Judicial Ethics 1996 . . . . 487	
California Government Code 1943 . . . 488, 497	
	<b>VI. SECONDARY EUROPEAN UNION LAW</b>
	Council Directive (EEC) 93/13 on Unfair Terms in Consumer Contracts, OJ 1993 L 95 . . . . . 120

## *List of Contributors*

**Stanimir Alexandrov** co-chairs the international arbitration practice of Sidley Austin LLP. He specializes in investor-state and commercial arbitration, and resolution of trade disputes. Mr Alexandrov represents private parties and governments in arbitrations before ICSID, ICC, UNCITRAL, LCIA, and AAA. He has been appointed to ICSID's Panel of Arbitrators and serves as an arbitrator in cases under the arbitration rules of ICSID, ICC, LCIA, and UNCITRAL. Before engaging in private practice, Mr Alexandrov was Bulgaria's Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs. He is a professor at George Washington University Law School and American University.

**Mahnoush H Arsanjani**, former Director of the Codification Division of the Office of Legal Affairs of the United Nations, served as Vice-President of the American Society of International Law, is a member of the Board of Editors of the American Journal of International Law, and is a member of the Institut de Droit International. She served as a member of the Expert Group established by the 2008 Ad Hoc Energy Ministers Meetings held in Jeddah and London, and as a special consultant to the International Energy Forum, Charter of the International Energy Forum 2010. She served as a member of the Bahrain Independent Commission of Inquiry and is a judge on the World Bank Administrative Tribunal.

**Piero Bernardini** is Of Counsel to Ughi e Nunziante Studio Legale. He was General Counsel Eni Group (1980 to 1985) and Chair, international arbitration—LUISS University—Rome (1982 to 2005). He is President, Italian Arbitration Association, Member, ICCA Council and Member, ICSID panel of conciliators and arbitrators by Italian appointment. He has served as Arbitrator, president of arbitral tribunals, member of ICSID annulment committees, and counsel in more than 200 commercial and investment treaty cases under the rules of ICSID, ICC, LCIA, NAI, Cairo Centre, UNCITRAL, CAM, AIA, VIAC, and SCC. He has been a speaker, moderator, or chairman in national and international congresses and seminars, and has authored books and articles dealing with petroleum, state contracts, investment protection, commercial contracts, and arbitration.

**Gary Born** is the world's leading authority on international arbitration and litigation. He is the author of *International Commercial Arbitration* (2nd edn, Kluwer Law International 2014) and numerous other works on international dispute resolution. Mr Born is also Chair of the International Arbitration Practice Group at Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP and has been ranked for the past twenty years as one of the world's leading international arbitration practitioners. He is a Professor of Law at the University of St Gallen Law School and teaches regularly at law schools in Europe, Asia, and North America.

**David D Caron** is Dean of the Dickson Poon School of Law, King's College London. He is a Barrister with 20 Essex Street; as well as a Bencher of Inner Temple. He is a member of the US State Department Advisory Committee on Public International

Law and of the Editorial Board of the American Journal of International Law. He is a former Chair of the Institute of Transnational Arbitration and a founding Co-Editor of World Arbitration and Mediation Review. He is listed as a Band 1 International Arbitrator in Chambers and was President of the American Society of International Law from 2010 to 2012.

**James H Carter** is a Senior Counsel in the New York office of Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP, where he serves as counsel and as an arbitrator. Mr Carter has participated in more than 150 international commercial and investment arbitration cases. He is a graduate of Yale College and Yale Law School, is a Vice Chair of the New York International Arbitration Center, and has served as Chairman of the Board of Directors of the American Arbitration Association, President of the American Society of International Law, and Chair of the American Bar Association Section of International Law.

**James Crawford** AC, SC, FBA is Whewell Professor of International Law, University of Cambridge. He was responsible for the ILC's work on the International Criminal Court (1994) and for the second reading of the ILC Articles on State Responsibility (2001). In addition to scholarly work on statehood, investment law, and international responsibility, he has appeared in around 100 cases before international courts and tribunals. In 2012, he was awarded the Hudson Medal by the American Society of International Law. In November 2014, he was elected to serve as a judge of the International Court of Justice.

**Rudolf Dolzer** was the Director of the Institute of International Law at the University of Bonn from 1996 to 2009. From 1992 to 1996, he served as Director General in the Office of the Chancellor of the Federal Republic. He has published *Bilateral Investment Treaties* in 1995, with Margrete Stevens, and *Principles of International Investment Law* in 2012, 2nd edition, with Christoph Schreuer. He has extensive experience in international investment arbitration.

**Donald Francis Donovan** serves as co-head of the international disputes practice at Debevoise & Plimpton LLP and teaches international arbitration and international investment law and arbitration at New York University School of Law. He concentrates his practice in international disputes before US courts, commercial and investor-state arbitration tribunals, and international courts, and he regularly sits as arbitrator in commercial and investor-state cases. Among other positions, he has served as President of the American Society of International Law, Chair of the Institute for Transnational Arbitration, and Vice-President of the International Council for Commercial Arbitration.

**Pierre-Marie Dupuy** is Emeritus Professor at the University of Paris (Panthéon-Assas) and at the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies in Geneva. He is an Associate Member of the Institut de Droit International and delivered the General Course of International Law at The Hague Academy of International Law in 2000 (RCADI 2003, Vol 297). Professor Dupuy is an international arbitrator (ICSID, UNICTRAL, PCA) and also has extensive experience in international (inter-state) dispute settlement, having been involved as counsel in more than twenty cases before the International Court of Justice.

**L Yves Fortier** PC, CC, OQ, QC, after graduating from McGill University and Oxford (Rhodes Scholar), joined Ogilvy Renault in Montréal and practised law as a trial lawyer. He argued cases before all courts in Canada and before the International Court of Justice in The Hague. In 1976, he took silk (QC) and in 1982 to 1983 he was President of the Canadian Bar Association. From 1988 to 1992, he served as Canada's Ambassador and Permanent Representative to the United Nations in New York. Since 1992, Mr Fortier has practised law almost exclusively as an arbitrator. He is recognized today as one of the top arbitrators in the world. From 1998 to 2001, he was President of the London Court of International Arbitration.

**Emmanuel Gaillard** heads Shearman & Sterling LLP's International Arbitration practice. He has advised and represented corporations, states, and state-owned entities in hundreds of international arbitrations. He has also acted as arbitrator in over fifty international arbitrations. Emmanuel Gaillard has written extensively on all aspects of arbitration law. His publications include *Fouchard Gaillard Goldman on International Commercial Arbitration*, a leading publication in this field, the first published essay on the legal theory of international arbitration, *Legal Theory of International Arbitration*, as well as numerous articles on international commercial and investment treaty arbitration. He is a Visiting Professor of Law at Yale Law School, where he teaches international commercial arbitration.

**Oscar M Garibaldi** currently practises as an independent arbitrator in investment and commercial cases. In 2013, he retired from Covington & Burling LLP, after a thirty-four-year career in which he specialized in international arbitration. Mr Garibaldi is a graduate of the University of Buenos Aires and Harvard Law School, and taught international law and legal philosophy at Cornell Law School and the University of Virginia Law School. He is trained in civil law, common law, and public international law, and has published frequently on topics related to arbitration and public international law.

**Judith A E Gill** has been a partner at Allen & Overy LLP since 1992. She graduated in Jurisprudence from Worcester College, Oxford University and qualified as a solicitor in 1985 and as a Solicitor Advocate in 1998. Ms Gill is regularly appointed as an arbitrator and frequently appears as lead advocate in arbitration proceedings. She is only the second woman solicitor advocate to be appointed Queen's Counsel. In July 2011, Ms Gill won the award for 'Best in Commercial Arbitration' at Euromoney's Women in Business Law Awards. Ms Gill is joint author of the leading textbook *Russell on Arbitration* and has published widely on arbitration issues.

**Sir Christopher Greenwood** took degrees in law and international law at Magdalene College, Cambridge, where he was Whewell Scholar. After graduation, he became a Fellow of Magdalene and University Lecturer in International Law. In 1996, he left Cambridge to take up the Chair of International Law at the London School of Economics, which he occupied until 2009. Called to the Bar by the Middle Temple, he was appointed Queen's Counsel in 1999 and was active in practice before the English courts, the International Court of Justice, and various international tribunals. In 2009, he became a judge of the International Court of Justice. He was knighted for services to public international law in 2009.



**Gavan Griffith** QC was Solicitor-General of Australia for fourteen years until 1997. He now practises as an Investment and Commercial Disputes Arbitrator from Essex Court Chambers, London.

**Horacio A Grigera Naón**, presently an independent international arbitrator and consultant on arbitration and business and international law matters and a Distinguished Practitioner in Residence and Director of the International Commercial Arbitration Center of the Washington College of Law, American University, Washington DC, is also a former Secretary General of the International Court of Arbitration of the International Chamber of Commerce and has been a practitioner in the field of international commercial arbitration and international business law during the last thirty years. Among many publications in those areas, he has authored the book *Choice-of-Law Problems in International Commercial Arbitration* (1992), and has lectured at The Hague Academy of International Law (2001) on the same topic.

**Hussein Haeri** is an international arbitration and public international law specialist and a Partner at Withers LLP in London. He is qualified as a Solicitor of the Supreme Court of England and Wales, and has practised in New York and Paris. Mr Haeri is an experienced advocate and has been counsel in numerous investment treaty and commercial arbitrations, as well as before the International Court of Justice and in domestic courts. He has taught at leading universities in the United Kingdom and France and is a regular author and speaker on international arbitration and public international law.

**Eckhard R Hellbeck** is counsel in the Washington, DC office of White & Case LLP. His practice focuses on international arbitration and litigation involving sovereign parties, in particular in the area of investment protection under bilateral and multilateral treaties. Before entering private practice, Mr Hellbeck was a lawyer and diplomat with the German Foreign Service for nine years. He is a member of the Bars of the District of Columbia, Frankfurt am Main, and New York, as well as of the American Bar Association, the German American Law Association, the International Bar Association, and the American Society of International Law.

**Kaj Hobér** was Partner at Mannheimer Swartling, Stockholm from January 1994 until 1 January 2015. He is now an associate member of 3 Verulam Buildings in London. He is former Professor of East European Commercial Law at the University of Uppsala from 1997 to 2009 and former Professor of International Law at the Centre for Energy, Petroleum and Mineral Law and Policy (CEPMLP), University of Dundee during 2010. As of 1 May 2012, he is Professor of International Investment and Trade Law at Uppsala University. Professor Hobér has acted as counsel and arbitrator (including chairmanships) in more than 400 international arbitrations, including numerous investment treaty arbitrations.

**Hans van Houtte** is the President of the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal in The Hague. He had the chair of International Private Law and International Law at the University of Louvain, where he still teaches arbitration. He has served as arbitrator in over 300 commercial disputes as well as in some twenty investment disputes. Author of three books and more than 150 articles on international commercial law

and arbitration, he also holds a degree in European Law, an LLM from Harvard, and the diploma *cum laude* from The Hague Academy of International Law.

**Michael Hwang SC** currently practises as an international arbitrator and mediator based in Singapore, but with door tenancies in London and Sydney. He also serves as the non-resident Chief Justice of the Dubai International Financial Centre Courts. He has two law degrees from Oxford University, to which he gained admission by winning an open scholarship examination. He has been: Judicial Commissioner of the Supreme Court of Singapore, Senior Counsel of the Supreme Court of Singapore, Singapore's non-resident Ambassador to Switzerland, President of the Law Society of Singapore, Vice-Chairman of the ICC International Court of Arbitration, Vice-President of ICCA, Court Member of LCIA, Adjunct Professor, National University of Singapore, and Commissioner of the United Nations Compensation Commission.

**O Thomas Johnson** is a member of the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal in The Hague. Prior to his appointment to that tribunal in 2012, he was a partner at the law firm of Covington & Burling LLP, where his practice focused on arbitrations between states and foreign investors and land and maritime boundary disputes. From 2002 until 2009, Mr Johnson was a member of the Panel of Arbitrators of the World Bank's International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes, appointed by the United States. He began his legal career at the US State Department Legal Adviser's Office (1971 to 1975).

**Daniel Kalderimis** is a partner at Chapman Tripp and leads the firm's international arbitration practice. He is admitted in New Zealand, New York, and England and Wales (where he is a solicitor-advocate). He is New Zealand's representative to the ICC Commission and correspondent to UNCITRAL for the New York Convention and the Model Law. Mr Kalderimis acts regularly as counsel in international arbitrations, has experience as an arbitrator, and appears as a barrister and solicitor in commercial litigation matters.

**Neil Kaplan CBE QC SBS** was called to the Bar of England and Wales in 1965. In 1980, he moved to Hong Kong to serve as Principal Crown Counsel; he became a QC in 1982; and in 1990, a Judge of the Supreme Court of Hong Kong. Since 1995, he has been involved in hundreds of arbitrations as co-arbitrator, sole arbitrator, or chairman. These arbitrations included commercial, infrastructure, and investment treaty disputes under numerous procedural rules. He was Chair of HKIAC for thirteen years and President of the Chartered Institute of Arbitrators in 1999/2000.

**Anna Kirk** is an employed barrister at Bankside Chambers in Auckland, working in international arbitration with David Williams QC. She was previously a senior associate at Herbert Smith in London specializing in international arbitration. She has a PhD from the University of Cambridge in International law and an LLB (Hons) and BA from the University of Waikato. She is a contributing author to *Williams and Kawharu on Arbitration* (2011).

**Carolyn B Lamm** is a partner at the Washington, DC office of White & Case LLP. She has been lead counsel for foreign states and corporations in significant international

arbitration and litigation proceedings throughout the world in over thirty-five years of practice. Ms Lamm was President of the District of Columbia Bar and the American Bar Association. She serves in a variety of leadership positions in ICCA; the American Bar Association; the American Society of International Law; the American Law Institute (Restatements on International Arbitration and Foreign Relations); and the American College of Trial Lawyers. She teaches International Investment Arbitration at the University of Miami School of Law.

**Julian D M Lew QC** presently practises as a full-time international arbitrator from Chambers at 20 Essex Street, London. He has been actively involved with international arbitration as a practitioner and an academic for more than forty years. He has been involved in hundreds of arbitrations as counsel and arbitrator under all the major arbitration systems. In addition, he is Professor of Arbitration Law and Head of the School of International Arbitration, Centre for Commercial Law Studies, Queen Mary, University of London. He has written extensively books and articles, and lectured on all aspects of international arbitration.

**Joshua Lim** is a former associate at Michael Hwang Chambers, where he assisted Michael Hwang SC primarily as tribunal secretary. Prior to that, he served in the Supreme Court of Singapore as a Law Clerk to the Chief Justice, the Judges of Appeal, and the Judges of the High Court. Joshua graduated from the Singapore Management University in 2011 with degrees in Law and Business Management, receiving the DBS Bank School Valedictorian Award in Law. He is currently a Deputy Public Prosecutor and State Counsel in the Attorney General's Chambers, Singapore.

**Loretta Malintoppi** is Of Counsel at Eversheds LLP, Singapore. She was admitted to the Paris and Roma Bars and is registered to practise as a foreign lawyer in Singapore. Ms Malintoppi acts as arbitrator and counsel in investor-state and commercial arbitrations under a variety of rules. Ms Malintoppi also appears regularly as counsel and advocate before the International Court of Justice and in inter-state ad hoc arbitrations. She is a co-author of the second edition of Professor Schreuer's *The ICSID Convention: A Commentary* (Cambridge University Press 2009), a co-editor of the series *International Litigation in Practice*, published by Martinus Nijhoff, and a regular author and speaker in the field of international law.

**Julie Maupin** is a Senior Research Fellow at the Max Planck Institute for Comparative Public Law and International Law in Heidelberg, Germany. She is an expert in the development implications and public interest impacts of international economic governance regimes. Previously a Lecturer at Duke Law School, where she taught international investment law, international commercial arbitration, and international dispute settlement, Dr Maupin also regularly advises international organizations, governments, businesses, and NGOs on matters of economic law and policy. She is an alumna of Yale (JD/MA Economics) and the Graduate Institute for International and Development Studies in Geneva (PhD, International Law).

**Bridie McAsey** is an associate in the International Arbitration practice group at Arnold & Porter. Ms McAsey has a public international law and international arbitration background and has co-authored or authored several articles in these areas. She

advises clients (including states and large commercial entities) on international arbitration matters, and has assisted arbitral tribunals. Prior to joining Arnold & Porter, Ms McAsey worked as Legal Adviser to the President of the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal in The Hague, at the Supreme Court of Victoria, and at White & Case LLP.

**Sundaresh Menon** studied law at the National University of Singapore in 1986 and later obtained a Master's degree from Harvard Law School. He was admitted to the Bar in Singapore in 1987; in New York in 1992; and was appointed Senior Counsel in Singapore in 2008. From April 2006 to March 2007, Mr Menon served as a Judicial Commissioner of the Supreme Court before returning to Rajah & Tann and later becoming its Managing Partner. He was appointed as Singapore's Attorney-General on 1 October 2010; as Judge of Appeal on 1 August 2012; and as the Chief Justice on 6 November 2012.

**Richard M Mosk** received his AB from Stanford and JD from Harvard. He was a member of the staff of the Warren Commission that investigated and issued a report on the assassination of President Kennedy, a law clerk on the California Supreme Court, a litigation partner in Los Angeles law firms, and a special Deputy US Federal Public Defender. He argued cases before the California and US Supreme Courts, was twice appointed as judge on the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal and repeatedly served as a substitute judge on that Tribunal. He was Chair of the Motion Picture Association Classification and Rating Administration, member of the Christopher Commission, served on a number of international arbitration panels, lectured and taught at various universities and law schools, including a course at The Hague Academy of International Law, and presently is an associate justice of the California Court of Appeal.

**Joseph E Neuhaus**, a partner at Sullivan & Cromwell since 1992, is coordinator of the firm's arbitration practice and focuses on international commercial litigation in both arbitral and court settings, with particular emphasis on Latin American matters. He has served as counsel and arbitrator in numerous arbitral proceedings, including ad hoc proceedings, arbitrations administered by the International Chamber of Commerce and the American Arbitration Association, and investor-state arbitrations under the UNCITRAL Rules. He began his career in arbitration working with Judge Charles Brower as a legal assistant to Judge Howard M Holtzmann of the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal in 1984 to 1986.

**Francisco Orrego Vicuña** is the director and professor of the LLM program on international law, investment, and arbitration offered by the University of Heidelberg and the Max Planck Institute in Santiago. He practises as an arbitrator for ICSID, the ICC, the PCA, and other institutions. He is currently a Judge at the Administrative Tribunal of the IMF and was formerly a judge and President at the World Bank Administrative Tribunal, participates in WTO panels, and has been a judge ad hoc at the International Court of Justice and ITLOS. He is an arbitrator member of 20 Essex Street Chambers in London.

**Antonio R Parra** is currently a Consultant with the Corporate Secretariat of the World Bank. He previously served as the first Deputy Secretary-General of the International

Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID), as Legal Adviser at ICSID, and as Senior Counsel and Counsel in the Legal Department of the World Bank. He is an Honorary Secretary-General of the International Council for Commercial Arbitration and a Fellow of the Chartered Institute of Arbitrators. He holds a Doctorate in Law from the University of Geneva and has published a book on ICSID as well as forty articles and contributions to edited volumes.

**Alan Redfern** has worked as an arbitrator since leaving Freshfields, where he was the senior litigation partner, and joining the Chambers of Lord Grabiner QC, One Essex Court, Temple. Alan has acted as chairman, sole arbitrator, or party-nominated arbitrator in over 100 arbitrations. These include disputes arising from: insurance and reinsurance contracts; research, development, and distribution projects; joint venture agreements; plant supply, computer software, telecommunications, and financing agreements; international construction projects; long-term oil and gas agreements; and engineering and defence contracts. Alan is a Vice-President of the International Court of Arbitration of the ICC and a former non-executive director of the LCIA. He is co-author of *Redfern and Hunter on International Arbitration* (soon to be in its sixth edition); and he also devised the 'Redfern Schedule', which is now used in arbitrations worldwide.

**W Michael Reisman**, Myres S McDougal Professor of International Law at Yale, is a member of the Institut de Droit International, Fellow of the World Academy of Art and Science, member of the Advisory Committee on International Law of the Department of State, President of the Arbitration Tribunal of the Bank for International Settlements, and member of the Board of the Foreign Policy Association. He was President of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights of the OAS, Vice-President and Honorary Vice-President of the American Society of International Law, Editor-in-Chief of the American Journal of International Law, and Vice-Chairman of the Policy Sciences Center. His most recent books are *International Commercial Arbitration: Cases, Materials, and Notes on the Resolution of International Business Disputes* (with Craig, Park and Paulsson) (2nd edn) (2015); *Foreign Investment Disputes: Cases, Materials and Commentary* (with Bishop and Crawford) (2014) and *Fraudulent Evidence before Public International Tribunals: The Dirty Stories of International Law* (Hersch Lauterpacht Memorial Lectures) (with Skinner) (2014).

**David P Riesenber**g is an associate in the Washington, DC office of White & Case LLP. He specializes in international arbitration and litigation involving sovereign parties. He served as a law clerk to Judge W Eugene Davis of the US Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and Judge Kathleen Cardone of the US District Court for the Western District of Texas. He received a JD and LLM in international law from Duke University School of Law.

**Arthur W Rovine** has been serving as an arbitrator in international cases under ICSID, NAFTA, PCA, ICC, and AAA/ICDR for several years. He was President of ASIL (2000 to 2002), Chairman of the International Law Section of the ABA (1985 to 1986), and Chairman of the International Law Committee of the New York City Bar (2009 to 2011). Mr Rovine was a member of the Board of Editors of the American Journal of International Law (1977 to 1987), and has been a member of the Council on Foreign Relations since 1987. He is Director of the annual Conference on International Arbitration at Fordham Law School, an Adjunct Professor of Law at Fordham, and Editor of the annual volume *Contemporary Issues in International Arbitration and*

*Mediation: The Fordham Papers*, published by Martinus Nijhoff. He writes and speaks frequently on international arbitration.

**Giorgio Sacerdoti** is Professor of international law at Bocconi University in Milan, Italy. As vice chairman of the OECD Working Group on Bribery, he chaired the drafting committee of the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention of 1997. From 2001 to 2009 he was a member of the WTO Appellate Body which he chaired in 2006 to 2007. He has been an arbitrator at the WTO, an arbitrator and chairman of tribunals at ICSID, and is active as an international commercial arbitrator. He also acts as counsel in international litigation, both before courts and in arbitration. He has authored more than 200 academic works in his fields of competence, the latest being as editor of *General Interests of Host States in International Investment Law* (Cambridge University Press 2014).

**Marija Šćekić** is an Associate in the International Arbitration Practice Group at Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP. She has experience of a range of complex international arbitration proceedings, including shareholder disputes and disputes in the technology and automotive sectors. Ms Šćekić's experience includes cases governed by a broad variety of substantive and procedural laws, and cases under the ICC, UNCITRAL, and ICSID rules.

**Stephan W Schill** is Professor of International and Economic Law and Governance at the University of Amsterdam and Principal Investigator in an ERC-funded project on 'Transnational Public-Private Arbitration as Global Regulatory Governance'. Formerly he was Senior Research Fellow at the Max Planck Institute for Comparative Public Law and International Law in Heidelberg and prior to that has assisted The Honorable Charles N Brower in international commercial and investor-state arbitrations. He is admitted to the bars in Germany and New York and is a Member of the ICSID List of Conciliators. He is also the Editor-in-Chief of the Journal of World Investment and Trade and author of several books and articles on international investment law.

**Christoph Schreuer** is a graduate of the Universities of Vienna, Cambridge, and Yale. He is a former Professor at Johns Hopkins University and University of Vienna, Member of the ICSID List of Arbitrators, Arbitrator in ICSID and UNCITRAL cases, and author of numerous publications in international investment law; <<http://www.univie.ac.at/intlaw/wordpress/>>.

**Stephen M Schwebel** practised at White & Case LLP, taught at Harvard Law School as Assistant Professor of International Law and at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies as the Burling Professor of International Law, and served in the Office of the Legal Adviser of the US Department of State as an assistant legal adviser, counsellor on international law, and a deputy legal adviser. He was a member of the UN International Law Commission from 1977 to 1980. He was elected a judge of the International Court of Justice in 1980, and served for nineteen years and as Court President from 1997 to 2000. He is an active international arbitrator.

**Abby Cohen Smutny** is a partner at White & Case LLP. She co-heads the firm's international arbitration practice in the Americas and heads the firm's public international



law practice. She is Senior Vice-Chair of the Institute for Transnational Arbitration, a Member of the Board of the American Arbitration Association, Vice-President of LCIA's North American User's Council, Co-Editor-in-Chief of the *World Arbitration and Mediation Review*, and a member of the Editorial Board of the *Yearbook on International Investment Law and Policy*. She is a former Vice-President of American Society of International Law, Vice-Chair of the Arbitration Committee of the IBA, and Chair of the International Law Section of the DC Bar.

**Epaminontas E Triantafilou** is Of Counsel at Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan LLP resident in London, United Kingdom. Previously he served as Legal Counsel at the Permanent Court of Arbitration in The Hague, the Netherlands, practised international arbitration with a major international law firm in Washington, DC, and was Legal Assistant to The Honourable Charles N Brower. Mr Triantafilou serves as Co-Managing Editor of the *World Arbitration and Mediation Review* and as a Member of the Executive Committee of the Institute for Transnational Arbitration. He holds BA and MA degrees from Brandeis University and a JD from the University of Chicago. He is admitted to practice in New York and in the District of Columbia.

**Albert Jan van den Berg** is President of the International Council for Commercial Arbitration and a founding partner at Hanotiau & van den Berg in Brussels, Belgium. He is a Visiting Professor at Tsinghua University, Beijing, and Emeritus Professor at Erasmus University, Rotterdam. Professor van den Berg is presiding and party-appointed arbitrator in numerous international commercial and investment arbitrations. He also acts as counsel in international commercial arbitrations. He is a former President of the Netherlands Arbitration Institute and Vice-President of the London Court of International Arbitration. Professor van den Berg has published extensively on international arbitration (<<http://www.hvdb.com>>), in particular the New York Convention of 1958 (<<http://www.newyorkconvention.org>>). His awards include: The International Who's Who of Business Lawyers, Arbitration: Lawyer of the Year in 2006 and 2011; and Global Arbitration Review, 'Best Prepared and Most Responsive Arbitrator' in 2013.

**V V Veeder QC**, educated in Paris, Bristol, and Jesus College, Cambridge, is an arbitrator practising from Essex Court Chambers, London; ICCA Governing Council Member; Vice-President of the LCIA; Visiting Professor on Investment Arbitration at the Sir Dickson Poon School of Law, King's College, London University; and UK Government Delegate and Adviser to the UNCITRAL Working Group on Arbitration.

**David Williams QC** is a barrister and international arbitrator and a member of Bankside Chambers, Auckland and Singapore. He is also an Associate Member of Essex Court Chambers, London. He is an Honorary Professor of Law at the University of Auckland and the co-author of *Williams and Kawharu on Arbitration* (2011), New Zealand's first comprehensive treatise on domestic and international arbitration. The book won the J F Northey Prize in 2012 for the best legal treatise published in New Zealand in that year. He is a former Justice of the New Zealand High Court and of the Court of the Dubai International Financial Centre. He sits part time as President of the Court of Appeal of the Cook Islands.

**Eduardo Zuleta** is Vice-Chair of the ICC, a member of the Panel of Arbitrators ICSID (Chairman's list), a member of the LCIA Court, Vice-Chair of the ITA, Vice-Chair of the Latin American Arbitration Association, and a member of the ICC Latin American Group. Mr Zuleta has extensive experience in international arbitration, as counsel and as arbitrator, in commercial and investment cases, under ICSID, ICC, UNCITRAL, and ICDR, among others. He is Partner at GPZ Abogados in Bogota, where he leads the practice of arbitration, international litigation, and international law. He obtained a JD from Universidad del Rosario, Bogota, Colombia, with a master's degree on financial law and an LLM and specialization in International Dispute Resolution, from Queen Mary, University of London.



# Practising Virtue

## An Introduction

*David D Caron, Stephan W Schill, Abby Cohen Smutny,  
and Epaminontas E Triantafylou*

### Moving Inside International Arbitration

This book is about what international arbitrators do, and what they ought to do. It aims at providing a deeper understanding of the functioning of, and challenges facing, international arbitration. It does so by inviting eminent international arbitrators to reflect on how they view the practice of international arbitration from the inside, rather than by providing an account of the governing national and international legal frameworks. This is timely given the increasing relevance of international arbitration and the surging interest in the system that has emerged from the application of legal principles by arbitral tribunals to disputes that span the globe.

In fact, international arbitration has become one of the principal mechanisms to settle cross-border disputes arising from a variety of legal relationships, including between States, between private commercial actors, and between private and public entities.<sup>1</sup> Its growth is due to the steep increase in international trade, commerce, and investment, coupled with the lack of judicial institutions, either at the national or the international levels, that could provide a neutral and effective mechanism for the settlement of emerging disputes. From this functional rationale, international arbitration has developed into a global system of adjudication that operates to a large extent according to its own procedural rules and dynamics, independently of domestic and international law. Structurally, international arbitration therefore may be better understood as part of a transnational justice system that cannot be grasped entirely through the conventional categories of national and international, private and public law.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The International Chamber of Commerce in Paris alone, one among now numerous arbitral institutions between New York and Singapore, São Paulo, and Stockholm, has been administering, in the past fifteen years, more than 700 proceedings per year. See International Chamber of Commerce, 'ICC in 2014—Programme of Action 2014' (2014) 6 <<http://www.iccwbo.org/news/brochures>> accessed 18 January 2014. The Permanent Court of Arbitration currently lists ninety-one pending cases, out of which six are inter-State and eighty-five are investor-State cases. See <[http://www.pca-cpa.org/showpage.asp?pag\\_id=1029](http://www.pca-cpa.org/showpage.asp?pag_id=1029)> accessed 18 January 2014. Investment treaty-based arbitrations have grown to over 568 disputes by the end of 2013. See UNCTAD, 'Recent Developments in Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS)', IIA Issue Note No. 1, 1 (April 2014) <[http://unctad.org/en/publicationslibrary/webdiaepcb2014d3\\_en.pdf](http://unctad.org/en/publicationslibrary/webdiaepcb2014d3_en.pdf)> accessed 18 January 2014.

<sup>2</sup> The notion of transnational law used in this context draws on Philip Jessup, *Transnational Law* (Yale University Press 1956) 2: 'Nevertheless I shall use, instead of "international law", the term "transnational law" to include all law which regulates actions or events that transcend national frontiers. Both public

The increasing importance of international arbitration as part of a transnational justice system is reflected in both the tectonic changes taking place in the practice of international arbitration and the increasing attention it has attracted from all major players in the field of law—private parties, including corporations, governments, non-governmental organizations, domestic courts, and academia. In response to its growing importance and use by disputing parties, international arbitration has become increasingly institutionalized, professionalized, and judicialized. At the same time, it has gained significance beyond specific disputes or disputing parties. International arbitration has become an institution that contributes to the shaping of law. International arbitration, in other words, does not function simply as a Montesquieuan *bouche de la loi*, passively applying pre-existing legal rules to the facts of the cases. Rather, it contributes significantly to making the rules and principles governing international economic transactions, both private and public.<sup>3</sup> International arbitrators are therefore not only transnational adjudicators, but they also contribute to the progressive development of transnational law. This, in turn, has given rise to concerns over the legitimacy of international arbitration.

While practitioners and scholars of international arbitration have begun to reflect on arbitration's increased importance,<sup>4</sup> so far this has had little influence on the scholarship addressing international adjudication generally.<sup>5</sup> The relatively modest footprint of international arbitration in international legal theory can be traced to two main causes. First, international arbitration historically has not been readily accessible for those who do not practise or study it closely. For those 'outside' (so to speak) international

and private international law are included, as are other rules which do not wholly fit into such standard categories.' Under this perspective, Jessup invited a perspective on all laws, whether public or private, national or international, that concern the regulation of matters transcending national frontiers.

<sup>3</sup> Walter Mattli, 'Private Justice in a Global Economy: From Litigation to Arbitration' (2011) 55 International Organization 919; A Claire Cutler, *Private Power and Global Authority: Transnational Law Merchant in the Global Political Economy* (Cambridge University Press 2003); Alec Stone Sweet, 'The New Lex Mercatoria and Transnational Governance' (2006) 13 Journal of European Public Policy 627; Benedict Kingsbury and Stephan W Schill, 'Investor-State Arbitration as Governance: Fair and Equitable Treatment, Proportionality, and the Emerging Global Administrative Law' in Albert J van den Berg (ed), *50 Years of the New York Convention*, ICCA Congress Series No. 14 (2009) 5; Christopher A Whytock, 'Private-Public Interaction in Global Governance: The Case of Transnational Arbitration' (2010) 12(3) Business and Politics, Article 10; UC Irvine School of Law Research Paper No. 2012-18 <<http://ssrn.com/abstract=2034561>> accessed 18 January 2014; Walter Mattli and Thomas Dietz, *International Arbitration and Global Governance: Contending Theories and Evidence* (Oxford University Press 2014).

<sup>4</sup> See inter alia Emmanuel Gaillard, *Legal Theory of International Arbitration* (Martinus Nijhoff 2010); Jan Paulsson, *The Idea of Arbitration* (Oxford University Press 2013).

<sup>5</sup> International arbitration plays, if at all, only a minor role in the burgeoning literature on international courts and tribunals. See, eg, Armin von Bogdandy and Ingo Venzke, *In Whose Name? A Public Law Theory of International Adjudication* (Oxford University Press 2014); Yuval Shany, *Assessing the Effectiveness of International Courts* (Oxford University Press 2014); Cesare Romano, Karen Alter and Yuval Shany (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of International Adjudication* (Oxford University Press 2014); Karen J Alter, *The New Terrain of International Law: Courts, Politics, Rights* (Princeton University Press 2014). Notable exceptions are Gary Born, 'A New Generation of International Adjudication' (2012) 61 Duke LJ 775, who argues that international arbitration is attributed too little attention in constructing a theory on international adjudication, and David D Caron, 'The Nature of the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal and the Evolving Structure of International Dispute Resolution' (1990) 84 American Journal of International Law 104, who argues that disputes have migrated between the dockets of interstate adjudication and international commercial and investment arbitration.

arbitration, the functioning of the arbitral process appears opaque. This is largely due to the confidential nature of most international arbitrations, with the possible exception of inter-State and investor-State proceedings, where arbitral awards tend to be public. Second, international arbitration scholarship, historically, has not extensively addressed the influential role played by international arbitrators in contributing to an emergent body of procedural and substantive law accepted transnationally. Arbitration literature still mostly treats international arbitration as an object of national and international regulation, not as a source of transnational legality.<sup>6</sup>

The present book looks at international arbitration from the ‘inside’, with an emphasis on its transnational character. Instead of concentrating on the national and international law governing international arbitration, it focuses on those practising international arbitration, in order to understand how international arbitration actually works, what its sources of authority are, and what legitimacy demands it must meet. Putting those who practise arbitration—in line with Luhmann’s systems theory of law—into the centre of the system of international arbitration also allows us to appreciate the way in which they contribute to the development of the law they apply.<sup>7</sup>

The importance of those inside international arbitration is connected to the powers arbitrators have. These encompass both the competence of arbitral tribunals to determine their own jurisdiction, that is, whether the disputing parties have concluded a valid agreement to arbitrate, and their power to decide on the parties’ mutual rights and obligations. Domestic courts, in turn, typically have a limited role in reviewing arbitration proceedings, which is largely directed towards ensuring due process and the enforcement of the parties’ rights during and after the arbitration proceedings, usually without reviewing the outcome on the merits. In addition, the practice of international arbitration has adopted and continues to evolve cultural and communicative practices that translate into a distinct international arbitration culture; this culture also influences how arbitrators apply and further contribute to the development of the applicable law,<sup>8</sup> thus vesting international arbitration with further autonomy from other legal systems.

Focusing on the practice of international arbitration, instead of on the governing legal rules and principles, may come as a surprise. This perspective is not unprecedented, however. Almost twenty years ago, in ‘Dealing in Virtue’, their ground-breaking sociological study of international arbitration, Yves Dezalay and Bryant Garth emphasized the central role of arbitrators by showing that a small elite group of lawyers engaged in the practice of international dispute resolution was actively building a transnational legal order that was largely independent from specific national legal practices. The present book relies on the insights of ‘Dealing in Virtue’, but takes them a step further. While Dezalay and Garth, when describing international arbitration from a sociological perspective, focused on the fact that arbitrators are remunerated

<sup>6</sup> In this sense Thomas Schultz, *Transnational Legality—Stateless Law and International Arbitration* (Oxford University Press 2014).

<sup>7</sup> Cf Niklas Luhmann, *Das Recht der Gesellschaft* (Suhrkamp 1988) 320–5.

<sup>8</sup> See Joshua Karton, *The Culture of International Arbitration and the Evolution of Contract Law* (Oxford University Press 2013).



in return for their ‘virtue’ in judgment, neutrality, and expertise,<sup>9</sup> this volume invites eminent arbitrators to reflect on the actual practice of international arbitration, and its contribution to the transnational justice system. Rather than being about ‘dealing in virtue’, this book is about ‘practising virtue’ in international arbitration.

In pursuing this idea, the book does not propose a comprehensive framework to analyse the structure and nature of international arbitration. Instead, it offers a platform for reflection on the foundations of international arbitration, its functioning and challenges to more than forty authors, who are themselves core actors—as arbitrators, counsel, and scholars—in international commercial and investment arbitration. Providing a platform for views from within international arbitration reflects the conviction that consideration of those insights is a necessary component to understanding what it means to ‘practise virtue’ in international arbitration.

### **International Arbitration as Part of the Transnational Justice System**

The contributions in this book are grouped around specific themes. *Part I* contains contributions that analyse international arbitration as an institution that forms part of the transnational justice system. This system both serves to protect rights in settling cross-border disputes and contributes to the development of global legal standards.

*Sundaresh Menon* lays out an understanding of international arbitration as part of a transnational system providing access to justice. As he shows, access to justice in international arbitration has the advantage of concentrating dispute settlement in a single arbitral forum, avoiding multiple, and potentially conflicting, decisions in domestic courts. Moreover, this concentration creates an opportunity for arbitral tribunals to develop global legal standards governing transborder economic relations. At the same time, understanding international arbitration as part of a transnational justice system has a normative sting. It requires, as Menon shows, that the system itself lives up to the highest demands for administering justice. This allows criticism of delays, high costs, and the lack of ethical standards in international arbitration, as well as unpredictability in court overview of arbitration and enforcement of arbitral awards.

The idea that international arbitration forms part of a justice system is also reflected in *Alan Redfern’s* contribution on the development of international arbitration over time. In his view, one of the most characteristic features of this development has been the professionalization of international arbitration. This professionalization can be seen in legal education, with international arbitration now being taught in various universities, in the way law firms organize themselves in international arbitration groups, in the practice of international arbitration institutions, and in the increasing activity of professional organizations. This development not only leads to an increasing institutionalization, but also has the effect that arbitration increasingly resembles the judicial process to which we are accustomed from the domestic context.

<sup>9</sup> Yves Dezalay and Bryant G Garth, *Dealing in Virtue: International Commercial Arbitration and the Construction of a Transnational Legal Order* (University of Chicago Press 1996) 8.

*Piero Bernardini's* contribution reflects on whether international arbitration can be analysed as part of one overarching framework or is better seen in a more differentiated fashion. Addressing the basic procedural features of international commercial and investment treaty arbitration, including the agreement to arbitrate, applicable law and procedure, confidentiality versus transparency, cost allocation, and dissenting opinions, he points out commonalities between both forms of international arbitration, but also cautions that differences should not be overlooked. This calls for a differentiated analysis of international arbitration depending on the dispute involved, but at the same time underlines the need for overarching and cross-cutting analysis.

*Eduardo Zuleta* then highlights that international dispute resolution not only has the function to settle individual disputes, but also has governance effects. These effects emerge because, even though there is no doctrine of precedent in international law and arbitration, international dispute settlement bodies often embed their decision-making in an extensive and thorough analysis of decisions previously rendered within the same regime or by other international bodies addressing the same or related points of law. International dispute settlement bodies therefore incrementally construe and develop norms for both private–private and private–public relations. Analysing investment treaty arbitration, human rights jurisprudence and disputes under state contracts, Zuleta identifies several of these rules and principles, such as the concept of the rule of law and due process.

*James H Carter* turns to the question of legitimacy of international arbitration. Responding to Jan Paulsson's suggestion that all arbitrators should be appointed by an institution, not the parties, he stresses the fundamental importance of the party-appointment of arbitrators for the parties' trust in the system. Furthermore, Carter points to the moderating effect the community of arbitrators has on individual arbitrators and arbitral tribunals. After all, it is this peer group in which arbitrators have to build and maintain a reputation for their virtue: judgment, neutrality, and expertise.

*Stephan W Schill*, finally, undertakes a closer analysis of the concept of legitimacy as it is used in the international arbitration context. He points out that, while the concept of legitimacy has become the prevailing standard against which the acceptability of international arbitration is measured—arguably also because there is no single source of law that authoritatively determines the criteria under which international arbitration is legal—different actors, such as the parties to proceedings, actual and potential users of arbitration as a group, the population of a specific country, and the international community as a whole have different conceptions of what legitimacy means and what implications it has for when and how international arbitration should be conducted. He calls for a more nuanced use of the concept of legitimacy to analyse international arbitration as part of the transnational justice system.

## History and Sociology of International Arbitration

*Part II* contains contributions that analyse international arbitration through the lens of interdisciplinary methodology, dealing with the history of international arbitration and sociological approaches to international dispute resolution. These contributions

show both the openness of actors inside international arbitration to make use of interdisciplinary methods and the usefulness of such methods for a better understanding of international arbitration.

The section opens with a detailed analysis by V V Veeder of the *Alabama Claims* arbitration that took place in 1872 between the United States and Great Britain. Veeder's account of this arbitration, which concerned the claim that Great Britain violated its duty of neutrality during the American Civil War and constituted the basic model for international arbitration today, is not only a historical contribution; instead, Veeder uses the historical scenery to respond to modern debates. In tracing meticulously how the United States and Great Britain reached agreement to arbitrate and how the proceedings developed on a day-to-day basis, Veeder argues that party-appointment of arbitrators is crucial for the parties to have trust in the decision-making process. This chapter shows that historical analysis can serve for the purposes of doctrinal argument and for helping to legitimize the existing system.

Antonio R Parra discusses more recent historical events, namely the involvement of the World Bank as an institution and of Eugene Black, its President from 1949 to 1962, in his personal capacity, in the mediation of foreign investment disputes in the late 1950s. This experience is significant as it prompted Aron Broches to start thinking about creating the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID). Parra's account stresses the importance of both institutions and individuals in bringing international arbitration to fruition. While not legitimizing ICSID as such, his use of history illustrates that much of international arbitration reacted to the practical needs to resolve concrete disputes that could otherwise not be satisfactorily resolved.

Stephen M Schwebel continues the theme of the importance of individuals in shaping the system of international dispute settlement. He discusses the little remembered 'Provisional Report on the Revision of the Statute' prepared by Hersch Lauterpacht shortly after he took office at the International Court of Justice in 1955. In it, Lauterpacht discussed possible changes and revisions of the Court's Statute in order for it to better achieve its mission to administer international justice. He addressed, inter alia, possible changes to the composition of the Court and its jurisdiction, and extending access to private parties to the Court. Although the Provisional Report was never followed by a final version, its spirit has continued to influence reform efforts in international dispute resolution.

As a close of the historical contributions, Oscar M Garibaldi recalls that history must always be examined critically. This also applies to assessing the value of earlier decisions, in particular in a system where such decisions have persuasive value for later tribunals. To make this point, Garibaldi concentrates on what he calls 'structural errors' relating to the determination of jurisdiction by arbitral tribunals. He focuses on the *North American Dredging* case in which the United States-Mexico General Claims Commissions, in Garibaldi's view incorrectly, declined jurisdiction in an inter-State proceeding because the contract between the respondent and the affected company excluded the latter from seeking diplomatic protection. Whether or not one agrees with Garibaldi, he makes a forceful argument that arbitral tribunals should resolve a dispute on the basis of an independent assessment of the applicable law and not uncritically follow earlier precedent.

Following these historical excursions, the next three contributions deal with the sociology of international arbitration. *Emmanuel Gaillard* takes a structural approach. He analyses international arbitration as a social field that is structured by social actors and their rituals. He structures the social actors in international arbitration into essential actors, such as the parties and arbitrators, arbitration service providers, such as arbitration institutions and counsel, and value providers, such as States passing arbitration legislation, international organizations, non-governmental organizations, and arbitration scholars. Rituals that structure the interaction of these actors are, in Gaillard's view, inter alia, arbitral hearings, arbitration conferences, and prizes given as symbols of professional recognition. Finally, Gaillard points out how a sociological analysis helps to illustrate how international arbitration has changed during the past decades from a 'solidaristic' to a more 'polarized' field, in which different roles in the arbitral process are allocated to different actors and where arbitration becomes subject to intense outside scrutiny.

*Giorgio Sacerdoti* presents an autobiographical perspective reflecting on his experience on transitioning from being a scholar of international law to being an international judge and arbitrator. For him, competence and connections, but also reputation for independence and impartiality, are important for making this transition. Musing on the qualities that make good arbitrators, Sacerdoti stresses the ability to work as part of a collective international peer group and the need for leadership and authoritativeness. At the same time, he argues for distinguishing between arbitration and dispute settlement in permanent international courts. While a 'systemic perspective', in his view, is crucial in international courts, it has less importance in international arbitration which, for him, is essentially a service to the parties.

Finally, *Donald Francis Donovan* turns to the role and function of advocates in international arbitration. Drawing on his own experience, he stresses that legal practice today is no longer separated into different national boxes, which are, in turn, separated from international law. Instead, advocates today operate increasingly within a transnational legal space. This can be seen in the practice of litigators in domestic courts, for whom foreign laws and international law have become part of their everyday practice. At the same time, the character of international law itself is changing as it is increasingly applied like national law in a judicial forum. Advocates, in this context, are more than representative of their clients' interests: they are actors who shape the future of the transnational space in which they operate and should bear responsibility for it.

## Authority of International Arbitral Tribunals and Its Limits

Following these interdisciplinary perspectives, *Part III* turns to a doctrinal analysis of the authority of international arbitral tribunals and its limits. The prevailing perspective, as outlined before, is that from the inside of international arbitration, from the perspective of the international arbitral process itself, rather than from an outside regulatory perspective.

It starts with an in-depth analysis by *Gary Born* and *Marija Šćekić* on pre-arbitration procedural requirements in international arbitration agreements and investment

treaties. Paradoxically, while aiming to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the arbitration process, these requirements often lead to additional disputes, with courts and tribunals having presented inconsistent interpretations. Born and Šćekić therefore suggest interpreting such requirements restrictively. Requirements to negotiate or conciliate, to the extent they are valid and enforceable, should be treated as non-mandatory and aspirational; mandatory pre-arbitration requirements should only be seen as affecting the admissibility of claims, rather than constituting bars to arbitral jurisdiction. The restrictive reading proposed would enhance the authority of arbitral tribunals and make arbitration into a more effective mechanism for administering transnational justice.

*Christoph Schreuer* then deals with inter-temporal questions concerning jurisdiction in international dispute settlement. Drawing on the practice of the International Court of Justice (ICJ), the Permanent Court of International Justice (PCIJ), and investment treaty tribunals, he posits that the basic rule is for jurisdiction to exist when the proceedings are initiated. This creates legal certainty as subsequent developments, including acts by the respondent, cannot defeat jurisdiction. This does not mean, however, that subsequent developments are irrelevant. On the contrary, if certain jurisdictional requirements are only met at a later point, this will usually provide the court or tribunal with jurisdiction. In appropriate cases, proceedings should therefore be suspended so that jurisdictional requirements can be met. Particularly striking to see is how Schreuer analyses ICJ and PCIJ jurisprudence alongside investment treaty jurisprudence as part of one overarching system of international dispute settlement.

*Rudolf Dolzer* turns to the specific role of local remedies and their relation to international arbitration. In his case survey to determine the role of local law in investment treaty arbitrations, he addresses four distinct issues: the exclusion of diplomatic protection under the ICSID Convention; the requirement to follow the traditional rule on the exhaustion of local remedies; the rule that ordinary commercial matters do not fall under the jurisdiction of ICSID; and the relevance of the rules of denial of justice. Dolzer finds that although ICSID tribunals rightly eschew diplomatic protection, some of them erroneously have introduced requirements to resort to, and even exhaust, local remedies when neither is required under the ICSID Convention or the relevant investment treaty. International tribunals should therefore not shy away from reinforcing their authority in relation to local courts.

Similarly, *L Yves Fortier* analyses the relationship between investor-State tribunals and national courts. He emphasizes that the harmonious relationship between both which involves ‘respect for one’s own and each other’s existence’ in the administration of transnational justice may be threatened when arbitrators under investment treaties scrutinize decisions of national courts. In Fortier’s view, the fine line investment tribunals have to navigate is between the legitimate review of whether national courts as State organs respect the State’s investment treaty obligations and the problematic review of national courts’ substantive application of national law, a task that is properly within the jurisdiction of national courts.

The relationship of arbitral tribunals to domestic courts is also addressed by *Horacio A Grigera Naón* who asks whether arbitrators have the power to declare a law unconstitutional. He shows that this depends, inter alia, on the applicable

*lex arbitri*. While some countries, such as Argentina, grant arbitrators wide-ranging powers and others, such as the United States, are more restrictive, a key consideration, in Grigera Naón's view, for arbitral tribunals in deciding this question is the idea of comity, that is whether it is 'proper and prudent' for arbitrators to reject the effects of a law, even though it has not been declared unconstitutional within the domestic legal order by the constitutional or other competent court.

Joseph E Neuhaus then deals with the enforceability of legislative stabilization clauses through international arbitration. Typically, these clauses are undertakings by governments in their national legislation not to alter benefits accorded to foreign investors for a specific period of time. Neuhaus compares legislative stabilization clauses with contractual stabilization provisions and concludes that the reasons for the enforceability of the latter support, mutatis mutandis, the enforceability of the former. Neuhaus identifies four reasons in support of this analogy: first, a stabilization promise creates a vested right that is entitled to protection as a matter of international law; second, agreements must be honoured; third, a stabilization clause creates a reliance interest on the part of the investor; and fourth, public policy requires that a state is able to bind itself in order to realize its aims.

Neil Kaplan turns to the problem of non-payment of cost advances by the respondent in an international arbitration proceeding. In case the claimant chooses to pay the respondent's advance on costs as well, the question arises how he or she can possibly recover that sum. Arbitral tribunals have developed two different reactions: either making use of provisional measures against the respondent, or making an award enforcing the contractual obligation of the respondent to make an advance on costs. For both solutions they assume their own jurisdiction. This shows how instrumental tribunals are in creating a level playing field for both parties in order to make arbitration into an effective dispute settlement mechanism.

The last two contributions deal with questions of legal ethics. The scope of legal privilege to defend against requests for document protection is the topic of Julian D M Lew's contribution. Unlike in the context of domestic court proceedings, the main problem Lew points to is the absence of clear rules on this issue in international arbitration. Similarly, which of several involved domestic rules could potentially apply to govern legal privilege is a source of uncertainty. This creates insecurity for attorney–client relations. In Lew's view, the best solution would consist in entrusting arbitral tribunals not only to make decisions on these issues, but also to develop the necessary rules independently from specific domestic legal orders.

David A R Williams and Anna Kirk, in turn, focus on the ethical standards applicable in international arbitration to the treatment of witnesses and the power of arbitral tribunals to enforce them. Similarly to the issue of legal privilege, it is unclear which of potentially different national standards could apply. This notwithstanding, Williams and Kirk show that an international consensus is starting to develop, for example, on the question of how witnesses of the opposing party in cross-examinations should be treated. They stress that the principles of fairness in cross-examination and of respect for the opposing witness constitute the applicable standard. These standards not only bind counsel, but also require and entitle arbitral tribunals to enforce them.



## Reasoning and Decision-Making in the Arbitral Process

*Part IV* focuses on legal argument in the various stages of the arbitral process. It groups together contributions on how counsel develop their arguments, how arbitrators interpret the applicable law, how they deliberate, and how arbitral awards and dissenting opinions are and should be reasoned to promote both the rule of law within the transnational arbitral system as well as enforceability in one or more domestic legal orders.

The section opens with a contribution by *David D Caron*, which rethinks the role of transparency in international arbitration. Instead of viewing transparency only as an end, Caron considers it as part of the regulatory toolbox available for the optimization of the arbitral process and the issuance of well-reasoned and authoritative awards. Focusing on the ‘opacity’ of confidential tribunal deliberations, Caron argues that although such confidentiality serves important purposes, there are ways to regulate and indeed to guide the tribunal’s deliberative process—examples include specifying who decides, delineating what materials may form the basis of decision, requiring that written reasons are required, and, in extreme cases, piercing the opaque shield of deliberations to uncover injustice.

An important aspect of the decision-making process in international arbitration is explored in *Judith A E Gill*’s analysis on the current state of legal argument in international arbitration. After surveying the different approaches taken due to variations in the backgrounds of both advocates and arbitrators, Gill observes that legal arguments are usually expounded in written submissions and subsequently presented briefly during oral hearings with the tribunal not engaging directly with such arguments at any point. Combined with the diminishing use of legal experts, which is partially due to the increasing collaboration of advocates across jurisdictions, the role of legal argument is at risk of appearing subsidiary even in cases where it plays a central role—a development against which both parties and tribunals should remain vigilant.

Subsequently, the book features four contributions on interpretation as a key aspect of legal reasoning. Focusing on the interpretation of international treaties, *Mahnoush H Arsanjani* and *W Michael Reisman* explore the varied interpretive approaches of international courts and tribunals when faced with different language versions of treaties that are amenable to different, and often conflicting, interpretations. Focusing on the recent investment treaty decision in *Kiliç v Turkmenistan*, Arsanjani and Reisman analyse the errors committed by the tribunal in its interpretation of apparently incompatible translations of the Turkey-Turkmenistan Bilateral Investment Treaty, thus violating Article 33 of the Vienna Convention of the Law of Treaties (VCLT).

The importance of the VCLT is also stressed in *Kaj Hobér*’s contribution. His case study based on the investment treaty arbitration *Millicom v Senegal* offers insights into treaty interpretation from the perspective of the arbitrator. Hobér, who served on the *Millicom* tribunal, vividly reflects on the interpretive dilemmas faced by that tribunal due to an ambiguously worded investment treaty, in particular with regard to a jurisdictional clause that appeared to require an additional act of consent by the host State. Hobér’s analysis shows how the tribunal dealt with each of those dilemmas, and arrived at a consensus judgment by applying the VCLT.

The appropriate application of the VCLT also lies at the heart of *Stanimir A Alexandrov's* chapter, which discusses cases dealing with the proper interpretation of most-favoured-nation (MFN) clauses, and the poignant dissents filed by Charles N Brower in those cases. Alexandrov analyses in particular *Austrian Airlines v The Slovak Republic*, *Daimler Financial Services AG v The Argentine Republic*, and *Renta 4 et al v The Russian Federation*. By noting in each case the manner in which Judge Brower emphasized the primacy of the treaty's text, avoided applying either a permissive or a restrictive interpretation, and exercised care in the use of supplementary materials, Alexandrov concludes that Judge Brower consistently applies the Vienna Convention rules of treaty interpretation.

*Epaminontas E Triantafilou's* chapter traces the origins of contemporaneity, an approach towards treaty interpretation that has been introduced relatively recently into investment treaty arbitration. Triantafilou identifies contemporaneity as the enquiry into the ordinary meaning of treaty terms at the time the treaty was concluded, and distinguishes the different types of cases where contemporaneity has been historically applied. Triantafilou argues that contemporaneity is not a general rule of treaty interpretation, although it may be employed subject to certain conditions, at an arbitral tribunal's discretion and consistent with the VCLT. In light of this argument, Triantafilou concludes that in nearly all recent instances in which tribunals have relied on contemporaneity, they have misapplied it.

*Richard M Mosk* further complements the presentation of the tribunal's reasoning process by shedding light on a highly confidential and pivotal aspect of that process: tribunal deliberations. The deliberative process is arguably the most sacrosanct part of arbitral decision-making, and glimpses into its inner workings are rare. Drawing on his experience as Judge of the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal, Mosk provides a step-by-step commentary on the deliberative process, while highlighting several important issues, including arbitrator misconduct, drawn-out deliberations, evidence and arguments not raised by the parties, and dissenting opinions, and offering, where possible, concise, practical solutions.

The subject of dissenting opinions, which have been appearing with increasing frequency in investment treaty arbitration, is explored by *Albert Jan van den Berg*. Whatever their advantages and disadvantages, dissenting opinions are significant because, when read together with the award, they offer additional insight into the tribunal's deliberative process. Van den Berg's contribution adds to a prior exchange of views with Judge Brower on the appropriateness of dissenting opinions in international arbitration. Van den Berg observes, among other things, that such dissents are invariably filed by the party-appointed arbitrator of the party that lost the case. According to van den Berg, this fact points to the partisan character of dissents and does not promote neutrality and collegiality, while also undermining the authority of arbitral awards.

Although arbitrators increasingly reason by relying on principles developed on a transnational level, the awards they issue must be enforceable by domestic courts that have jurisdiction over assets of the losing party. The authority and enforceability of arbitral awards comprise the subject matter of the chapter by *Michael Hwang and Joshua Lim*. Hwang and Lim identify the common elements of 'pathological' arbitral awards,

and the manner in which such awards may be challenged under the United Nations Commission of International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) Model Law on Commercial Arbitration. Hwang and Lim's choice of the Model Law reflects the fact that the Law has served as the basis of the great majority of national arbitration legislations passed since 1985, when the Model Law was adopted. The authors identify several issues under the broad 'pathologies' of lack of reasoning and breach of natural justice, and suggest remedies for such defects that would protect an award from challenge.

## Studies in Investment Treaty Arbitration

To conclude, *Part V* contains contributions on specific issues in investment treaty arbitration. While dealing with a large number of seemingly different issues, the main theme running through all contributions in this part is the central role attributed to arbitral tribunals as law-makers in the field of investment law. They do not merely interpret and apply investment treaties, but actively make the meaning of investment treaties by interpreting and applying them.

*O Thomas Johnson* starts out with an evaluation of whether the expectations of developed and developing countries in signing bilateral investment treaties (BITs) have materialized, in particular whether BITs have delivered on the promise to promote foreign investment. While acknowledging that the jury is still out on the economic effects of BITs, he stresses that BITs have managed to create, by introducing investor-State arbitration, a dispute settlement mechanism that Johnson considers far superior to available alternatives, such as diplomatic protection and dispute settlement in domestic courts. The principal contribution of investment treaties, in Johnson's view, therefore lies in their contribution to international dispute settlement.

*Christopher Greenwood* addresses MFN clauses, whose competing interpretations have created a seemingly lasting rift in investment treaty jurisprudence. Greenwood's presentation covers many contours of MFN clauses, including their history, function, and proper application and interpretation. Greenwood dispels the confusion created by the interpretation of an MFN clause as a means of additional provisions being 'written into' the treaty, and treats thorny issues such as whether an MFN clause may serve as an independent source of jurisdiction, thereby potentially expanding the scope of the dispute resolution clause.

*Loretta Malintoppi* and *Hussein Haeri* deal with the role of the non-disputing State party in the various stages of an investment treaty relationship, ranging from making the applicable law and participating in an actual arbitration, to enforcing resulting awards. As Malintoppi and Haeri show, the non-disputing party can play an important role in contributing to the effective settlement of investment disputes and ensuring that arbitral tribunals fulfil their mandate in the interests of all contracting parties. Yet, Malintoppi and Haeri also argue that the involvement of non-disputing parties should not be without limits. It should respect, in particular, due process rights of investors in ongoing proceedings in order not to prejudice them through the non-disputing party's intervention.

*Francisco Orrego Vicuña's* chapter offers insight into the often complicated impact of time on jurisdictional and substantive requirements under investment treaties.

Issues of temporal jurisdiction as well as the temporal scope of substantive provisions continue to divide and at times confuse the reasoning of investment treaty tribunals. Orrego Vicuña's case survey confirms that the principle of non-retroactivity remains sacrosanct, with the exception of composite acts that begin before the effective date of a treaty and conclude after that date. Orrego Vicuña also comments on certain special scenarios, such as the provisional application of the Energy Charter Treaty, the timing of investments for purposes of jurisdiction, and composite acts arising under both customary international law and the *lex specialis* represented by the treaty.

One condition for the authority of international arbitrators is their independence and impartiality. These principles are addressed by *James Crawford*, who focuses particularly on arbitrator challenges in ICSID arbitrations. Analysing the text of the ICSID Convention and the practice of ICSID tribunals, he points out that the threshold under ICSID for 'manifest lack of independence' is higher than the standard for 'reasonable doubt' under UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules. Yet, the precise content of either standard is not sufficiently clear. Crawford therefore considers that the test under the ICSID Convention for a lack of arbitrator independence or impartiality is in need of greater conceptual clarity.

*Gavan Griffith* and *Daniel Kalderimis* tackle one of the most controversial issues relating to the independence and impartiality of arbitrators in investment treaty arbitration. They address 'issue conflicts' that may arise out of the arbitrator's relationship with the subject matter, not the parties, of the case. Such conflicts can arise where the arbitrator is involved as counsel in another case involving the same legal issue, where the arbitrator has expressed opinions on the issues at stake in academic writing, or more generally is challenged on the basis of a commitment or ideas he or she holds in relation to the case. Griffith and Kalderimis stress that commitments to an understanding of what the arbitrator in question considers to be the correct interpretation of the law cannot result in a successful challenge, whereas care needs to be taken where what looks like a commitment to the law obscures a lack of openness vis-à-vis one of the parties.

*Abby Cohen Smutny* then tackles the complex subject of compensation for unlawful takings under customary international law and international investment treaties. Her treatment of the issue, including a close examination of the famous *Chorzów Factory* case, leads Smutny to conclude that the methodology of determining the compensation due, including the date at which the taken property must be valued, depends on the specific undertakings of the expropriating State, the nature of the State's wrongful behaviour, and the available evidence of loss suffered. Smutny's incisive analysis serves to dispel any lingering confusion over lawful versus unlawful expropriations and the remedies associated therewith.

Another fertile field of debate in investment treaty arbitration is offered by theories of compensation, which seek to link treaty standards with economically sound approaches to calculating loss. The appropriate measure of compensation for the breach of international treaties figures prominently in the chapter by *Hans van Houtte* and *Bridie McAsey*. They focus specifically on damages based on future income, whether from earnings of an enterprise or guaranteed tariffs under an investment contract. Their analysis encompasses not only the 'reasonable certainty' standard

employed frequently by tribunals requested to determine damages based on future income, but also innovative suggestions for tackling scenarios where the evidence may not support reasonable certainty. Such suggestions include postponing the damages phase until sufficient evidence emerges, issuing an award subject to conditions allowing its future amendment in respect of the amount of damages, or issuing a partial award, with the final award to follow once damages can be appropriately determined.

Complementing the chapters on remedies, *Arthur W Rovine's* chapter provides an overview of the state of jurisprudence on the allocation of costs in investment treaty arbitration. Rovine diagnoses an upward trend in the number of awards awarding the prevailing party at least a portion of its costs or, most frequently, allowing the parties to bear their own costs. In either scenario, Rovine finds that the rationale for doing so can vary widely. In some instances, tribunals provide no rationale at all. Rovine concludes that precise and thorough reasoning should underlie every decision on costs, so that a consistent jurisprudence and predictability can emerge in this unsettled area of arbitral decision-making.

Rounding up the contributions on investment treaty arbitration, *Carolyn B Lamm, Eckhard R Hellbeck, and David P Riesenberg* re-examine closely the annulment decisions in the *Amco Asia* case, which were pivotal to the establishment of the appropriate annulment standard in ICSID arbitration. They highlight the often-overlooked fact that the first annulment decision (*Amco Asia I*) established a lower bar than the one usually applied today for the challenge of ICSID awards based on an ICSID tribunal's 'manifest excess of powers'. It was the innovative (and more stringent) standard adopted by the second annulment committee (*Amco Asia II*) that is typically adopted to this day under Article 52 of the ICSID Convention. The authors conclude by juxtaposing *Amco Asia II's* standard for annulment based on manifest excess of powers with national legislative regimes, noting that those systems usually do not turn at all on the distinct standard introduced by *Amco Asia II*.

Finally, *Pierre-Marie Dupuy* and *Julie Maupin* provide an astute summary of the resolution of the Institut de droit international (IDI) in respect of perceived weaknesses in the functioning of the international treaty regime governing foreign direct investment. The issues discussed by the IDI, resulting in a subsequent Resolution, included: the relationship between BITs and customary international law; the issue of the parties' consent and the prerequisites of the selected arbitration mechanism; the interaction between international and domestic law under investment treaties; and new actors and problems in investment arbitration.

# PART I

## INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION AS PART OF THE TRANSNATIONAL JUSTICE SYSTEM





# The Transnational Protection of Private Rights

## Issues, Challenges, and Possible Solutions

*Sundaresh Menon\**

### I. Introduction

In the wake of the two World Wars that rocked the international order in the twentieth century, the right of nations to self-determination was enshrined in Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations.<sup>1</sup> Among the most important developments of the post-war era has been the disintegration of the colonial empires and a consequent massive increase in the number of states and polities.<sup>2</sup> With this came a proliferation of borders that each contained different sovereign legal systems and laws.

At the same time, the rebuilding and reconstruction of the post-war world created both the impetus and the opportunity to focus on development and economic growth.<sup>3</sup> So even as the number of *discrete* states and polities increased, the world witnessed a rapid increase in the *connectedness* of its economies and cultures. Thomas Friedman observed in his international bestseller, *The World is Flat*,<sup>4</sup> what might now be accepted as conventional wisdom: that increased connectivity has resulted in the accelerated flattening of the world, facilitating the phenomenon of globalization. But globalization occasions the need for a more homogenous and harmonized legal framework that can accommodate the vast increase in economic relationships which cross borders that might not previously have existed or been quite so firm.

With the fragmentation of the colonial empires and the ‘birth of scores of new states in the so-called Third World’,<sup>5</sup> developed and developing countries found themselves separated by massive gulfs in terms of their relative states of social, economic, and

\* This chapter is adapted from the Charles N Brower Lecture delivered on 10 April 2014. The views and ideas contained here are personal. I am deeply grateful to my colleague, Justin Yeo, Assistant Registrar of the Supreme Court, for the considerable assistance he gave me in the research and preparation of this lecture and for his valuable contributions to the ideas which are contained herein.

<sup>1</sup> Chapter I, Article 1, Part 2 of the UN Charter states that the purposes of the United Nations are, inter alia, ‘[t]o develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace’. See Charter of the United Nations (signed 26 June 1945, entered into force 24 October 1945) 1 UNTS 16, <<http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/chapter1.shtml>> accessed 22 July 2014.

<sup>2</sup> Malcolm Shaw, *International Law* (6th edn, Cambridge University Press 2008) 38.

<sup>3</sup> The post-Second World War economic expansion is widely recognized as a period of economic prosperity which occurred in the mid-twentieth century following the end of the Second World War in 1945.

<sup>4</sup> Thomas L Friedman, *The World Is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-First Century* (Farrar, Straus and Giroux 2005).

<sup>5</sup> Shaw (n 2) 38.

political development. In these circumstances, there were always going to be difficulties in attaining transnational harmonization in law, policy, and practice pertaining to commercial transactions.

At the dawn of a new millennium, we face the challenge of dealing, on a global scale, with movements in opposite directions. On the one hand, the emphasis on decolonization and self-determination in the post-war era has seen a movement *towards* building barriers and fixing legal and political boundaries between jurisdictions. On the other hand, globalization sees a movement to break economic barriers and transcend boundaries. While the first movement sees growth in the number of individual systems of law, the second calls for laws and legal systems that are not so tightly constrained by jurisdictional boundaries so that they can more effectively support the immense growth in transnational trade and commerce.

My focus today is on the legal protection of private economic rights in the transnational arena. The term ‘international economic law’ has been adopted as a shorthand reference for regulation in this immense field.<sup>6</sup> For conceptual and analytical clarity, I propose to approach my subject by considering the regulation of transnational economic relationships at three different levels:

- (i) first, where a party’s rights are not regulated or governed by any contract, but where there is nonetheless a need to protect one’s interests or rights in commercial property;
- (ii) second, where there is a contract between the parties, by which they look to protect their rights as between themselves; and
- (iii) third, where a foreign investor looks to protect its investment against unlawful interference by a host state.

These are not exhaustive of the range of regulatory mechanisms that affect transnational economic relationships. For instance, even though ‘international trade law’ (or ‘world trade law’)<sup>7</sup> relates to international rules and conventions that seek to manage trade relations between states, these do impact directly on individual actors. While this is certainly important in international commerce, I do not discuss it as a discrete category given the constraints of time, and instead focus on the three levels, which relate to private actors being *directly* involved in protecting their private economic rights.

<sup>6</sup> See, eg, the terminology adopted by the Legal Information Institute of the Cornell University Law School, Legal Information Institute, ‘International Economic Law’, <[http://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/international\\_economic\\_law](http://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/international_economic_law)> accessed 22 July 2014.

<sup>7</sup> The terminology ‘international trade law’ is adopted, inter alia, by the Legal Information Institute of the Cornell University Law School, <[http://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/international\\_economic\\_law](http://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/international_economic_law)> and <[http://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/International\\_trade](http://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/International_trade)> accessed 22 July 2014. The terminology ‘world trade law’ is adopted, inter alia, in text books, eg, Simon Lester, Bryan Mercurio, and Arwel Davies, *World Trade Law* (2nd edn, Hart Publishing 2012); Henrik Horn and Petros Mavroidis, *Legal and Economic Principles of World Trade Law* (Cambridge University Press 2013); in commentaries, eg, Peter-Tobias Stoll, *Max Planck Commentaries on World Trade Law* (Brill 2005); and by universities, eg, The National University of Singapore, Course Listing, <[http://www.law.nus.edu.sg/student\\_matters/course\\_listing/courses\\_desc.asp?MC=LL4060B&Sem=1](http://www.law.nus.edu.sg/student_matters/course_listing/courses_desc.asp?MC=LL4060B&Sem=1)> accessed 22 July 2014 (offering a course on ‘World Trade Law’).

I begin with a brief overview of the existing legal order at each of the three levels, focusing my observations and analyses on selected fields of law. I look to identify some of the key issues and thereafter close with a section where I share some thoughts on what might lie ahead.

## II. Issues and Challenges

### A. Level One: The Protection of Commercial Interests in the Absence of a Contractual Relationship

Contracts are the lifeblood of commerce. Yet, there are many instances where there is a need to protect commercial property in the absence of any contractual arrangements. This can arise in many discrete areas of law, including, for instance, the wide range of economic torts, such as conspiracy, trade libel, conversion, and so on.

I focus today on the transnational protection of intellectual property (IP) rights. IP is essentially a jurisdiction-bound area of law and the drawbacks that exist in this area are clearly exposed in an increasingly transnational marketplace.<sup>8</sup>

#### 1. Snapshot of the International IP Regime

IP rights are traditionally ‘territorial’ in nature.<sup>9</sup> They are conferred by individual jurisdictions for rights owners to reap, within that jurisdiction, the economic benefits of their protected subject matter. They had their genesis in a world that was vastly different from ours today, and may be traced at the very least to legislation in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries,<sup>10</sup> when there was hardly any need for the protection of IP rights to be robust across national borders. IP was mainly exploited within a limited geography and there was little scope for the extra-territorial infringement of IP rights. In these circumstances, the territorial nature of the regime did not pose much difficulty.

The incidence of cross-border IP interests has grown significantly in recent years.<sup>11</sup> There are numerous actors,<sup>12</sup> including the World Trade Organization (WTO) and

<sup>8</sup> See William Cornish, David Llewelyn, and Tanya Aplin, *Intellectual Property: Patents, Copyright, Trade Marks and Allied Rights* (8th edn, Sweet & Maxwell/Thomson Reuters 2013) para 1-31, where the learned authors suggest that IP law has wider associations with territoriality than other civil rights of action in general.

<sup>9</sup> Daniel Lifschitz, ‘The ACTA Boondoggle: When IP Harmonization Bites Off More Than It Can Chew’ (2011) 34 *Loy LA Int’l & Comp L Rev* 197, 201. It has been observed that the territorial nature of IP rights has several potential ramifications. For instance, the scope and validity of an IP right in a particular country may be determined by that country’s law independently of equivalent rights over the same subject matter in other countries; the IP right may only affect activities pursued within a particular geographical territory; the IP right may only be asserted by a particular country’s nationals and other persons as the national law permits; or the IP right may be asserted only in the courts of the country for which it is granted, *ibid*.

<sup>10</sup> Susanna H S Leong, *Intellectual Property Law of Singapore* (Academy Publishing 2013) paras 01.001 and 01.025.

<sup>11</sup> Benedatta Ubertazzi, *Exclusive Jurisdiction in Intellectual Property* (Mohr Siebeck 2012) 4; see also Marketa Trimble, ‘When Foreigners Infringe Patents: An Empirical Look at the Involvement of Foreign Defendants in Patent Litigation in the US’ (2011) 27 *Santa Clara Computer & High Tech L J* 499, 544, where the author notes that in the US Federal District courts, the number of IP cases involving at least one defendant from a foreign jurisdiction increased by 20% from 2004 to 2009.

<sup>12</sup> Graeme B Dinwoodie, ‘The International Intellectual Property Law System: New Actors, New Institutions, New Sources’ (2007) 10(2) *Marq Intell Prop L Rev* 205, 210.

the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), as well as state governments, national judiciaries, and national regulatory boards. There are also many new sources of law, including free trade agreements (FTAs), bilateral investment treaties (BITs),<sup>13</sup> and the jurisprudence of national courts. With so many different actors and sources of law, the need for harmonization of the international IP framework has been the subject of discussion for some time.

Developments in the technology patents industry provide a sign of our times. In the massive Apple-Samsung patent dispute, the late Steve Jobs memorably declared that he was willing to ‘go to thermonuclear war’, ‘spend[ing] [his] last dying breath’ and ‘every penny’ in Apple’s vast reserves to ‘right [Android’s] wrong’.<sup>14</sup> Apple commenced patent litigation against Samsung in April 2011, and by July 2012, the ‘thermonuclear war’ had reached the shores of the United States, South Korea, Japan, Germany, the United Kingdom, France, Italy, the Netherlands, and Australia.<sup>15</sup> At the last count, the two technology giants were involved in more than fifty lawsuits globally over claims for damages that ran into billions of dollars.

We should not be surprised if more such disputes follow. In fact, a whole new patent licensing industry has already emerged, with certain technology companies reverse-engineering new devices for the purpose of helping patent owners to prove that the devices of others infringe their patents.<sup>16</sup>

## *2. Some Difficulties with the International IP Framework*

Not only do these massive international IP disputes involve huge amounts of money, they also have to be fought in a multitude of jurisdictions, with potentially different standards being applied and different outcomes being reached.

### **(a) Lack of Common Standards**

While broad frameworks for the protection of IP rights are being harmonized to a growing extent arising from efforts to comply with the obligations under the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), there remains an essential lack of common standards. In part, this is because the application of the law by national courts has varied tremendously within those frameworks. How a particular state chooses to protect IP rights—which in essence are artificial monopolies—can depend heavily on its relative stage of economic

<sup>13</sup> Which typically impose TRIPS-plus standards, and which ratchets up the global standard through the TRIPS ‘Most-Favoured-Nation Treatment’ principle.

<sup>14</sup> Walter Isaacson, *Steve Jobs* (Simon & Schuster 2011) 512; see also ‘Steve Jobs Vowed to “Destroy” Android’ *BBC News* (21 October 2011), <<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/technology-15400984>> accessed 22 July 2014.

<sup>15</sup> Godfrey Lam, ‘Staging the Mobile Phone Wars’, 4th Judicial Seminar on Commercial Litigation (Singapore) (17 May 2013) para 6 (article on file with author).

<sup>16</sup> Kate Porter, ‘Ottawa Home to Robust, Controversial Patent Licensing Industry’ *CBC News* (26 November 2013), <<http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/ottawa/ottawa-home-to-robust-controversial-patent-licensing-industry-1.2440034>> accessed 22 July 2014.

development and indeed even on its moral or other values. As has been observed, while IP is largely a legal construct, it is not just about law and economics; it is often also about politics.<sup>17</sup>

In designing the international IP system, the balance sought is that ‘between universal norms and the national autonomy necessary to legislate a substantive balance appropriate to each nation-state’.<sup>18</sup> However, it is extremely difficult to attain meaningful international consensus on how that precise balance should be struck. This is unsurprising, given that the national strategic interests of the various states will often not be aligned. For instance, while the United States and the European Union have tried to encourage other countries to adopt higher IP enforcement standards through the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA), the increasingly powerful developing countries such as China, India, and Brazil have ‘shown no urgent desire’ to join such a system.<sup>19</sup> A particular example draws from the experience in the pharmaceutical industry. States economically dependent on pharmaceutical companies tend towards applying IP laws to protect those interests, while states facing increasing healthcare costs tend towards laws which keep healthcare affordable. The recent decision by the Indian Supreme Court, rejecting Novartis’ attempt to seek the evergreening of a pharmaceutical patent, illustrates the point.<sup>20</sup>

In researching this chapter, I did come across an example of the successful harmonization of IP standards in the Andean region.<sup>21</sup> It seems implausible that this can extend across a wide geography. Indeed, such harmonization was largely premised on factors that are far more likely to obtain in a regional rather than in an international context.<sup>22</sup> The Andean states were in similar states of development and therefore had similar interests in relation to IP policy. They were thus able to agree to a common set of laws which were clear, detailed, and precise. They were also able to agree on common adjudicatory mechanisms. As a check on the system, private actors were also allowed to file complaints against a member state’s alleged non-compliance. This confluence of factors which accounts for the extensive degree of agreement that was achieved in that instance is unlikely to occur in the international context in the foreseeable future.

### (b) Multiplicity of Proceedings

Second, as illustrated by the Apple-Samsung dispute, the multiplicity of proceedings across different jurisdictions is largely unavoidable with major transnational IP disputes. This arises because where there has been an alleged infringement of IP

<sup>17</sup> Peter K Yu, ‘ACTA and Its Complex Politics’ (2011) 3 WIPO J 1, 16.

<sup>18</sup> Dinwoodie (n 12) 206.

<sup>19</sup> Yu (n 17).

<sup>20</sup> *Novartis AG v Union of India & Others*, Civil Appeal No 2706-2716 of 2013 (Supreme Court of India) (1 April 2013), <<http://supremecourtindia.nic.in/outtoday/patent.pdf>> accessed 10 September 2014.

<sup>21</sup> Laurence R Helfer, Karen J Alter, and Florencia Guenzovich, ‘Islands of Effective International Adjudication: Constructing an Intellectual Property Rule of Law in the Andean Community’ (2009) 103(1) *Am J Int’l L* 1.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*

rights in more than one jurisdiction, the doctrine of *res judicata* does not always or necessarily apply.

Nor, as a matter of law, can there be *cause of action estoppel*. A French patent registration is a different juridical and legal creature from its English counterpart. A French judgment on the infringement of a French patent cannot give rise to cause of action estoppel between the same proprietor of the equivalent English rights and the same defendant who is performing equivalent acts in England because the basis of the cause of action is different in each case.<sup>23</sup> While there might arguably be *issue estoppel* where the same legal issue arises for determination and the same legal principle applies in both jurisdictions, this question remains largely unexplored in the case law.<sup>24</sup>

The multiplicity of proceedings gives rise to at least three major problems:

- (i) First, there is an immense strain on the resources of the parties. The cost of the Apple-Samsung wars is not known to the public, but one can be certain that the figures will be staggering. The same can safely be said about the pharmaceutical patent wars. While lawyers might not be complaining, one wonders if these vast amounts of money would not be better spent on innovation, research, and development.
- (ii) Second, the need to sustain or defend multiple proceedings potentially engenders injustice in view of economic inequalities between different commercial parties. Deep-pocketed multinational corporations might well be able to simultaneously finance large-scale litigation across numerous jurisdictions, but smaller enterprises might not be able to afford the cost involved in protecting their own IP in this way.<sup>25</sup>
- (iii) Third, national court systems are often called on to bear an immense cost to resolve such disputes.<sup>26</sup> The Australian leg of the Apple-Samsung dispute was so large that it necessitated an 'unprecedented' assignment of two federal court judges to hear the case at first instance.<sup>27</sup> The matter commenced in 2011, and the hearings before these two judges had an estimated end date in April 2014.<sup>28</sup> It might be anticipated that one or both parties could lodge an appeal as has

<sup>23</sup> Cornish et al (n 8) para 2-70.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid; although the learned authors cited *Bristol Myers v Beecham* [1978] FSR 553, which assumes the possibility of issue estoppel arising pursuant to a foreign judgment.

<sup>25</sup> Ubertazzi (n 11) 3.

<sup>26</sup> Litigation has numerous externalities, and the immense costs incurred by legal systems cannot be ignored. Steven Shavell notes that litigation involves two externalities: the litigant neither takes into account the legal costs that he causes others to incur, nor recognizes the associated effects on deterrence and other social benefits. Between 1960 and 1992, legal expenditures in the United States as a percentage of GDP grew from 0.523% to 1.47%: see Steven Shavell, 'The Fundamental Divergence between the Private and the Social Motive to use the Legal System' (1997) 26 J Legal Stud 575.

<sup>27</sup> The case filed in the Federal Court of Australia involved Apple claiming that Samsung infringed 19 of its patents on a total of 120 grounds, in nine smartphones and two tablets produced by Samsung. Samsung has claimed that Apple infringed several of its patents in some iPhone and iPad models: see James Hutchinson, 'Legal Twist in Apple, Samsung Case' *Financial Review* (25 February 2013), <[http://www.afr.com/p/technology/apple\\_samsung\\_patent\\_hearing\\_unprecedented\\_5ubyczd0dP9yFHfzmlsiqM](http://www.afr.com/p/technology/apple_samsung_patent_hearing_unprecedented_5ubyczd0dP9yFHfzmlsiqM)> accessed 22 July 2014.

<sup>28</sup> Mark Summerfield, 'What's up Down Under with Apple and Samsung?' (18 November 2013), <<http://blog.patentology.com.au/2013/11/whats-up-down-under-with-apple-and-samsung/>> accessed 22 July 2014.

been done throughout the interlocutory stages of the matter. Will a jurisdiction less wealthy than Australia be able to devote such judicial resources to settle a battle between deep-pocketed multinational corporations? And in any case, should taxpayers be financing judicial systems that are deployed to resolve these wars? This is an important question because national courts generally do not recover the full costs of running their operations.

All this must also be seen in light of the fact that commercial realities may impose immense time pressure on the parties and the courts to resolve their multi-billion-dollar law suits within a relatively short period of time.<sup>29</sup>

### 3. *Brief Conclusion*

It has been said that the ability to enforce IP rights on a transnational basis is crucial for their effective protection.<sup>30</sup> However, there remains a conspicuous lack of harmonization on the important issues of jurisdiction and applicable law, as well as the recognition and enforcement of judgments in the context of IP rights.<sup>31</sup>

In light of the modern reality that invention, innovation, and originality are increasingly realized on a far more international and collaborative basis, the lack of harmonization in the international IP regime and the jurisdiction-bound framework for the protection of IP rights stand as drawbacks or shortcomings in the supportive machinery for this aspect of transnational commerce.

## B. Level Two: The Protection of Commercial Interests through Contracts

I move to the second level of the transnational protection of private rights, where the parties look to protect their commercial interests through contracts. In this area, certainly in the post-war era and especially in the last three decades or so, international commercial arbitration has become the mechanism of choice.<sup>32</sup> In some cases, these contracts might instead provide for disputes to be resolved through the courts. Where this is so, as the situation now stands, many of the issues raised in the previous section will arise and I do not repeat those observations here.

### 1. *Snapshot of International Commercial Arbitration*

The rise in transnational contractual arrangements inevitably spawned a corresponding increase in disputes between parties from different jurisdictions and this gave

<sup>29</sup> Lam (n 15) para 50.

<sup>30</sup> Ubertaini (n 11) 3.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid 1–2.

<sup>32</sup> In this regard, it was observed in the 1980 edition of the American Bar Association's journal that: '[f]ostered by the demands of an expanding international commerce, by the businessman's traditional distrust of foreign adjudication, and by numerous court decisions upholding its awards, international arbitration is distinctly in vogue'; see Francis J Higgins, William G Brown, and Patrick J Roach, 'Pitfalls in International Commercial Arbitration' (1980) 35 *The Business Lawyer* 1035; see also Richard M Mosk, 'Trends in International Arbitration' (2011) 18 *SW J Int'l L* 103, 105.



rise to calls for a dispute resolution system that had at least two primary characteristics. First, there had to be a neutral forum for the resolution of disputes, so as to minimise the concern that disputes would be resolved in the unfamiliar judicial and legal terrain of a foreign land.<sup>33</sup> Second, decisions had to be clothed with cross-border enforceability.

The latter provided the impetus that led to the emergence of the 1958 Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (New York Convention), and with it, international arbitration became a viable system of international commercial dispute resolution. In contrast to perceptions concerning litigation in national courts, arbitration promises neutrality, international enforceability of awards, flexibility, and confidentiality.<sup>34</sup> It also held the promise (at least initially) of a faster and less expensive form of dispute resolution, as well as the avoidance of some of the complexity and excessive legalism and formality of traditional judicial proceedings.<sup>35</sup>

Parties began to turn to international arbitral tribunals for relief, with national courts serving as supplemental aids to support those arbitral proceedings.<sup>36</sup> By the turn of the millennium, arbitration had become a commonplace mode of dispute resolution provided for in an immense range of commercial arrangements,<sup>37</sup> and by the end of the first decade of the new millennium, arbitration perhaps had become ‘the preferred method of resolving international commercial disputes’.<sup>38</sup> There is empirical evidence to support this in the impressive statistics put forward by arbitral institutes.

## *2. Some Difficulties with International Commercial Arbitration*

But even as international commercial arbitration might be seen as the preferred mechanism for resolving cross-border transactional disputes, a targeted survey of corporate counsel published in 2013 by the School of International Arbitration at Queen Mary, University of London, bears noting. The report indicates that corporate counsel

<sup>33</sup> See, eg, Steven Seidenberg, ‘International Arbitration Loses Its Grip’ (April 2010) American Bar Association Journal, <[http://www.abajournal.com/magazine/article/international\\_arbitration\\_loses\\_its\\_grip/](http://www.abajournal.com/magazine/article/international_arbitration_loses_its_grip/)> accessed 22 July 2014, where the author notes that arbitration ‘offers parties a neutral forum, where neither side has the “home court” advantage of litigating in its nation’s courts’; see also ‘International Arbitration: Corporate Attitudes and Practices’ Queen Mary, University of London (School of International Arbitration) (2006) 5, <[http://www.pwc.be/en\\_BE/be/publications/ia-study-pwc-06.pdf](http://www.pwc.be/en_BE/be/publications/ia-study-pwc-06.pdf)> accessed 22 July 2014, which states: ‘So why do nine out of ten corporations seek to avoid transnational litigation? The most common explanation is anxiety about litigating under a foreign law before a court far from home, with a lack of familiarity with local court procedures and language.’

<sup>34</sup> Alan Redfern and Martin Hunter, *Law and Practice of International Commercial Arbitration* (2nd edn, Sweet & Maxwell 1991) paras 1-42, 1-43, 1-44, and 1-53.

<sup>35</sup> Higgins et al (n 32) 1036.

<sup>36</sup> See, eg, Art 9 of the UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration (1985).

<sup>37</sup> Sundaresh Menon, ‘Transnational Commercial Law: Realities, Challenges and a Call for Meaningful Convergence’, Keynote Address at the 26th LAWASIA Conference and the 15th Biennial Conference of Chief Justices of Asia and the Pacific (27–30 October 2013) para 23.

<sup>38</sup> Seidenberg (n 33). Commentators have gone so far as to state that international arbitration has become the established method of determining international commercial disputes: see, eg, Alan Redfern and Martin Hunter, *Law and Practice of International Commercial Arbitration* (4th edn, Sweet & Maxwell 2004) para 1-01, where it was pointed out that the International Chamber of Commerce recorded 344 requests for arbitration in 1986 and 580 requests in 2003; Susan D Franck, ‘The Role of International Arbitrators’ (2005–06) 12 ILSA J Int’l & Comp L 499.

refers 47% of their international disputes to arbitration and this is the same proportion that is referred to litigation.<sup>39</sup> Even allowing for the fact that arbitration might not be an option for the parties in many of these cases due to the absence of arbitral agreements, or because the subject matter is not arbitrable, and so on,<sup>40</sup> the statistic does seem surprising.

Certainly, in the course of the last couple of years, there has been a chorus, perhaps a cacophony of voices, suggesting that this might be due to a number of issues that threaten the continuing vitality of international commercial arbitration. I briefly touch on four areas.

#### (a) Judicialization, Delay, Laboriousness, and Rising Costs

Among the more frequently raised concerns is the contention that international commercial arbitration has lost its edge in avoiding the delays, contentiousness, and costliness of judicial trials. The flexibility and relative informality of arbitration was once its key advantage.<sup>41</sup> Ironically, that flexibility might allow the practitioners of arbitration to create highly litigious and legalistic proceedings that increasingly simulate or even surpass litigation in terms of the amount of time required to complete the dispute resolution process and with it, the amount it will ultimately cost. Arbitration is increasingly 'formal, costly, time-consuming, and subject to hardball advocacy'.<sup>42</sup> Litigation seems to have percolated into the groundwater of arbitration, resulting in a marriage of convenience that some have called 'arbitigation'<sup>43</sup> or 'off-shore litigation'.<sup>44</sup>

What is perhaps surprising is that the criticism levelled at arbitration on the ground that it is characterized to an increasing degree by 'judicialization'<sup>45</sup> or 'legalisation'<sup>46</sup> is not a wholly new development. A quarter of a century ago in 1989, Lord Mustill observed that commercial arbitration was developing into a process with 'all the elephantine laboriousness of an action in court, without the saving grace of the exasperated judge's power to bang together the heads of recalcitrant parties'.<sup>47</sup>

<sup>39</sup> 2013 International Arbitration Survey conducted by the School of International Arbitration at Queen Mary, University of London, 'Corporate Choices in International Arbitration: Industry Perspectives' (2013) 7, <<http://www.pwc.com/gx/en/arbitration-dispute-resolution/assets/pwc-international-arbitration-study.pdf>> accessed 22 July 2014.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid, which notes that: 'Several interviewees commented that, for certain cases, the use of litigation is unavoidable. This is because arbitration is sometimes unavailable by operation of law—for example, in non-contractual claims like breach of patent rights, as well as in potentially non-arbitrable disputes (eg in employment).'

<sup>41</sup> See, eg, *ibid*.

<sup>42</sup> This statement was made in Thomas J Stipanowich, 'Arbitration: The "New Litigation"' (2010) U Ill L Rev 1, 8, in the context of American business arbitration, but it applies similarly to international commercial arbitration. This view is also supported by *ibid*, 5, 21–2; see also Higgins et al (n 32) 1042 (recognizing that whether arbitration is more or less costly than court adjudication may depend on the precise ambit of discovery obligations and procedures).

<sup>43</sup> L Tyrone Holt, 'Whither Arbitration? What Can Be Done to Improve Arbitration and Keep Out Litigation's Ill Effects' (2009) 7 DePaul Bus & Comp L J 455 (citing Jeffrey W Stempel, 'Forgetfulness, Fuzziness, Functionality, Fairness, and Freedom in Dispute Resolution: Serving Dispute Resolution through Adjudication' (2003) 3 Nev L J 305, 314).

<sup>44</sup> Elena V Helmer, 'International Commercial Arbitration: Americanized, "Civilized", or Harmonized?' (2003) 19(1) Ohio St J Disp Resol 35, 46.

<sup>45</sup> Stipanowich (n 42) 8; Helmer (n 44) 36.

<sup>46</sup> Helmer (n 44) 36.

<sup>47</sup> Stipanowich (n 42) 23 (citing Michael John Mustill, 'Arbitration: History and Background' (1989) 6 J Int'l Arb 43, 56).

How did this come to pass? There are a number of reasons for this, and I venture three:

- (i) First, the adversarial influence of Anglo-American legal practice has perhaps contributed to the transplantation of legalistic litigation methods, practices, and strategies into international commercial arbitration.<sup>48</sup>
- (ii) Second, the increasing formality of arbitration today probably has much to do with the reality of the commercial world. Large commercial transactions featuring multiple parties and contracts have become far more common today<sup>49</sup> and the disputed amounts are now 'regularly in the hundreds of millions or even billions'.<sup>50</sup> With the stakes going up, winning has become all-important and all-consuming.
- (iii) Third, much delay and laboriousness might arise out of the absence of appellate mechanisms. The lack of an avenue for appeal is traditionally justified on the ground that finality is achieved more quickly. But as the practice of arbitration evolved, the absence of appeals has encouraged parties to approach the process as a 'one shot' contest in which the winner takes all, and parties pour extensive resources into the battle. One might question the efficiency of such a process as compared to the traditional mechanisms where issues are distilled as they progress through the appellate ladder with greater focus and precision at each rung. The absence of appeals has also diverted more attention towards the setting aside of arbitral awards. Setting aside an award is a limited opening that offers possible recourse for a disgruntled party, but the success of an application to set aside an award depends in large measure on the supervisory court's approach towards arbitration in general and how it interprets the circumstances of each case in particular.<sup>51</sup> Arbitrators are generally keen to avoid even tenuous grounds for the setting aside of an award, and so as to 'bullet-proof' the award, there is sometimes a tendency to be more liberal in admitting evidence, allowing more extensive document production processes, and granting extended hearing time.<sup>52</sup>

#### **(b) Lack of Ethical Standards**

A second area of concern pertains to whether there is a need for a widely accepted set of ethical standards or guidelines in the context of international commercial arbitration. In the past, arbitration was a small industry that could be effectively governed by implied understandings among actors in the industry. But the internationalization of

<sup>48</sup> Ibid; George M von Mehren and Alana C Jochum, 'Is International Arbitration Becoming Too American?' (2011) 2 *Global Business Law Review* 47, 49–50; Roger P Alford, 'The American Influence on International Arbitration' (2003) 19(1) *Ohio St J Disp Resol* 69; Helmer (n 44) 46.

<sup>49</sup> S I Strong, 'Increasing Legalism in International Commercial Arbitration: A New Theory of Causes, a New Approach to Cures' (2013) 7(2) *World Arbitration & Mediation Review* 117, 119.

<sup>50</sup> Seidenberg (n 33). The author was citing the view of Joseph R Profaizer, of counsel to Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker in Washington, DC.

<sup>51</sup> Toby Landau QC, 'Opening Keynote Address at the Singapore International Arbitration Forum' (2 December 2013).

<sup>52</sup> Stipanowich (n 42) 13, 15.

arbitration has resulted in an exponential increase in the number of arbitral institutions, cases, and practitioners. It is impossible for the industry to continue to depend on implied norms, understandings, peer standards, and shared values when these might no longer exist. The absence of widely accepted standards must enhance the risk of unpredictability in how this great diversity of practitioners might conduct themselves.

### (c) Unpredictability in Enforcement Due to Ad Hoc Nature of Courts' Oversight

A third area of concern is the ad hoc nature of national courts' oversight of arbitration, the inherent consequence of which is that from time to time there will be inconsistent and even conflicting results in enforcement. The *Dallah* cases<sup>53</sup> provide a good illustration of this point, where the English and French apex courts were separately called upon to decide the issue of whether the Government of Pakistan was bound by the arbitration agreement, notwithstanding that it was not, in terms, a party to the contract. On identical legal issues and identical facts, the apex courts in these two countries came to diametrically opposed conclusions on the enforceability of the award.

As we in the Singapore Court of Appeal recently observed, while the New York Convention sets out a common framework with a common set of grounds for the enforceability of awards, the enforceability of a particular award ultimately depends on the interpretation that is placed on those grounds by national courts.<sup>54</sup>

### (d) Unpredictability in Arbitral Decisions Due to Lack of Jurisprudence

I mention a final area of concern, namely the lack of consistency and predictability that might sometimes stem from the lack of publicly available jurisprudence.

It is true that there is a growing body of *lex arbitralis materialis* containing transnational substantive rules which arbitrators can draw upon or refer to in deciding disputes.<sup>55</sup> International commercial arbitral tribunals increasingly refer to and rely on other awards as precedents in their decision-making processes.<sup>56</sup>

But the coherence of jurisprudence emanating from tribunals remains challenged by the confidentiality of arbitral proceedings, as well as the absence of appeal and error-correction mechanisms. As an increasing number of major and complex commercial cases are heard by arbitral tribunals rather than by municipal appellate courts,<sup>57</sup> this threatens to hinder the development of a coherent freestanding body of substantive international commercial law, and over time, this must add to the cost of transnational trade.

<sup>53</sup> See *Dallah Real Estate and Tourism Holding Co v Ministry of Religious Affairs of the Government of Pakistan* [2011] 1 AC 763.

<sup>54</sup> *PT First Media TBK (formerly known as PT Broadband Multimedia TBK) v Astro Nusantara International BV* [2014] 1 SLR 372, 75.

<sup>55</sup> Menon (n 37) para 29 (citing Loukas Mistelis, 'Unidroit Principles Applied as "Most Appropriate Rules of Law" in a Swedish Arbitral Award' (2003) III(3) Uniform L Rev 631).

<sup>56</sup> Ibid (citing Emmanuel Gaillard and John Savage (eds), *Fouchard, Gaillard, Goldman on International Commercial Arbitration* (Kluwer Law International 1999) 802).

<sup>57</sup> Mosk (n 32) 107.