

International Investment Law and Arbitration

Commentary, Awards and other Materials

C. L. Lim, Jean Ho and
Martins Paparinskis

An abstract graphic at the bottom of the cover featuring layered, wavy shapes in various shades of blue and white, resembling a stylized landscape or watercolor wash.

CAMBRIDGE

International Investment Law and Arbitration

COMMENTARY, AWARDS AND OTHER MATERIALS

What was once a contested body of principles applied peripherally to the international settlement of expropriation disputes has been transformed and in its place now stands an important area of international disputes practice. *International Investment Law and Arbitration* offers a comprehensive introduction to the subject. Presenting the facts of daily legal practice and the largely unaltered aims of the subject alongside a broad selection of key awards and original materials, historical developments are discussed in the context of the changing directions in the arbitral jurisprudence and current treaty and arbitration reform debate. Accessible and engaging commentary is integrated throughout, end of chapter questions test reader understanding and further reading lists support and encourage exploration of the subject. Suitable for postgraduate law students studying modules on international investment arbitration, *International Investment Law and Arbitration* offers an indispensable introduction to the subject.

CHIN LENG LIM is Professor of Law and a Member of Court and the Senate of the University of Hong Kong. He is Choh-Ming Li Professor-Elect at the Chinese University of Hong Kong, Visiting Professor at King's College London and practises as a barrister from chambers in London at Keating Chambers. He once served as a government international law counsel and with the United Nations Compensation Commission in Geneva.

JEAN HO is Assistant Professor of Law at the National University of Singapore. She had previously practised international investment law and arbitration at Shearman & Sterling LLP. She is a Member of the BIICL's Investment Treaty Forum and an Expert on the UNIDROIT Working Group on Land Investment Contracts.

MARTINS PAPARINSKIS is Reader in Public International Law at University College London, Faculty of Laws. He is the Book Review Editor of *Journal of World Investment and Trade*, a member of the Panel of Arbitrators of the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes, a member of the Permanent Court of Arbitration, and a member of the management board of the EU Fundamental Rights Agency.

International Investment Law and Arbitration

COMMENTARY, AWARDS AND OTHER
MATERIALS

Chin Leng Lim

The University of Hong Kong

Jean Ho

National University of Singapore

Martins Paparinskis

University College London



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre, New Delhi – 110025, India

79 Anson Road, #06–04/06, Singapore 079906

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107180338

DOI: [10.1017/9781316847954](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316847954)

© Chin Leng Lim, Jean Ho and Martins Paparinskis 2018

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2018

Printed in the United Kingdom by Clays Ltd.

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Lim, C. L. (Chin L.), author. | Ho, Jean, author. | Paparinskis, Martins, author.

Title: International investment law and arbitration : commentary, awards, and other materials / Chin Leng Lim, The University of Hong Kong; Jean Ho, National University of Singapore; Martins Paparinskis, University College London.

Description: Cambridge [UK] ; New York : Cambridge University Press, [2017]

Identifiers: LCCN 2017033079 | ISBN 9781107180338

Subjects: LCSH: Investments, Foreign (International law) | International commercial arbitration. | Investments, Foreign – Law and legislation.

Classification: LCC K3830 .L525 2017 | DDC 346/.092–dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2017033079>

ISBN 978-1-107-18033-8 Hardback

ISBN 978-1-316-63220-8 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Contents

Foreword [xiii](#)

Preface [xv](#)

Acknowledgments [xvi](#)

Table of Treaties, National Legislation, Cases and Awards [xvii](#)

List of Abbreviations [xlii](#)

1. The Origins of Investment Protection and International Investment Law [1](#)
 - Chapter Outline [1](#)
 - Introduction [2](#)
 1. Diplomatic Espousal, Mixed and Other Similar Commissions [2](#)
 - 1.1 Diplomatic Espousal [2](#)
 - 1.2 Diplomatic Espousal and Diplomatic Settlement [4](#)
 - 1.3 Mixed International Commissions, National Commissions and Modern Claims Settlement [5](#)
 2. Legal Uncertainty and the Conflicting Attempts to Restate the Law in the United Nations (1945–1970s) [10](#)
 - 2.1 Legal Chaos [10](#)
 - 2.2 Efforts at the United Nations [14](#)
 3. The Creature of the 'Internationalised' Contract [22](#)
 4. Reaching for Treaty-Based Investor–State Arbitration [24](#)
 5. ICSID, International Courts and Other Modern Institutions [26](#)
 6. The Nature of Investment Treaty Arbitration and the Sources of the International Law on Foreign Investment [31](#)
 - Conclusion [34](#)
 - Questions [35](#)
 - Suggestions for Further Reading [36](#)
2. Investment Contracts and Internationalisation [37](#)
 - Chapter Outline [37](#)
 - Introduction [37](#)
 1. Key Awards on Internationalisation [39](#)
 2. The Backlash against Internationalisation [50](#)
 3. Types of Investment Contracts [52](#)

3.1	Natural Resource Concessions	52
3.2	Public Service Concessions	53
3.3	Build-Operate-and-Transfer (BOT) Contracts	54
3.4	Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs)	54
	Conclusion	55
	Questions	55
	Suggestions for Further Reading	56
3.	The Metamorphosis of Investment Treaties	57
	Chapter Outline	57
	Introduction	57
1.	Creation: 1959–1990	59
1.1	The Earliest Investment Treaties	61
1.2	The ICSID Convention	63
1.3	Draft Multilateral Investment Treaties	64
2.	Accelerated Growth: 1990s–2007	66
2.1	Partial Convergence in Treaty Content	67
2.2	Claims against Host States and <i>Jurisprudence (In)constante</i>	70
3.	'Resistance and Change': 2007 and Beyond	73
3.1	Cracks in the Investment Treaty Regime	73
3.2	Changes in the Investment Treaty Regime	78
	Conclusion	83
	Questions	84
	Suggestions for Further Reading	85
4.	Investment Dispute Settlement	86
	Chapter Outline	86
	Introduction	86
1.	Investment Arbitration as a Principal Means of Settlement Today	87
1.1	An Unusual Feature in Investment Arbitration	87
1.2	'Arbitration without Privity'	88
2.	Consent to Investment Arbitration	94
2.1	Forms of Consent and Agreement to Investment Arbitration	94
2.2	The Writing Requirement	97
3.	<i>Electa una Via</i> ('Fork in the Road') Clauses, 'No U-Turn' Clauses and Other Procedural Preconditions	100
3.1	Dispute Clauses and Procedural Preconditions	100
3.2	Exhaustion of Local Remedies	100
3.3	'Fork in the Road' Clauses, 'No U-Turn' Clauses and the Problem of Parallel Proceedings	101
4.	Contractual Forum Selection Clauses	104
5.	The Call for a Return to Adjudication, and Other Investment Dispute Settlement Bodies	105
6.	ICSID versus Ad Hoc Arbitration	106
	Conclusion	110
	Questions	111
	Suggestions for Further Reading	111

5. Jurisdiction, Admissibility and Parallel Proceedings	112
Chapter Outline	112
Introduction	112
1. 'Jurisdiction' and 'Admissibility'	114
2. Consequences of the Distinction	121
2.1 No Consequence	121
2.2 Consequence for Post-Request Developments	122
2.3 Consequence for Handling Objections	123
2.4 Consequence for Stay	123
2.5 Consequence for Challenges	124
3. Procedure for Addressing Objections to Jurisdiction and Admissibility	124
3.1 Bifurcation between Preliminary Objections and Merits	124
3.2 Claims Manifestly without Legal Merit	126
4. Objections to Jurisdiction and Admissibility	128
4.1 Investor	128
4.2 State	130
4.3 Investment	130
4.4 Consent and Other Issues	131
5. Parallel Proceedings	132
5.1 Consent by Disputing Parties	133
5.2 Special Treaty Rules	133
5.3 No Issue	134
5.4 Sequential Proceedings: Collateral Estoppel/ <i>Res Judicata</i>	135
5.5 Parallel Proceedings: Abuse of Process	137
5.6 Remedies	139
Conclusion	141
Questions	143
Suggestions for Further Reading	143
 6. Applicable Laws	 144
Chapter Outline	144
Introduction	144
1. <i>Lex causae</i>	145
1.1 Sources of Laws	145
1.2 Interplay of Laws	150
1.2.1 Configuration 1 – Matching Each Head of Claim to Its Governing Law	150
1.2.2 Configuration 2 – <i>Renvoi</i> to National Law	151
1.2.3 Configuration 3 – Composite National-International Law	153
1.3 Arbitral Mandate and Choice-of-Laws	155
2. <i>Lex arbitri</i>	156
3. <i>Lex loci arbitri</i>	161
Conclusion	163
Questions	163
Suggestions for Further Reading	164

7. Evidence	165
Chapter Outline	165
Introduction	165
1. The Burden of Proof	166
1.1 Onus Probandi Actori Incumbit	166
1.2 The 'Vanishing' Burden	167
1.2.1 The <i>RosInvestCo</i> Arbitration	168
1.2.2 The <i>Hulley, Yukos</i> and <i>Veteran Petroleum</i> Arbitrations	170
1.3 The 'Shifting' Burden	172
2. The Standard of Proof	174
2.1 Balance of Probabilities	174
2.2 Circumstantial Evidence	174
2.3 No Evidence	177
Conclusion	179
Questions	180
Suggestions for Further Reading	180
8. Provisional Measures	181
Chapter Outline	181
Introduction	182
1. Interim Measures and Sovereign Respondents	183
2. Recourse to National Courts and the Power of ICSID Tribunals	186
3. Other Types of Relief	192
4. The Test Applied by Tribunals	197
Conclusion	208
Questions	208
Suggestions for Further Reading	209
9. Protected Investments	210
Chapter Outline	210
Introduction	210
1. The Subjective Meaning of Protected Investments	211
2. The Objective Meaning of Protected Investments	218
2.1 The ICSID Tests	219
2.2 The Non-ICSID Test	221
3. The Dual Meaning of Protected Investments	223
3.1 Binding Objective Criteria	224
3.2 Illustrative Objective Criteria	226
Conclusion	230
Questions	231
Suggestions for Further Reading	231
10. Protected Investors	232
Chapter Outline	232
Introduction	232
1. Nationality-Based Eligibility for Protection	234
1.1 Form – Critical Date(s) of Nationality Possession	235
1.2 Substance – Circumstances of Nationality Acquisition	236

1.2.1 'Round-Tripping'	236
1.2.2 Litigation-Oriented Nationality Acquisition	238
2. Individual Investors	239
2.1 Authentication of Nationality	239
2.2 Dual Nationality/Permanent Residents	241
3. Corporate Investors	244
3.1 Place of Incorporation	244
3.2 Foreign Control	247
4. 'Divisible' Investors	251
Conclusion	255
Questions	256
Suggestions for Further Reading	257
11. Fair and Equitable Treatment, and Full Protection and Security	258
Chapter Outline	258
Introduction	258
1. Relationship with an International Minimum Standard of Treatment	259
1.1 The 'Minimum Standard' of Treatment	259
1.2 Fair and Equitable Treatment	260
1.3 Full Protection and Security	262
2. The Heads of Claim under FET and FPS, Their Evolution and Inter-Relationship	263
2.1 Heads of Claim under FET	263
2.1.1 Arbitrary and Discriminatory Treatment	263
2.1.2 Violation of Due Process and Lack of Transparency	264
2.1.3 Is There a Requirement of 'Bad Faith' on the Part of the Host State?	266
2.1.4 Recent Developments in the Scope of the FET Rule: Protecting Investors' Legitimate Expectations, and the Stability of the Business and Legal Environment Surrounding the Investment	268
2.2 Full Protection and Security	278
2.3 Inter-Relationship of FET and FPS beyond Physical Security	281
3. 'Narrowing Down' FET: Some Recent Examples of Treaty Clauses	283
4. 'Qualified' and 'Unqualified' Treaty Clauses, and the Interaction of Treaty and Custom	284
4.1 NAFTA and the 'North American' Model of 'Qualified' Treaty Clauses	284
4.2 'Unqualified' FET Treaty Clauses and Their Relationship with International Custom	287
Conclusion	291
Questions	292
Suggestions for Further Reading	292
12. Contingent Standards: National Treatment and Most-Favoured Nation Treatment	293
Chapter Outline	293
Introduction	293
1. Nine Lives of National Treatment	295
1.1 National Treatment	295
1.2 Expropriation	297
1.3 Fair and Equitable Treatment	297
1.4 Other Examples	298
2. Interpretation and Application of National Treatment	299
2.1 Like Circumstances	300

2.2	Distinctions in Treatment	304
2.3	Justification	306
3.	Most-Favoured Nation Treatment and Primary Obligations	309
4.	Most-Favoured Nation Treatment and International Dispute Settlement	314
4.1	Applicable, with Public Policy Exceptions	316
4.2	Inapplicable, Unless Explicitly Provided for	317
4.3	Applicable to Admissibility, But Not Jurisdiction	318
4.4	Applicable to Objectively Unfavourable Treatment	319
4.5	Recent Developments	320
	Conclusion	321
	Questions	322
	Suggestions for Further Reading	322
13.	Expropriation	323
	Chapter Outline	323
	Introduction	323
1.	The Object of Expropriation	324
1.1	Property Rights	325
1.2	Contractual Rights	326
1.2.1	Contract as Property	327
1.2.2	Sovereign Contractual Interference	329
1.3	Shareholder Rights	332
2.	The Existence of Expropriation	334
2.1	Direct Expropriation	334
2.2	Indirect Expropriation	335
3.	The Legality of Expropriation	338
3.1	Public Purpose	338
3.2	Compensation	339
3.2.1	The Rule of Compensation for Expropriation	339
3.2.2	The First Exception to the Rule of Compensation for Expropriation: Investment Valued at Nil	341
3.2.3	The Second Exception to the Rule of Compensation for Expropriation: Regulatory Taking	342
3.3	Due Process	342
3.4	Circumstances Precluding Wrongfulness and Non-Precluded Measures	344
	Conclusion	346
	Questions	347
	Suggestions for Further Reading	348
14.	Umbrella Clauses	349
	Chapter Outline	349
	Introduction	349
1.	The Umbrella Clause	350
2.	The Awards	352
2.1	<i>SGS v. Pakistan</i>	352
2.2	<i>SGS v. Philippines</i>	355
2.3	A Matter of Treaty Construction?	357
2.4	The Spectre of 'the Two "SGS" Arbitrations' Lurks	363

2.5 Distinguishing Treaty Law from Contract Law	366
2.6 Forum Selection Clauses	368
3. Examples of Umbrella Clauses	369
Conclusion	372
Questions	373
Suggestions for Further Reading	373
15. Defences	374
Chapter Outline	374
Introduction	374
1. Concept of Defences	376
2. Defences in Obligations	381
3. Defences in Exceptions	383
3.1 Non-Precluded-Measures Clause	383
3.2 Modern Exceptions	387
4. Defences in Circumstances Precluding Wrongfulness	389
4.1 Consent	390
4.2 Countermeasures	392
4.3 Necessity	395
4.4 Consequences	397
Conclusion	399
Questions	400
Suggestions for Further Reading	400
16. Remedies	401
Chapter Outline	401
Introduction	401
1. The Principle of Full Reparation for Internationally Wrongful Acts	402
2. Compensation and Restitution	403
2.1 Compensation for Expropriation	404
2.2 Compensation for Violations of Other Treaty Standards	406
2.3 Moral and Punitive Damages	408
3. Methods of Valuation	410
3.1 Discounted Cash Flow (DCF)	411
3.2 <i>Damnum Emergens Plus Lucrum Cessans</i> (DELIC)	417
4. Interest	422
Conclusion	423
Questions	424
Suggestions for Further Reading	424
17. Costs and Legal Fees	425
Chapter Outline	425
Introduction	425
1. The Question of Costs in the Context of Investment Arbitration	426
2. Types of Costs	427
2.1 'Arbitration Costs' or 'Costs of the Proceedings'	427
2.2 'Legal' or 'Party' Costs	429
3. Cost Allocation by the Tribunal	430

3.1	UNCITRAL and ICSID Rules	430
3.2	Tribunal Considerations	431
4.	The 'Loser-Pays' Principle, or 'Costs after the Event'	434
5.	Security for Costs	440
	Conclusion	444
	Questions	446
	Suggestions for Further Reading	446
18.	Challenging and Enforcing Awards, and the Question of Foreign State Immunities	447
	Chapter Outline	447
	Introduction	447
1.	ICSID and 'Non-ICSID' Awards	448
2.	'Non-ICSID' Arbitration	449
3.	ICSID Arbitration	452
4.	Foreign State Immunity, Act of State and Non-Justiciability	460
	4.1 Foreign State immunity	460
	4.2 Pleas of Act of State and Non-Justiciability	466
5.	Attachment of Assets: The 'Final Refuge'	474
	Conclusion	476
	Questions	476
	Suggestions for Further Reading	476
19.	New Directions in International Investment Law and Arbitration	477
	Chapter Outline	477
	Introduction	477
1.	The Backlash	479
	1.1 The Backlash to NAFTA and in the United States, 2001–2004	479
	1.2 The Global Backlash Begins in Earnest, 2007–Date	483
	1.3 The Treaty Terminations Begin	491
2.	The New Treaty Clauses	495
	2.1 Reforming Treaty Substantive Rules in Recent Treaties	496
	2.1.1 Reforming the FET Rule	496
	2.1.2 Reforming the Expropriation Rule	498
	2.1.3 Other Innovations in Substantive Standards of Treaty Protection	499
	2.2 Procedural Innovations	500
3.	The European Proposal for a Multilateral Investment Court	504
	Conclusion	513
	Questions	513
	Suggestions for Further Reading	513
	<i>Index</i>	515

Foreword

International investment law and arbitration commands global interest. It is the arena in which investor-State dispute settlement unfolds, a taught subject at the undergraduate and postgraduate levels, a field of practice, an academic pursuit, and even a political campaign. Shaped by general international law, investment treaties, arbitral *jurisprudence* and academic writings, international investment law and arbitration is as dynamic as its constituent variables. The variety of viewpoints on virtually every legal issue sustains an intense, ongoing international dialogue. Yet, this variety also poses a serious challenge to the systematic study of international investment law and arbitration.

This book is the first to synthesise the moving parts of international investment law and arbitration into a comprehensive narrative with a hybrid casebook-textbook format. By pairing carefully curated extracts from voluminous Awards and other documents with original commentary and analysis, Lim, Ho and Paparinskis deftly enhance the informative value of a traditional casebook with the explanatory value of a traditional textbook. And in doing so, they have written a book that gives their readers the best of both worlds.

Relying on their significant combined teaching, publishing and practical experience, Lim, Ho and Paparinskis deconstruct the many legal complexities and controversies of international investment law and arbitration in nineteen meticulous and engaging chapters. *International Investment Law and Arbitration: Commentary, Awards and Other Materials* fills the niche in the market for a compact general treatise which strikes a fine balance between doctrinal rigour and practical relevance. It is a book that both students and specialists will find accessible and instructive.

This remarkable first edition is an indispensable resource and an important contribution to the mastery of a prominent discipline.

Emmanuel Gaillard

Global Head of International Arbitration, Shearman & Sterling LLP

Professeur agrégé des Facultés de droit

Professor of Law, Sciences Po Law School

Visiting Professor of Law, Yale Law School

Paris, France

Preface

The past two decades epitomised the emergence of international investment arbitration as one of the most dynamic areas of legal practice. Given the considerable number of published arbitral awards and legal writings, and the underlying public international law principles, acquiring a firm understanding of international investment law and arbitration has become harder for students, practitioners and others. There is a place for a book which reproduces within a single, portable volume selected extracts from arbitral decisions, other documents and legal writings accompanied by concise, up-to-date and reliable commentary on both the law and procedure of international investment arbitration. Questions of procedure and practice have become bound up with the application of substantive international law protections, raising important questions of technical international law. There is also the need for the subject to be explained in academic institutions in a way which reflects its historical development, conceptual basis and intellectual contribution to the peaceful settlement of disputes. It is this combination of aims which this book seeks to advance.

A further justification is that the field is in a renewed state of flux. It appeared to us that there is scope for a book which aims to convey the effect of these broader developments, not least on the latest innovations in treaty design and language. However, we have also been wary of exaggerating the current backlash against investment treaties and arbitration. While this book is alive to the gathering forces of change, for now one need look no further than the facts of daily legal practice and the largely unaltered aims of the subject.

The present book draws upon the experience derived from teaching the subject in three different jurisdictions. No work can be faultless. It is especially true of a first edition and we hope to benefit from the comments of our peers about the ways in which this first attempt might be improved. In terms of the allocation of writing responsibility, Lim was tasked with [Chapters 1, 4, 8, 11, 14, 17, 18 and 19](#); Ho with [Chapters 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13 and 16](#); and Paparinskis with [Chapters 5, 12 and 15](#). We have tried to state the law and its surrounding developments as they appeared to us in May 2017.

Acknowledgments

With the usual caveat, we would like to express our immense gratitude to Finola O'Sullivan, Marta Walkowiak, Caitlin Lisle and Valerie Appleby at Cambridge University Press, without whose initial encouragement and enthusiasm, subsequent patience, forbearance, experience and expert guidance this book would not have been possible. We would like to thank Chao Junqing at the University of Hong Kong and Alastair Simon Chetty at the National University of Singapore for their research and editorial assistance, and also Cheng Chi, now in practice, who provided much-needed assistance during the early stages of the book. Finally, we thank our students in Hong Kong, Singapore and London. Hopefully they will discover both things that are familiar as well as some improvements in this book. C. L. Lim acknowledges with gratitude the University of Hong Kong's provision of leave support, the Class of '61's generosity which made a Lionel A. Sheridan Visiting Professorship possible at the National University of Singapore, as well as support from the Shanghai 1000 Plan and SUIBE, Shanghai. Jean Ho would like to acknowledge partial funding support from the Singapore Ministry of Education Academic Research Fund Tier 1 (WBS No. R-241-000-156-115).

Treaties, National Legislation, Cases and Awards

TREATIES AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL INSTRUMENTS¹

1948 Final Act of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment, 24 March 1948 ('Havana Charter') 64

Art. 12 65

Agreement between Australia and Japan for an Economic Partnership, 8 July 2014 ('Australia–Japan EPA') 81

Art. 14.6 81

Agreement between Singapore and EFTA, 26 June 2002 69

Agreement between the Arab Republic of Egypt and the Republic of Poland for the Reciprocal Promotion and Protection of Investments, 1 July 1995 ('Poland–Egypt BIT') 254

Agreement between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Republic of the Philippines for the Promotion and Reciprocal Protection of Investments, 18 April 1997 146

Art. 1(1) 146

Agreement between the Government of Hong Kong and the Government of Australia for the Promotion and Protection of Investments, 15 September 1993 ('Hong Kong–Australia BIT') 238

Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Croatia and the Government of Canada for the Promotion and Protection of Investments, 3 February 1997 ('Croatia–Canada BIT') 78

Art. II(2)(a) 79

Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Cyprus and the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic on Mutual Promotion and Protection of Investments, 24 May 1989 ('Cyprus–Hungary BIT') 329, 343

Art. 4(1) 330

¹ For the texts of bilateral investment treaties (BITs), see UNCTAD's 'Investment Policy Hub' at www.investmentpolicyhub.unctad.org. For the investment chapters of free trade agreements (FTAs), see the WTO's 'RTA Information System' at www.rtais.wto.org.

Art. 4(1)(a) 343

Art. 7 346

Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Finland and the Government of the Republic of Ecuador on the Promotion and Protection of Investments, 18 April 2001

Art. 14 74

Agreement between the Government of the Socialist Republic of Romania and the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Sudan on the Mutual Promotion and Guarantee of Capital Investments, 8 December 1978 ('Romania–Sudan BIT') 61

Art. 3(1) 61

Art. 3(2) 61

Art. 4 61

Agreement between the Government of the United Arab Emirates and the Government of the Italian Republic for the Promotion and Protection of Investments, 22 January 1995 ('Italy–United Arab Emirates BIT') 240

Agreement between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of Malaysia for the Promotion and Protection of Investments, 21 May 1981 ('UK–Malaysia BIT') 212, 216, 455

Art. 1(1)(a) 213

Art. 7(1) 212

Agreement between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt, 11 June 1975 ('UK–Egypt BIT') 62, 64

Art. 1(a)(i) 325

Art. 5(1) 325–6

Art. 8 62

Art. 11 64

Agreement between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic for the Promotion and Reciprocal Protection of Investments, 9 March 1987

Art. 6 152

Agreement between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the Promotion and Reciprocal Protection of Investments, 6 April 1989 ('UK–Soviet BIT') 168, 170

Art. 5 171

Art. 5.1 168–9

Agreement between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Hungarian People's Republic for the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investments, 2 September 1987 ('Netherlands–Hungary BIT') 327

Art. 1(a)(iii) 327

Art. 4(1) 328–9

Agreement between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Republic of Poland on Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investments, 7 September 1992 ('Netherlands–Poland BIT') 332

Art. 1(a)(ii) 332

Art. 5 332

Agreement between the Swiss Confederation and the Hungarian People's Republic on the Reciprocal Promotion and Protection of Investments, 5 October 1988 ('Swiss–Hungary BIT') 327

Art. 1(2)(e) 327

Art. (1)(2)(c) 327

Art. 6 327

Art. 6(1) 328

Agreement for the Promotion and Protection of Investments between the Republic of Italy and the Arab Republic of Egypt, 2 March 1989 ('Italy–Egypt BIT') 240–1

Agreement on Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investments between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, 29 April 1991 ('Netherlands–Czech Republic BIT') 252

Agreement on the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investments between the Federal Republic of Germany and Pakistan, 1 December 2009 59

Argentina–France BIT, 3 July 1991 311–12

Art. IV4 309

ASEAN Comprehensive Investment Agreement (ACIA), 29 February 2009 216, 234–5, 250

Art. 4(a) 217

Art. 4(c) 217

Art. 4(d) 233

Art. 4(e) 233

Art. 4(g) 233

Art. 28(b) 250

ASEAN Treaty for the Promotion and Protection of Investments, 15 December 1987 68

Art. IV 68

(Belgium–Luxembourg Economic Union)–Hungary BIT, 14 May 1986 ('BLEU–Hungary BIT') 157–9

Art. 9(2) 158

Central America Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA), 28 May 2004 67, 380

China–Australia Free Trade Agreement, 17 June 2015

Art. 9.12 81

China–Canada BIT, 9 September 2012 481, 497

Art. 4(2) 260

Annex B.10, para. 2 481

Annex B.10, para. 3 481, 499

China–Japan–Korea Trilateral Investment Treaty, 13 May 2012 101–2, 498

Art. 3 481

Art. 4 [481](#)

China–Laos BIT, 31 January 1993 [255](#)

China–Uzbekistan BIT, 13 March 1992

Art. 6(3) [481](#), [499](#)

China–Uzbekistan BIT, 19 April 2011

Art. 3 [481](#)

Art. 4 [481](#)

Colonia Protocol on Reciprocal Promotion and Protection of Investments, 17 January 1994 [68](#)

Convention between the Government of the French Republic and of the Democratic Republic of Sudan on the Encouragement and the Reciprocal Protection of Investments, 31 July 1978 ('France–Sudan BIT') [61](#)

Art. 3 [61](#)

Art. 5 [61](#)

Art. 8 [61](#)

Convention between the Government of the French Republic and the Government of the Federal Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia on the Protection of Investments, 28 March 1974 [210](#)

Convention Establishing the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA), 11 October 1985

Art. 2 [68](#)

Art. 12(d) [68](#)

Art. 23 [68](#)

Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, 4 November 1950 ('European Convention on Human Rights') [470](#)

Art. 6 [375](#)

European Convention on Human Rights, Protocol 1, 20 March 1952

Art. 1 [375](#)

Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, 10 June 1958, 330 UNTS 3 ('New York Convention') [28](#), [97](#), [160](#), [162–3](#), [187](#), [372](#), [447–9](#), [461](#), [471](#), [474–6](#), [508](#)

Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes Between States and Nationals of Other States, 18 March 1965, 575 UNTS 159 ('ICSID Convention') [25](#), [27–8](#), [59–61](#), [63–4](#), [66](#), [73–5](#), [84](#), [96](#), [103](#), [106–7](#), [109](#), [114](#), [123](#), [131](#), [145](#), [149](#), [158–9](#), [175](#), [181](#), [187](#), [192–4](#), [205](#), [212](#), [215](#), [221](#), [223–6](#), [228–30](#), [234](#), [241](#), [249](#), [320](#), [371–2](#), [380](#), [390](#), [428](#), [437](#), [443](#), [447–9](#), [452](#), [455–7](#), [459–60](#), [474](#), [476–8](#), [485](#), [495](#), [504](#), [507](#)

Art. 21 [194](#)

Art. 22 [194](#)

Art. 25 [153](#), [195](#), [455](#)

Art. 25(1) [97](#), [130](#), [212–18](#), [223](#), [229–30](#), [235](#), [455](#)

Art. 25(2) [129](#), [235](#), [240](#)

Art. 25(2)(a) [243](#)

Art. 25(2)(b) [129](#), [248–9](#), [253](#), [256](#)

- Art. 26 120, 186, 190, 192, 198
- Art. 41 114
- Art. 41(2) 114
- Art. 41(5) 110
- Art. 42(1) 156
- Art. 45(1) 178
- Art. 46 88
- Art. 52 124, 150, 160, 289, 452, 454
- Art. 52(1) 175, 213, 424
- Art. 52(1)(b) 124, 145
- Art. 52(1)(e) 411, 417
- Art. 54 27, 458–9, 474–5
- Art. 54(1) 159, 449, 459, 476
- Art. 57 109
- Dominican Republic–Central America Free Trade Agreement (DR–CAFTA), 5 August 2004
- Art. 10.12 379
- Art. 10.20.4 126
- Art. 10.28(e) 326
- Draft Convention on Investments Abroad ('Abs–Shawcross Draft Convention'), 1959 25–6, 64, 351, 369
- Art. 2 350, 369
- Draft OECD Multilateral Agreement on Investment, 1998
- Preamble 69
- Draft United Nations Code of Conduct on Transnational Corporations, 1986
- Art. 48 68
- Energy Charter Treaty, 17 December 1994 25, 29, 66, 69, 76, 131, 157, 215, 237, 298, 306, 379
- Art. 1(7) 129
- Art. 10 306
- Art. 13(1) 170
- Art. 17 379
- Art. 17(1) 247
- Art. 29 25
- Preamble 247
- EU–Canada Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA), 30 October 2016 78, 83, 85, 250, 283, 298, 320, 336, 377–8, 382, 387, 389, 400, 496–7, 503, 505–6
- Annex 8-A(3) 381
- Annex 8-A 337–8, 342
- Annex 8-B 378
- Art. 8.1 250
- Art. 8.7(4) 312

- Art. 8.8 298
- Art. 8.10 79
- Art. 8.10(2)(a)–(f) 496
- Art. 8.10(4) 497
- Art. 8.11 298
- Art. 8.13 298
- Art. 8.15 387
- Art. 8.16 378
- Art. 8.18(1) 250
- Art. 8.24 133
- Art. 8.27 59
- Art. 8.29 83
- Art. 8.32 126
- Art. 8.33 126
- Art. 8.36 80
- Art. 8.43 133
- Art. 28.3 388
- Art. 28.6 388
- General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), 30 October 1947 375, 386
- Art. XX 308, 375, 386
- Art. XXI 375
- General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), 15 April 1994 ('GATT 1994')
- Art. XX(b) 388
- Art. XX(g) 388
- German Model BIT 1998 69
- Art. 4(4) 70
- German Model BIT 2005
- Art. 14(3) 493
- Germany–Argentina BIT, 9 April 1991 318
- Art. 4(1) 282
- Hague Convention on Choice of Court Agreements, 30 June 2005 508
- Art. 1(1) 508
- Art. 5(1) 508
- Art. 6 508
- Art. 8 508
- Art. 9 508
- Harvard Draft Convention on the Responsibility of States for Injuries to the Economic Interests of Aliens, 1961 64
- Hong Kong–Australia BIT, 15 September 1993 238
- ILC Articles on Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts, 2001, UN Doc. A/56/83 (2001) 130, 338, 376
- Art. 3 104, 294
- Art. 20 390
- Art. 22 392

- Art. 25 149, 395
 Art. 27 398
 Art. 33(2) 397
 Art. 49 392
 ILC Draft Articles on Diplomatic Protection 2006, adopted by the ILC at its 58th session in 2006, UN Doc. A/61/10, ILC Ybk 2006/II(2) 3, 57
 Art. 1 3
 Art. 11(b) 30
 India Model BIT 2016
 Art. 3(1) 261
 Israeli–Czech Republic BIT, 23 September 1997 223
 Italy–Argentina BIT, 3 June 1988
 Art. 8 113
 Korea–Australia Free Trade Agreement, 8 April 2014
 Art. 11.16 81
 Lithuania–Ukraine BIT, 8 February 1994
 Art. 1(2)(b) 237
 NAFTA Free Trade Commission, Notes of Interpretation of Certain Chapter 11 Provisions, 31 July 2001 260, 478, 482
 Netherlands–Laos BIT, 16 May 2003 255
 North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), 17 December 1992 25, 29, 243, 250, 256, 262, 264, 267, 270, 274, 284–7, 291, 295, 297, 301, 304–5, 307–9, 317, 392, 394–5, 408, 436–7, 476, 478–80, 482–5, 496, 498–9, 513
 Art. 102(1)(c) 243
 Art. 102(1)(e) 243
 Art. 201 242–3
 Art. 1102 295–6
 Art. 1105 265, 270, 309, 381
 Art. 1105(1) 68, 274, 284–5, 482–3
 Art. 1117(1) 250
 Art. 1117(1)(a) 242
 Art. 1120 252
 Art. 1126(2) 252
 Art. 1139 242
 Chapter 11 25, 66, 243, 394, 434, 477, 479, 482, 484
 OECD Draft Convention on the Protection of Private Foreign Investment, 12 October 1967 25, 64, 67
 Oman–Yemen BIT, 20 September 1998 409
 Rome Convention on the Law Applicable to Contractual Obligations, 1980 Official Journal of the European Communities C027/34 ('Rome Convention') 161
 Art. 7 161–2
 Statute of the International Court of Justice, 26 June 1945
 Art. 38 44, 47, 497

Art. 38(1) 148

Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, 13 December 1920

Art. 38 38, 43

Switzerland–Uzbekistan BIT, 16 April 1993 223

Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) Agreement, 4 February 2016 81, 102, 283, 295–6, 302, 305–7, 309, 496, 498–500

Art. 9.23.3 500

Art. 9.23.4–6 500

Art. 9.24 80

Art. 9.4 294, 304, 307

Art. 9.6(2) 260, 500

Art. 9.6(2)(a) 261

Art. 9.6(4) 283, 496

Art. 9.8(1) 499

Art. 29.1(4) 395

Art. 29.4(8) 262

Footnote 17 499

Treaty between the Federal Republic of Germany and Pakistan for the Promotion and Protection of Investments, 25 November 1959 ('1959 Germany–Pakistan BIT') 59–60

Art. 2 59

Art. 3(1) 60

Art. 3(2) 60

Art. 7 60, 371

Treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of Zaire Concerning the Reciprocal Encouragement and Protection of Investment, 3 August 1984 70

Treaty between the United States of America and the Argentine Republic Concerning the Reciprocal Encouragement and Protection of Investment, 14 November 1991 ('US–Argentina BIT') 66, 151, 246, 374, 383, 399

Art. I(1)(a)(ii) 250

Art. I(1)(b) 250

Art. II(1) 60

Art. II(2)(a) 60

Art. II(2)(c) 153

Art. VII(1) 246–7

Art. VII(8) 248

Art. XI 149, 345, 383, 388, 396, 400

Preamble 247

Treaty between the United States of America and the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic Concerning the Reciprocal Encouragement and Protection of Investments, 22 October 1991 ('US–Czech BIT') 132

Treaty between the United States of America and the Arab Republic of Egypt Concerning the Reciprocal Encouragement and Protection of Investments, 11 March 1986 ('US–Egypt BIT') 254

- Treaty Establishing the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), 5 November 1993
 Art. 159 [68](#)
- Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation between Argentina and the United States, 27 July 1853 ('Argentina-US FCN Treaty')
 Art. VIII [60](#)
 Art. XIII [60](#)
- Treaty with the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic Concerning the Reciprocal Encouragement and Protection of Investment, 22 October 1991 ('US-Czech Republic BIT') [252](#)
- United Nations Convention on Jurisdictional Immunities of States and Their Property, 2 December 2004 [460-1](#)
 Art. 17 [465](#)
- United Nations Convention on Transparency in Treaty-based Investor-State Arbitration, 10 December 2014 ('Mauritius Convention on Transparency') [500](#)
- United States Model BIT 2004 [260](#), [262](#), [281](#), [481-3](#), [485](#), [493](#), [496](#), [498](#)
- United States Model BIT 2012
 Art. 1 [233-5](#), [239](#)
 Art. 5(2) [260](#)
 Art. 5(2)(a) [261](#)
 Art. 6(1) [499](#)
 Art. 28.3 [500](#)
 Art. 28.4-6 [500](#)
 Annex B, para. 1 [499](#)
 Section B [235](#)
- United States-Australia Free Trade Agreement, 18 May 2004
- United States-Chile Free Trade Agreement, 6 June 2003 ('US-Chile FTA')
 Art. 10.3 [70](#)
- United States-Singapore Free Trade Agreement, 6 May 2003 [486](#)
- Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, 1155 UNTS 331, 22 May 1969 [33](#), [290-1](#), [310](#), [384](#), [491](#)
 Art. 31 [84](#), [153-4](#), [312](#), [359](#), [361](#)
 Art. 31(1) [276](#), [288](#)
 Art. 31(3) [384](#)
 Art. 31((3)(c) [291](#)
 Art. 32 [84](#), [153-4](#)
- World Bank Guidelines on Treatment of Foreign Direct Investment, 1992 [339](#), [410](#), [413](#), [415](#), [422](#)
 Art. III(2) [68](#)
 Art. IV(6) [339](#), [411](#)
 Art. VI(i) [411](#), [421](#)

ARBITRATION RULES

ICC Rules of Arbitration, 1 January 2012 155

Art. 21 155

ICSID Convention, Regulations, and Rules: Rules of Procedure for Arbitration
Proceedings, 10 April 2006 159–60, 380, 500–2

Rule 4 380

Rule 39 160–1, 185, 191, 193, 442–3

Rule 39(1) 110

Rule 41 114, 380

Rule 41(2) 123

Rule 41(3) 125

Rule 41(5) 126–7

Rule 41(6) 110

Rule 50–4 160

ICSID Additional Facility Arbitration Rules, 10 April 2006 103, 159, 186, 372, 503

Art. 46(4) 186

SCC Arbitration Rules, 1 January 2007 159, 168

Art. 26(1) 168

UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules, 15 December 1976

Art. 15(1) 126

Art. 24(1) 165

UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules, 6 December 2010

Art. 7–16 157

Art. 12(1) 109

Art. 17 126

Art. 17(1) 126

Arts. 18–32 157

Art. 21(3) 88

Art. 23(1) 114

Art. 23(2) 110

Art. 23(3) 110, 125–6

Art. 26 160, 184, 201, 207

Arts. 33–43 157

Art. 38 436

Art. 40 434, 436

Art. 41 110

Art. 42 430

Rule 15(2) 110

UNCITRAL Rules on Transparency in Treaty-based Investor-State Arbitration, 16
December 2013 80, 84, 157, 500, 502

Art. 2 80, 502

Art. 3 80, 502

Art. 4 [80](#), [502](#)

Art. 5 [80](#), [502](#)

Art. 6 [80](#), [502](#)

Art. 7 [80](#), [502](#)

Art. 8 [80](#), [502](#)

UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTIONS

General Assembly Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, UNGA Res. A/Res/3201 (S-VI) (9 May 1974) [171](#)

General Assembly Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, UNGA Res. A/Res/3202 (S-VI) (15 May 1974) [171](#)

General Assembly Resolution on a Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, UNGA Res. A/Res/3281(XXIX) (12 December 1974) [16](#), [18–21](#), [50](#), [64](#), [171](#)

Permanent Sovereignty Over Natural Resources, UNGA Res. 1803 (XVIII) (14 December 1962) [50](#), [64](#), [171](#)

UN Security Council resolution 687, UN Doc. S/RES/687 (1991), 8 April 1991 [9](#)

UN Security Council resolution 692, UN Doc. S/RES/692 (1991), 20 May 1991 [9](#)

NATIONAL LEGISLATION BY COUNTRY

Australia

Foreign States Immunities Act 1985

Section 17 [465](#)

Egypt

Egyptian Law No. 43 of 1974 [63](#)

Canada

State Immunity Act 1980

Section 12(1)(a) [466](#)

Pakistan

State Immunity Ordinance

Section 10 [465](#)

Singapore

State Immunity Act 1979

Section 11 [465](#)

South Africa

Foreign States Immunities Act 1981
Section 10 465

United Kingdom

State Immunity Act 1978 190, 462–3
Section 9 465, 475
UK Act of 1996 452
Section 67 452
Section 68 452
Civil Jurisdiction and Judgments (Hague Convention on Choice of Court Agreements
2005) Regulations (SI 2015/1644) 508

United States

The Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments of the US Constitution 264
Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act 1976
Section 1605(a)(1) 475
Section 1605(a)(6) 465, 475
Section 1611(b)(2) 183
Immigration and Nationality Act
Title III 233, 239

Venezuela

2001 Land Law 147

International Cases

Barcelona Traction, Light and Power Co., Ltd (Belgium v. Spain) [1970] ICJ Rep. 3 5, 87, 244
Case Concerning Ahmadou Sadio Diallo (Guinea v. Congo) (Preliminary Objections) [2007] ICJ Rep. 579 30
Case Concerning Ahmadou Sadio Diallo (Guinea v. Congo) (Preliminary Objections, Judgment) [2007] ICJ Rep. 582 246
Case Concerning the Factory at Chorzów (Indemnity) (Merits) (Germany v. Poland), PCIJ Reports, Series A, No. 17, p. 4 11, 340, 402–4, 424, 444
Case Concerning Military and Paramilitary Activities in and Against Nicaragua (Nicaragua v. United States of America) (Merits) [1986] ICJ Rep. 14 178, 202
Case of Grainger and Others v. United Kingdom (Application No. 34940/10) (2012) 55 EHRR SE13 342
Case of Nationality Decrees Issued in Tunis and Morocco (France v. Great Britain) (Request for an Advisory Opinion) [1923] PCIJ Rep. Series B No. 4 240

- Corfu Channel Case* [1949] ICJ Rep. 1, Dissenting Opinion of Judge Krylov, 9 April 1949 [262](#)
- Electronica Sicula SpA (ELSI) (United States of America v. Italy)* [1989] ICJ Rep. [15](#) [29](#), [87](#), [276](#), [280](#), [361](#)
- Estate of Jean-Baptiste Caire (France v. Mexico)* (1929) V RIAA [516](#) [262](#)
- 'Lotus' Case* (1927) PCIJ Rep. Series A No. 10 [47](#)
- Mavrommatis Palestine Concessions (Greece v. United Kingdom)* (1924) PCIJ Rep. Series A No. 2 [2](#)
- Neer Case (United States of America v. Mexico)*, Decision of 15 October 1926, 4 RIAA [60](#) [262](#), [285](#)
- Northern Cameroons (Cameroon v. United Kingdom)* [1963] ICJ Rep. 15, Separate Opinion of Judge Sir Gerald Fitzmaurice, 2 December 1963 [116](#)
- Nottebohm Case (Liechtenstein v. Guatemala) (Second Phase)* [1955] ICJ Rep. [4](#) [241](#), [245](#)
- Serbian and Brazilian Loans* (1929) PCIJ Rep. Series A No. 20 [22](#), [48](#)
- Whaling in the Antarctic (Australia v. Japan: New Zealand intervening)* [2014] ICJ Rep. [226](#) [123](#)

Arbitral Awards

- Abaclat v. Argentina* (ICSID Case No. ARB/07/5), Decision on Jurisdiction and Admissibility, 4 August 2011, Dissenting Opinion of Professor Georges Abi-Saab [93](#)
- Accession Mezzanine Capital LP and Another v. Hungary* (ICSID Case No. ARB/12/3), Award, 17 April 2015, Decision on Respondent's Objection under Arbitration Rule 41(5), 16 January 2013 [127](#), [152](#), [180](#), [327](#), [330](#)
- ADC Affiliate Ltd and Other v. Hungary* (ICSID Case No. ARB/03/16), Award of the Tribunal, 2 October 2006 [297](#), [338](#)
- ADF v. United States of America* (ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/00/1), Final Award, 9 January 2003 [265](#), [285](#)
- AGIP SpA v. Government of the Congo* (ICSID Case No. ARB/77/1), Award, 30 November 1979 [52](#)
- Aguas Cordobesas SA and Another v. Argentina* (ICSID Case No. ARB/03/18) [53](#)
- Aguas del Tunari, SA v. Bolivia* (ICSID Case No. ARB/02/3), Decision on the Respondent's Objections to Jurisdiction, 21 October 2005 [249](#)
- Aguas Provinciales de Santa Fe SA and Others v. Argentina* (ICSID Case No. ARB/03/17) [53](#)
- Alex Genin, Eastern Credit Ltd, Inc. and AS Baltoil v. Estonia* (ICSID Case No. ARB/99/2), Award, 25 June 2001 [266](#)
- Amco Asia Corp. v. Indonesia* (ICSID Case No. ARB/81/1), Award on the Merits, [20](#) November 1984, Decision of the Ad Hoc Committee on Annulment, 16 May 1986, Decision on Jurisdiction, 25 September 1983 [174–6](#)
- American Manufacturing & Trading Inc. v. Congo* (ICSID Case No. ARB/93/1), Award, 21 February 1997 [70](#)

- Ampal-American Israel Corp. and Others v. Egypt* (ICSID Case No. ARB/12/11), Decision on Jurisdiction, 1 February 2016, Decision on Liability and Heads of Loss, 21 February 2017 [137](#), [139](#), [143](#), [254–5](#)
- Anatolie Stati and Others v. Kazakhstan* (SCC Arbitration V (116/2010)), Award, 19 December 2013 [223](#)
- Anglia Auto Accessories Ltd v. Czech Republic* (SCC Arbitration Case V 2014/181), Final Award, 10 March 2017 [347–8](#)
- Ansung Housing Co., Ltd v. China* (ICSID Case No. ARB/14/25), Award, 9 March 2017 [127](#), [131](#)
- Antoine Goetz et Consorts v. Burundi* (Affaire CIRDI ARB/95/3), Sentence, 10 February 1999 [343](#)
- Apotex Holdings Inc. and Apotex Inc. v. United States of America* (ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/12/1), Award, 25 August 2014 [136](#), [138](#), [172](#)
- Archer Daniels Midland Co. and Tate & Lyle Ingredients Americas v. Mexico* (ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/04/05), Award, 21 November 2007 [302–4](#), [393–4](#)
- Asian Agricultural Products Ltd v. Sri Lanka* (ICSID Case No. ARB/87/3), Award, 27 June 1990 [93](#), [165](#), [278](#), [280](#)
- ATA Construction, Industrial and Trading Co. v. Jordan* (ICSID Case No. ARB/08/2), Award, 18 May 2010 [404](#)
- Autopista Concesionada de Venezuela CA (Aucoven) v. Venezuela* (ICSID Case No. ARB/00/5), Award, 23 September 2003 [54](#), [339](#), [418](#)
- AWG Group Ltd v. Argentina* (UNCITRAL), Decision on Jurisdiction, 3 August 2006, [251](#)
- Azurix Corp. v. Argentina* (ICSID Case No. ARB/01/12), Award, 14 July 2006, Decision on the Application for Annulment by the Argentine Republic, 1 September 2009 [53](#), [74](#), [178](#), [250](#), [266–7](#), [281–2](#), [288–90](#)
- Bayindir Insaat Turizm Ticaret Ve Sanayi AS v. Pakistan* (ICSID Case No. ARB/03/29), Award, 27 August 2009 [172](#)
- Bernhard Friedrich Arnd Rüdiger von Pezold and Others v. Zimbabwe* (ICSID Case No. ARB/10/15), Award, 28 July 2015 [266](#), [397](#), [408](#)
- Berschader v. Russia* (SCC Case No. 080/2004), Award, 21 April 2006 [98](#)
- Bilcon of Delaware and Others v. Canada* (UNCITRAL), Award on Jurisdiction and Liability, 17 March 2015 [287](#), [302](#), [305](#), [307](#), [309](#)
- Biwater Gauff (Tanzania) Ltd v. Tanzania* (ICSID Case No. ARB/05/22), Award, 24 July 2008 [199](#), [228–30](#), [327](#), [403](#)
- Brandes Investment Partners LP v. Venezuela* (ICSID Case No. ARB/08/3) [54](#)
- British Petroleum Exploration Co. (Libya) Ltd v. Government of Libya* (1979) 53 ILR 297, Award, 10 October 1973 [232](#)
- Burlington Resources Inc. v. Ecuador* (ICSID Case No. ARB/08/5), Decision on Liability, 14 December 2012, Procedural Order No. 1, 29 June 2009 [343](#)
- Cable Television of Nevis Ltd and Another v. St Kitts and Nevis* (ICSID Case No. ARB/95/2), Award, 13 January 1997 [249](#)

- Cambodia Power Co. v. Cambodia and Electricité du Cambodge* (ICSID Case No. ARB/09/18), Decision on Jurisdiction, 22 March 2011 [113](#)
- Cargill, Inc. v. Mexico* (ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/05/2), Award, 18 September 2009 [393–5](#)
- Caratube International Oil Co. LLP v. Kazakhstan* (ICSID Case No. ARB/08/12), Decision Regarding Claimant's Application for Provisional Measures, 31 July 2009 [196–7](#)
- Case A-I* (1982), I Iran-USCTR 144 (First Phase) [8](#)
- CEAC Holdings Ltd v. Montenegro* (ICSID Case No. ARB/14/8), Award, 26 July 2016, Separate Opinion by Arbitrator Park, 4 July 2016 [129–30](#)
- Ceskoslovenska Obchodni Banka AS v. Slovakia* (ICSID Case No. ARB/97/4), Decision of the Tribunal on Objections to Jurisdiction, 24 May 1999 [95](#), [227–8](#)
- Champion Trading Co. and Ameritrade International, Inc. v. Egypt* (ICSID Case No. ARB/02/9), Award, 27 October 2006 [299](#)
- Channel Tunnel Group and Another v. UK Secretary for Transport and Another* (PCA), Partial Award, 30 January 2007 [278–9](#)
- Chemtura Corp. v. Canada* (UNCITRAL), Award, 2 August 2010 [381–2](#)
- Churchill Mining Plc and Planet Mining Pty Ltd v. Indonesia* (ICSID Case No. ARB/12/14 and 12/40), Decision on Jurisdiction, 24 February 2014, Procedural Order No. 9, Provisional Measures, 8 July 2014 [94–6](#), [197](#)
- City Oriente Ltd v. Ecuador and Empresa Estatal Petróleos del Ecuador (Petroecuador)* (ICSID Case No. ARB/06/21), Decision on Provisional Measures, November 2007 [195–7](#), [204](#)
- CME Czech Republic BV v. Czech Republic* (UNCITRAL), Final Award, 14 March 2003, Partial Award, 13 September 2001, Separate Opinion on the Issues of Quantum Phase by Arbitrator Brownlie, 14 March 2013 [132–6](#), [139](#), [143](#), [252–5](#), [271](#), [433](#)
- CMS Gas Transmission Co. v. Argentina* (ICSID Case No. ARB/01/8), Award, 12 May 2005, Decision of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Application for Annulment of the Argentine Republic, 25 September 2007 [74](#), [149](#), [154](#), [250](#), [264](#), [268](#), [278](#), [346](#), [367](#), [372](#), [384–5](#), [387](#), [404](#), [454](#)
- Compañía de Aguas del Aconquija SA and Vivendi Universal v. Argentina* (ICSID Case No. ARB/97/3), Decision on Annulment, 3 July 2002 [104](#), [150](#), [352](#), [366](#)
- Compañía del Desarrollo de Santa Elena SA v. Costa Rica* (ICSID Case No. ARB/96/1), Final Award, 17 February 2000 [410](#)
- Consortium RFCC v. Morocco* (ICSID Case No. ARB/00/6), Sentence Arbitrale, 22 December 2003 [327](#)
- Consorzio Groupement LESI Dipenta v. République Algérienne Démocratique et Populaire* (ICSID Case No. ARB/03/8), Sentence, 10 January 2005 [218](#)
- Continental Casualty Co. v. Argentina* (ICSID Case No. ARB/03/9), Award, 5 September, 2008, Decision on the Applications for Partial Annulment, 16 September 2011 [346](#), [386](#), [397](#), [400](#)
- Corn Products International, Inc. v. Mexico* (ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/04/01), Decision on Responsibility, 15 January 2008, Separate Opinion by Arbitrator Lowenfeld, 15 January 2008 [393–5](#)

- Crystallex International Corp. v. Venezuela* (ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/11/2), Award, 4 April 2016 298, 305, 330, 335, 404–6
- Dallah Real Estate and Tourism Holding Co. v. The Ministry of Religious Affairs, Government of Pakistan* (ICC Case No. [unknown]), Final Award, 23 June 2006, unpublished, excerpted in [2010] UKSC 46 54, 179
- Desert Line Projects LLC v. Yemen* (ICSID Case No. ARB/05/17), Award, 6 February 2008 408–9
- Eastern Sugar v. Czech Republic* (UNCITRAL, SCC Case No. 088/2004), Final Award on Tribunal Costs, 12 April 2007 429–30
- EDF International SA and Others v. Argentina*, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/23, Award, 11 June 2012, Decision on Annulment, 5 February 2016, Decision on Objections to Jurisdiction, 27 April 2006 53, 309, 311, 396–9
- Electrabel SA v. Hungary* (ICSID Case No. ARB/07/19), Decision on Jurisdiction, Applicable Law and Liability, 30 November 2012 157, 159
- Electricité de France (EDF) International SA v. Hungary* (UNCITRAL-PCA), Award (not public), 4 December 2014 157
- El Paso Energy International Co. v. Argentina* (ICSID Case No. ARB/03/15), Award, 31 October 2011, Decision on the Application for Annulment of Argentina, 22 September 2014 53, 250, 335, 346, 352, 363–5, 368, 372, 384, 387, 400, 402
- Emmis International Holding BV and Others v. Hungary* (ICSID Case No. ARB/12/2), Award, 16 April 2014, Decision on Respondent's Objection under ICSID Arbitration Rule 41(5), 11 March 2013 127, 327–9, 331
- Enkev Beheer BV v. Poland* (UNCITRAL-PCA Case No. 2013–01), First Partial Award, 29 April 2014 332–3
- Enron v. Argentina* (ICSID Case No. ARB/01/3), Award, 22 May 2007, Decision on Annulment, 30 July 2010 335, 407
- Eureko BV v. Poland* (UNCITRAL), Partial Award, 19 August 2005 356, 364
- Fedax NV v. Venezuela* (ICSID Case No. ARB/96/3), Decision of the Tribunal on Objections to Jurisdiction, 11 July 1997 219, 224, 226
- Franck Charles Arif v. Moldova* (ICSID Case No. ARB/11/23), Award, 8 April 2013 242
- Fraport AG Frankfurt Airport Services Worldwide v. Philippines* (ICSID Case No. ARB/03/25), Award, 16 August 2007 54, 146
- Fraport AG Frankfurt Airport Services Worldwide v. Philippines (II)* (ICSID Case No. ARB/11/12), Award, 10 December 2014 130–1, 146
- GAMI Investments Inc. v. Mexico* (UNCITRAL), Award, 15 November 2004 307
- Garanti Koza v. Turkmenistan* (ICSID Case No. ARB/11/20), Decision on Objection to Jurisdiction for Lack of Consent, 3 July 2013, Dissenting Opinion by Arbitrator Boisson de Chazournes, 3 July 2013 319–20
- Gemplus SA and Talsud SA v. Mexico* (ICSID Case Nos ARB(AF)/04/3 and ARB(AF)/04/4), Award, 16 June 2010 53, 338, 407–8
- Giovanni Alemanni and Others v. Argentina* (ICSID Case No. ARB/07/8), Decision on Jurisdiction and Admissibility, 17 November 2014 112–14

- Glamis Gold v. United States of America* (UNCITRAL), US Rejoinder, 15 March 2007, Award, 8 June 2009 259, 286
- Global Trading v. Ukraine* (ICSID Case No. ARB/09/11), Award, 23 November 2010 110
- Grand River Enterprises Six Nations Ltd and Others v. United States of America* (UNCITRAL), Award, 12 January 2011 307
- Guaracachi America, Inc. and Another v. Bolivia* (PCA Case No. 2011–17), Award, 31 January 2014 342
- Himpurna California Energy Ltd (Bermuda) v. PT (Persero) PLN (Indonesia)*, in A. J. van den Berg (ed.), *Yearbook of Commercial Arbitration* (Alphen aan den Rijn: Kluwer Law International, 2000), vol. XXV, Award, 4 May 1999 422
- Hochtief AG v. Argentina* (ICSID Case No. ARB/07/31), Decision on Liability, 29 December 2014 132, 311, 318, 382, 391, 397
- Holiday Inns SA and Others v. Morocco* (ICSID Case No. ARB/72/1), Decision on Jurisdiction, 12 May 1974 63
- Home Frontier Missionary Society (United States of America v. Britain)* (1920) VI RIAA 42 262
- Houston Contracting Co. v. Iran and Others* (1988) 20 Iran-USCTR 3 177
- Hulley Enterprises Ltd (Cyprus) v. Russia* (PCA Case No. AA226), Final Award, 28 July 2014, Interim Award on Jurisdiction and Admissibility, 30 November 2009 168, 170–1, 237
- Hussein Nuaman Soufraki v. United Arab Emirates* (ICSID Case No. ARB/02/7), Award, 7 July 2004, Decision of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Application for Annulment of Mr Soufraki, 5 June 2007 129, 240
- I. P. Busta and J. P. Busta v. Czech Republic* (SCC Case No. v. 2015/014), Final Award, 10 March 2017, Partially Dissenting Opinion of Professor Philippe Sands QC, 10 February 2016 115
- Iberdrola Energía SA v. Guatemala* (ICSID Case No. ARB/09/5) 53
- Iberdrola SA and Another v. Bolivia* (PCA Case No. 2015–05) 80
- İçkale İnşaat Ltd Şirketi v. Turkmenistan* (ICSID Case No. ARB/10/24), Award, 8 March 2016 119–21, 143, 312, 322
- Impregilo v. Pakistan* (ICSID Case No. ARB/03/3) 372
- Impregilo SpA v. Argentina* (ICSID Case No. ARB/07/17), Decision on Jurisdiction, 22 April 2005 53
- In the Matter of the Chagos Marine Protected Area Arbitration* (PCA Case No. 2011–03), Award, 18 March 2015 113
- International Thunderbird Gaming Corp. v. Mexico* (NAFTA-UNCITRAL), Arbitral Award, 26 January 2006 172, 268–70, 287, 431, 434–7, 441
- Ioan Micula and Others v. Romania* (ICSID Case No. ARB/05/20), Decision on Jurisdiction and Admissibility, 24 September 2008 129, 242
- Ioannis Kardassopoulos v. Georgia* (ICSID Case No. ARB/05/18), Award, 3 March 2010, Decision on Jurisdiction, 6 July 2007 224, 338
- Joseph C. Lemire v. Ukraine* (ICSID Case No. ARB/06/18), Decision on Jurisdiction and Liability, 21 January 2010 299

- Joy Mining v. Egypt* (ICSID Case No. ARB/03/11), Award on Jurisdiction, 6 August 2004 107–9, 372
- Karaha Bodas Co. LLC v. Pertamina and PT (Persoro) PLN*, 16 Mealey's International Arbitration Reports C1, Final Award, 18 December 2000 418–22
- Kılıç İnşaat İthalat İhracat Sanayi ve Ticaret Anonim Şirketi v. Turkmenistan* (ICSID Case No. ARB/10/1), Award, 2 July 2013 123–4, 318
- Klöckner Industrie-Anlagen GmbH and Others v. Cameroon and Another* (ICSID Case No. ARB/81/2), Award, 21 October 1983, Decision of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Application for Annulment Submitted by Klöckner against the Arbitral Award rendered on 21 October 1983, 3 May 1985 145, 156, 249
- Kristian Almås and Geir Almås v. Poland* (PCA Case No. 2015–13), Award, 27 June 2016 130
- Lao Holdings NV v. Laos* (ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/12/6), Decision on Jurisdiction, 21 February 2014, Ruling on Motion to Amend the Provisional Measures Order, 30 May 2014 197, 255
- Lena Goldfields v. USSR, The Times*, 3 September 1930 30, 38–9, 42, 44, 47
- Leonard and Mavis Daley v. Iran* (1988) 18 Iran-USCTR 232 177
- Les Laboratoires Servier, SAS and Others v. Poland* (PCA-UNCITRAL), Award (Redacted), 14 February 2012 172
- LESI SpA and Astaldi SpA v. Algeria* (ICSID Case No. ARB/05/3), Decision, 12 July 2006 218
- LG&E Energy Corp. and Others v. Argentina* (ICSID Case No. ARB/02/1), Decision on Liability, 3 October 2006 53, 250, 263–4, 346, 404
- Libananco Holdings v. Turkey* (ICSID Case No. ARB/06/8), Award, 2 September 2011 438
- Liberian Eastern Timber Corp. v. Liberia* (ICSID Case No. ARB/83/2), Award, 31 March 1986 249
- Libyan American Oil Co. v. Government of Libya* (1977) 17 ILM 3, 62 ILR 140, Award, 12 April 1977 30, 232
- Liman Caspian Oil BV and NCL Dutch Investment BV v. Kazakshtan* (ICSID Case No. ARB/07/14), Award, 22 June 2010 379
- Loewen Group, Inc. and Raymond L. Loewen v. United States of America* (ICSID Case No. ARB (AF)/98/3), Award, 26 June 2003 265–7, 274
- Maffezini v. Spain* (ICSID Case No. ARB/97/7), Decision of the Tribunal on Objections to Jurisdiction, 25 January 2000, Procedural Order No. 2, Decision Provisional Measures, 28 October 1999 101, 185, 316–18, 320–1, 486
- Malaysian Historical Salvors Sdn Bhd v. Government of Malaysia* (ICSID No. ARB/05/10), Award on Jurisdiction, 17 May 2007, Decision on the Application for Annulment, 16 April 2009, Dissenting Opinion of Judge Mohamed Shahabuddeen, 16 April 2009 107, 213–14, 454–5
- Malicorp Ltd v. Egypt* (ICSID Case No. ARB/08/18) 54
- Mamidoil Jetoil Greek Petroleum Products Société SA v. Albania* (ICSID Case No. ARB/11/24), Award, 30 March 2015 338
- Marion Unglaube v. Costa Rica* (ICSID Case No. ARB/08/1) 54

- Marvin Roy Feldman Karpa v. Mexico* (ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/99/1), Award, 16 December 2002, Interim Decision on Preliminary Jurisdiction Issues, 6 December 2000 [242](#)
- Metal-Tech Ltd v. Uzbekistan* (ICSID Case No. ARB/10/3), Award, 4 October 2013 [131](#)
- Metalclad Corp. v. Mexico* (ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/97/1), Award, 30 August 2000
- Methanex v. United States of America* (UNCITRAL), Final Award, 3 August 2005 [301–3](#), [305](#), [434–5](#), [437](#), [477–8](#), [486](#)
- MNSS BV and Other v. Montenegro* (ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/12/8), Award, 4 May 2016 [391–2](#)
- Mobil Investments Canada Inc. and Murphy Oil Corp. v. Canada* (ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/07/4), Decision on Liability and Principles of Quantum, 22 May 2012, Partial Dissenting Opinion by Arbitrator Sands, 17 May 2012 [131](#), [378](#)
- Mohamed Abdulmohsen Al-Kharafi & Sons Co. v. Libya and Others* (Unified Agreement for the Investment of Arab Capital in the Arab States), Final Arbitral Award, Cairo Regional Center for International Commercial Arbitration, 22 March 2013 [54](#), [409](#)
- Mohammad Ammar Al-Bahloul v. Tajikistan* (SCC Arbitration No. V (064/2008)), Final Award, 8 June 2010
- MOL Hungarian Oil and Gas Co. Plc v. Croatia* (ICSID Case No. ARB/13/32), Decision on Respondent's Application under ICSID Arbitration Rule 41(5), 2 December 2014 [127](#)
- Mondev v. United States of America* (ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/99/2), Award, 11 October 2002 [265](#), [284–5](#)
- MTD Equity Sdn Bhd and MTD Chile SA v. Chile* (ICSID Case No. ARB/01/7), Decision on Annulment, 21 March 2007 [310–11](#), [314](#), [322](#)
- National Gas SAE v. Egypt* (ICSID Case No. ARB/11/7), Award, 3 April 2014 [129](#)
- National Grid Plc v. Argentina* (UNCITRAL), Award, 23 November 2008 [337](#)
- Noble Ventures v. Romania* (ICSID Case No. ARB/01/11), Award, 12 October 2005 [352](#), [357–62](#), [365](#), [369](#)
- NTA v. Municipality Jabal Al Akhdar* (ICC Case No. 7245), Interim Award, 28 January 1994, unpublished [179](#)
- Occidental Exploration and Production Co. v. Ecuador* (LCIA Case No. UN 3467), Final Award, 1 July 2004 [277](#), [281–2](#), [300](#), [302](#), [304–5](#)
- OI European Group BV v. Venezuela* (ICSID Case No. ARB/11/25), Award, 10 March 2015 [423](#)
- Oxus Gold Plc v. Uzbekistan* (UNCITRAL), Final Award, 17 December 2015 [88](#), [327](#), [408](#)
- Pac Rim Cayman LLC v. El Salvador* (ICSID Case No. ARB/09/12), Decision on the Respondent's Jurisdictional Objections, 1 June 2012 [122](#), [380](#)
- Pan American Energy LLC and Another v. Argentina* (ICSID Case No. ARB/03/13) [250](#)
- Pantechniki SA Contractors & Engineers (Greece) v. Albania* (ICSID Case No. ARB/07/21), Award, 30 July 2009 [131](#)
- Parkerings-Compagniet AS v. Lithuania* (ICSID Case No. ARB/05/8), Award, 11 September 2007 [299–300](#), [327](#)
- Patua Power Ltd (Bermuda) v. PT (Persoro) PLN (Indonesia)*, 14 Mealey's International Arbitration Reports B1, Award, 4 May 1999 [418](#), [422](#)

- Paushok v. Mongolia* (UNCITRAL), Award on Jurisdiction and Liability, 28 April 2011 88, 207–8
- Petroleum Development Ltd v. The Sheikh of Abu Dhabi* (1951) 18 ILR 144 30, 39, 88
- Philip Morris Asia Ltd v. Australia* (PCA Case No. 2012–12), Award on Jurisdiction and Admissibility, 17 December 2015 (Böckstiegel, Kaufmann-Kohler, McRae), Procedural Order No. 8 (Regarding Bifurcation of the Procedure), 14 April 2014 80, 115, 125–6, 132, 238–9, 256, 505
- Philip Morris Brands Sàrl and Others v. Uruguay* (ICSID Case No. ARB/10/7), Award, 8 July 2016, Decision on Jurisdiction, 2 July 2013 79, 122, 381
- Philippines v. China* (PCA Case No. 2013–19), Award on Jurisdiction and Admissibility, 29 October 2015 113
- Phoenix Action, Ltd v. Czech Republic* (ICSID Case No. ARB/06/5), Award, 15 April 2009 218, 234, 238
- Plama Consortium Ltd v. Bulgaria* (ICSID Case No. ARB/03/24), Decision on Jurisdiction, 8 February 2005, Award, 27 August 2008 205, 247, 317
- Pope & Talbot Inc. v. Canada* (UNCITRAL), Award on the Merits of Phase 2, 10 April 2001 301, 307–9, 482–3
- Poštová banka, a.s. and ISTROKAPITAL SE v. Greece* (ICSID Case No. ARB/13/8), Award, 9 April 2015, Decision on Poštová banka's Application for Partial Annulment of the Award, 29 September 2016 130, 378
- Quasar de Valores SA and Others v. Russia* (SCC Case No. 24/2007), Award, 20 July 2012 168
- Quiborax SA, Non Metallic Minerals SA and Allan Fosk Kaplún v. Bolivia* (ICSID Case No. ARB/06/2), Award, 16 September 2015, Decision on Provisional Measures, 26 February 2010 197–8, 297, 299, 302, 305, 307, 423
- Rachel S. Grynberg, Stephen M. Grynberg, Miriam Z. Grynberg, and RSM Production Corp. v. Grenada* (ICSID Case No. ARB/10/6), Award, 10 December 2010 110, 136
- RDC v. Guatemala* (ICSID Case No. ARB/07/23), Award, 29 June 2012 286
- The Renco Group v. Peru* (ICSID Case No. UNCT/13/1), Decision as to the Scope of the Respondent's Preliminary Objections under Article 10.20.4, 18 December 2014, Partial Award on Jurisdiction, 15 July 2016 126, 131
- Renée Rose Levy and Gremcitel SA v. Peru* (ICSID Case No. ARB/11/17), Award, 9 January 2015 218, 221–3
- Romak SA (Switzerland) v. Uzbekistan* (PCA Case No. AA280), Award, 26 November 2009 218, 221–3
- The Rompetrol Group NV v. Romania* (ICSID Case No. ARB/06/3), Decision on Respondent's Preliminary Objections on Jurisdiction and Admissibility, 18 April 2008, Award, 6 May 2013 129, 173
- Ron Fuchs v. Georgia* (ICSID Case No. ARB/07/15), Award, 3 March 2010 338
- Ronald S. Lauder v. Czech Republic* (UNCITRAL), Final Award, 3 September 2001 132, 252–3
- RosInvestCo v. Russia* (SCC Case No. V079/2005), Award, October 2007, Final Award, 12 September 2010 98–9, 168–72

- RSM Production Corp. v. St Lucia* (ICSID Case No. ARB/12/10), Decision on St Lucia's Request for Security for Costs, 13 August 2014 [110](#), [193](#), [442](#)
- Ruler of Qatar v. International Marine Oil Co.* (1953) 20 ILR 534, Award, June 1953 [39](#), [41](#), [44](#), [88](#)
- Rumeli Telekom AS and Another v. Kazakhstan* (ICSID Case No. ARB/05/16) [54](#)
- Saba Fakes v. Turkey* (ICSID Case No. ARB/07/20) [54](#)
- Saipem v. Bangladesh* (ICSID Case No. ARB/05/7), Decision on Jurisdiction, 21 March 2007 [98](#), [347](#)
- Salini v. Jordan* (ICSID Case No. ARB/02/13), Decision on Jurisdiction, 9 November 2004 [314](#), [358–62](#)
- Salini Costruttori SpA and Another v. Morocco* (ICSID Case No. ARB/00/4), Decision on Jurisdiction, 23 July 2001 [107–9](#), [211](#), [218–20](#), [222–6](#), [228–30](#), [455](#)
- Saluka Investments BV v. Czech Republic* (UNCITRAL), Partial Award, 17 March 2006 [88](#), [268–75](#), [279–81](#), [299](#), [478](#), [486](#)
- Sanum Investments Ltd v. Government of Laos* (UNCITRAL, PCA Case No. 2013–13), Award on Jurisdiction, 13 December 2013 [98](#), [131](#), [255](#)
- Sapphire International Petroleum Ltd v. National Iranian Oil Co.* (1963) 35 ILR 136, Award, 15 March 1963 [23–4](#), [39–40](#), [43–6](#), [48–50](#), [88](#), [418](#)
- SARL Benvenuti and Bonfant v. Congo* (ICSID Case No. ARB/77/2), Award, 8 August 1980 [339](#)
- Saudi Arabia v. Arabian American Oil Co.* (1958) 27 ILR 117 [39](#), [42–3](#), [88](#)
- SAUR International SA v. Argentina* (Affaire CIRDI No. ARB/04/4), Award, 22 May 2014 [407–8](#)
- S. D. Myers, Inc. v. Government of Canada* (UNCITRAL), Partial Award, 13 November 2000, 40 ILM 1408 [260](#), [265](#), [271](#), [291](#), [433](#), [435](#), [482–3](#)
- Sempra Energy International v. Argentina* (ICSID Case No. ARB/02/16), Award, 28 September 2007, Decision on the Argentine Republic's Application for Annulment of the Award, 29 June 2010 [53](#), [250](#), [264](#), [288–9](#), [335](#), [346](#)
- Sergei Paushok, CJSC Golden East Co. and CJSC Vostokneftegaz Co. v. Government of Mongolia* (UNCITRAL), Order on Interim Measures, 2 September 2008 [197](#), [202–7](#)
- SGS Société Générale de Surveillance v. Pakistan* (ICSID Case No. ARB/01/13), Decision on Objections to Jurisdiction, 6 August 2003 [219](#), [350–5](#), [358–9](#), [362–3](#), [372](#)
- SGS Société Générale de Surveillance v. Paraguay* (ICSID Case No. ARB/07/29), Decision on Jurisdiction, 12 February 2010 [372](#)
- SGS Société Générale de Surveillance v. Philippines* (ICSID Case No. ARB/02/6), Decision on Objections to Jurisdiction, 29 January 2004, Decision on Jurisdiction, 29 January 2004, Declaration by Arbitrator Crivellaro, 29 January 2004 [352](#), [355–60](#), [362–4](#), [368](#), [390–1](#)
- Siemens v. Argentina* (ICSID Case No. ARB/02/8), Award, 6 February 2007 [282](#), [287–8](#), [314](#), [318](#)
- Société des Grands Travaux Marseille v. East Pakistan Industrial Development Corp.* (ICC Case No. 1803), Award, 12 December 1972 [179](#)

- Société Ouest Africaine des Bétons Industriels v. Senegal* (ICSID Case No. ARB/82/1), Award, 25 February 1988 [339](#)
- Southern Pacific Properties (Middle East) Ltd v. Egypt* (ICSID Case No. ARB/84/3), Decision on Jurisdiction and Dissenting Opinion, 14 April 1988, 3 ICSID Rep. [131](#) [54](#), [63–4](#), [94](#)
- SPP (Middle East) Ltd and Southern Pacific Properties Ltd v. Egypt and Another* (ICC Arbitration No. YD/AS NO 3493), Award, 11 March 1983 [94](#), [146](#), [148](#), [155](#), [180](#)
- Spyridon Roussalis v. Romania* (ICSID Case No. ARB/06/1), Declaration by W. Michael Reisman, 28 November 2011, Award, 7 December 2011 [88](#), [335–6](#)
- Starrett Housing Corp. and Another v. Iran and Others* (1987) 16 Iran-USCTR 112, Final Award, 14 August 1987 [418](#)
- Suez, Sociedad Generale de Aguas de Barcelona and Another v. Argentina* (ICSID Case No. ARB/03/19), Decision on Jurisdiction, 3 August 2006 [251](#), [317](#)
- Talsud SA v. Mexico* (ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/04/4), Award, 16 June 2010 [53](#), [338](#), [407–8](#)
- Tecnicas Medioambientales Tecmed SA v. Mexico* (ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/00/2), Award, 29 May 2003 [269](#), [275–7](#), [279](#), [288](#)
- Telenor Mobile Communications AS v. Hungary* (ICSID Case No. ARB/04/15), Award, 13 September 2006, Decision on Jurisdiction, 13 December 2006 [98](#), [318](#), [336–7](#)
- Texaco Overseas Petroleum Co./California Asiatic Oil Co. v. Libya* (1977) 53 ILR 389(1979), 17 ILM 1(1978), Award on the Merits, 19 January 1977 [15](#), [17–24](#), [30](#), [39–40](#), [46–50](#), [88](#), [232](#), [404](#)
- The Sopron-Kőszeg Local Co.* (1930) 24 AJIL 164, Award, 18 June 1929 [51](#)
- Tokios Tokelés v. Ukraine* (ICSID Case No. ARB/02/18), Award, 26 July 2007, Decision on Jurisdiction, 29 April 2004, Order No. 1, Claimant's Request for Provisional Measures, 1 July 2003 [172](#), [191](#), [194](#), [196–7](#), [237](#), [486](#)
- Total SA v. Argentina* (ICSID Case No. ARB/04/01), Decision on Liability, 27 December 2010 [397](#)
- Toto Costruzioni Generali SpA v. Lebanon* (ICSID Case No. ARB/07/12), Award, 11 September 2009 [225](#)
- Trans-Global Petroleum v. Jordan* (ICSID Case No. ARB/07/25), Tribunal's Decision on Respondent's Objection under Rule 41(5) of the ICSID Arbitration Rules, 12 May 2008 [110](#), [127](#)
- Tza Yap Shum v. Peru* (ICSID Case No. ARB/07/6), Decision on Jurisdiction and Competence, 19 June 2009 [98](#)
- Urbaser SA and Other v. Argentina* (ICSID Case No. ARB/07/26), Award, 8 December 2016 [397](#)
- Vacuum Salt Products Ltd v. Ghana* (ICSID Case No. ARB/92/1), Award, 16 February 1994 [249](#)
- Venezuela v. Tidewater Investment SRL and Another* (ICSID Case No. ARB/10/5), Award, 13 March 2015, Decision on Annulment, 27 December 2016 [413](#), [417](#), [423](#)

- Venezuela Holdings, BV and Others v. Venezuela* (ICSID Case No. ARB/07/27), Award of the Tribunal, 9 October 2014, Decision on Annulment, 9 March 2017 124, 139–41, 410
- Venezuela US, SRL v. Venezuela* (PCA Case No. 2013–34), Dissenting Opinion of Professor Marcelo Kohen, 26 July 2016, Interim Award on Jurisdiction, 26 July 2016 131–2, 320
- Vestey Group Ltd v. Venezuela* (ICSID Case No. ARB/06/4), Award, 15 April 2016 147, 180
- Veteran Petroleum Ltd (Cyprus) v. Russia* (PCA Case No. AA228), Final Award, 18 July 2014, Interim Award on Jurisdiction and Admissibility, 30 November 2009 168, 170–1, 237
- Victor Pey Casado & President Allende Foundation v. Chile* (ICSID Case No. ARB/98/2), Revision Decision, 18 November 2009 457
- Vigotop Ltd v. Hungary* (ICSID Case No. ARB/11/22), Award, 1 October 2014 54, 166, 327, 329–32
- Vito G. Gallo v. Government of Canada* (NAFTA-UNCITRAL, PCA Case No. 55798), Award (Redacted), 15 September 2011 172
- Waguih Elie George Siag and Clorinda Vecchi v. Egypt* (ICSID Case No. ARB/05/15), Award, 1 June 2009, Decision on Jurisdiction, 11 April 2007, Partially Dissenting Opinion of Professor Francisco Orrego Vicuña, 11 April 2007 173, 240–1
- Walter Bau AG (In Liquidation) v. Thailand* (UNCITRAL), Award, 1 July 2009 54, 337
- Waste Management Inc. v. Mexico ('No. 2')* (ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)00/3), Award, 30 April 2004 53, 260, 263, 265, 271, 286
- WCN Factoring Ltd v. Czech Republic* (PCA Case No. 2014–34), Award, 22 February 2017 115
- Wena Hotels Ltd v. Egypt* (ICSID Case No. ARB/98/4), Award, 8 December 2000 325–6, 332, 334
- Westland Helicopters v. Arab Organization for Industrialization and Others* (ICC Case No. 3879), Interim Award, 5 March 1984 179
- William Ralph Clayton and Others v. Government of Canada* (NAFTA-UNCITRAL, PCA Case No. 2009–04), Award on Jurisdiction and Liability, 17 March 2015 166, 302, 308
- World Wide Minerals v. Kazakhstan* (UNCITRAL), Decision on Jurisdiction, 19 October 2015 131
- Yousef Maiman and Others v. Egypt* (UNCITRAL) 254
- Yukos Universal Ltd (Isle of Man) v. Russia* (PCA Case No. AA227), Final Award, 28 July 2014, Interim Award on Jurisdiction and Admissibility, 30 November 2009 131–2, 167–71, 237

NATIONAL CASES BY COUNTRY

Canada

Bowlay Logging Ltd v. Domtar Ltd [1978] 4 WWR 105 417

Collavino Inc. v. Tihama Development Authority [2007] 9 WWR 290 466

France

Creighton v. Qatar, Cass. Civ. 1, 28 September 2011 466

Gouvernement du Pakistan v. Société Dallah Real Estate and Tourism Holding Co., Cour d'Appel de Paris, No. 09/28533, 17 February 2011 160

Mohamed Abdulmohsen Al-Kharafi & Sons Co. v. Libya and Others, Cour d'Appel de Paris, No. 13/18811, 28 October 2014 54, 409

Germany

Walter Bau Case, Case No. III ZB 40/12 475

Hong Kong

Congo v. FG Hemisphere Associates LLC (No. 1) (2011) 14 HKCFAR 95 (Court of Final Appeal, Hong Kong) 461, 463

Singapore

Government of Laos v. Sanum Investments Ltd [2015] SGHC 15 471

Sanum Investments Ltd v. Government of Laos [2016] SGCA 57 98, 131

United Kingdom

AEI Rediffusion Music v. Phonographic Performance [1999] 1 WLR 1507 445

American Cyanamid Co. v. Ethicon Ltd [1975] AC 396 186

Buttes Gas and Oil Co. v. Hammer (No. 3) [1982] AC 888 466–7, 469–71

C & P Haulage v. Middleton [1983] 1 WLR 1461 417

Czech Republic v. European Media Ventures [2007] EWHC 2851 98

Ecuador v. Occidental Production and Development Co. [2006] EWHC 345 (Comm) 451

ETI Euro Telecom International NV v. Bolivia and Another [2008] EWCA Civ. 880

Giles v. Thompson [1993] 3 All ER 321

Occidental Exploration and Production Co. v. Ecuador [2005] EWCA Civ. 1116 188, 452, 466–8

Svenska v. Lithuania [2007] 2 WLR 876 475

Viorel Micula, Ioan Micula, SC European Food SA, SC Starmill SRI, SC Multipack SRI v. Romania [2017] EWHC 31 (Comm) 459

Yukos Capital SARL v. OJSC Rosneft Oil Co. [2012] EWCA Civ. 855 466

United States

- Abrams v. United States of America*, 250 US 616 (1919) [2](#)
- Banco Nacional de Cuba v. Sabbatino*, 307 F2d 845 (2nd Cir. 1962), 376 US 398 (1964) [13–14](#), [471](#)
- Ipitrade International SA v. Nigeria*, 465 F.Supp.824 (DDC 1978) [475](#)
- L. Albert & Son v. Armstrong Rubber Co.*, 178 F2d 182 (1949) [417](#)
- NML Capital Ltd v. Argentina*, 699 F3d 246, 261–263 (2nd Cir. 2012) [183](#)
- Walker International Holdings Ltd v. Congo*, 395 F3d 229 (2004) [466](#)

Abbreviations

TREATIES AND OTHER INSTRUMENTS

ACIA	ASEAN Comprehensive Investment Agreement
C–J–K TIT	China–Japan–Korea Trilateral Investment Treaty
CAFTA-DR	Dominican Republic–Central America–United States Free Trade Agreement
CETA	Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement
DR–CAFTA	Dominican Republic–Central America Free Trade Agreement
ECT	Energy Charter Treaty
FTAA	Free Trade Area of the Americas
GATS	General Agreement on Trade in Services
Hague Choice of Court Convention	Convention of 30 June 2005 on Choice of Court Agreements ('Hague Convention on Choice of Court Agreements')
ICSID Additional Facility Rules	Self-contained rules which define the scope of the Additional Facility for investor-State disputes which do not fall under the ICSID Convention; for example, where one of the parties is not an ICSID Member State or a national thereof
ICSID Convention	Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States
ICSID Arbitration Rules	ICSID Convention Arbitration Rules
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Agreement
New York Convention	Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards
TPP	Trans-Pacific Partnership
TRIMS	Trade-Related Investment Measures Agreement
TTIP	Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership
UNCITRAL Model Law	UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration
UNCITRAL Rules	UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules
VCLT	Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties

Bodies

AAA	American Arbitration Association
AALCO	Asian–African Legal Consultative Organisation
ACICA	Australian Centre for International Commercial Arbitration
AF	Additional Facility
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
BIICL	British Institute of International and Comparative Law
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
HKIAC	Hong Kong International Arbitration Centre
ICC	International Chamber of Commerce
ICJ	International Court of Justice
ICSID	International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes
IUSCT	Iran–US Claims Tribunal
ILC	International Law Commission
IUSCT	Iran–United States Claims Tribunal
KLRCA	Kuala Lumpur Regional Centre for Arbitration
LCIA	London Court of International Arbitration
NAFTA FTC	NAFTA Free Trade Commission
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PCA	Permanent Court of Arbitration
PCIJ	Permanent Court of International Justice
SCC	Stockholm Chamber of Commerce
SIAC	Singapore International Arbitration Centre
UN	United Nations
UNCC	UN Compensation Commission
UNCITRAL	UN Commission on International Trade Law
UNCTAD	UN Conference on Trade and Development
WTO	World Trade Organization

Common Terms

ASR	Articles on State Responsibility
BIT	bilateral investment treaty
BOT	build-operate-and-transfer
CFtE	costs follow the event
DCF	discounted cash flow
DELC	<i>damnum emergens plus lucrum cessans</i>
EPA	Economic Partnership Agreement
FET	fair and equitable treatment
FMV	fair market value
FPS	full protection and security

FTA	free trade agreement
GSP	Generalized System of Preferences
IIA	international investment agreement
MFN	most-favoured nation
MIT	multilateral investment treaty
MST	minimum standard of treatment
MTBE	methyl tertiary-butyl ether
NIEO	New International Economic Order
NT	national treatment
PPA	power purchase agreement
PPP	public-private partnership
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

1

The Origins of Investment Protection and International Investment Law

CHAPTER OUTLINE

Investment treaty arbitration derives from the consent of the host State, given under a treaty, to submit itself to arbitration in the event of a dispute with a foreign investor. Today, such treaty-based arbitration is the most prominent aspect of international investment arbitration, but it is only one aspect or form of it. Arbitration itself is only one of several means of settling investment disputes between foreign investors and host States. In the past, international investment disputes were resolved diplomatically by the 'home' State of the investor taking up its grievance against a foreign 'host' State, thereby making that grievance the home State's own. Such a claim might be pursued purely through diplomatic means, but throughout the nineteenth century and persisting well into the twentieth century there were several examples of the settlement of investment disputes through 'mixed' claims commissions. These were commissions of an international character which in time were supplemented by national claims commissions. Diplomatic espousal and mixed commissions operated in tandem. Where the commission failed, as it sometimes did, there were diplomatic negotiations leading to 'lump sum' settlements. [Section 1](#) discusses these earlier forms of international investment dispute settlement. [Section 2](#) goes on to discuss the unsettled period following the Second World War from 1945 to the 1970s, during which the standards of protection, particularly the standard of compensation, as well as the means of settlement – whether that ought to be in domestic courts or by way of international arbitration – were controversial. In response to controversy and uncertainty, there was an effort to transform the standards of protection into contractual terms, and to introduce contractual agreements to arbitrate any disputes. The attempt to 'contractualise' international investment protection became an attempt to elevate the contracts themselves onto the international plane, such that the contractual commitments to standards of protection and arbitration would themselves have the force of international law. That is the subject of [Section 3](#). [Section 4](#) deals with the rise, subsequently, of treaty-based protection and treaty-based arbitration in place of the role which contract had played. Thus emerged today's ubiquitous bilateral investment treaties (BITs) and the

sort of investment treaty arbitration for which they provide. [Section 5](#) discusses related modern institutions; namely, the International Centre for the Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID), as well as the inter-State adjudication of investment disputes before the International Court of Justice (ICJ). [Section 6](#) rounds off this opening chapter with a brief introduction to the modern sources of international law usually relied upon by international investment tribunals.

INTRODUCTION

Many who know nothing of international law are likely to have heard of ‘investor-State dispute settlement’ (‘ISDS’ for short). Some of what has been heard may be discouraging.¹ What is meant by ISDS today is, often, a form of treaty-based arbitration – a late-twentieth-century development. Investment treaty arbitration is the principal focus of this book, although it is not its sole focus. In comparison, contractually based arbitration has had a longer and sturdier history. There are forms of investment arbitration too which are based neither on treaty nor contract, such as arbitrations brought by private claimants on the basis of a host State’s consent to arbitration embodied in a national law, say a national petroleum law, or even in a host State’s investment authorisation or in some other document.²

Still, it is important to be reminded of history. The American Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes once wrote that ‘time has upset many fighting faiths’.³ The converse is true too. Old ideas return. They recur. Seemingly fresh ideas that are emerging, such as the European Union’s proposal today that ‘private’ investment treaty arbitration should be replaced with a multilateral international investment court, cannot be appreciated fully without some acknowledgment of the history of the subject. History may also prove to be the best guide to the future where overbroad international protection for foreign investors is again being challenged, as it once was by the newly decolonised nations of Africa and Asia.

1. DIPLOMATIC ESPOUSAL, MIXED AND OTHER SIMILAR COMMISSIONS

1.1 Diplomatic Espousal

We should begin, first, with diplomatic protection. Injury to an alien, including injury to a foreign investor, can trigger diplomatic protection by the investor’s home State. The Permanent Court of International Justice, the predecessor to the present-day International Court of Justice, had put it this way:⁴

¹ For which, see, e.g., P. Eberhardt and C. Olivet (with contributions from T. Amos and N. Buxton), *Profiting from Injustice: How Law Firms, Arbitrators and Financiers Are Fuelling an Investment Arbitration Boom* (Brussels/Amsterdam: Corporate Europe Observatory and the Transnational Institute, 2012).

² All of this we will come to in [Chapter 4](#) of this book.

³ *Abrams v. USA*, 250 US 616 (1919) (Holmes J.).

⁴ *Mavrommatis Palestine Concessions (Greece v. UK)* [1924] PCIJ Rep. Series A No. 2, 12.

... it is an elementary principle of international law that a state is entitled to protect its subjects, when injured by acts contrary to international law committed by another state, from whom they have been unable to obtain satisfaction through the ordinary channels.

The term 'diplomatic protection', however, is wide. In the view of the International Law Commission (ILC), that body entrusted with the codification and progressive development of international law, the 'other means of peaceful settlement' include 'negotiation, mediation and conciliation' in addition to 'arbitral and judicial dispute settlement'. In its Draft Articles on Diplomatic Protection, the ILC defines diplomatic protection as:⁵

... the invocation by a State, through diplomatic action or other means of peaceful settlement, of the responsibility of another State for an injury caused by an internationally wrongful act of that State to a natural or legal person that is a national of the former State with a view to the implementation of such responsibility.

The aim is to ensure both protection and reparation for a national wronged by a foreign State.⁶ It should be added, for the sake only of completeness, that this definition in the Draft Articles on Diplomatic Protection keeps to the formulation in the ILC's Draft Articles on State Responsibility for Internationally Wrongful Acts.⁷

The legal fiction, said to originate with Vattel's dictum that whosoever injures a national injures the State itself,⁸ is this. The claim becomes that of the home State itself, not that of the injured national.⁹ It is a fiction which now more than ever is confronted with the reality of investors bringing claims directly before an investment arbitration tribunal. This book is about the new reality, particularly since the late 1990s, of investor-State arbitration. Although not unimaginable, this reality today was once thought to have been unlikely. In the beginning, diplomatic protection meant the espousal of an investor's claim by its own State.

Maximilian Koessler, 'Government Espousal of Private Claims before International Tribunals', (1946) 13 *Chicago Law Review* 180, 180–181

International law has not so far developed a generally accepted theory to explain the nature of 'diplomatic protection'. Yet in the postwar era this phrase will be employed to an extent unknown before the war to define the action taken by state against state to secure redress of alleged wrongs done to individuals or corporations. Although many of these claims will be settled by mutual agreement of the respective foreign offices, in many cases the issues will be submitted to an international body of arbitration or adjudication. Such litigation may become

⁵ Art. 1, Draft Articles on Diplomatic Protection, text adopted by the ILC at its 58th session, 2006, UN Doc. A/61/10; YrBk of the ILC, 2006, vol. II, Part Two, 24, 27. The page numbers refer to UN Doc. A/61/10.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 24.

⁷ For '[a]ny system of law must address the responsibility of its subjects for breaches of their obligations'; J. Crawford, *State Responsibility: The General Part* (Cambridge University Press, 2014), 3.

⁸ E. de Vattel, *The Law of Nations or the Principles of Natural Law Applied to the Conduct and to the Affairs of Nations and Sovereigns* (Washington, DC: 1758, English translation by C. G. Fenwick, Carnegie Institution, 1916), vol. III, 136.

⁹ See further A. Vermeer-Künzli, 'As If: The Legal Fiction in Diplomatic Protection' (2007) 18(1) *EJIL* 37.

the most important aspect of postwar 'diplomatic protection'. The term itself is not very felicitous since it does not describe an essential or characteristic feature of the institution. The unique character of this international litigation does not lie in the employment of diplomatic measures. Its peculiarity is based on the fact that the claim of a private person, normally without judicial standing as against a foreign state, is espoused by a state and thus converted into a government claim which will be heard by the appropriate international tribunal. An historical analogy may be suggested. It appears that 'interposition', in the sense just referred to, is similar to the representation of the serf by his lord under feudal law. This feudal representation grew out of the fact that the serf, devoid of a standing in the barons' courts, would have been a defenseless victim of aggression by any other lord but for the championship of his own lord. Similarly, the private person today, unrecognized by international courts or arbitration bodies, would be without legal protection against an offending foreign state were not that private person's claim espoused by his government.

...

A streamlined law of nations, granting to private persons a standing before international courts and arbitration commissions, could do away with the roundabout relief through diplomatic protection, just as the emancipation of the serfs eliminated the need for feudal representation.

1.2 Diplomatic Espousal and Diplomatic Settlement

We have travelled far since. Diplomatic espousal was viewed as a thing fraught with risk. If only to paraphrase McNair, it arises at the behest of troublesome individuals who are prone to invent claims and were therefore a bit of a nuisance. It was also hardly irrelevant that claimants often enough asked for the right to wage private war through the grant of special reprisals.¹⁰ McNair observed that the famous *Don Pacifico* incident was notable in that regard. A British subject who suffered loss and injury when his house was broken into and plundered by a riotous mob had sought and obtained British espousal of his claim for the loss and injury sustained to him and his family. Lord Palmerston was in that case advised by Sir John Dodson that the Greek authorities had breached 'the duty of every civilized Government to protect Persons and Property within its Jurisdiction'.¹¹ This led to a claim by the British Government for losses sustained. The same principle had been expressed, as Professors Rudolf Dolzer and Christoph Schreuer have pointed out, by John Adams during the year before he became the President of the United States following the conclusion of a friendship, commerce and navigation (FCN) treaty with France¹² – a precursor to today's bilateral investment treaties.¹³

¹⁰ Lord McNair, *International Law Opinions: Selected and Annotated* (Cambridge University Press, 1956), vol. 11, 197, 198.

¹¹ J. Dodson to Lord Palmerston, 13 July 1847; reproduced in McNair, *International Law Opinions*, 239.

¹² Cited and quoted in R. Dolzer and C. Schreuer, *Principles of International Investment Law*, 2nd edn (Oxford University Press, 2012), 1.

¹³ For the influence of FCN treaties today, see K. J. Vandeveld, *Bilateral Investment Treaties: History, Policy and Interpretation* (Oxford University Press, 2010).

For our purposes, it would be excessive to explore the various criteria which have been applied by individual governments in deciding upon the exercise of their discretionary power. Suffice to say that the exhaustion of local remedies is typically a requirement,¹⁴ so too the requirement that the injured party should have the protecting State's nationality, which in turn might involve further questions about the continuity of that nationality and its duration.

The chief shortcoming of diplomatic espousal from the viewpoint of the private party who alleges injury is the discretionary nature of that remedy.¹⁵ There is no assurance that protection will be forthcoming. In comparison, the investor may elect, on its own, whether or not to pursue that right directly and when to do so. This may be advantageous not just to the claimant, but also to the State, which is spared from the role of serving as a debt collector for its merchantmen.

The story of how diplomatic espousal, which although it remains, gave way to investor-State claims and arbitration, is a story of adaptation, experimentation and human ingenuity. The roots lie in the mixed international commissions of old.

1.3 Mixed International Commissions, National Commissions and Modern Claims Settlement

The idea of a 'mixed' dispute settlement mechanism, where mixed nationality commissioners are chosen by the States, has a long history. Such international claims commissions have existed since the earliest 'investment' disputes. International mixed claims commissions should also be distinguished from 'national' claims commissions, which represent a related, but distinct, device, as the extract by Professor Lillich, below, explains.

So far as mixed claims commissions were concerned, these were an inherently flexible device which had been designed to settle claims between the citizens of different States, between the citizens of one State against another State and also between the States themselves.¹⁶ One should be careful to observe that this does not mean that individuals could simply appear to press their own claims as they can today in investment arbitration.¹⁷ Typically, such commissions were established under treaty by States – i.e. by more than one State, unlike in the case of national commissions – and it is the States which play a key role in choosing the commissioners who would comprise a majority of their own nationals. Mixed commissions were most prominent during the nineteenth century, during which some eighty or so of them replaced the single arbitrator tribunals of an

¹⁴ Flexibly interpreted, see, e.g., 'Letter of US Secretary of State to Minister to Turkey, 5 February 1853' (1906) 6 *Moore's Digest of International Law* 264, also reproduced in C. F. Dugan, D. Wallace, Jr, N. D. Rubins and B. Sabahi, *Investor-State Arbitration* (Oxford University Press, 2008), 28. Dugan *et al.* cite the Canadian Foreign Ministry's position, requiring nationality at the time of loss and presentation of claim and in the case of a company its formation under Canadian law prior to the time of the presentation of the claim, as well as the exhaustion of local remedies again flexibly interpreted (*ibid.*, 29–30).

¹⁵ See the well-known passage in *Barcelona Traction, Light and Power Co., Ltd (Belgium v. Spain)* [1970] ICJ Rep. 3, p. 44.

¹⁶ See R. Dolzer, 'Mixed Claims Commissions' in *Max Planck Encyclopedia of Public International Law*, available at www.opil.oupilaw.com (last updated: May 2011). As ideas in the field tend to, this very flexibility now returns in modern form in the Iran-US Claims Tribunal and the UN Compensation Commission, discussed further below.

¹⁷ This only appeared after the First World War (Dolzer, 'Mixed Claims Commissions').

earlier era. They presaged today's 'mixed' arbitral tribunals. Unlike diplomatic espousal, such commissions would not normally require the exhaustion of local remedies. The mixed claims commissions lasted well into the late 1930s,¹⁸ one of the more prominent being perhaps the commission established by the United States and Mexico just before the Second World War in order to settle the Mexican agrarian expropriations.¹⁹

As for national commissions, these are explained in the extract below.

Richard B. Lillich, *International Claims: Their Adjudication by National Commissions* (New York: Syracuse University Press, 1962) (footnotes omitted)

Many proposals have been made through the years for the establishment of international judicial bodies to facilitate the settlement of claims. All would modify or eliminate the espousal concept and give the individuals more or less direct access to some form of permanent international tribunal. All, unfortunately, have come to naught. Nor have the increasing availability of municipal fora to aliens for the prosecution of direct claims against the sovereign and the concurrent trend toward the restrictive theory of sovereign immunity alleviated the situation for the vast majority of aggrieved individuals, whose only recourse against a foreign state remains via the method of espousal.

The United States at an early date sought to avoid the unwieldy espousal concept whenever a large number of claims arose against a single state by resort to international claims commissions. Beginning with the Jay Treaty of 1794, regarded as the commencement of modern international arbitration, this country [i.e. the United States] pursued a policy of advocating the use of mixed claims commissions. These commissions, composed of nationals of the United States, the foreign country, and a third state, would receive and adjudicate claims brought by the United States on behalf of its nationals against the foreign country. Other states followed suit and 'gradually this jurisprudence attained an increasing influence on the development of international law'. [Quoting Professor Stuyt]

While the mixed claims commission promoted the rule of law in that it substituted a legal for a political determination, and while in a sense it relieved the Department of State of the burden of severally presenting many essentially nongovernmental claims, it soon became apparent that the success of a mixed commission depended to a disproportionate degree upon the ability of its commissioners. Indeed, the very nature of the device was such as to produce commissioners of nonjudicious, adversary temperament. If commissioners performed their duties with speed and impartiality the mixed commission was a useful device for the settlement of international claims and the development of customary international law. But too often this was not the case.

One of the Jay Treaty commissions, for instance, was rendered so ineffective by the conduct of the commissioners that it was eventually abandoned, the United States paying

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ Or at least those occurring after 1927. For the Mexican agrarian expropriations, see [Section 2](#), below, which reproduces the US–Mexican correspondence of 1938. A further round of expropriations of British and American property in 1938 were settled by means of expert determination instead, in which both sides appointed expert assessors. See further A. Lowenfeld, *International Economic Law*, 2nd edn (Oxford University Press, 2008), 479–480.

a lump sum to Great Britain and the latter establishing a national commission to distribute the money. The failure of this mixed commission was undoubtedly one reason why a year later, in 1803, the United States accepted a lump sum from France in settlement of certain American claims which it distributed by means of the first United States national claims commission. Thus it can be seen that 'the domestic claims commission is not an innovation' [Quoting Coerper] of recent years but a device dating back to the earliest days of modern international arbitration.

National commissions have been utilized frequently by the United States during the past 150 years. Such commissions have distributed funds under treaties, conventions, or agreements with Spain in 1819, Great Britain in 1826, Denmark in 1830, France in 1831, the Two Sicilies in 1832, Spain in 1834, Peru in 1841, Mexico in 1848, Brazil in 1849, China in 1858, Rumania, Italy, the U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia. Lump sum settlements with Rumania and Poland were concluded in 1960, and the Department of State currently is conducting negotiations with several Eastern European countries in an effort to achieve a settlement of outstanding claims. Future lump sum settlements with these countries will be handled by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, which is now processing Czech and Polish claims.

The wholehearted adoption by the United States of the lump sum method of handling large groups of international claims, indicated by the various settlements mentioned above and commented upon by many writers, was due less to the superior features of this method of adjudicating claims than to the inherent defects and repeated failures of mixed claims commissions. The ineffectiveness of one Jay Treaty commission leading to the utilization of the first United States national commission established a pattern which has been followed many times over. Indeed, in the case of the 1826 Convention with Great Britain, the 1848 Treaty with Mexico, and the 1934 and 1941 Conventions with Mexico, there had been prior attempts to settle these claims by means of mixed commissions which each time had failed. The failure of these mixed commissions led not only to an assumption of their work by national commissions, but also caused the Department of State to place increased reliance on the national commission technique of settling international claims. Following the 1826 Convention with Great Britain, for example, the United States negotiated lump sum settlements in 1830 with Denmark, in 1831 with France, in 1832 with the Two Sicilies, in 1834 with Spain, and in 1841 with Peru. After the 1848 Treaty with Mexico, lump sum settlements were concluded in 1849 with Brazil and in 1858 with China. The breakdown of the prewar mixed commissions with Mexico, followed by the 1934 and 1941 Conventions with that country, resulted in the national claims commission device being used by the United States almost to the exclusion of any other type.

Even if commissioners on a mixed commission could function smoothly, there is doubt whether the mixed commission would be adequate to handle the wholesale claims of the postwar period. As far back as 1938, McKernan noted that 'a large number of claims demands a certain speed of adjudication which is impossible if the claims are to be decided by commissioners of different nationalities, and language, and who are educated in different legal systems'. Six years later Hudson pointed out that extraordinary delays were a common characteristic of mixed commissions and had tended to jeopardize confidence in them.

The best-known modern successors of the mixed claims commissions of old are the Iran–US Claims Tribunal and, though fundamentally different for being strictly a claims-processing facility, the UN Compensation Commission.²⁰ The Iran–US Claims Tribunal in particular has contributed significantly to the jurisprudence on investment claims. Professor Lillich’s account of mixed international claims commissions and national claims commissions provides a helpful introduction to a part of the controversy over the nature of the Iran–US Claims Tribunal.

The tribunal had been established under the Second Algiers Declaration (‘The Claims Settlement Declaration’). One question had concerned the status of the tribunal since it was at least unclear whether the Algiers Declaration was a treaty. It was argued that it was a treaty albeit concluded through an intermediary, and the tribunal itself considered it a treaty. Still it was not clear even then that what resulted was necessarily an international tribunal, even though Article II(1) of the Claims Settlement Declaration called it such.²¹ This is Professor Lillich’s point in the extract above – namely, that a treaty could be used to establish an agreement between two States, but, although still obligated under treaty, a State might establish a national, rather than an international, commission for the settlement of the relevant claims.

The Iran–US Claims Tribunal was established, as was typically the case, as a response to traumatic events flowing from the Iranian Revolution of 1979 and the Iran Hostage Crisis. The First Algiers Declaration dealt broadly speaking with, among other things, the hostage crisis, the return of Iranian assets, the settlement of Iranian bank loans and Iran’s commitment to pay into a fund from which awards in successful claims against it may be paid. The second, the Claims Settlement Declaration, with which we are primarily concerned, established a nine-member tribunal, three appointed by each side and three more by mutual agreement.²² The UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules applied. Importantly, the tribunal was entrusted with, among other things, claims by the nationals of each against the other (i.e. the United States and Iran) in respect of the assertion of private law rights.²³ There lies the resemblance with the mixed international commissions of old. Here, it is a mixed international tribunal.

²⁰ The UNCC, whose tasks are now practically completed, was not entrusted to decide upon the question of liability itself, but merely questions of causation and quantum. There are other modern examples, such as the commissions for German forced labour during the Second World War, and the claims of Austrian holocaust survivors and their heirs. See Dolzer, ‘Mixed Claims Commissions’.

²¹ See S. J. Toope, *Mixed International Arbitration: Studies in Arbitration between States and Private Persons* (Cambridge: Grotius, 1990), 266–268; citing, inter alia, *Case A-I* (1982), I Iran–USCTR 144 (First Phase).

²² G. H. Aldrich, *The Jurisprudence of the Iran–US Claims Tribunal* (Oxford University Press, 1996), 2–6.

²³ Article II(1) of the Claims Settlement Declaration, see Toope, *Mixed International Arbitration*, 268; Aldrich, *The Jurisprudence of the Iran–US Claims Tribunal*, 6. Part of the complexity over determining the true nature, or status, of the tribunal concerns its varied mandate, for the tribunal was also charged with contractual claims between the United States and Iran themselves, as well as with the interpretation and application of the two Algiers Declarations (Aldrich, *ibid.*, 6). The other part concerns whether claimants have direct rights, or whether the right of espousal by the State of nationality is retained (Toope, *Mixed International Arbitration*, 268). Yet, this is not unique to the tribunal, and is a question which arises even with investment treaty arbitration, as this chapter goes on to discuss, immediately below.

A further, contemporary example of a bespoke arrangement is the UN Compensation Commission (UNCC),²⁴ which was established by the UN Security Council in Resolution 692 after the end of the Gulf War.²⁵ The UNCC was established to effect war reparations, excluding such costs and losses, and damage or injury borne by the Allied Coalition Forces during the Gulf War following Iraq's invasion and occupation of Kuwait. An important difference between the UNCC and the Iran-US Claims Tribunal is that Iraq's liability for injury, death, loss and damage to individuals, corporations and countries had already been determined by the UN Security Council itself.²⁶ All that remained were issues of claims management, and the determination by three-person panels of UNCC Commissioners of issues of causation and the assessment of damages for a total of some 2.6 million claims subsequently filed against Iraq. Because liability had already been determined beforehand and was not an issue before the panels of Commissioners, the UNCC is most aptly termed a claims-processing facility dealing only with the screening of claims and the actual disbursement of funds. Be that so, the panels applied international law principles as well as internal UNCC law,²⁷ and there was an acute sense of the requirements of due process as with any tribunal proceedings. Moreover, as with other dispute resolution methods such as in the World Trade Organization (the WTO), the Commissioners did not hand down awards, but only made 'recommendations' for approval by a higher political body. That body was the UNCC Governing Council comprising all the Members of the Security Council, sitting in committee in Geneva.

The following section goes on to describe the emergence of modern international investment arbitration, following an initial attempt to turn, first, to contract law both in respect of the provision of substantive legal standards of protection and as the basis of the agreement to arbitrate. Eventually, however, those who sought a more effective system of investment protection reached for another, wholly innovative device – namely, treaty-based investor-State arbitration in which the promise to arbitrate was made by the host State to the claimant's home State. The following is therefore a tale about the shift from what initially was a substantial reliance upon general, customary international law principles, to a contractual and thereafter to a treaty-based system of law and dispute settlement which we now tend to think of when we refer to 'investment treaty arbitration'. Such investment treaty arbitration should be distinguished from the other examples

²⁴ The UNCC's official internal designation within the United Nations was Ad Hoc Committee 26 of the UN Security Council. See further R. B. Lillich (ed.), *The United Nations Compensation Commission: Thirteenth Sokol Colloquium* (Irvington, NY: Transnational, 1995); M. Frigessi di Rattalma and T. Treves (eds), *The United Nations Compensation Commission: A Handbook* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1999); C. S. Gibson, T. M. Rajah and T. J. Feighery (eds), *War Reparations and the UN Compensation Commission: Designing Compensation after Conflict* (Oxford University Press, 2015); C. L. Lim, 'On the Law, Procedures and Politics of United Nations Gulf War Reparations' (2000) 4 *SJICL* 435.

²⁵ Resolution 692 (UN Doc. S/RES/692 (1991), 20 May 1991) established the UNCC and the Compensation Fund.

²⁶ UN Security Council Resolution 687 (UN Doc. S/RES/687 (1991), 8 April 1991), para. 16: 'Reaffirms that Iraq, without prejudice to the debts and obligations of Iraq arising prior to 2 August 1990, which will be addressed through the normal mechanisms, is liable under international law for any direct loss, damage, including environmental damage and the depletion of natural resources, or injury to foreign Governments, nationals and corporations, as a result of Iraq's unlawful invasion and occupation of Kuwait.'

²⁷ This included the Decisions of the UNCC Governing Council, such as that adopting the UNCC's rules of procedure (officially, 'Provisional Rules for Claims Procedure') (UN Doc. S/AC.26/1992/INF.1).

discussed earlier of investment claims settlement, inter-State forms of investment arbitration in which the claim is brought by the home State against the host State,²⁸ and international adjudication.

2. LEGAL UNCERTAINTY AND CONFLICTING ATTEMPTS TO RESTATE THE LAW IN THE UNITED NATIONS (1945–1970s)

In both contractual and treaty-based investment arbitration, a procedural innovation of great importance was that unlike diplomatic espousals of the past, the claim would be the investor's own and in the case of a treaty between the investor's home State and the host State conferring the right to bring a claim, the home State has no business in respect of the claim; meaning, it has no legal interest and no control over its commencement, advancement and management.²⁹ This idea may be traced to the manner in which diplomatic espousal had evolved into mixed claims commissions in which agreements between disputing States had allowed commissions before which claimants may pursue their claims 'directly' against the host State.³⁰

Yet, in order to understand how contractually based and treaty-based investment arbitration emerged, we should begin with the fluid state of customary international law principles during the 1960s which persisted well into the 1980s. This had prompted multilateral diplomatic attempts to clarify such principles of customary law at the UN General Assembly. The initial efforts at the United Nations, as we shall see, ultimately led to: (1) the articulation of principles (under UNGA Resolution 1803, for example) which sought to ensure that investors' *contracts* with host States had themselves some international law basis;³¹ (2) investor rights being eventually placed upon a firm treaty footing instead;³² and (3) the procedural innovation of allowing claimants to 'own' their claims without requiring the adoption of such claims by their home States.

2.1 Legal Chaos

In the *Don Pacifico* incident referred to earlier, there had been discussion of compensation, but no principles apart from the sanctity of foreign-owned property had apparently been relied on. The classical view on the appropriate standard of compensation for the expropriation of foreign-owned property is that expressed in the *Chorzow Factory* case, a case decided in 1927 by the Permanent Court of International Justice, the predecessor to the International Court of Justice. The case had involved the Polish forfeiture of two German companies in violation of a German–Polish treaty commitment.

²⁸ Although investment treaties can and do provide for both investor-State and inter-State claims, and thus there is a certain looseness even to the term 'investment treaty arbitration'.

²⁹ This view is at least forcefully argued in Z. Douglas, *The International Law of Investment Claims* (Cambridge University Press, 2009), 10 and esp. 19. Regarding this section of this chapter generally, see further, e.g., Lowenfeld, *International Economic Law*, 483–485.

³⁰ Douglas, *The International Law of Investment Claims*, 11.

³¹ Section 3, below. See also the theory of the internationalisation of State contracts in Chapter 2 of this book.

³² Section 4, below.

Case Concerning the Factory at Chorzow (Claim for Indemnity) (Germany v. Poland), Claim No. 13 (PCA), Merits [1928] PCIJ Ser. A – No. 17, 47

The essential principle contained in the actual notion of an illegal act – a principle which seems to be established by international practice and in particular by the decisions of arbitral tribunals – is that reparation must, as far as possible, wipe out all the consequences of the illegal act and reestablish the situation which would, in all probability, have existed if that act had not been committed. Restitution in kind, or, if this is not possible, payment of a sum corresponding to the value which a restitution in kind would bear; the award, if need be, of damages for loss sustained which would not be covered by restitution in kind or payment in place of it – such are the principles which should serve to determine the amount of compensation due for an act contrary to international law.

It was precisely the erosion of that view, prior to the widespread Arab oil nationalisations following the Second World War, which led to the sort of grave legal uncertainty about the appropriate customary international law standards and which,³³ in turn, triggered efforts at the UN General Assembly to restate the law.

The story of doubt over the legal principles governing compensation during the twentieth century is, typically, told by referring to a 1938 exchange of letters between the US Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, and his Mexican counterpart. In truth, it was not only the Mexican Revolution, but also the Russian Revolution, which had cast the key principles governing takings of alien property into doubt. The ideas which were subsequently to receive expression in the Mexican Minister's correspondence trace their roots to the doctrine espoused by the Argentinian jurist Carlos Calvo in the previous century. This nineteenth-century doctrine stood, first, for the view that the foreign investor shall be accorded no better treatment than that accorded to the host State's own nationals. It stood, secondly, for insistence upon settlement by the domestic courts of the host State alone. Thirdly, it stood for rejection of the home State's right to diplomatic espousal.³⁴ That idea was expressed most clearly in diplomatic practice, prior to the Second World War, in the 1938 US–Mexican correspondence following the earlier Mexican policy of agrarian expropriations which had, in turn, culminated in the then new 1917 Mexican Constitution. Parts of that correspondence are reproduced below. In the end, there was no agreement on the law, although Secretary Hull's position was taken to have stood for the view of 'Western' governments. In any event, it may be said that tribunals generally carried on applying the classical principles of protection of foreign-owned property, which is what makes the *Sabbatino* case, also reproduced below, so spectacular in its admission that customary international law had, by 1964, fallen into a state of considerable legal uncertainty.

³³ For an overview, see the debate between Professors Schachter and Mendelson. See O. Schachter, 'Compensation for Expropriation' (1984) 78 *AJIL* 121; M. H. Mendelson, 'Compensation for Expropriation: The Case-Law' (1985) 79 *AJIL* 414.

³⁴ See, e.g., R. Dolzer and C. Schreuer, *Principles of International Investment Law*, 2nd edn (Oxford University Press, 2012), 1–2.

Below are some excerpts from the US–Mexican correspondence of 1938.³⁵

US Secretary of State to Mexican Ambassador to the United States, 21 July 1938

The taking of property without compensation is not expropriation. It is confiscation. It is no less confiscation because there may be an expressed intent to pay at some time in the future.

If it were permissible for a government to take the private property of the citizens of other countries and pay for it as and when, in the judgment of the government, its economic circumstances and its local legislation may perhaps permit, the safeguards which the constitutions of most countries and established international law have sought to provide would be illusory.

Mexican Minister of Foreign Affairs to US Ambassador, 3 August 1938

My Government maintains ... that there is in international law no rule universally accepted in theory nor carried out in practice, which makes obligatory the payment of immediate compensation nor even of deferred compensation, for expropriations of a general and impersonal character like those which Mexico has carried out for the purpose of redistribution of the land.

...

Nevertheless, Mexico admits, in obedience to her own laws, that she is indeed under obligation to indemnify in an adequate manner; but the doctrine which she maintains on the subject, which is based on the most authoritative opinions of writers of treaties on international law, is that the time and manner of such payment must be determined by her own laws.

Notice Mexico's proposition here; namely, that compensation is not payable under *international* law for *non-discriminatory* expropriation – expropriations of a 'general and impersonal character'.

US Secretary of State to Mexican Ambassador, 22 August 1938

The Government of the United States merely adverts to a self-evident fact when it notes that the applicable precedents and recognized authorities on international law support its declaration that, under every rule of law and equity, no government is entitled to expropriate [foreign-owned³⁶] private property, for whatever purpose, without provision for prompt, adequate and effective payment therefor.

...

³⁵ See further G. H. Hackworth, *Digest of International Law* (Washington, DC: US Department of State, 1942), vol. III, 655–661; Lowenfeld, *International Economic Law*, 475–481, from which these excerpts are derived.

³⁶ Secretary Hull had conceded in the July note, above, that: 'We cannot question the right of a foreign government to treat its own nationals in this fashion if it so desires. This is a matter of domestic concern.'

The Mexican Government refers to the fact that when it undertook suspension of the payment of its agrarian debt, the measure affected equally Mexicans and foreigners. It suggests that if Mexico had paid only the latter to the exclusion of its nationals, she would have violated a rule of equity.

...

Your Excellency's Government intimates that a demand for unequal treatment is implicit in the note of the United States ...

I must definitely dissent ...

...

There is now announced by your Government the astonishing theory that this treasured and cherished principle of equality, designed to protect both human and property rights, is to be invoked, not in the protection of personal rights and liberties, but as a chief ground of depriving and stripping individuals of their conceded rights. It is contended, in a word, that it is wholly justifiable to deprive an individual of his rights if all other persons are equally deprived, and if no victim is allowed to escape ... The proposition scarcely requires an answer.

By 1964, the world was the height of the Cold War. Suddenly, there was a surprising and controversial concession by no less a body than the US Supreme Court. The case had concerned the Cuban expropriation of American-owned properties, including a sugar concern belonging to an American investor which had gone into receivership pending a determination by the courts of ownership, but whose temporary receiver – a certain Mr Sabbatino – had successfully persuaded the purchaser of a shipment of sugar not to pay the Cuban Government itself, but rather the ‘rightful’ American owner of the expropriated sugar shipment. The claim in *Sabbatino* was, quite extraordinarily, a claim by the Banco Nacional de Cuba itself brought in the US courts for conversion and damages. In the court of appeals below, Judge Waterman uttered a ringing endorsement of the role of the US courts in upholding international law, declaring in favour of the defendant that ‘until the day of capable international adjudication among countries, the municipal courts must be the custodians of the concepts of international law, and they must expound, apply and develop that law whenever they are called upon to do so.’³⁷ International lawyers would have seen this as a classic call towards ‘piggy-backing’ – i.e. using the various domestic courts of the world to uphold international law.

But on appeal to the US Supreme Court, an eight-to-one majority judgment held against Sabbatino in favour of the Banco Nacional de Cuba on account of the fact that the Act of State doctrine prevented the court from inquiring into the validity of the actions of a foreign government on its own soil.³⁸ The reasoning reproduced in part below caused a scandal which prompted the US Congress to reverse that decision with Congress’ ‘Sabbatino Amendment’, also known as the ‘Second Hickenlooper Amendment’, which

³⁷ *Banco Nacional de Cuba v. Sabbatino*, 307 F2d 845 (2nd Cir. 1962).

³⁸ For the Act of State doctrine, see [Chapter 18](#) of this book.