

INDEX

- arbitrariness
 - arbitrary measures clauses in investment treaties, 71
 - as breach of fair and equitable treatment, 70–1, 120–2
 - ELSI* case, 121–2
 - as method of review, 73, 120–3
- Argentine economic crisis, 3–4, 87–97, 105–6, 110–2, 139–40, 147–8, 175
- balancing
 - as concept between state and investor interests, 6–7, 74, 113–15, 117, 124, 174
 - fair balance concept in ECtHR case law, 64–5
 - proportionality *stricto sensu* and, 24, 27–8, 62, 160, 168
 - in US constitutional law, 17
- comparative law
 - domestic legal systems and, 16–18
 - general principles of law and, 19–20
 - role of, 10–20
 - selection of comparators, 12–16
- Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU)
 - derogation clauses, 15, 49–50, 81, 96–7, 129, 132, 152
 - mandatory requirements, 15, 49, 58, 132, 152
 - proportionality analysis and
 - legitimacy of regulatory objective, 49–50
 - necessity test, 58–9
 - proportionality *stricto sensu*, 62–4, 164–5, 184–5
 - suitability test, 54
 - standard of review, factors
 - influencing
 - activist approach, 14
 - European consensus, 14, 50, 58, 62–3, 133
 - strategic considerations, 184–5
 - customary international law
 - customary plea of necessity, 87–92, 95, 111, 153
 - expropriation, 75–6, 173–4
 - minimum standard of treatment of aliens, 102, 144, 181–2
- deference
 - Alexy, theory of, 35–6
 - definition of, 34–5
 - democratic legitimacy as basis for, 41–2
 - developing countries, impact of
 - deferential approach, 41–3
 - institutional competence and
 - expertise as basis for, 38–43
 - proportionality analysis, relationship
 - to, 6, 31, 45–6, 193–4
 - regulatory autonomy and proximity
 - as basis for, 37–8, 42
 - standard of review, relationship to, 34
 - uncertainty and, 22, 29, 34–46, 43, 49–50, 54–7, 59, 62, 68, 91, 109, 123, 128, 135, 138–40, 143, 145–8, 156, 158, 168, 171, 186–7, 189–90, 192, 194
 - v. non-justiciability, 187–8

- derogation clauses. *See* treaty exceptions
- discrimination
de jure *cf de facto*, 78, 156, 158–9
 discriminatory measures clauses in investment treaties, 71
 fair and equitable treatment and, 70
 intention, relevance of, 79, 135–7, 156–8
 less favourable treatment, 80
 like circumstances, 78–80
 methodological approach to determining state liability, 80–81, 116
 most-favoured nation treatment, 78–9
 national treatment, 14, 78, 80, 156–8
 purpose of prohibition, 79–81, 156
 suitability test and, 156–60
- ECHR. *See* European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)
- ECtHR. *See* European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR)
- European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), 13, 15, 32, 41, 50, 81, 165, 177, 183
- European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR)
 proportionality analysis and legitimacy of regulatory objective and, 50–2
 margin of appreciation, 45, 54, 60, 65, 165, 177, 183–4
 necessity test, 59–60
 proportionality *stricto sensu*, 64–6, 165
 suitability test, 54–5
 reasonableness as method of review, 117–18
 standard of review, factors influencing
 activist approach, 14–15, 165
 European consensus, 14–15, 50–1, 133
 strategic considerations, 184
- Exceptions clauses. *See* treaty exceptions
- expropriation, 75–8
 methodological approaches to determining state liability, 75–8
 police powers doctrine, 75–7, 79, 127–8
 recent treaty practice, 78, 196
- fair and equitable treatment, 70–5
 elements of obligation, 70–1
 grounds of review and, 181–3
 legitimate expectations, 71–5
 methodological approaches to determining state liability, 74–5
 minimum standard of treatment of aliens and, 102, 144, 181–2
 NAFTA Article 1105 Note of Interpretation, 32, 181–4
 substantive review and, 70–5
- General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), general exceptions to burden of proof and, 151–2
 chapeaux, 56–7, 95–6
 legitimate objective, 52–3
 necessity test, 60–1
 proportionality *stricto sensu*, 47, 66–7, 165
 suitability test, 55–6
 standard of review. *See* World Trade Organization tribunals
- incommensurability, 27–8, 164
- Inter-American Court of Human Rights, 18
- ICSID Convention, 2, 4–5, 9, 33, 38, 89–90, 151, 178
- investment treaties
 object and purpose of, 7–10
 preambles, 8–10, 160
 recent treaty practice specifying method and standard of review, 6, 33, 196

- investor-state arbitration
 analogy to domestic public law
 adjudication, 12, 16–18
 as international public law
 adjudication, 13–16
 institutional structure of, 2, 6, 43,
 70, 164
 reforms to, 6, 30, 196
- least-restrictive means analysis. *See*
 necessity test
- legitimate expectations. *See* fair and
 equitable treatment
- method of review. *See also* grounds of
 review; standard of review
 arbitrariness as, 12–13, 73, 79,
 120–2
 definition of, 6–7, 31–2
 full proportionality analysis as, 83–6
 legitimate objective as, 115–16
 necessity test as, 87–106
 proportionality *stricto sensu* without
 necessity testing as, 106–13
 review for unreasonableness as,
 117–20
 suitability test as, 116–17
 v. standard of review, 31–2
- necessity test
 Argentina-US BIT security
 exception, 87–97
 burden of proof, 151–4
 CJEU approach to, 58–9
 v. customary plea of necessity,
 87–90
 definition of, 25
 desirability in investor-state
 arbitration, 154–9
 discrimination claims and, 155–60
 domestic law and, 100–3
 ECtHR approach to, 59–60
 as method of review, 87–106
 Pareto optimality and, 156
 procedural approach to, 149–50
 strict approaches to, 147
 WTO tribunals' approach to, 60–2
- non-discrimination. *See* discrimination
 non-precluded measures clauses. *See*
 treaty exceptions
- proportionality analysis
 benefits of, 26–7
 criticisms of, 27–9, 43, 68, 160,
 168–70
 general principles of law and,
 19
 in public international law, 23–4
 legitimacy of regulatory objective
 and. *See* regulatory objectives,
 legitimacy of
 necessity test and. *See* necessity test
 origin of, 23–4
 penalties and, 15, 85
 proportionality *stricto sensu* and. *See*
 proportionality *stricto sensu*
 structure of, 23–6
 suitability test and. *See* suitability
 test
- proportionality *stricto sensu*
 CJEU approach to, 46, 62–4, 184–5
 desirability in investor-state
 arbitration, 164–8
 ECtHR approach to, 46, 64–6, 165
 extent of interference with
 investment, relevance of,
 162–4
 as method of review without prior
 necessity testing, 106–15
 procedural approach to, 161–2
 restatement of threshold of
 disproportionality, 161,
 167–8
 WTO tribunals' approach to, 47,
 66–7, 165
- rational connection test, rational
 relationship test. *See* suitability
 test
- reasonableness
 as method of review, 117–20
 unreasonable measures clauses in
 investment treaties, 71
Wednesbury unreasonableness, 118

- regulatory autonomy, impact of
 - investor-state arbitration, 1–4, 9, 20, 22, 31, 68, 74, 79, 85, 128, 132, 146, 170, 186, 193–4
- regulatory objectives, legitimacy of
 - CJEU approach to, 49–50
 - discriminatory objectives, 127, 135–8, 156–8, 167, 171
 - ECtHR approach to, 50–2
 - endorsement of government policy, 130–3
 - international harmonization or consensus, relevance of, 133–5
 - as method of review, 115–16
 - strict approaches to, 128–30
 - WTO tribunals' approach to, 52–3, 133–4
- remedies, relevance to role of proportionality analysis, 177–9
- Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) Agreement
 - necessity testing, 61–2, 152
 - standard of review and, 47
- scientific evidence and expertise, 99–100, 142–4
- standard of review
 - deference, relationship to, 34
 - definition of, 6, 29–32
 - factors influencing, 34
 - international harmonization or consensus, 53, 133–5, 145
 - crisis and emergency situations, 139–40
 - strategic considerations, 184–6
 - inherent powers of international courts and tribunals and, 33, 186
 - self-judging provisions, 33, 92–3
 - stipulation in treaty text, 32–3
 - v. grounds of review, 31–2, 181–3
 - v. method of review, 31–2
- state of necessity. *See* customary international law
- suitability test
 - CJEU approach to, 54
 - common state practice and, relevance of, 144–5
 - discrimination inquiry and, 156–8
 - ECtHR approach to, 54–5
 - error made by government and, 140–2
 - as method of review, 116–17
 - pretextual objectives, identification of, 145–6
 - reliance on state's expertise, 142–4
 - strict approaches to, 138–40
 - WTO tribunals' approach to, 55
- Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) Agreement
 - legitimacy of regulatory objective and, 134
 - necessity testing, 61, 152
- treaty exceptions, 81–2
 - Argentina-US BIT security exception, 87–97
 - burden of proof and, 153
 - customary plea of necessity relationship to, 87–8
 - nexus requirements, 82, 173–4
 - permitted regulatory objectives, 82
 - recent treaty practice, 81, 196
 - role of exception clause, 81
 - role of proportionality analysis where treaty contains exception clause, 175–7
 - self-judging provisions, 33, 92–3, 196
- Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), 15, 32, 41, 49, 81
- United Nations Human Rights Committee, 18, 41
- Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, 7–10

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-08790-3 - Proportionality and Deference in Investor-State Arbitration: Balancing Investment Protection and Regulatory Autonomy

Caroline Henckels

Index

[More information](#)

INDEX

225

- World Trade Organization (WTO) tribunals. *See also* General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS); Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) Agreement; Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) Agreement
- Appellate Body, institutional role of, 48–9, 52–3, 60–1, 67, 184
- international investment law, relationship to, 14
- standard of review, factors influencing
- common interests and values of WTO members, 52–3, 133–4
- strategic considerations, 184