

Contents

<i>Foreword – James Crawford</i>	<i>page</i> xxi
<i>Preface</i>	xxii
<i>Table of investment cases</i>	xxvi
<i>Table of cases of international courts and tribunals</i>	li
<i>Table of cases of municipal courts</i>	lviii
<i>Table of appendices</i>	lxii
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	lxiii
1. The juridical foundations of investment treaty arbitration	1
A. Investment treaties and investment treaty arbitration	1
B. The legal character of the investment treaty regime	6
Rule 1. Where the contracting states to an investment treaty have agreed to a procedure for the judicial settlement of disputes between an investor and the host state, a claim advanced by the investor in accordance with such procedure is its own claim and the national contracting state of the investor has no legal interest in respect thereof.	10
Rule 2. The rules of admissibility of diplomatic protection in general international law are not generally applicable to the regime for the settlement of disputes between an investor and the host state created by an investment treaty.	10
A. The beneficiary of investment treaty rights	10
B. The ‘derivative’ model versus the ‘direct’ model	11
C. Conclusions on the nature of the investor’s rights: Two alternative ‘direct’ models	32
2. Applicable laws	39
Rule 3. An investment treaty tribunal has the inherent authority to characterise the issues in dispute and determine the laws applicable thereto.	40

A.	A complex approach to applicable law in investment disputes	40
B.	The source of the choice of law rules	44
C.	Characterisation	45
D.	The issue in dispute	47
E.	An incidental question	50
Rule 4.	The law applicable to an issue relating to the existence or scope of property rights comprising the investment is the municipal law of the host state, including its rules of private international law.	52
A.	Property rights and the municipal law of the host state	52
B.	The fallacy of municipal laws as facts before an investment treaty tribunal	69
Rule 5.	The law applicable to the issue of whether the claimant's property rights constitute a protected investment is the investment treaty.	72
Rule 6.	The law applicable to an issue relating to the jurisdiction of the tribunal and admissibility of claims and counterclaims is the investment treaty and, where relevant, the ICSID Convention.	74
Rule 7.	The law applicable to the issue of whether the claimant is a national of a contracting state is the investment treaty and the municipal law of that contracting state.	77
Rule 8.	The law applicable to the issue of whether a legal entity has the capacity to prosecute a claim before an investment treaty tribunal is the <i>lex societatis</i> .	78
Rule 9.	The law applicable to the issue of whether the host state is the proper respondent to the claim is the law governing the obligation forming the basis of the claim.	79
Rule 10.	The law applicable to the issue of liability for a claim founded upon an investment treaty obligation is the investment treaty as supplemented by general international law.	81
Rule 11.	The law applicable to an issue relating to a claim founded upon a contractual obligation, tort or restitutionary obligation, or an incidental question relating thereto, is the law governing the contract, tort or restitutionary obligation in accordance with generally accepted principles of private international law.	90
Rule 12.	The law applicable to an issue relating to the consequences of the host state's breach of an investment treaty obligation is to be found in a <i>sui generis</i> regime of state responsibility for investment treaties.	94

<i>Contents</i>		ix
	A. The notion of a distinct regime of state responsibility	94
	B. Content of the distinct regime of international responsibility created by investment treaties	96
Rule 13.	The law applicable to an issue relating to the procedure of the arbitration is the investment treaty, the applicable arbitration rules, and, in some cases, the law of the seat of the arbitration.	106
	A. The role of the seat of the arbitration	106
	B. Sovereign immunity from jurisdiction and arbitrations involving states	110
	C. Sovereign immunity and investment treaty arbitration	113
	D. State practice on the legal character of investment treaty arbitrations	115
	E. The relevance of the procedural law in practice	120
	F. ICSID arbitrations	120
Rule 14.	The choice of law rules set out in this chapter are compatible with Article 42(1) of the ICSID Convention.	125
	A. Article 42(1) of the ICSID Convention and the choice of law rules in this chapter	125
3.	Taxonomy of preliminary issues relating to jurisdiction and admissibility in investment treaty arbitration	134
Rule 15.	For an investment treaty tribunal to proceed to adjudge the merits of claims arising out of an investment, it must have jurisdiction over the parties and the claims, and the claims submitted to the tribunal must be admissible.	135
	A. The investment as the <i>quid pro quo</i> for the application of the treaty	135
	B. The distinction between investment claims and investor claims	136
	C. A taxonomy of preliminary issues	141
Rule 16.	An investment treaty tribunal is vested with adjudicatory power (jurisdiction) if a national of one contracting state has acquired an investment in another contracting state in accordance with Rule 22 to Rule 24 and the host state of the investment has consented to the arbitration of investment disputes in accordance with Rule 20 and Rule 21.	143
	A. The existence of adjudicative power. The host state's consent and the investment. Jurisdiction	143
Rule 17.	The material, personal and temporal scope of an investment treaty tribunal's adjudicatory power	

	(jurisdiction) over claims relating to an investment is determined in accordance with Rule 25 to Rule 42.	144
	A. The scope of the adjudicative power. Jurisdiction	144
Rule 18.	A decision concerning whether a claim qualifies for present determination (admissibility) by an international treaty tribunal having adjudicatory power (jurisdiction), whether it is expressed as with or without prejudice to the possible revival of that claim, is a decision on the merits insusceptible of review beyond that which is available to decisions on the merits generally.	146
	A. The exercise of the adjudicative power. Admissibility	146
Rule 19.	If a tribunal has elected to make a preliminary ruling on issues relating to its jurisdiction or the admissibility of claims, then such issues must be determined conclusively by the tribunal in its preliminary decision. This is subject to the exception relating to the tribunal's <i>ratione materiae</i> jurisdiction in Rule 27 and Rule 28.	149
4.	Consent to the arbitration of investment disputes	151
Rule 20.	The host contracting state party must have consented to the arbitration of investment disputes with a claimant having the nationality of another contracting state party pursuant to the provisions of the investment treaty and, where relevant, the ICSID Convention. Such consent must be valid at the time the arbitration proceedings are commenced.	151
Rule 21.	In addition to the acquisition of an investment in the host contracting state party pursuant to Rule 22 and Rule 23, the claimant must have satisfied any conditions precedent to the consent of the host contracting state party to the arbitration of investment disputes as stipulated in the investment treaty.	151
	A. The scope of issues relating to consent	151
5.	Investment	161
	A. Introduction to the concept of an investment	161
Rule 22.	The legal materialisation of an investment is the acquisition of a bundle of rights in property that has the characteristics of one or more of the categories of an investment defined by the applicable investment treaty where such property is situated in the territory of the host	

<i>Contents</i>		xi
	state or is recognised by the rules of the host state's private international law to be situated in the host state or is created by the municipal law of the host state.	170
	A. Applicable laws	170
	B. The territorial connection with the host state	171
	C. 'A bundle of rights in property'	172
	D. The categories of investments	175
Rule 23.	The economic materialisation of an investment requires the commitment of resources to the economy of the host state by the claimant entailing the assumption of risk in expectation of a commercial return.	189
	A. The importance of certainty	190
	B. 'Commitment of resources to the economy of the host state'	191
	C. Elements of the <i>Salini</i> test not retained in Rule 23	198
Rule 24.	Where the claimant relies upon a contract to establish an investment pursuant to Rule 22 and Rule 23, the tribunal should differentiate between rights <i>in personam</i> as between the contracting parties and rights <i>in rem</i> that are memorialised by the contract. The rights <i>in personam</i> do not generally qualify as an investment independently of the rights <i>in rem</i> .	202
	A. The importance of distinguishing rights <i>in rem</i> and rights <i>in personam</i>	202
	B. Consequential errors produced by a failure to characterise investment rights	207
	C. The provisions of investment treaties	224
6.	Jurisdiction <i>ratione materiae</i>	233
Rule 25.	In accordance with the terms of the contracting state parties' consent to arbitration in the investment treaty, the tribunal's jurisdiction <i>ratione materiae</i> may extend to claims founded upon an investment treaty obligation, a contractual obligation, a tort, unjust enrichment, or a public act of the host contracting state party, in respect of measures of the host contracting state party relating to the claimant's investment.	234
	A. Investment treaty provisions on the scope of consent to arbitration	234
	B. Jurisdiction over contractual claims	236
	C. 'Measure of the host contracting state party'	240

	D. The nexus between the measure and the investment: ‘relating to ...’	242
	E. ‘Claimant’s investment’	248
	F. Investment treaties with limited consent to arbitration	250
Rule 26.	In accordance with the terms of the contracting state parties’ consent to arbitration in the investment treaty, the tribunal’s jurisdiction <i>ratione materiae</i> may extend to counterclaims by the host contracting state party founded upon a contractual obligation, a tort, unjust enrichment, or a public act of the host contracting state party, in respect of matters directly related to the investment.	255
	A. The significance of the consent to arbitration and the applicable arbitration rules	256
	B. The requisite nexus between the counterclaim and the investment	260
Rule 27.	For the purposes of Rule 25 and Rule 26, the legal foundation of the claims submitted to the tribunal must be objectively determined by the tribunal in ruling upon the scope of its jurisdiction <i>ratione materiae</i> in a preliminary decision.	263
	A. The importance of an objective test	263
	B. The judgments of the International Court of Justice	265
	C. Investment treaty precedents confirming the objective test	266
	D. Investment treaty precedents upholding a subjective test	267
Rule 28.	The test for the legal foundation of a claim for the purposes of Rule 27 is whether the facts alleged by the claimant in support thereof are <i>prima facie</i> capable of sustaining a finding of liability on the part of the host state by reference to the legal obligation invoked in support of the claim.	273
Rule 29.	Where the host state party’s consent to arbitration is stipulated in an investment agreement rather than in an investment treaty, then, subject to the terms of the arbitration clause, the tribunal’s jurisdiction <i>ratione materiae</i> may extend to claims founded upon an international obligation on the treatment of foreign nationals and their property in general international law, an applicable investment treaty obligation, a contractual obligation, a tort, unjust enrichment or a public act of the	

<i>Contents</i>	xiii
host state party in respect of measures of the host state relating to the claimant's investment.	277
A. The relevance of the legal instrument containing the arbitration clause	277
7. Jurisdiction <i>ratione personae</i>	284
Rule 30. The tribunal's jurisdiction <i>ratione personae</i> extends to one of the contracting state parties and to an individual or legal entity (the 'claimant') which has the nationality of another of the contracting state parties in accordance with the relevant provision in the investment treaty and the municipal law of that contracting state party and, where applicable, Article 25 of the ICSID Convention.	285
A. The nationality of individuals and legal entities	285
Rule 31. The claimant must have had the relevant nationality at the time of the alleged breach of the obligation forming the basis of its claim and continuously thereafter until the time the arbitral proceedings are commenced.	290
Rule 32. The claimant must have had control over the investment in the host contracting state party at the time of the alleged breach of the obligation forming the basis of its claim. There is no requirement of continuous control over the investment until the time that arbitration proceedings are commenced or thereafter.	297
A. No requirement of continuous control	297
B. The concept of 'control'	299
Rule 33. If an investment treaty stipulates that the investment can be held directly or indirectly by the claimant, then it is immaterial that the investment is held through an intermediate legal entity with the nationality of a third state.	310
Rule 34. The claimant must have capacity to sue in accordance with its personal law or, in the case of a legal entity, the <i>lex societatis</i> , at the time arbitration proceedings are commenced.	312
Rule 35. Subject to an express provision to the contrary in an investment treaty, a claimant legal entity having the nationality of a contracting state party need not have substantial connections with that contracting state party. <i>Ergo</i> , there is no requirement that the capital invested by the claimant originates from the claimant or another legal entity or individual with the nationality of the claimant.	313

	A. No requirements of substantial connection or origin of capital	314
	B. ‘Subject to an express provision to the contrary in an investment treaty’	317
Rule 36.	The tribunal’s jurisdiction <i>ratione personae</i> may extend to a legal entity having the nationality of the host contracting state party where such legal entity is under the control of an individual or legal entity in Rule 30, in accordance with an express provision in an investment treaty or by application of Article 25(2)(b) of the ICSID Convention.	318
Rule 37.	Where an individual claimant with the nationality of one contracting state also has the nationality of the host contracting state party, the tribunal’s jurisdiction <i>ratione personae</i> extends to such an individual only if the former nationality is the dominant of the two, subject to a contrary provision of an investment treaty or the application of Article 25 of the ICSID Convention.	321
Rule 38.	The rules for the nationality of claims in the general international law of diplomatic protection do not apply to issues of nationality in investment treaty arbitration.	323
	A. The irrelevance of rules of diplomatic protection to investment treaty arbitration	323
	B. The International Law Commission’s Draft Articles on Diplomatic Protection	325
8.	Jurisdiction <i>ratione temporis</i>	328
Rule 39.	The tribunal’s jurisdiction <i>ratione temporis</i> extends to claims relating to the claimant’s investment, which are founded upon obligations in force and binding upon the host contracting state party at the time of the alleged breach.	328
	A. The intertemporal rule in relation to obligations	329
	B. ‘Relating to the claimant’s investment’	336
Rule 40.	The tribunal’s jurisdiction in Rule 39 may be limited to investment disputes which have arisen after the investment treaty has entered into force, in accordance with an express provision of the investment treaty.	336
Rule 41.	The claimant’s investment in Rule 39 can have been made before or after the investment treaty entered into force, subject to an express provision to the contrary in the investment treaty.	340

<i>Contents</i>		xv
Rule 42.	Without prejudice to Rule 39, a tribunal can take into account facts relating to the claim but occurring prior to the tribunal's jurisdiction <i>ratione temporis</i> provided that those facts are not relied upon as constituent elements of the breach of the obligation forming the basis of the claim.	341
A.	Facts occurring prior to the tribunal's jurisdiction <i>ratione temporis</i>	342
9.	The obligation to accord most-favoured-nation treatment and the jurisdiction of an investment treaty tribunal	344
Rule 43.	A most-favoured-nation (MFN) clause in the basic investment treaty does not incorporate by reference provisions relating to the jurisdiction of the arbitral tribunal, in whole or in part, set forth in a third investment treaty, unless there is an unequivocal provision to that effect in the basic investment treaty.	344
A.	Introduction	344
B.	The precedents of the International Court of Justice	345
C.	The false question	356
D.	No incorporation by reference of provisions of a third treaty dealing with jurisdiction	360
E.	'Unless there is an unequivocal provision to that effect in the basic investment treaty'	362
10.	Admissibility: Contractual choice of forum	363
A.	The importance of preserving the efficacy of contractual choice of forum clauses	363
B.	Lessons from the Calvo Clause litigation	366
Rule 44.	Where the tribunal has determined pursuant to Rule 27 and Rule 28 that the legal foundation of the claim is an investment treaty obligation, and the object of that claim is the vindication of contractual rights forming part of the claimant's investment, and there is a <i>bona fide</i> dispute concerning the existence or scope of those rights, then the tribunal should generally stay its jurisdiction otherwise established in accordance with Rule 25 to Rule 29 in favour of a judicial or arbitral forum stipulated in the contract as having exclusive jurisdiction in relation to disputes arising out of the contract.	370

A.	‘Where the tribunal has determined pursuant to Rule 27 and Rule 28 that the legal foundation of the claim is an investment treaty obligation...’	370
B.	‘...the object of that claim is the vindication of contractual rights forming part of the claimant’s investment’	371
C.	‘...there is a <i>bona fide</i> dispute concerning the existence or scope of those [contractual] rights’	372
D.	‘...in favour of a judicial or arbitral forum stipulated in the contract as having exclusive jurisdiction in relation to the disputes arising out of the contract’	375
E.	‘...the tribunal should generally stay its jurisdiction otherwise established in accordance with Rule 25 to Rule 29’	378
Rule 45.	Where the tribunal has determined pursuant to Rule 27 and Rule 28 that the legal foundation of the claim is a contractual obligation, the tribunal should decline its jurisdiction otherwise established in accordance with Rule 25 to Rule 29 in favour of a judicial or arbitral forum stipulated in the contract as having exclusive jurisdiction in relation to disputes arising out of the contract.	393
Rule 46.	Without prejudice to Rule 44 and Rule 45, the tribunal should exercise its jurisdiction over the claim if the tribunal is satisfied on the basis of compelling evidence that the claimant will be subjected to a denial of justice in the forum stipulated in the contract.	394
11.	Admissibility: Shareholder claims	397
A.	Introduction to the principle of admissibility for shareholder claims	398
B.	The <i>Barcelona Traction</i> case	403
Rule 47.	A claim founded upon an investment treaty obligation which seeks a remedy for the interference by the host state contracting party with the rights attaching to a shareholding in a company having the nationality of the host state is admissible.	407
A.	‘Rights attaching to a shareholding’	407
Rule 48.	A claim founded upon an investment treaty obligation which seeks a remedy for the breach by the host state contracting party of undertakings or representations	

	<i>Contents</i>	xvii
	made to the shareholder but not to the company, or such a claim for other types of loss that are separate and distinct from the company's loss, is admissible.	414
	A. Undertakings or representations made to shareholders	414
	B. Shareholder claims for types of loss that are separate and distinct from the company's loss	415
Rule 49.	A claim founded upon an investment treaty obligation which seeks a remedy for the diminution of value of a shareholding in a limited liability company having the nationality of the host contracting state party is admissible if the claimant can establish a <i>prima facie</i> case that: (i) the assets of the company have been expropriated by the host contracting state party so that the shareholding has been rendered worthless; or (ii) the company is without or has been deprived of a remedy to redress the injury it has suffered; or (iii) the company is without or has been deprived of the capacity to sue either under the <i>lex societatis</i> or <i>de facto</i> ; or (iv) the company has been subjected to a denial of justice in the pursuit of a remedy in the system for the administration of justice of the host contracting state party.	415
	A. Introduction	416
	B. First limb of Rule 49: Expropriation of the assets of the company	425
	C. Second limb of Rule 49: Deprivation of a remedy for the company	427
	D. Third limb of Rule 49: Deprivation of the company's capacity to sue	428
	E. Fourth limb of Rule 49: Denial of justice in the pursuit of a remedy by the company	430
	F. Inadmissible shareholder claims for reflective loss	430
	G. The special case of the European Convention on Human Rights	444
	H. The special case of NAFTA	446
	I. Relevant provisions of investment treaties and the ICSID Convention	451
	J. The special case of the Iran/US Claims Tribunal	453
Rule 50.	For a claim to be admissible pursuant to Rule 49, the tribunal should satisfy itself that the shareholder's claim will not: (i) unfairly expose the host state or the company to a multiplicity of actions; (ii) materially	

prejudice the interests of the creditors of the company; or, (iii) interfere with a fair distribution of the recovery among all interested parties.	455
12. Admissibility: Dispositions relating to the legal and beneficial ownership of the investment	458
A. Diplomatic protection and investment treaty arbitration distinguished	458
Rule 51. The legal or beneficial ownership of an investment can be structured in such a way so as to attract the protection of an investment treaty in force at the host state of the investment.	460
Rule 52. The legal or beneficial ownership of an investment cannot be transferred in order to establish the jurisdiction of an investment treaty tribunal in respect of an alleged injury to that investment attributable to measures of the host state save where the host state has given its express consent to such a transfer on notice of this consequence.	461
Rule 53. Dispositions relating to the legal and beneficial ownership of the investment that occur after the claimant has validly filed a notice of arbitration have no effect upon the admissibility of its claims.	466
13. Admissibility: Denial of Benefits	468
Rule 54. Where a ‘denial of benefits’ provision is successfully invoked by the host state in arbitration proceedings against the claimant, the substantive protection of the investment treaty is denied to the claimant and its claims must be dismissed as inadmissible.	468
<i>Appendices</i>	473
1. Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States (1965) – ICSID (excerpts)	473
2. Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (1958)	481
3. North American Free Trade Agreement (1992) – NAFTA (excerpts)	486
4. Energy Charter Treaty (1994) (excerpts)	509
5. China Model BIT (1997)	525
6. France Model BIT (2006)	532
7. Germany Model BIT (2005)	539

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-85567-9 - The International Law of Investment Claims
Zachary Douglas
Table of Contents
[More information](#)

	<i>Contents</i>	xix
8.	Netherlands Model BIT (1997)	547
9.	Turkey Model BIT (2000)	553
10.	United Kingdom Model BIT (2005, with 2006 amendments)	559
11.	United States of America Model BIT (2004)	568
	<i>Index</i>	600