

## INDEX

*Note:* Page numbers in **bold** type relate to the Commentaries, those in *italics* to the summaries and those in roman type to the excerpts reproduced. “Investment” embraces “foreign investment”.

**Abaclat:** *see* *Abaclat* (background); *Abaclat* (admissibility); *Abaclat* (jurisdiction *ratione materiae*: “investment” (BIT 1/ICSID 25(1))); *Abaclat* (jurisdiction *ratione materiae*: legal dispute requirement); *Abaclat* (jurisdiction *ratione personae*) (BIT 1(2), BIT Protocol and ICSID 25); *Abaclat* (jurisdiction and admissibility) (dissenting opinion (Abi-Saab)); *Ambiente Ufficio*; Argentina–Italy BIT (1990)

### **Abaclat (background)**

costs 391

Disqualification Proposal (First) (manifest lack of ICSID 14 qualities)

alleged lack of independent judgement 370

burden of proof (*onus probandi incumbit actori*) 171

rejection of Proposal (ICSID 58) 370–1

burden of proof (*onus probandi incumbit actori*) 371

“impartiality” as “independence” (ICSID 14(1)) 371

as objective standard 371

Disqualification Proposal (Second) (manifest lack of ICSID 14 qualities)

alleged lack of independent judgement (failure to treat parties equally) 372

rejection of Proposal (ICSID 58) 371

facts in date order

respondent’s efforts to restructure economy following major debt crisis/large

placement of sovereign bonds (1991–2001) 366–7

default on external bond debt (23 December 2001) 367

“pesification” (Public Emergency and Reform Law 2002) 367

establishment of the TFA (*l’Associazione per la Tutela degli Investitori in Titoli Argentini*) (18 September 2002) 367

Argentina–IMF agreement of credit package (September 2003) 367

Dubai Proposal for the reduction of the face value of the unstructured debt (September 2003) 367

establishment of the GCAB (Global Committee of Argentina Bondholders) 367–8

Exchange Offer 2005 (14 January to 25 February 2005) 368

litigation following 368

Law No. 26.017 (2005) (Emergency Law) 368

TFA notification to Argentine Ministry of Economy and Production of a dispute under ICSID (28 February 2006) 368

procedural history in date order

transmission of the request for arbitration to the respondent (26 September 2006) 368

objecting to the request as a class action/to changes to the request 368–9

registration of the request (7 February 2007) 369

constitution of the Tribunal 369

submission of list of current members of TFA (23 May 2008) 369

resignation of President Briner (27 July 2009) 369

***Abaclat (background)*** (cont.)

- appointment of Pierre Tercier as president (2 September 2009) 369
- procedural order on confidentiality issues (27 January 2010) 369
  - decisions on respondents' access to claimants' database 369–70
- hearing on jurisdiction (7 to 13 April 2010) 370
  - launch of Exchange Offer 2010 370
- withdrawal of some claimants subscribing to the Exchange Offer 2010 (5 October 2010) 370
  - entitlement to withdraw (IR 8) 373, 380
- notification to respondent of fraudulent consent of two of the claimants (13 July 2011) 370
- respondent's urgent request for provisional measures (21 July 2011) (rejected) 370
- majority Decision on jurisdiction and admissibility (4 August 2011) 370
- First Disqualification Proposal (15 September 2011) 370
  - suspension of proceedings (AR 9(6)) 370
- arbitrator Abi-Saab's dissenting opinion (28 October 2011) 370
- resignation of arbitrator Abi-Saab (1 November 2011) 370
- PCA Secretary-General's recommendation on request for disqualification (19 December 2011)/rejection of proposal (21 December 2011) 370–1
- appointment of Santiago Torres Bernárdez as member of Tribunal (19 January 2012) 371
- appointment of Database Verification expert (7 July 2012–8 February 2013) 371–2
- final Database Verification report (5 September 2013) 372
- Second Disqualification Proposal (19 December 2013) (rejection (4 February 2014)) 372
- respondent's rejoinder memorial on liability and quantum (31 March 2014) 372
- hearing on liability and quantum (16 to 24 June 2014) 372
- post-hearing submissions (29 September to 12 November 2014) 372
- Settlement Agreement (21 April 2016) 372–3
- Consent Award (AR 43(2)) 373
  - arbitrator Torres Bernárdez's reservations/exchanges with the majority 373
- procedural issues
  - admissibility of RfA Annexes/claimants' responsibility for content 381
  - adoption of collective proceedings approach 381
  - ICSID "gaps" in procedural provisions, Tribunal's power/obligation to fill (ICSID 44) 73, 373–4

***Abaclat (admissibility)***

- abuse of rights (TFA's role), dismissal of allegation 380–1
- mass claims 73, 373–4
  - absence of provision for as a reparable "gap" (ICSID 44) 27, 378
  - matters for consideration 378–9
    - "simplified procedure", necessity/acceptability 377–9
  - consent to jurisdiction distinguished 377–8
- prior consultation and domestic litigation requirements (BIT 8(3)) 379–80
  - disregard for, justification 379–80
- sovereign debt policy considerations, relevance to admissibility 379
- withdrawal and addition of claimants
  - addition prior to constitution of Tribunal 380
  - withdrawal, admissibility prior to registration of arbitration request (IR 8) 380
  - withdrawal after registration as request for termination of proceedings, mass claims distinguished 380

- Abaclat (jurisdiction ratione materiae: “investment” (BIT 1/ICSID 25(1)))*** 394–408
- introduction
  - contribution, role
    - acceptance as a criterion 52–4, 399–400
    - dual role (contribution constituting investment/rights and value derived from contribution) 399
    - ICSID 25/BIT approaches to distinguished 399–400
  - ICSID/BITs, scope distinguished 399
  - “investment”, definition and role 384, 398–400
    - “any kind of asset invested or reinvested . . . in the territory of the other Party including . . .” (BIT 1(1)) 384–403
    - inherent meaning 398, 404–5
  - issue (analysis of term “investment” and conformity with requirements) 394–5
  - key legal provisions 395
    - BIT 1(1)/BIT 8(7), texts 395–7, 401
    - forum selection clauses (bond documents) 397–8
  - outer limits/double-barrelled test (ICSID 25(2)(b)) 374, 398–400, 404–5
    - definition 374, 399, 400
    - ICSID preamble/BIT preamble as evidence of approach 400
  - investment under BIT 1(1) 401–3
    - as broad, non-restrictive formulation 401
    - as categorization of “investments” from perspective of rights and values generated 401
    - financial instruments/bonds as “investment” 72, 375, 401–3
      - interrelationship with securities 375, 402–3
    - Tribunal’s conclusion (bonds and security entitlements as investments) 403
    - as typical definition 399, 401
  - investment under ICSID 25(1)
    - compliance of bonds and securities with ICSID 25(1), need for 375, 403–4
    - “contribution” requirement, as inherent in the contribution, duration and risk requirement 405
    - “inherent meaning” approach 404–5
    - outer limits/double-barrelled test (ICSID 25(2)(b)) 404–5
    - rejection of *Salini* criteria, reasons for 375, 403–4
    - Tribunal’s conclusion (existence of contribution) 375–6, 403–4, 405
  - laws and regulations of host State, compliance with
    - alleged misconduct by third parties, relevance 376, 408
    - merits, issues reserved for 407, 408
    - as part of the definition of “investment” 376, 407
  - territoriality (investment/expenditure in the territory)
    - forum selection clauses in contractual documents, treaty obligations, independence of 374, 376, 406–7
    - place of investment, criteria
      - financial investment distinguished 376, 405–6
      - linkage to specific economic enterprise in host State 376, 405–6
      - where and/or for the benefit of whom the funds are ultimately used 376, 405
    - Tribunal’s conclusion (satisfaction of the “made in Argentina” requirement) 376, 407
  - Tribunal’s conclusion
    - bonds/securities as “investment” 408
    - claimants’ purchase of securities as “investment” 408
    - lawfulness of bonds and securities 408

- Abaclat (jurisdiction *ratione materiae*: “investment” (BIT 1/ICSID 25(1)))*** (cont.)  
 “made in the territory of Argentina” requirement, satisfaction of 408  
 outer limits/double-barrelled test (ICSID 25(2)(b)) 408
- Abaclat (jurisdiction *ratione materiae*: legal dispute requirement)*** 387–94  
 overview  
 alleged breaches of BIT  
   2(2) (fair and equitable treatment) 389  
   2(2) (non-impairment by arbitrary or discriminatory treatment) 390  
   3(1) in connection with Argentina–Chile BIT 7(2) (MFN treatment) 390  
   3(1) (national treatment) 390  
   5 (expropriation) 390  
 key documents 388  
 summary of issues for determination 387–9  
 treaty vs contract basis of the claims 374, 388, 391–3  
 contract-based claims  
   claims outside the scope of the ICSID proceedings 393–4  
   umbrella clause/MFN treatment and 388, 391–3, 394  
   sovereign act engaging State responsibility outside contractual framework as breach of  
   treaty 391–3  
 treaty basis, consequences 388  
 Tribunal’s decision  
   establishment of prima facie case 394  
   exclusion of third-party claims not based on the BIT 394  
   treaty-based nature of claims 394  
   umbrella clause, irrelevance of discussion (judicial economy) 394  
 Tribunal’s decision (prima facie jurisdiction) 390–1
- Abaclat (jurisdiction *ratione personae*) (BIT 1(2), BIT Protocol and ICSID 25)*** 376–8  
 consent to jurisdiction  
 requirements  
   BIT 8 (absence of formal requirements) 377  
   ICSID 25(1) (writing) 377  
 Tribunal’s findings 176–7  
   absence of fraud, coercion or essential mistake vitiating 377  
   sufficiency of BIT (consent of respondent) 377  
 MFN treatment, relevance 378, 380
- Abaclat (jurisdiction and admissibility) (dissenting opinion (Abi-Saab))*** 381–7, 408–23  
 conclusion (lack of jurisdiction)  
   exclusion of mass claims 381–2  
   exhaustion of local remedies (BIT 8) 382–3  
   *ratione materiae* (failure of securities to qualify as “investment”) 381  
 jurisdiction *ratione materiae*/“investment” (ICSID 25(1)/BIT 1(1)) 383, 409–23  
 contribution to the economic development as object and purpose (ICSID preamble)  
   411–12, 419, 422–3  
 financial instruments as special case 383, 412–13  
   determination of status on a case-by-case basis 383, 412–13, 418  
   loans funding an investment and free-standing loans, distinguishability 21–3  
   primary/secondary market transactions, distinguishability 383, 414–15  
 language issues (BIT 1(1)) 413, 414  
 outer limits/double-barrelled test (ICSID 25(2)(b)) 409–11  
   compliance of BIT/FTA with the objective limits of ICSID 25(1), need for 383

- ICSID *travaux préparatoires* as evidence of intention to create 383, 410
- Salini/Salini*-type elements requirement
  - contribution to the economic development 383, 411
  - duration 383
  - profit and return 383
  - risk 383
- territorial link requirement 383–4, 415–23
  - BIT “in the territory” requirements 415–17, 418–19
  - Fedax* 420–1
  - forum selection clauses, relevance 416–17
  - linkage to specific economic enterprise in host State 417
  - unity of the investment principle and 419–20
  - where and/or for the benefit of whom the funds are ultimately used 419, 420
- treaty vs contract basis of the claims 384
- “jurisdiction”/“admissibility”, definitions 382
- mass claims, admissibility 381–2, 384–6
  - absence of provision for as a reparable “gap” (ICSID 44) 385
  - conclusion (rejection) 381–2
  - curtailment of respondent’s right to pursue individual examination of claims 386
  - due process considerations 385–6
  - exclusion of rectifying measures 384–5
  - explicit consent, need for 385
  - majority’s unjustified divergence from the rules of procedure 385
  - representation of the parties, risks associated with (AR 18) 385–6
  - policy considerations, Tribunal’s obligation to take into account 386–7
  - risks of Tribunal overreaching its powers 386–7
- abuse of process/bad faith/abuse of rights**
  - bad faith/good faith and 253–4
  - costs, effect on 232
  - jurisprudence
    - Abaclat* 380
    - Malaysian Historical Salvors* 160
    - Philip Morris v. Australia* 63
    - Phoenix* 59–60, 63, 232, 253–4
- Additional Facility**, relationship between AF Rules and the ICSID Convention
  - AF 2(a) proceedings
    - consent to jurisdiction under ICSID 25(1) requirements (AF 3) 68–9, 758, 765–6
    - non-applicability of Convention to (AF 3) 765
- Additional Facility Rules (2006)**
  - 2(a) (approval for AF proceedings “arising directly out of an investment”) 68–9, 765–6
  - 3 (non-applicability of ICSID provisions to AF 2(a) proceedings) 68–9, 758, 765
  - 4(2) (conditions for approval of AF 2(a) proceedings) 68–9, 758, 765–6
  - 57(1) (supplementary decisions) 754–5
- admissibility**: *see also* abuse of process; exhaustion of local remedies; jurisdiction (ICSID)
  - jurisdiction distinguished
    - Abaclat* 377–8, 382
    - ICSID 63, 377–8
  - sovereign debt policy considerations, relevance 379

**advisory jurisdiction (arbitration tribunal), exclusion 640**

*AES*: see *AES* (background); *AES* (jurisdiction and admissibility); *AES* (merits)

***AES* (background)**

## complaints

- alleged adaption and application of legislation in a way to adversely affect claimants' business in breach of BITs and 1994 FIL 612
- alleged breaches of ECT 10(1), ECT 14(1), BIT II(2)(a) and BIT II(2)(c) 613, 614
- amendments of Electricity Law 1994 as breach of 1994 FIL stabilization clause 613–14
- proceedings in local courts for annulment of Altai Agreement arbitration clause as breach of 1994 FIL 612–13

## facts in date order

- Altai Agreement (23 July 1997) 612
- various transactions relating to transfer of hydroelectric concession assets and rights of State-owned entities (October 1997) 612
- de-monopolization of the electricity generation sector (1997–2009) 612
- claimants' acquisition of power plants and trading companies holding concessions with respondent (creation of AES Entities) (1996–7) 612

## procedural history in date order

- respondent's proceedings in the EKO Court of First Instance for invalidation of arbitration clause in the Altai Agreement (9 April 2003) (dismissal of claim (26 September 2003)) 612–13
- EKO Supreme Court overturns January 2004 decision and annuls arbitration clause (26 January 2004) 612–13
- registration of request for arbitration (20 July 2010) 611–12
- hearing on liability (10 to 14 September 2012) 615
- hearing on quantum (7 January 2013) 615

## respondent's position

- merits 614–15
- objection to the jurisdiction 614

## Tribunal's decision

- allocation of costs, relevant factors 623
- jurisdiction (acceptance of/absence of impediment to hearing claims) 615
- merits (finding of breach of fair and equitable treatment claim/dismissal of other claims) 615
- restitution and compensation claims, rejection 615, 622–3

***AES* (jurisdiction and admissibility)**

- admissibility, objections to/Tribunal's dismissal of
  - “bifurcation clause” (“fork in the road”) as impediment/different disputes
  - disputes relating to breach of treaty/breach of domestic legislation 617
  - “fundamental basis of the claim” test 617
  - identity of parties, object and cause test 617
- exhaustion of local remedies, absence of requirement for in the BIT, ECT and ICSID 617
- waiver of claims for non-invocation at an earlier stage 617
- areas of agreement
  - “arising out of a [qualifying] investment” 613
  - basis of jurisdiction (BIT/ECT) 615
  - “between a contracting State and a national of another contracting State” requirement 613
  - existence of legal dispute 613

- Tribunal's decision (acceptance of jurisdiction/finding of "no impediment" to hearing the claims) 615, 628–9
- written consent (1994 FIL disputes) (application *ratione materiae*: FIL exclusions) 615–16, 624
- Tribunal's rejection of respondent's argument (insufficient specificity to bring electricity sector within the exclusions) 616, 624–5
- written consent (1994 FIL disputes) (application *ratione temporis*: effect of amendment/termination of legislation) 616–17, 625–9
- ad hoc* approach to 616, 627
- contract law principles, applicability 628
- date of making investment as critical date 628–9
- host State's freedom to change legislation including position on consent vs limited right under international law to withdraw unilateral commitment 625
- non-retroactivity 616–17, 628–9
- relevant factors
- activation of consent by offerees 628
- existence of a stabilization clause 616, 628
- legitimate expectations 616, 628
- nature and purpose of legislation 616, 628–9
- text of consent 616, 627, 628
- revocation of consent to arbitrate and revocation of legislation distinguished 616, 627
- Rumeli* 626–7, 628
- Tribunal's decision (continuing validity of respondent's FIL consent) 628–9
- unilateral declaration, effect 625–9
- written consent (BIT VI/ECT 26 disputes) (agreement on) 624
- AES (merits)**
- fair and equitable treatment post-2009, legitimate expectation of a reasonable return on investment 621–2
- fair and equitable treatment pre-2009
- "manifestly unjust"/"grossly unfair" test 619–20
- stabilization and 619
- Tribunal's conclusion (failure to meet the standard) 519, 619
- legitimate expectations
- claims 617
- Tribunal's analysis (requirements/State's rights)
- clear and explicit representations to induce investments 618
- exercise of State's regulatory authority in pursuit of a public interest 617–18
- treaty- and contract-based expectations distinguished 618
- Tribunal's conclusions 618
- stabilization clause post-2009 621
- stabilization clause pre-2009 618–19
- legitimate expectations and 618–19
- predictable changes 619
- right to stabilization in the absence of a clear commitment 619
- umbrella clause pre-2009, absence of trigger 620–1
- unreasonable and arbitrary measures, overlap with fair and equitable treatment complaint/tribunal's rejection 620
- Ambiente Ufficio**: see *Abaclat*; *Ambiente Ufficio* (background); *Ambiente Ufficio* (jurisdiction and admissibility); *Ambiente Ufficio* (jurisdiction and admissibility) (dissenting opinion (Torres Bernárdez)); Argentina–Italy BIT

- Ambiente Ufficio (background)** *Note:* for full record of the facts *see Abaclat* (background).  
 facts in date order  
   respondent's default on sovereign bonds (December 2001) 508  
   Exchange Offer 2005 (14 January to 25 February 2005) 508  
   Law No. 26.017 (2005) (Emergency Law) 508  
   NASAM Mandate (prior to commencing the arbitration proceedings) 508  
   Exchange Offer 2010 (27 April 2010) 508  
     accepted by 29 claimants/renaming of the case 509  
 parties' positions  
   claimant (alleged violation of BIT 2(2), 3(1) and 5) 508  
   respondent (objections to the jurisdiction *ratione personae* and *ratione materiae*) 508  
 procedural history in date order  
   registration of request for arbitration (28 July 2008) 507  
   hearing on jurisdiction and admissibility (25 to 27 January 2011) 509  
   further comments in respect of the dissenting *Abaclat* opinion (25 November/13  
     December 2011) 509  
   decision on jurisdiction and admissibility (8 February 2013) 509  
   dissenting opinion (Torres Bernárdez) 509  
   consultation with parties about discontinuance of proceeding for non-payment of  
     expenses (18 June 2014) 509  
   rejection of claimants' request for a delay of payment of outstanding advances  
     (1 August 2014) 509–10  
   individual statement of arbitrator Torres Bernárdez on effect of discontinuance (4 May  
     2015) 510  
   discontinuance of proceedings (AFR 14(3)(d)) (28 May 2015) 510  
 procedural issues  
   competence/duty of tribunal to determine (*compétence de la compétence*) (ICSID  
     41(1)) 526–7, 528–9  
   costs (subject to discontinuance) (equal division of arbitration costs/each to pay own  
     costs) 512  
   interpretation (VCLT 31/VCLT 32 as applicable law) 528–9, 532
- Ambiente Ufficio (jurisdiction and admissibility)**  
 dispute settlement clause (BIT 8)  
   compliance obligation 515  
   consultations (BIT 8(1)), circumstances rendering impossible, effect 515  
   as a legal obligation 515  
 jurisdiction *ratione materiae* (“investment” (ICSID 25(1)/BIT 1(1))) 514, 520–50  
   “any other right to benefits or services with an economic value” 544  
   BIT 1(1), text (Spanish, Italian and English) 520–2  
   as broad, non-restrictive formulation 513, 534–5  
   commercial/trade transaction vs investment, jurisprudence 67–8, 538–9  
   compliance of bonds and securities with ICSID 25(1), need for 526–7  
   context 533  
   excluded classes of dispute, notification (ICSID 25(4)) 64–5, 530–2, 533, 572–3, 576  
   financial instruments/bonds as “investment” 523–6  
     parties' arguments 523  
     primary/secondary market transactions, distinguishability 544  
   jurisprudence/scholarly writings 536–8  
   legality/accordance with the laws and regulations of host State 548–50  
     BIT provision as determining factor 548–50



- laws and regulations of the host State relating to investments as applicable law 548–50
- Tribunal’s decision 550
- object and purpose 533–5
- outer limits/double-barrelled test (ICSID 25(2)(b)) **29–32**, 513, 522–3, 526–7, 540
  - ICSID 25(1) as autonomous, overriding definition 527
  - parties’ arguments 526
- residual/catch-all clauses 544
- State practice 536
- territoriality (investment/expenditure in the territory/“invested in the territory” (BIT 1(1))) 514, 545–8
  - ability to exercise sovereign rights, relevance 547–8
  - linkage to specific economic enterprise in host State, exclusion of need for 547
  - parties’ arguments 545
  - Tribunal’s conclusion 548
  - where and/or for the benefit of whom the funds are ultimately used test 514, 545–7
- translation issues (VCLT 33) 514, 543–4
- Tribunal’s conclusions
  - bond issuance/circulation of securities as single economic operation 525
  - bonds/securities as investments 538–9
  - unity of the investment principle **6**, **17**, 512, 513, 523–6, 542, 543
- jurisdiction *ratione materiae* (sovereign bonds as “investment” under ICSID 25(1))
  - ordinary meaning 513, 532–3
  - Salini/Salini*-type elements 513–14, 539–43
    - overview 539–41
    - “contribution to the economic development of the host State”/significant contribution 543
    - contribution (general) 542
    - duration 542
    - profit and return 542–3
    - risk 542
    - Tribunal’s conclusion 513–14
    - “typical characteristics” vs “jurisdictional requirements” 513, 539–41
    - unity of the investment and 542, 543
  - travaux préparatoires*/adoption of Article 25(1) 529–32
- jurisdiction *ratione personae* (claimants’ Italian nationality)
  - burden of proof/*onus probandi actori incumbit* 512
  - evidence of (“documents or other evidence”), examples of 512
  - standing/unity of the investment 512, 526
    - effect of proceedings in Italian courts, as matter for the merits 512
- multiparty claims
  - absence of a provision for, consequences/compensating factors
    - discussion of the issue at the conclusion of the ICSID Convention 510
    - ICSID practice 510
    - inclusion of bonds as indicative of openness to multiparty claims 510
  - claimants as individuals acting in their own names 510
  - class action/mass claims distinguished 510
  - limit on numbers, exclusion 510–11
  - need for a contractual link, exclusion 510–11

***Ambiente Ufficio* (jurisdiction and admissibility) (cont.)**

consent (claimants)

absence of any special requirements under ICSID 36(1) 511

request for arbitration as written consent 511

consent (respondent), absence of evidence to suggest any need for a special approach to 510

fairness and due process, possibility of measures to ensure 511

Tribunal's decision (dismissal of objections) 510, 515, 550

costs (reservation of decision until merits stage) 515

finding of prima facie treaty claims (respondent's exercise of sovereign rights) 514

***Ambiente Ufficio* (jurisdiction and admissibility) (dissenting opinion (Torres Bernárdez)) 550–609**

admissibility

failure to establish existence of a legal dispute on critical date 519

problems with signature and filing of arbitration request 519

conclusion (lack of jurisdiction *ratione materiae*, *ratione personae* and for non-compliance with BIT 8) 515

dispute settlement clause (BIT 8), compliance obligation

prior consultation and domestic litigation requirements (BIT 8(3)) 518–19

circumstances rendering impossible, effect 518

disregard for, justification 519

failure to accept terms as failure to accept offer 519

jurisdiction *ratione materiae*/"investment" (ICSID 25(1)/BIT 1(1))

summary of views 550–1

bonds/securities, interrelationship 553–4

commercial/trade transaction vs investment 517

portfolio investment, uncertain status as covered "investment" 517

primary/secondary market transactions, distinguishability 517, 552, 554–5, 560–3

*Salini/Salini*-type elements

legality/accordance with the laws and regulations of host State 518

territoriality/"in the territory of" 518

unity of the investment principle 552–63

jurisdiction *ratione personae* 516–17

burden of proof 517

majority's failure to verify essential elements 516–17

mass claims, admissibility/multiparty proceedings alternative 515–16

consent (claimant) 516

consent (respondent) 516

due process considerations 516

***amicus curiae***

jurisprudence

AR 37(2), *Bewater Gauff* 190–1AR (AF) 41(3), *Apotex* 654–6

requirements (AR (AF) 41(3)) 654–6

**annulment of arbitral award (ICSID 52) (general including procedural matters)**

appeal distinguished 700

as exceptional remedy/high threshold 700

**annulment of arbitral award (ICSID 52), grounds**

contradictory analysis 700–1

failure to state reasons (ICSID 52(1)(e)) 700

- jurisprudence
  - MINE 700*
  - Poštová banka 700–1*
- sufficiency to understand how tribunal arrived at its conclusion 700
- manifest excess of power (ICSID 52(1)(b))
  - failure to consider BIT definition of “jurisdiction” following finding of non-compliance with ICSID 25(1) definition 115–17, 142–52
- jurisprudence
  - Amco* (annulment) 165
  - CMS v. Argentina* (annulment) 165
  - Lucchetti* (annulment) 164
  - Malaysian Historical Salvors* (annulment) (dissenting) 25, 163–6
  - MTD* (annulment) 165
  - Repsol* (annulment) 164, 165
  - Soufraki* (annulment) 164
  - Vivendi I* (annulment) 165
  - Wena* (annulment) 164
  - “manifest” 163–6
- Apotex:** *see Apotex* (background); *Apotex* (merits); *Apotex* (procedure and jurisdiction)
- Apotex (background)**
  - facts in date order
    - FDA inspection and observations on Etobicoke (late 2008) 652
    - Apotex’s response to FDA observations (January 2009) 652
    - FDA warning letter (June 2009) 652
    - FDA inspection of Signet/further findings of significant deficiencies (July/August 2009) 652
    - FDA’s issue without warning of an Import Alert (August 2009–July 2011) 652
  - facts (status of *Apotex*)
    - regulation (Health Canada/FDA) 651–2
    - structure 651
  - parties’ positions (claimant)
    - alleged breaches
      - BIT II(2)(b) (non-impairment) 652–3
      - NAFTA 1102 (national treatment) 652, 653
      - NAFTA 1103 (MFN treatment) 652, 653
      - NAFTA 1105 (minimum standard of treatment) 652, 653
    - “investor” (NAFTA 1116)/“investment” (NAFTA 1138), qualification as 652
    - quantum claims 653
  - parties’ positions (respondent)
    - claimants’ failure to appreciate seriousness of failings 653
    - jurisdiction
      - ANDAs, “investment” status (*Apotex I and II Award*) 653–4
      - Import Alert as internal agency guidance without a connection to an “investment” 654
    - liability, responses on alleged breaches of NAFTA 1102/NAFTA 1103/NAFTA 1105 654
  - procedural history in date order
    - request for arbitration (29 February 2012) 651
    - Apotex I/Apotex II* distinguished 651
    - decision to bifurcate quantum proceedings (29 October 2012) 653

**Apotex (background)** (cont.)

- Tribunal's invitation for *amicus curiae* applications (31 January 2013) 654
- Mexico submission on the interpretation of NAFTA 1139(h) by reference to NAFTA 1101 (territorial requirement) (9 February 2013) 654
- Tribunal's rejection of request to treat jurisdictional objections as a preliminary matter (25 February 2013) 653
- Procedural Order rejecting applications to participate as a non-disputing party (AR (AF) 41(3)) (4 March 2013) 654–6

**Apotex (merits)**

- alleged breach of NAFTA 1102 (national treatment), requirements
  - fact-specific analysis 661
  - “in like circumstances” with identified domestic comparators 661–2
  - less favourable treatment than comparators 661–2
  - “treatment” 661–2
  - Tribunal's decision (dismissal of claims) 661–2
- alleged breach of NAFTA 1103 (MFN treatment) 661, 662
  - Tribunal's decision (failure to establish the “like circumstances” requirement) 662
- alleged breach of NAFTA 1105(1) (minimum standard of treatment) 662–4
  - “in accordance with [customary] international law” 663–4
  - Restatement (Second) of Foreign Relations Law 663–4
  - State practice 663–4
  - standard of review (“very high threshold of severity and gravity”) 664
  - Tribunal's decision (reasonableness of respondent's action/claimant's failure to meet high threshold) 664
- burden of proof/possibility of a shift, adverse inferences 662
- costs 665
- non-impairment (Jamaica–US BIT II(6)), applicability under NAFTA 1103 (MFN treatment)
  - parties' arguments 664–5
  - Tribunal's conclusion (non-applicability of BIT to FDA administrative decisions) 664–5

**Apotex (procedure and jurisdiction)**

- res judicata* 659, 673–89
  - dispositif*, whether limited to 676–81
    - issue estoppel and 659, 676–8
  - finality/binding force of decision and (NAFTA 1136(1)) 659, 673–4
    - ICJ/PCIJ 59 compared 674
  - as general principle of international law 674–81
  - as general principle of law 675
  - identity of parties and cause of action, need for 675–6
  - stare decisis* distinguished 659, 674
  - Tribunal's conclusion 687–8
    - dissenting opinion 660–1, 688–9
  - UNCITRAL 32(2) and (3)/*Apotex I and II* Award 659, 681–2
- seat of arbitration, factors determining choice 657
  - dissenting opinion 657
- territoriality requirement (NAFTA 1101(1)(b)) (Import Alert of 28 August 2009) 657–9, 665–72
  - “relating to”, need for a legally significant connection 658, 667–72
    - Apotex Inc. 658–9, 672
    - Apotex-Holdings 658–9, 672
    - Apotex-US 658–9, 668–72

**Argentina**

- Law No. 26.017 (2005) (Emergency Law) 368, 508  
 “pesification” (Public Emergency and Reform Law 2002) 367

**Argentina–Chile BIT (1991) by article**

- 7(2)(a) (nationality/MFN treatment) 388, 389, 390, 391  
 text 389

**Argentina–Italy BIT (1990) by article:** *see also* *Abaclat*; *Ambiente Ufficio*

- 1(1) (“investment means . . . any kind of asset invested or reinvested . . . in the territory of the other Party including . . .”) 374–6, 394–403, 413–23, 517–18  
 as categorization of “investments” from perspective of rights and values generated 401  
 “in conformity with the laws and regulations of the host State” 376, 407–8, 548–50  
 “in the territory of”/“invested in the territory” 376, 415–16, 418–19, 545–8  
 text  
   English 395–6, 401, 422  
   Italian 396, 520  
   Spanish 395–6, 520–1  
 translation issues (VCLT 33) 413, 414, 514, 543–4  
 as typical definition 399, 401  
 1(1)(b) (“shares of stock . . . including minority or indirect interest”) 374  
 1(1)(c) (“obligations . . . having economic value . . .”) 375–6  
   bonds as 375, 401–2  
   bonds/securities as 383  
 1(2)(a) (“investor”: juridical person) 376–7  
 1(2)(b) (“investor”: natural person) 376–7  
 2(2) (arbitrary/discriminatory measures) 390, 508  
 2(2) (fair and equitable treatment) 389  
 3 (national/MFN treatment) 388–9, 391, 415–16, 508  
   text 388–9  
 3(1) (national/MFN treatment) 390, 519  
   dispute settlement clauses, applicability to 378, 380, 519  
 5 (nationalization/expropriation) 508  
 8 (dispute settlement) 373–4, 382–3  
   absence of specific form requirement for consent 377  
   binding nature 515  
   as hierarchy of interconnected means 379, 382–3  
 8(1) (consultations) 379, 515, 518–19  
   circumstances rendering impossible, effect 515  
   as a legal obligation 515  
 8(2) (exhaustion of local remedies), binding nature 382, 515  
 8(3) (option of arbitration after 18-months domestic litigation), disregard of “18 months”,  
   effect 379–80, 382–3, 515, 519  
 8(7) (applicable law) 397, 548–50  
   as law applicable to the merits 407, 549

**Bayview (jurisdiction)**

- background  
 claimants’ position  
   alleged diversion of water in Mexico belonging to the claimants in breach of  
   NAFTA 1102/NAFTA 1105 and NAFTA 1110 169  
   claim to investment in Mexico in the form of rights over waters of the Rio Bravo/Rio  
   Grande 169

**Bayview (jurisdiction)** (cont.)

- list of protected investments affected by the alleged violations 169
- transfer of the water rights (Mexico–US Water Treaty (1944)) 169
- procedural history in date order
  - registration of request for arbitration (Additional Facility) (1 July 2005) 168
  - Tribunal’s decision to deal with jurisdiction as a preliminary matter (14 February 2006) 169
  - submissions by the US (under NAFTA 1128) and official US bodies in relation to the claims (10 September–18 December 2006) 170
  - hearing on jurisdiction (14/15 November 2006) 171
  - Award (19 June 2007) (denial of jurisdiction on territorial grounds) 171
- costs 173
- jurisdiction (parties’ positions)
  - compliance with mandatory procedural requirements
    - claimants 170
    - respondent 170
  - jurisdiction *ratione temporis*
    - claimants 170
    - respondent 170
  - territorial jurisdiction
    - claimants 170
    - respondent 169
  - jurisdiction (Tribunal’s analysis) 171–3, 175–82
    - compliance with mandatory procedural requirements 175
    - decision (dismissal for want of territorial jurisdiction) 173, 182
    - “foreign investment”/“foreign investor” 177–9
      - ordinary meaning of Chapter XI provisions 177–8
    - status of claimants (individuals/juridical persons) 168–9
    - territorial jurisdiction (“in the territory” requirement) 172–3, 173–82
      - rejection of claimants’ claim to ownership of property in Mexico 160–1, 173
      - treaty interpretation (statements and conduct of parties) (VCLT 31(3)) 179–80
- “bifurcation clause” (“fork in the road”)
  - different disputes
    - breach of treaty/breach of domestic legislation 617
    - “fundamental basis of the claim” test 617
    - identity of parties, object and cause test 617
  - exhaustion of local remedies and 617
- BITs (bilateral investment treaties)** *Note:* individual BITs are indexed only when they are instrumental in cases published in the *ICSID Reports*.
  - breach as basis for jurisdiction, sovereign action taken outside contractual framework 374, 391–3, 394
  - interpretation
    - effectiveness (*effet utile*) (VCLT 31(1)) 696
    - VCLT/general principles of law as applicable law 233–4, 309, 318–19, 331–5, 496–7, 696
- Biwater Gauff:** *see* *Biwater Gauff* (background/administrative matters); *Biwater Gauff* (jurisdiction); *Biwater Gauff* (merits (alleged breaches of BIT)); *Biwater Gauff* (remedies (ILC(SR) 31/ILC(SR) 36 obligation to make reparations for any moral or material damage))

***Biwater Gauff* (background/administrative matters)**

- costs (each to bear own) 200
  - Born (dissenting) 200–1
  - facts in date order
    - Energy and Water Utilities Regulatory Authority Act 2001/establishment of EWURA 186
    - Dar es Salaam Water Supply and Sanitation Project (“the Project”), award of contract to manage and operate (December 2002) 185–6
    - funding arrangements 185–6
    - City Water contracts with DAWASA (Dar es Salaam Water and Sewage Authority) (19 February 2003) 186
    - CRDB’s provision of performance bond 186
    - Lease Contract/provisions 186
    - POG (Contract for the Procurement of Goods) 186
    - SIPE (Supply and Installation of Plant and Equipment Contract) 186
    - difficulties with the Project/City Water’s breaches of contract/failed request for interim review (May 2003–May 2005) 186–7
    - repudiation of the contract (13 May 2005) 187
    - DAWASA’s termination of City Waters’ contract (25 May 2005) 187
    - deportation of City Waters’ senior management, seizure of company’s assets and installation of DAWASCO (1 June 2005) 187
    - City Water loses in UNCITRAL proceedings for breach of the Lease Contract (31 December 2007) 187
  - parties’ positions, alleged breach of BIT
    - 2(2) (fair and equitable treatment) 187, 188
    - 2(2) (full protection and security) 186, 187, 188
    - 2(2) (unreasonable or discriminatory measures) 187, 188
    - 5(1) (expropriation) 187, 188
    - 6 (unrestricted transfer of capital and returns) 187, 188
  - procedural history in date order
    - Biwater Gauff’s request to institute arbitration proceedings (5 August 2005) 185
    - Procedural Order No. 3 (provisional measures on confidentiality of proceedings) (29 September 2006) 189–90
    - parties’ arguments 189–90
    - Procedural Order No. 5 (*amicus curiae* status) (2 February 2007) 189
    - evidentiary hearing on merits and jurisdiction (16–21 April 2007) 189
    - Award (31 December 2007) 189
    - despatch (24 July 2008) 189
- Biwater Gauff* (jurisdiction)**
- challenge to (grounds)
    - claims under breach of the Tanzanian Investment Act (absence of clear and precise language) 192–3
    - failure to meet the “arising directly out of an investment” test 188, 191
    - failure to observe cooling-off period 193
    - jurisdiction based on Tanzanian Investment Act 188, 192
    - lack of corporate approval for arbitral proceedings 188, 192
    - Project as loss leader, Tribunal’s response
      - evidence of risk/commitment 191, 204
      - loss leader status/motivation, relevance to ICSID jurisdiction 192, 204
      - relevance of risk/commitment 204

***Biwater Gauff (jurisdiction)*** (cont.)

Project as loss, respondent's arguments 191, 203–4

Tanzanian Investment Act 188, 192–3

*Salini* test (Tribunal's analysis) 201–4

flexible/pragmatic approach, need for 201–3

perceived absence of an ICSID 25(1) definition as basis for resort to 191, 201–2

“typical characteristics” vs “jurisdictional requirements” 192

unity of the investment principle and 60, 202

***Biwater Gauff (merits (alleged breaches of BIT))***

expropriation (BIT 5(1)) 193–5

breach of contract distinguished 194

abuse of power transcending 194

creeping expropriation 193–4

Tribunal's conclusion

acceptance of issues related to abuse of power 194–5

*Biloune* compared 195

limitation of considerations to non-contractual issues 194

rejection of claims relating to repudiation of the Lease Contract and the Performance

Bond 194

fair and equitable treatment (BIT 2) 195–7

elements of

consistency 196

good faith 196

legitimate expectations 196

transparency 196

high threshold/“egregious behaviour” 196

minimum international standard, as additional to 195

Tribunal's conclusion (acceptance of claimant's claim)

cases of expropriation previously identified as violation 196

failure to manage public expectations 196

Tribunal's decision (action not in breach of) 196–7

full protection and security (BIT 2(2))

as State's guarantee of physical, commercial and legal stability in a secure environment 198

Tribunal's finding of breach 198

unreasonable or discriminatory measures (BIT 2) 197–8

Tribunal's decision

accepted claims 198

rejected claims 198

unrestricted transfer of investment (BIT 2(2))

measures covered by 198

Tribunal's dismissal of claim 198

***Biwater Gauff (remedies (ILC(SR) 31/ILC(SR) 36 obligation to make reparations for any moral or material damage)***

dissenting opinion (Born) 200

Tribunal's decision (limitation to declaratory relief): grounds

absence of proof that losses caused by violations 191, 199

claimant's inadequate performance 191

failure to establish damages 199–200



**BLEU–Russia BIT (1989) by article**

- 10.1 (pre-arbitration procedure)
  - “concerning the . . . compensation to be paid under Art. 5” 213
  - other BITs compared
    - Russia–Spain 213–14
    - Russia–UK 213–14

**bonds:** *see* financial instruments

**burden/standard of proof**

- adverse inferences 662
- claimant (*onus probandi actori incumbit*) 432–4, 512
- credibility of party 433
- differential treatment, need for 661
- disqualification proposal 371
- indirect deprivation 641
- investment 742
- jurisdiction: *see* jurisdiction headings
- legitimate expectation 617–18, 619
- national of another contracting State (juridical person) (ICSID 25(2)(b)), agreement to treat as 432–4, 512
- shift 433, 442, 661

**Caratube:** *see* Caratube (background); Caratube (jurisdiction)

**Caratube (background)**

- facts in date order
  - CCC’s contract with respondent for the exploration and development of the Caratube oil field (December 2000) 425
  - Transfer Agreement assigning CCC’s Caratube rights to claimant (8 August 2002) 425
  - MEMR’s reviews of CIOC’s performance (2003–6) 426
  - Hourani’s acquisition of CIOC SPAs (May 2004–May 2006) 425–6
  - MEMR’s notification to CIOC of intention to extend exploration period (February 2007) 426
- parties’ positions
  - claimant 426–7
  - respondent 427
- procedural history in date order
  - registration of request for arbitration (16 June 2008) 425
  - request for provisional measures (14 April 2009) 427
  - hearing on provisional measures (30 June 2009) 427
  - rejection of request for provisional measures (30 June 2009) 427
  - procedural orders in respect of discovery between respondent and claimant (2 April/26 May 2010) 427–8
  - petition in US District Court DC to compel discovery from non-parties (28 April 2010) 427
  - hearing on jurisdiction and the merits (7 to 17 February 2011) 428
  - Award declining jurisdiction and apportioning costs (5 June 2012) 428
  - application for annulment of award (2 October 2012) 428
  - registration of application for annulment of award/stay of enforcement (AR 54(2)) (5 October 2012) 428
  - constitution of *ad hoc* Committee (12 November 2012) 428

**Caratube (background)** (cont.)

- registration of another request by CIOC and Hourani for arbitration based on contractual dispute resolution procedure (28 June 2013) 428
- dismissal of application for annulment (21 February 2014) 428
- Contractual Award (27 September 2017) 428–9

**Caratube (jurisdiction)**

- costs (failure to bifurcate the proceedings)
  - allocation difficulties 434
  - Tribunal's decision 434
  - unnecessary costs incurred 434
- "investment" (BIT I(1)(a): "every kind of investment . . . owned or controlled directly or indirectly by [nationals or] companies of the other party") 438–45
- "contribution to the economic development of the host State", need for 431–2, 442–5
  - Abaclat* 442
  - preamble ("maximum effective utilization of economic resources") 442–3
- "inherent meaning of investment" under ICSID jurisprudence, relevance to determination of foreign ownership/control (BIT VI(8)) 431, 444–5
- interpretative aids
  - dictionaries (to establish ordinary meaning) 431, 440–1
  - explanatory note for legislative purposes 442
  - other BITs concluded by the parties 431, 440
  - preamble (to understand "investment" in context and in the light of the BITs' object and purpose) 431, 441–5
  - US Model BITs' *travaux préparatoires* 443–4
- lack of clarity/departure from usual formulae 431, 440
- parties' right to establish a special meaning (VCLT 31(4)), absence of evidence 440
- Phoenix* factors (contribution, duration and risk) 431, 444–5
  - interdependence 433
- sources of investment, relevance 431, 433, 443
- national of another contracting State (juridical person) (ICSID 25(2)(b)), agreement to treat as
  - agreement of parties, need for
    - continuing effect of implicit contractual agreement in case of assignment to a third party 430
    - inclusion of arbitration clause in contract as implicit agreement 429–30
  - burden of proof (*actori incumbit probatio*)/possible reversal 432–4
  - foreign control, as outer limit/need for compliance with both ICSID 25(2)(b) and BIT 430–3
- outer limit (ICSID 25(2)(b)), foreign control as 430
- preliminary matters
  - applicable law (by agreement) (AR, Kazakh law and such rules of international law as may be applicable) 429
    - including prior arbitral decisions 429
    - VCLT 31(1) (ordinary meaning in its context and in the light of the BIT's object and purpose) 440
  - confirmation of *compétence de la compétence* including right to restate ambiguous or unclear objections (ICSID 41/AR 41(2)) 429
  - previous ICSID tribunal decision as aid 429
  - Tribunal's decision 429, 445

- confidentiality of arbitral proceedings**, provisional measures (*Biwater Gauff*) 189–90
- consent to ICSID jurisdiction**
- BIT as, sufficiency 377
  - critical date, date of investment 628
  - fraud, coercion or essential mistake, effect 377
  - importance/as overriding condition 145–8
  - instruments of: *see also* “investment” (ICSID 25) (overview) (“Subject matter jurisdiction: the notion of investment” (Waibel))
    - switch from investment contract to investment treaty, effect 39–40
  - jurisprudence
    - AES* 614–17
    - Rumeli* 626–7
  - legislation as
    - as offer requiring acceptance 193
    - ratione materiae*, exclusion of certain sectors, specificity requirement 616, 624–5
    - ratione temporis*, effect of amendment/termination of legislation 616–17, 625–7
    - termination/amendment of legislation, effect: *see* consent to ICSID jurisdiction, withdrawal
    - as unilateral act 192–3
  - mass claims: *see* mass claims, admissibility
  - multiparty claims: *see* multiparty claims, admissibility
  - power of attorney for purpose of 377
  - requirements: *see also* “investment”; legal dispute arising directly out of investment (ICSID 25(1)); national of another contracting State (juridical person) (ICSID 25(2)(b)); national of another contracting State (juridical person) (ICSID 25(2)(b)), agreement to treat as; national of another contracting State (natural person) (ICSID 25(2)(a)); unity of the investment principle
  - clear and precise offer, need for 192–3
  - formality, relevance 377
  - ICSID 25(1) (writing) 377
  - written consent, need for
    - consent in BIT coupled with arbitration request, sufficiency 465
    - submission of dispute to ICSID as 511, 624
    - written consent of duly appointed legal representative, sufficiency 511
- consent to ICSID jurisdiction, withdrawal**
- amendment/termination of legislation containing consent, effect 616–17, 625–9
    - ad hoc* approach to 616, 627
    - contract law principles, applicability 628
    - host State’s freedom to change legislation including position on consent vs limited right under international law to withdraw unilateral commitment 625
    - non-retroactivity 616–17, 628–9
    - relevant factors
      - activation of consent by offerees 628
      - existence of a stabilization clause 616, 628
      - legitimate expectations 616, 628
      - nature and purpose of legislation 616, 628–9
      - text of consent 616, 627, 628
    - revocation of consent to arbitrate and revocation of legislation distinguished 616, 627
  - exclusion of unilateral withdrawal (ICSID 25(1)) 627

**consent to ICSID jurisdiction, withdrawal** (cont.)

jurisprudence

*Abaclat* 370, 373, 380, 512*AES* 616–17, 625–9*Ambiente Ufficio* 512*Rumeli* 626–7, 628

unilateral withdrawal, admissibility prior to registration of arbitration request (IR 8) 380, 512

**contribution:** *see* “contribution to the economic development of the host State”;  
 “contribution to the economic development of the host State”, jurisprudence;  
 contribution (general considerations); contribution (general considerations),  
 jurisprudence

**“contribution to the economic development of the host State” 58–60**

as an essential element 59, 155–60, 411, 419, 422–3

“contribution to the economy”

dependence of protection on flow of capital 431, 442

inherent in

contribution, duration and risk requirement 58, 59, 230, 236–7, 271, 404–5

“maximum effective utilization of economic resources” objective 442–3

as preferred formula 59, 236, 758–9, 767–8

“used to create an economic value” 450, 455, 458–60, 465–71

date of investment as critical date for determination 746

economic activity in the host country requirement 231, 238–9

intention/good faith attempts to engage in, sufficiency 231–2, 248–50, 478

as flexible/discretionary criterion 59, 236–7, 746

ICSID object and purpose (ICSID preamble) 156, 158–9, 286–7, 293, 411

limited acceptance as a criterion 58, 291

“positive impact”/“significant contribution”, need for 137–41, 160–1, 294 n. 73, 451, 461–2, 543

good faith/proportionality/abuse of rights as test 160

“infinitesimally small development”, exclusion 117, 160

nominal price for purchase of ownership, relevance 231, 246, 433–4

substantial commitment 456, 477–84

prioritization of BIT/acceptance of anything the parties may agree as illogical/counter to ICSID 25(1) 161–3

process of creation, need for 699

rejection as a stand-alone element 58–9, 286–7, 293, 463

review of the jurisprudence 158–9

Schreuer 155, 159

subjectivity 58, 451, 463

*travaux préparatoires* 159**“contribution to the economic development of the host State”, jurisprudence***Abaclat* 431, 442*Abaclat* (dissenting) 411, 419, 422–3*Ambiente Ufficio* 543*Amco* 156*Bayindir* 134–5, 141*Biwater* 158*Caratube* 431–2, 442–5*CSOB* 121, 128–9, 135, 141, 158, 769–70

- Deutsche Bank* **58–9**, 451, 458–60, 461–2, 463  
*Deutsche Bank* (dissenting) 456, 469–71, 477–84  
*Fakes* **58**, 286–7, 294 n. 73, 766  
*Gavazzi* **58**, 745–6  
*Helnan* 235  
*Jan de Nul* 135, 141, 235–6  
*Joy Mining* 134, 235  
*LESI* **58**, 236  
*LESI DIPENTA* 126–7, 134–5  
*Malaysian Historical Salvors* 121, 134–41, 235, 294 n. 73  
*Malaysian Historical Salvors* (annulment) **58**  
*Malaysian Historical Salvors* (annulment) (dissenting) 117–18, 152–67  
*Mitchell* **7**, 89  
*Mitchell* (annulment) **7**, **59**, 104–7, 127–8, 135, 139–40, 155, 158, 159, 236  
*MNSS* **59–60**, 758–9, 767–8  
*Pey Casado* 474  
*Pey Casado* (annulment) 269–70, 276–7, 474, 584  
*Phoenix* **59–60**, 231–2, 236–7, 245–7, 248–50, 658–9, 767–8  
*Poštová banka* 699, 767  
*PSEG* 135–7  
*Romak* 261, 272–4  
*Salini* **47 n. 99**, 125  
*Sedelmayer* 237  
*SGS v. Dominican Republic* 246 n. 85  
*Tokelés* 239
- contribution (general considerations) 52–6**  
 acceptance/rejection as a criterion  
   absence as fatal flaw **54–5**  
   acceptance **52–4**, 399–400, 461–2  
     as sole test 403–4  
   examples **54–6**  
   passive/indirect investments **55**  
   rejection **52**  
 classification as  
   non-financial forms **7**, **89**, 98, 104–5, 107–8, 124, 125, 132, 139–40, 203–4, 461  
   plans for investment 743–4  
 dual role (contribution constituting investment/rights and value derived from contribution) 399  
   ICSID 25/BIT approaches to distinguished 399–400  
 factors of possible relevance  
   “active relationship between investor and investment” **55**  
   compliance with contract 744  
   motivation/purpose of contribution/investment 181, 204, 742–4  
   unity of the investment considerations **55**  
 relevance in relation to financial instruments **72–3**
- contribution (general considerations), jurisprudence**  
*Abaclat* **52–4**, 399–400  
*Alapli* **55**  
*Alcoa* 106, 120  
*Ambiente Ufficio* 542

**contribution (general considerations), jurisprudence (cont.)**

- Bayindir* 461
- Biwater Gauff* **52**
- Deutsche Bank* 451, 461–2
- Enkev Beheer* **70–1**
- Fakes* **54**, 286–7
- Flemingo DutyFree* **55**
- Gavazzi* 742–4
- HICEE* **54–5**
- LESI* 461
- Malaysian Historical Salvors* 132
- Malaysian Historical Salvors (annulment)* **52**
- Poštová banka* **54**
- RFCC* 461
- Romak* **54**
- Salini* 124
- SCB v. Tanzania* **54, 55**

**corporation, capacity/status/legal personality**

- jurisprudence
  - BG* 703
  - CMS* 704
  - El Paso* 702–3
  - HICEE* 702
  - Paushok* 704–5
  - Poštová banka* 701–5
  - ST-AD GmbH* 702, 704
  - Urbaser* 703–4
- shareholders distinguished 694–5, 701–5

**costs (Additional Facility)**

- arbitration costs, allocation in accordance with relative success 765
- each party to bear its own 765

**costs (ICSID *ad hoc* Committee (ICSID 61(2) and 52(4))) 701****costs (ICSID arbitral tribunal: ICSID 61(2))**

- arbitration/tribunal costs, equal division 699
- avoidable, failure to bifurcate proceedings, extra costs incurred/difficulty of allocation 434–5
- in case of, abuse of process 232
- discretion of tribunal 739
- jurisprudence
  - Apotex* 665
  - Fakes* 288
  - Gavazzi* 739, 740
  - Phoenix* 232
- parties to bear own 699
- relevant factors
  - bad faith 454
  - claim manifestly outside ICSID jurisdiction 288
  - complexity of issues 699
  - egregious breach of obligations 454
  - loser pays principle 665

- professional/unprofessional handling of proceedings 306, 699
  - unfamiliarity of proceedings 306
- costs (UNCITRAL arbitral tribunal: Rules 38–40)**
  - reasonableness 323
  - relevant factors (conduct of parties) 323
- customary international law (CIL)**
  - requirements/sources, consistent and widespread State practice 663–4
  - standard of treatment of alien, minimum international standard 663–4
  - treaties and similar instruments reflecting, Restatement (Second) of Foreign Relations Law 663–4
- Czech Republic–Israel BIT (1997) by article:** *see also Phoenix*
  - preamble (purpose: “to intensify economic cooperation to the mutual benefit of both countries”) 231, 239–40
  - 1(1) (“investment”: “any kind of assets invested in economic activity . . .”) 240
- damages as a remedy**
  - causal link between violation and losses 191
  - double recovery, risk of 454
  - moral damages 191
- Denmark–Russia BIT (1993) by article,** 3(4) (MFN treatment) 214–15, 216–17
- Deutsche Bank:** *see Deutsche Bank* (background); *Deutsche Bank* (jurisdiction); *Deutsche Bank* (jurisdiction) (dissenting opinion (Ali Khan)); *Deutsche Bank* (merits)
- Deutsche Bank (background)**
  - facts in date order
    - Hedging Agreement (8 July 2008) 448
      - description of 448
    - falling oil prices (late July/August 2008) 448
    - Central Bank’s investigation into the hedging transaction (early November 2008) 448
    - individual petitions to Supreme Court with allegations about the Hedging Agreement and CPC’s behaviour (early November 2008) 448
    - Supreme Court’s Interim Order suspending CPC payments to claimant, suspending CPC chairman and calling for criminal investigation (28 November 2008) 448
    - claimant’s exercise of right to terminate the Hedging Agreement (3 December 2008) 449
    - communication to claimant of Investigation Report highlighting multiple irregularities (6 January 2009) 449
      - claimant’s objections to the Report 449
    - petitioners’ decision not to pursue claim/confirmation of Stop-Payment Order (27 January 2009) 449
    - objections to the jurisdiction (14 December 2009) 449
    - rejection of respondent’s request for bifurcation (25 February 2010) 449
  - parties’ positions
    - claimant (alleged breaches of BIT 2, BIT 4(1), BIT 4(2) and BIT 8) 449
    - respondent (counter to claimant’s claims) 449
  - procedural history in date order
    - request for arbitration (24 March 2009) 448
    - hearing (25 August to 5 September 2011) 449
    - Award (31 October 2012) 449–50
    - application for annulment of Award (8 March 2013) 450
    - constitution of *ad hoc* committee (17 April 2013) 450
    - termination of proceedings (9 September 2016) 450

***Deutsche Bank (jurisdiction)*** 450–2, 458–65

attribution/State responsibility for acts of

CPC as State-controlled corporation (ILC(SR) 8) 452

Supreme Court/Central Bank as organs of State (ILC(SR) 4) 452

consent in writing, need for (ICSID 25(1)), parties' compliance 465

“investment” (BIT 1(1)(c)) (“claims to money which has been used to create an economic value or claims to any performance having an economic value and associated with an investment”) 450, 458–60

Hedging Agreement as 459

territoriality (investment/expenditure in the territory) 450

forum selection/choice of law clauses in contractual documents, relevance 450, 460

where and/or for the benefit of whom the funds are ultimately used 450, 459–60

“investment” (ICSID 25(1)) 451, 460–5

commercial/trade transaction vs investment 451, 464

contingent liability, exclusion 451, 464

“contribution to the economic development of the host State”

“positive impact”/“significant contribution”, need for 451, 461–2

rejection as a stand-alone element 451, 463

subjectivity 451, 463

duration

claimant's compliance with 463

as a typical element 462–3

outer limits/double-barrelled test 451, 460–1

profit and return, rejection as required element 451, 461, 463

*Salini/Salini*-type elements

contribution, duration and risk as most frequent/useful elements 451, 460

flexible/pragmatic approach (*Biwater Gauff*) 451, 460–1

Tribunal's decision (dismissal of objections) (Khan dissenting) 450, 464–5

validity of the Hedging Agreement 451–2

***Deutsche Bank (jurisdiction) (dissenting opinion (Ali Khan))***

“investment” (BIT 1(1)(c)) (“claims to money which has been used to create an economic value or claims to any performance having an economic value and associated with an investment”) 455–6, 465–71

“associated with an investment” requirement 455–6, 465–9

applicability to money claims 455–6, 466–9, 471

Hedging Agreement, failure to meet BIT 1(1) “investment” requirements 471

“used to create an economic value” 69–71

“investment” (ICSID 25(1))

commercial/trade transaction vs investment 456, 480–4

“contribution to the economic development of the host State” 456, 469–71, 477–84

outer limits/double-barrelled test (ICSID 25(2)(b)) 472–6

*Salini/Salini*-type elements 456, 472–6

review of the jurisprudence 472–6

timing of determination as (inception of “investment”) 456, 477–80

treaty interpretation

every element of treaty to be given effect (VCLT 31(1)) 466–7

similar terms in different treaties as context (VCLT 31(2)) 467

***Deutsche Bank (merits)*** 452–4

alleged breach of BIT 2 (fair and equitable treatment) 452–3

as autonomous standard/equivalence to customary international law minimum standard 452–3



- dissenting opinion 457–8
- Tribunal's finding (acts of Supreme Court and Central Bank as breach) 453
- alleged breach of BIT 4(2) (expropriation)
  - creeping/indirect expropriation 453–4
  - dissenting opinion 457
  - proportionality requirement 454
  - regulatory takings 453–4
  - Tribunal's finding (acts of Supreme Court/Central Bank as expropriation of claimant's claim to Hedging Agreement claim) 454
- alleged breach of BIT 4(2) (full protection and security)/BIT 8 (umbrella clause), as superfluous in view of decisions on fair and equitable treatment/expropriation 454
- costs (egregious nature of breaches/bad faith as ground for full recovery) 455
- damages 454
  - respondent's arguments 454
  - Tribunal's decision 454
    - double recovery, need to avoid 454
- Tribunal's decision (Khan dissenting) (finding of expropriation and breach of fair and equitable treatment obligation) 450
- diplomatic protection**, ICSID/BITs regime as a departure from 284
- dispute settlement clause obligations**, failure to accept as non-acceptance of arbitration offer 519
- disqualification of conciliator or arbitrator (ICSID 57)**
  - benchmark as objective standard 371
  - burden of proof (*onus probandi incumbit actori*) 371
  - grounds (manifest lack of ICSID 57 qualities) 370–1
  - impartiality/independence of judgment, factors possibly indicating absence of, "impartiality" as "independence" (ICSID 14(1)) 371
  - jurisprudence
    - Abaclat* 370–1, 372
    - Fakes* 282
- dual nationality**: *see* national of another contracting State (natural person) (ICSID 25(2)(a)), dual/multiple nationality
- duration as *Salini* element**
  - flexibility of term 462
  - limited use of 56
  - one-off transactions 261, 274–5
  - rejection as a relevant criterion 56
  - time extensions and 132
  - as a typical characteristic 463
- duration as *Salini* element, jurisprudence** 744–5
  - Abaclat* (annulment) 56
  - Ambiente Ufficio* 542
  - Bayindir* 133
  - Biwater Gauff* 56
  - Caratube* 56
  - Deutsche Bank* 56, 462–3
  - Fakes* 56
  - Gavazzi* 744–5
  - Joy Mining* 126
  - LESI* 463
  - LESI-DIPENTA* 133

**duration as *Salini* element, jurisprudence** (cont.)

- Malaysian Historical Salvors* 132–3
- Malaysian Historical Salvors* (annulment) **56**, 132–3
- MCI* 462–3
- Phoenix* 231, 237–8, 247
- Romak* **56**, 261, 274–5, 462
- Salini* 124

**Energy Charter Treaty (1994)**, Article 26 (settlement of investor–State disputes),  
 limitation of applicability to breach of ECT Part III obligations 623

**Enkev Beheer**: see *Enkev Beheer* (background); *Enkev Beheer* Final Award (costs); *Enkev Beheer* (First Partial Award (jurisdiction))

**Enkev Beheer (background)**

facts in date order

- claimant starts operations in Łódź (1960s) 632
- Spatial Plan (1993) 632
- claimant's acquisition of shares in Enkev Polska/undertaking to modernize (2001) 632
- City Council's Study of Conditions and Directions of Development (2002) 632
- expiry of 1993 Spatial Plan (2003) 632
- Spatial Planning and Development Act (27 March 2003) 632
- Road Legislation (10 April 2003) 632
- claimant's acquisition of further shares in Enkev Polska (2005) 632
- alleged threats and acts of expropriation (2007–9) 632
- claimant's permission to expand warehouse capacity on the Łódź Premises (2007) 632
- City's resolution on large-scale development of City centre/negotiations with Enkev Polska to acquire the Łódź Premises (2007) 632–3
- City's initial offer to purchase the Łódź Premises (24 December 2008) 633
- claimant's further acquisition of shares in Enkev Polska (2009) 633
- City's proposal of another site for Enkev Polska's operations (rejected by Enkev Polska and the claimant) (mid-2010) 633
- City's EIA-based Study of Conditions and Directions of Development (2010) 633
- Regional Director's decision to go ahead with a plan to construct a road through the Łódź Premises (27 September 2010) 633
- Enkev Polska's complaint that it had not been notified of EIA procedure (November 2010) 633
- Enkev Polska's application to convert usufruct right over Łódź Premises into full ownership (November 2011) 633
- Enkev Polska advised of obligation to vacate part of Łódź Premises (January 2012) 633
- City's renewed offer to acquire the Łódź Premises (rejected) (May 2012) 633
- rejection of alternative sites as physically unsuitable for Enkev Polska (July 2012) 633
- confirmation of plan for road through the Łódź Premises and warning of the risk of expropriation (July 2012) 633
- postponement of expropriation and repeated offer to purchase (September 2012) 633
- Constitutional Court's confirmation of the constitutionality of the 2003 Road Legislation (16 October 2012) 632
- valuation report on which the parties did not agree (14 January 2013) 633
- City's request for EU funding (28 June 2013) 636
- parties' positions (claimant)
  - allegation of breaches of BIT 3(1), BIT 3(5) and BIT 5 635
  - request for relief and costs 635

- parties' positions (respondent)
  - objections to the jurisdiction 635
  - response to claimant's allegations 635
- procedural history in date order
  - request for arbitration (6 August 2012) 631
    - notification to respondent of request (6 August 2012) 633–4
  - constitution of Tribunal (30 November 2012) 634
  - respondent's objection to the jurisdiction/request for bifurcation (21 January 2013) 634
  - City's undertaking not to issue decision on expropriation before 4 February 2013 (25 January 2013) 634
  - respondent's response to request for interim measures (4 February 2013) 634
  - dismissal of request for interim measures/decision to appoint an expert (UNCITRAL 29) (13 February 2013) 634
  - agreement to bifurcate proceedings (19 April 2013) 635
  - appointment of expert/mandate (21 May 2013) 635
  - hearing on jurisdiction and liability (13/14 June 2013) 635
  - expert's report on visit to the Łódź Premises (14 June 2013) 635
  - filing of parties' post-hearing briefs (5 July 2013) 636
  - expert's revised report (15 July 2013) 636
  - City's withdrawal of 2013 Expropriation Request with intention to resubmit by the end of September (25 July 2013) 636
  - motions for immediate expropriation (30 September/30 December 2013) 636
  - closure of proceedings (22 April 2014) 636
  - First Partial Award (29 April 2014) 636
  - Award on Costs (13 June 2014) 636
    - acceptance of jurisdiction on all claimant's claims 636
    - dismissal of all claims on the merits 636
    - rejection of request to add Enkev Polska as co-claimant 636
- Enkev Beheer (Final Award (costs)) 642–3**
- Enkev Beheer (First Partial Award (jurisdiction)) 636–40, 643–8**
  - jurisdiction *ratione materiae* ("investment" (BIT 1(a))) (claimant's assets)
    - parties' positions 637
      - claimant 646–7
      - respondent 644–6
    - Tribunal's analysis
      - exclusion of subsidiary's profits, goodwill and know-how 70–1, 637–8, 643–8
      - shareholding in Enkev Polska as shares and "rights derived from shares" 637, 647
  - jurisdiction *ratione personae* (claimant's compliance with BIT 1(b)(ii) requirements) 637
  - premature claims (action prior to expropriation/failure to exhaust local remedies)
    - parties' positions (claimant) (absence of requirement) 639
    - parties' positions (respondent) 638
  - premature claims (notification of claims/obligation to seek amicable resolution (BIT 8(1)))
    - parties' positions (claimant) 639
    - parties' positions (respondent) 638
    - Tribunal's decision (avoidance of over-formalistic approach) 639
  - premature claims (six-months rule (BIT 8(2)))
    - parties' positions (claimant) (request to substitute three-months rule on MFN grounds) 639
    - parties' positions (respondent) 638
    - Tribunal's decision 639

***Enkev Beheer (First Partial Award (merits))***

- alleged breaches of BIT 3, Tribunal's findings
  - 3(1) (fair and equitable treatment) 642
  - 3(2) (full protection and security) 642
  - 3(5) (umbrella clause) 642
- dismissal of all claims 642
- alleged breaches of BIT 5 (direct or indirect deprivation of assets) 640–2
  - direct deprivation, Tribunal's finding against 640
  - indirect deprivation (claimant's arguments) 641
  - indirect deprivation (Tribunal's analysis)
    - burden/standard of proof 641
    - diminution in value of assets as a result of expected expropriation, whether 642
    - expectation of expropriation causing diminution in value of assets, whether 641
    - "just compensation"/"real value", equivalence to "adequate, effective and prompt compensation" 641–2

Tribunal's role, exclusions

- advisory jurisdiction 640
- appellate/administrative review proceedings 640
- declaratory award on interpretation 640

**estoppel**, categories, issue estoppel 659, 676–9, 736

**excluded classes of dispute, notification (ICSID 25(4))**

- addition of provision ( Executive Directors' Report) 64–6, 96–7, 119, 147–8, 153–4, 531–2
- as "context" 533, 576
- jurisprudence
  - Abaclat* 65 n. 188
  - Ambiente Ufficio* 64–5, 530–2, 533, 572–3, 576
  - Biwater Gauff* 202
  - Fedax* 65 n. 188
  - Malaysian Historical Salvors* 118–19, 147–8, 153–4
  - Mitchell* 97, 103–4
- legal effect 530
- as mechanism to counter broad understanding of "investment" (ICSID 25(1)) 533, 572–3, 576
- "outer limits" requirement and 93–4, 147, 530
- rarity of resort to 65–6
- travaux préparatoires* 45–6, 65

**exhaustion of local remedies**

- in absence of provision for 760
- "bifurcation clause" ("fork in the road") and 617
- BIT provisions
  - absence of provision 617
  - disregard of provisions, justification for 379–80, 382–3, 515
  - "eighteen months from the notification of commencement of an action before the national courts" 379–80, 515
- ECT 26(4), absence of provision for 617, 639
- jurisprudence
  - Abaclat* 379–80
  - dissenting 382–3
  - AES* 617
  - Ambiente Ufficio* 515

*Enkev Beheer* 638, 639  
*MNSS* 760

**expert**

role/task 635  
 UNCITRAL 29 634–5

**expropriation/nationalization**

classification as  
 breach of contract  
   abuse of power transcending 194  
   distinguished 194  
 burden/standard of proof 641  
 creeping expropriation/“measure tantamount to nationalization or expropriation”  
   736–7  
   expectation of expropriation causing diminution in value of assets 641  
   regulatory takings 453–4  
   series of acts over several years 193–4  
   unlawful expropriation distinguished 218  
 “deprivation” as term used in treaty 640  
 deprivation of use or reasonably expected economic benefit of property, “in whole or  
   significant part” 20  
 economic/financial loss, relevance 194  
 indirect expropriation: *see* creeping expropriation *above*  
 partial expropriation 20–4  
 requirements/relevant factors, proportionality 454  
 tax measures  
   confiscatory tax 218  
   limitation to extraordinary, punitive, arbitrary or discriminatory measures 218  
   revocation of tax benefit 218–19  
 lawfulness, requirements  
   due process 641  
   “just compensation”/“real value” (BIT provision) 641–2  
   public interest/purpose 641

**expropriation/nationalization (jurisprudence)**

*Biloune* 195  
*Biwater Gauff* 193–5  
*Cargill* 23  
*Deutsche Bank* 453–4  
*EnCana* 23  
*Enkev Beheer* 640–2  
*Eureko* 22  
*Feldman* 22  
*GAMI* 23  
*Gavazzi* 736–7  
*Grand River* 22  
*Metalclad* 20  
*Middle East Cement* 22  
*MNSS* 764–5  
*Philip Morris* 22  
*Quasar de Valores* 218–20  
*Telenor* 21  
*Waste Management* 22

**fair and equitable treatment**

- breach of contract, as breach of fair and equitable treatment, rarity 760
- definition/measure
  - ad hoc* approach 195–6
  - BIT provisions 452
  - consistency, need for 196
  - high threshold/“egregious behaviour” 196
  - “manifestly unjust”/“grossly unfair” 619–20, 760
  - “unjust, arbitrary, discriminatory, or [in] violation of due process” 760
- failure to notify investor of difficulties with their bank, exclusion as breach of 760–1
- good faith and 196
- legitimate expectations and 196, 621–2
- minimum international standard, whether additional to 195, 452–3
- stabilization and 619
- transparency, need for 196, 619
- unity of investment principle and 23

**fair and equitable treatment, jurisprudence**

- AES* 619–20
- Biwater Gauff* 195–7
- Deutsche Bank* 452–3
- Enkev Beheer* 642
- Gavazzi* 736
- MNSS* 760–3
- Waste Management* 195–6, 452–3, 760

**Fakes:** *see Fakes* (background); *Fakes* (jurisdiction *ratione materiae* (“investment” (ICSID 25(1))))); *Fakes* (jurisdiction *ratione personae* (ICSID 25(2)(a)) (dual nationality))

**Fakes (background)**

- facts (disputed) in date order
  - ownership of Telsim pre-28 March 2003 280–1
  - transfer of Standard Telekom’s shares in Telsim to Masoud (28 March to 2 April 2003) 281
  - transfer of Masoud’s temporary Telsim share certificates to claimant (3 July 2003) 281
  - Telsim’s confirmation of claimant’s registration as a shareholder in Telsim’s records (15 July 2003) 281
  - receivership (February 2004) and sale of Telsim’s assets to a third party (May 2006) 281
- procedural history in date order
  - request for arbitration (13 August 2007) 280
  - constitution of tribunal (4 March 2008) 282
  - proposal for disqualification of claimant’s appointment (14 March 2008) 282
  - dismissal of proposal for disqualification (28 April 2008) 282
  - objections to the jurisdiction (24 June 2008) 282
  - agreement to request for bifurcation (1 October 2008) 282
  - hearing on jurisdiction (5 and 6 October 2009) 282
  - Tribunal’s decision (14 July 2010) 282–3

**Fakes (jurisdiction *ratione materiae* (“investment” (ICSID 25(1))))** 284–8, 288–302

- abuse of process (bad faith/fraudulent misrepresentation) 292–3, 297–302
- “contribution to the economic development of the host State”
  - ICSID object and purpose (ICSID preamble) 286–7, 293
  - limited acceptance as a criterion 286–7, 291

- “positive impact”/“significant contribution”, whether necessary 54, 294 n. 73
- rejection as a stand-alone element 293
- good faith/bona fide actions, as criterion for determining as “investment” (ICSID 25(1)) 287, 293–4
- legality/accordance with the laws and regulations of host State
  - BIT provision as determining factor 287, 294–6
  - limitation to compliance with laws and regulations relating to investments 287, 295
  - validity of temporary share certificates 287, 296–7
- outer limits/double-barrelled test (ICSID 25(2)(b)) 287, 296–302
  - prioritization of BIT/acceptance of anything the parties may agree as illogical/counter to ICSID 25(1) 286, 292
- parties’ arguments
  - claimant 281–2, 285
  - respondent 284–5, 289
- rights derived from the Fakes/Uzan arrangement, qualification as ICSID 25(1)/BIT 1(b) investment 287–8, 297–302
  - absence of
    - intention to actually transfer rights/claimant as bait 287–8, 298–302
    - meaningful role for claimant as explanation of low price for the temporary shares 299–300
  - failure to transfer rights as “promised” 88, 300
- Salini/Salini*-type elements 284–7, 290–4
  - contribution, duration and risk 286, 291, 293
  - flexible/pragmatic (*Biwater Gauff*) 286, 290–1, 311–12
  - indispensable criteria (*Salini*) 291–2
- Fakes (jurisdiction *ratione personae* (ICSID 25(2)(a)) (dual nationality))**
  - diplomatic protection and 284
  - dominant and effective nationality test
    - in absence of BIT requirement 283–4
    - exceptions to exclusion 284
    - ICSID tribunals’ rejection of 284
    - Iran–US Claims Tribunal practice distinguished 284
  - parties’ arguments
    - claimant 281, 283–4
    - respondent 282, 283
  - person holding *inter alia* nationality of host State, exclusion from protection 284
  - Tribunal’s decision (dismissal of objection) 284
- financial instruments, status as ICSID 25 investment:** *see also* “contribution to the economic development of the host State”; “investment” (ICSID 25), classification as; sovereign bonds
  - bank guarantee 126
  - bonds: *see* sovereign bonds *below*
  - a contentious issue 71–2, 409–13
  - contingent liability, exclusion
    - Deutsche Bank* 451, 461, 470, 478, 480
    - Joy Mining* 7
    - PSEG* 480
  - determination of
    - on a case-by-case basis 383, 412–13, 418
    - timing (inception of “investment”) 477–80

**financial instruments, status as ICSID 25 investment** (cont.)

legal uncertainty **71–5**

“loans, claims to money or to any performance under contract having a financial value”  
 705–21, 768–72

“ordinary” meaning and 517–18, 532

portfolio investment, uncertain status as covered “investment” **34–5, 46, 72**, 412, 474,  
 517, 554, 555, 559, 562, 586, 594

as portfolio investments **72**

promissory notes: *see* promissory notes

risk and contribution as key issues **72–3**

scholarly writings

Amerasinghe 537

Delaume 537

Schreuer 537

securities, interrelationship with sovereign bonds 374, 375, 401–3, 513, 553–4

sovereign bonds **71–5, 695–8, 705–21**

BITs practice, diversity **73**

loans funding an investment and free-standing loans, distinguishability **73–5, 383**,  
 412–13, 421–3, 557–9, 698, 769–70

primary/secondary market transactions, distinguishability 383, 414–15, 517, 544, 552,  
 554–5, 560–3, 599–600, 604–5, 695–6, 699, 719–20

private indebtedness/corporate debt distinguished 697–9

securities, interrelationship with 374, 375, 401–3, 513, 553–4

territoriality and **61, 381, 383–4, 415–23, 518, 545–8**

decision to locate outside host State, effect **75, 416**

uncertainty of jurisdiction/move towards acknowledgement, non “investment” status  
**75 n. 247**

unity of the investment principle and **6, 17, 419–20, 523–6, 543, 552–63**

**financial instruments, status as ICSID 25 investment, jurisprudence** 536

*Abaclat* **61, 72, 73, 366–7, 375, 401–3, 405–7, 478–9, 523–4, 525, 696–7**

*Abaclat* (dissenting) 383, 412–23

*Alemanni* **72**

*Ambiente Ufficio* **67, 72, 73, 75, 523–50**

*Ambiente Ufficio* (dissenting) 724

*Bayview* 416

*CSOB* **9–10, 72–3, 524, 536, 769–70**

*Deutsche Bank* **72, 73, 74**

*Deutsche Bank* (dissenting) **74, 481–4**

*Fedax* **72–3, 478, 536–7**

*Global Trading* **74**

*Joy Mining* **6–7, 126, 536–7**

*MNSS* **74, 759, 768–72**

*Phoenix* **73 n. 238**

*Portigon* **73 n. 238, 74**

*Poštová banka* **72, 73, 74, 691–3, 695–8, 700–1, 705–21, 724–7**

*PSEG* 536 n. 213

*Romak* **74, 414**

*Sempra* 536

**foreign control of corporation:** *see* national of another contracting State (juridical person)  
 (ICSID 25(2)(b)), agreement to treat as, foreign control



**forum selection clauses in treaty/contract**

- contractual clauses, independence of treaty obligations 374, 376, 406–7
- jurisprudence
  - Abaclat* 374, 376, 406–7, 460
  - Abaclat* (dissenting) 416–17
  - Deutsche Bank* 450, 460

**free transfer of investments, right to, *Biwater Gauff* 198****FTC Interpretative Note (31 July 2001)**

- binding effect (NAFTA 1131(2)) 663
- minimum standard of treatment in accordance with international law
  - CIL, as at time of conclusion of NAFTA 662–3
  - NAFTA jurisprudence, *Apotex* 662–4

**Gavazzi:** *see Gavazzi* (background); *Gavazzi* (admissibility and jurisdiction issues other than *ratione materiae*); *Gavazzi* (jurisdiction *ratione materiae* (“investment”) (ICSID 25/BIT 1(1))); *Gavazzi* (merits/liability); *Gavazzi* (quantum); *Gavazzi* (Rubino-Sammartano dissenting)

**Gavazzi (background)**

- facts in date order
  - Share Purchase Contract (SPC) (claimant’s acquisition of 70% of shares in Socomet) (19 April 1999) 729–30
    - respondent’s undertaking to restructure Socomet’s debts 730
  - notification of completion of debt restructuring (3 June 1999) 730
    - completion of purchase 730
    - subsequent discovery that the restructuring had not taken place 730
  - freezing of Socomet’s bank accounts/further restructuring arrangements (September 1999 to July 2001) 730
  - claimants’ recognition of Socomet’s insolvency/Socomet’s filing for bankruptcy (October 2002) 730
- procedural history in date order
  - APAP’s arbitration against claimant at Bucharest Court of International Commercial Arbitration alleging breaches of the SOP (October 2002)/claimants’ counterclaims, claims dismissed/counterclaims granted in full 730
  - challenge to Romanian 2007 Award/award overturned (2007/2009) 731
  - further proceedings related to the 2002 Award culminating in final rejection by the Court of Cassation (2011) 731
  - registration of request for arbitration (27 August 2012) 729
  - hearing on jurisdiction and admissibility (2–5 June 2014) 732
  - dissenting opinion on ruling on jurisdiction and liability (21 April 2015) 732–3
  - ruling on jurisdiction and liability (21 April 2015) 732–3
    - claimant’s withdrawal of BIT 10 claim 732
  - hearing on quantum (1–3 February 2016) 733
  - Award (18 April 2017) 733
    - dissenting opinion on quantum 733
  - decision on rectification (13 July 2017) 733
  - dissenting opinion on decision on rectification (13 July 2017) 733

**Gavazzi (admissibility and jurisdiction issues other than *ratione materiae*)**

- alleged absence of “legal obligation” 735
- attribution of impugned acts to respondent (ILC(SR) 4) 736
- counterclaim (claimants’ alleged failure to comply with investment obligations) 732

**Gavazzi (admissibility and jurisdiction issues other than *ratione materiae*)** (cont.)

- dissenting opinion 738
- issue estoppel distinguished (dissenting opinion) 738
- jurisdiction *ratione personae* 733
- res judicata* 735–6
- time-limits for institution of claim (ICSID)
  - absence of provision for in Convention/AR 735
  - applicable law 735

**Gavazzi (jurisdiction *ratione materiae* (“investment”)) (ICSID 25/BIT 1(1))** 734, 742–6

- applicable law
  - BIT/ICSID 25(1) as interpreted under international law 734, 741
  - irrelevance of Romanian law 741
  - outer limits/double-barrelled test (ICSID 25(2)(b)) 741
- BIT definitions
  - “claims to money or any right relating to obligations . . . having an economic or financial value connected with investments” (BIT 1(1)(d)) 741
  - “rights of a financial nature accruing by law or by contract” (BIT 1(1)(f)) 741
  - “shares . . . in companies . . . incorporated in the territory” (BIT 1(1)(b)) 734, 741
- burden of proof 742
- contribution
  - parties’ arguments 734, 742–4
  - Tribunal’s analysis
    - compliance with contract 744
    - motivation/purpose of contribution/investment 742–4
  - Tribunal’s conclusion (acquisition of shares and other commitments and plans as an “investment”) 734, 744
- “contribution to the economic development of the host State”
  - parties’ arguments 58, 745–6
  - Tribunal’s analysis
    - date of investment as critical date for determination 746
    - as flexible/discretionary criterion 47, 58, 746
- duration
  - parties’ arguments 744–5
  - Tribunal’s conclusion (claimants’ satisfaction of the requirement) 745
- risk
  - parties’ arguments 745
  - Tribunal’s conclusion (political nature of the risk) 745
- Romanian Award (2007), whether
  - parties’ arguments (claimants) 745–6
  - parties’ arguments (respondents) 734–5, 745
  - Tribunal’s conclusions
    - award as a claim to money covered by the BIT as an investment 735, 748
    - unity of the investment 748
  - Tribunal’s finding 741
- Gavazzi (merits/liability)**
  - alleged breach of BIT 2(3) (fair and equitable treatment)
    - parties’ arguments (claimant) 731
    - parties’ arguments (respondent) 736
    - Tribunal’s analysis and conclusion 736
  - alleged breach of BIT 2(5) (denial of justice)

- parties' arguments (claimant) 731, 732
- parties' arguments (respondent) 732
- Tribunal's finding (high threshold requirement) 737
- alleged breach of BIT 4 (expropriation)
  - parties' arguments (claimant) 731–2
  - parties' arguments (respondent) 732
  - Tribunal's analysis and conclusion 736–7
- alleged breach of BIT 10(2) (umbrella clause)
  - parties' arguments (claimant) 731, 732
  - parties' arguments (respondent) 732
- Gavazzi (quantum)**
  - assessment of damages
    - applicable law (BIT 4/customary international law) 738–9
    - elements for inclusion, capital invested/increases in capital 739
    - methodology
      - breach of contract and treaty distinguished 739
      - date of valuation (August 2002 (date of deprivation)) 738
      - equitable objective considerations (BIT 4(4)) 739
      - fair market value 739
      - going concern, exclusion 738
      - “unlevered income” approach 738–9
    - Tribunal's summary of reasons behind its decisions 739
  - interest (compound) 738, 739
    - costs (“following the event”) 739
    - starting date (date of wrong) 739
- Gavazzi (Rubino-Sammartano dissenting)**
  - admissibility
    - issue estoppel 737, 738
    - respondent's counterclaim 738
  - quantum
    - costs, “follow the event” rule in relation to the quantum phase 740
    - entitlement to compensation
      - absence in relation to interest and costs 739–40
      - limitation of claimant's right to compensation to breach of BIT 2(3) (fair and equitable treatment) 740
    - interest
      - exclusion of compound interest in principle 740
      - starting date (date of award) 740
- Germany–Sri Lanka BIT (2000) by article**
  - 1 (“investment includes every kind of asset including . . .”) 450
  - 1(c) (“investment . . . claims to money used to create an economic value and associated with an investment”) 450, 458–60, 465–71
    - “associated with an investment” requirement 455–6, 466–9, 471
  - 2 (fair and equitable treatment) 449, 452–3, 457–8
  - 4(1) (full protection and security) 449, 454
  - 4(2) (expropriation) 449, 453–4, 457
  - 8 (umbrella clause) 449, 454
- Global Trading (jurisdiction):** *see also* Ukraine–US BIT (1994)
  - background (facts as alleged by the claimant) 304
  - background (procedural history in date order)

**Global Trading (jurisdiction)** (cont.)

- registration of request for arbitration (11 June 2009) 303–4
- constitution of Tribunal (2 December 2009) 301
- objection to the jurisdiction (absence of an ICSID 25(1)/BIT 1 investment) (5 January 2010), parties' arguments 304
- hearing on ICSID Arbitration Rule 41(5) (7 July 2010) 304
- Award (1 December 2010) 304
- costs "to lie where they fall", justification 306
- "investment" (BIT I(a)(iii) ("claim to money . . . associated with an investment")) 306, 309–11
  - commercial/trade transaction vs investment 306, 309–11
  - parties' arguments
    - claimants 310
    - respondent 309–10
  - "investment" (BIT I(a)(v) ("right conferred by law or contract . . . licences and permits pursuant to law")) 311
  - "investment" (ICSID 25(1))
    - commercial/trade transaction vs investment 311–13
    - flexible/pragmatic (*Biwater Gauff*) 311–12
  - "manifestly without merit" claim (AR (41(5)))
    - "clear and obvious" test 305
    - right to be heard 305
    - time-limit for Tribunal's response 305
- outer limits/double-barrelled test (ICSID 25(2)(b)) 305, 307–9
  - parties' freedom to define/consent
    - compliance of BIT with the objective limits of ICSID 25(1) 308
    - prioritization of BIT/acceptance of anything the parties may agree as illogical/counter to ICSID 25(1) 308
  - parties' arguments
    - claimants 307
    - respondent 306–7
  - Tribunal's decision 305, 313

**good faith/bona fide actions**

- burden/standard of proof 297
- as criterion for determining as "investment" (ICSID 25(1)) 287, 293–4
- general principle of international law 239–40, 242–5
- jurisprudence
  - Amco* 243
  - Fakes* 292–3, 297–302
  - Fraport* 243 n. 79
  - Inceysa* 243–4, 253–4
  - Phoenix* 63, 232, 241–4, 250–4
  - Plama* 244
  - SGS v. Dominican Republic* 253 n. 108
  - World Duty Free* 244 n. 82

**Greece–Slovakia BIT (1991) by article**

- I (definitions), text 706
- I(1)(c) ("investment": loans, claims to money or to any contractual performance having a financial value) 705–21

- HICEE:** *see* **HICEE** (background); **HICEE** (“treaty interpretation issue”); **HICEE** (“treaty interpretation issue”) (applicability of VCLT) (Brower dissenting)
- HICEE (background)**
- claimant’s business structure 315, 327
  - claimant’s position
    - alleged breach of BIT 3, BIT 4 and BIT 5 (Health Insurance Companies and Healthcare Supervision Act 2007 as) 315, 326–7
    - requested relief 327
  - costs
    - challenge to arbitrator 317
    - proceedings 323
  - procedural history in date order
    - appointment of arbitrators (17 December 2008 to 26 May 2009) 315
    - notice of arbitration (BIT 3/UNCITRAL 3) (17 December 2008) 315
    - notification of jurisdictional objections (16 March 2010) 314
    - bifurcation of proceedings to deal first with “treaty interpretation issue” (29 March 2010) 314–15
    - hearing (20/21 July 2010) 317
    - Partial Award (23 May 2011) 317
    - claimant’s challenge to arbitrator Tomka (7 June 2011) (dismissed) 317
    - Tribunal’s decision to make separate award on costs of challenge 317
    - Final Award on costs (17 October 2011) 317
  - HICEE (“treaty interpretation issue”)** 315–17, 318, 327–46
    - interpretation of BIT, approach to
      - BIT definitions (BIT 1) 330
      - “key issue” (way in which an investment may be made) 318, 330
      - ordinary meaning/context/object and purpose (VCLT 31) 318–19, 332–3
      - organic link between “investment” and “investor”, need for 318, 330–1
      - parties’ agreement on uniformity of meaning across the versions/use of a single [English] version 329–30
      - similar terms in BIT articles 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7 as context (VCLT 31(2)) 318, 330–1
      - travaux préparatoires*/supplementary means, resort to in case of
        - ambiguity/obscurity 319, 334
        - extraneous materials 319, 335–46
        - manifestly absurd or unreasonable 319, 334–5
      - VCLT as applicable law 318–19, 331–5
    - “invested either directly or through an investor of a third State” (BIT 1(a)) (“key phrase”) 316–17, 318–22, 323–6, 330, 331–63
      - “direct” 318–19, 331–5
        - applicability of VCLT 31/VCLT 32 318–19, 331–2
        - parties’ positions 331
      - investments by a Slovak corporate entity in another Slovak corporate entity, exclusion 54, 322–3, 345–6
    - resort to supplementary means (VCLT 32) 319, 334–46
      - Agreed Minutes of negotiations 320, 336
      - evidence from officials in office at time of negotiation 319–20, 336
      - Netherlands’ Explanatory Notes 322, 337–44
      - other Netherlands/Czechoslovakia BITs with “not materially different language” 322, 341–5

**HICEE (“treaty interpretation issue”) (cont.)**

*travaux préparatoires* 319

two ordinary meanings (VCLT 31)/directional vs relational 318–19, 331–5

MFN treatment (BIT 3(2)/BIT 3(5))

claimant’s position 316, 323

Tribunal’s decision (exclusion of any broadening of definition of protected investors or their investments) 317, 323

Tribunal’s clarification (two sub-issues) 329

Tribunal’s decision 317

Tribunal’s task

parties’ positions 316–17, 328–9

differing perceptions 329

**HICEE (“treaty interpretation issue”) (applicability of VCLT) (Brower dissenting)**

323–6, 346–63

conclusion 323, 362–3

“manifestly absurd or unreasonable result” (VCLT 32(b)) 325, 349–50

object and purpose (preamble), compatibility with investment via a local subsidiary 324, 348–9

“ordinary meaning” (VCLT 31) 323–5, 346–54

resort to supplementary means (VCLT 32) 325–6, 349–50

Netherlands’ Explanatory Notes 325, 355–63

**ICSID Arbitration Rules (2003), 9 (disqualification of arbitrators) 282****ICSID Arbitration Rules (2006)**

9(6) (disqualification: suspension of proceedings) 370

18 (representation of the parties) 385–6

fraud or forgery and 385–6

19 (procedural orders) 369

34(2)(a) (evidence: tribunal’s right to request documents, experts and witnesses) 229

37(2) (submissions of non-disputing parties/*amicus curiae*) 189, 190–1

41(5) (challenge to the jurisdiction for manifest lack of legal merit: 30-day time-limit) 305

43(1) (agreement to discontinue proceeding) 450

43(2) (settlement and discontinuance: embodiment of settlement agreement in the award) 373

50 (interpretation, revision and annulment of award) 693

**ICSID Convention (1965)**

object and purpose

“international cooperation for economic development” (ICSID preamble) 121, 155–60

“investment”, definition in accordance with 121, 153–4, 155–6, 158–60, 230, 234

provision of international methods of dispute settlement 143, 156

stimulation of flow of private international capital 143, 237–9

**ICSID Convention (1965), interpretation**

applicable law/aids

Executive Directors’ Report 121

ICSID preamble 121

VCLT 31 121, 233–4

- gaps in procedural provisions, tribunal's power/obligation to fill (ICSID 44) **27, 378**
  - Abaclat* **27, 378**
  - Ambiente Ufficio* **27**
- guidelines, teleological approach/object and purpose **121**
- illegality of investment as defence**: *see also* legality/accordance with the laws and regulations of host State
- jurisprudence
  - Anderson* **19**
  - Blusun* **19**
  - Fakes* **63**
  - Fraport* **19–20**
  - Inceysa* **19**
  - Kim* **19**
  - Mamidoil* **19, 20**
  - Spentex* **19**
  - TSA* **19**
  - von Pezold* **19**
  - Yukos* **19**
- unity of the investment principle as means of extending consequences of an illegality to the whole investment **19–20**
- Institution Rules (ICSID) (IR)**, 8 (withdrawal of request) **373, 380**
- interest**
  - compound, ICSID jurisprudence **739**
  - date of award/judgment as *dies a quo* **740**
- “investment”**: *see* “investment” (ICSID 25) (overview) (“Subject matter jurisdiction: the notion of investment” (Waibel)); “investment” (ICSID 25), classification as; “investment” (ICSID 25), interpretation; “investment” (ICSID 25), requirements/relevant factors; “investment” (ICSID 25) (*Salini/Salini*-type elements); “investment” (ICSID 25) (*Salini/Salini*-type elements), jurisprudence (general)
- “investment” (ICSID 25) (overview) (“Subject matter jurisdiction: the notion of investment” (Waibel))** **26–82**
  - introduction/conclusion: the objective vs subjective controversy over meaning of investment **26–42**
    - as an unresolved issue/problems arising **78–9**
    - “objective”/“subjective”, definitions **26**
    - points of divergence
      - contribution to host country's economic development, status **26**
      - elements relevant for objective determination of existence of investment **26**
      - investment as contract vs investment as property **35, 126**
      - possibility of objective meaning of “investment” (ICSID 25) **26**
    - scholarly opinion **27–8**
    - tribunal practice **27**
  - interpretation issues **42–71**
    - absence of ICSID definition/flexible concept **26–8**
    - commercial transaction test **67–8**
    - evolution of meaning **35–9**
    - ICSID Additional Facility, UNCITRAL and SCC cases, presumption of identity of “investment” with ICSID cases **46–63, 68–71, 124, 125**

- “investment” (ICSID 25) (overview) (“Subject matter jurisdiction: the notion of investment” (Waibel)) (cont.)**
- Enkev Beheer* (UNCITRAL) **70–1**
  - MNSS* (AF) **69**
  - Romak* (UNCITRAL) **60–70**
  - inconclusive *travaux préparatoires* **39–42**
  - travaux préparatoires* **43–6**
  - objective elements, commercial transaction test: *see* “investment” (ICSID 25), classification as, commercial/trade transaction vs investment
  - objective meaning, trend towards **28–35**: *see also* outer limits/double-barrelled test (ICSID 25(2)(b))
    - cases in date order addressing the question **28 n. 8 30–1**
    - opposition to 166–7
    - outer limits/double-barrelled test (ICSID 25(2)(b)) **28–35**, 153–5
    - statistics/small number of relevant decisions **28**
  - objective meaning, trend towards, jurisprudence
    - Abaclat* **27 n. 3, 28**
    - AES* **27 n. 1**
    - Al Tamimi* **28 n. 6**
    - Ambiente Ufficio* **27 n. 4, 28**
    - ATA* **28 n. 6**
    - Deutsche Bank* **28**
    - Fakes* **28**, 285–8, 290–302
    - Garanti Koza* **28 n. 6**
    - Gavazzi* **28 n. 6**
    - Global Trading* **28**, 308–9
    - Joy Mining* **28**, 119
    - Malaysian Historical Salvors* **28**, 118–19
    - Mitchell* **28**
    - MNSS* **28 n. 6**
    - Phoenix* **28**, 230, 233–45
    - Poštová banka* **28 n. 6**
    - Romak* **28**, 260–2, 262–7
    - Salini* 123–6
    - Tethyan Copper* **28 n. 6**
  - objective in name only (broad/limitless interpretation) **63–7**
    - Douglas on **64**
    - “facially absurd”, limitation of exclusion to **42–3, 63–4**, 360 n. 75
    - irrelevance of ICSID 25/primacy of investment treaty **64**
    - methods for limiting exposure to arbitration, relevance
      - ICSID 25(4) (exclusion mechanism) **64–6**
      - ICSID reservation **66**
    - Mortenson on **27 n. 2, 63–7**
  - objective in name only (broad/limitless interpretation), jurisprudence
    - Abaclat* **65 n. 188**
    - Ambiente Ufficio* **64–5, 456, 533–5**: *see also* *Ambiente Ufficio*
    - Fedax* **65 n. 188**
  - objective vs subjective controversy over the meaning of investment: *see* “investment” (ICSID 25), interpretation



- special and controversial cases of investments: *see also* investment (ICSID 25),  
 classification as, arbitral awards and judgments  
 arbitral awards and judgments **75–9**  
 financial instruments, legal uncertainty **71–5**: *see also* financial instruments, status as  
 ICSID 25 investment
- “investment” (ICSID 25), classification as** *Note*: included under this heading are treaty  
 formulations and other possibilities considered for inclusion.
- absence of an ICSID 25(1) definition, effect: *see also* outer limits/double-barrelled test  
 (ICSID 25(2)(b))  
 dominance of instrument of consent **26–8, 78, 95, 103–4, 116, 156, 286, 292, 513**  
 Executive Directors’ Report 96–7, 119, 147, 153, 156, 202, 529–32  
 limited effect of *Salini* elements 460–1
- absence of an ICSID 25(1) definition, jurisprudence  
*Abaclat* **27, 378–9**  
*Abaclat* (dissenting) 409–10  
*Ambiente Ufficio* 513, 527–32  
*Bewater Gauff* 202, 460–1  
*Deutsche Bank* 459–60  
*Malaysian Historical Salvors* (annulment) 143–6  
*Malaysian Historical Salvors* (annulment) (dissenting) 153–5  
*Pey Casado* (annulment) 154, 308–9
- “all types of assets and particularly . . .” 221–4  
 “any kind of asset invested in economic activity . . .” 240  
 “any kind of asset invested either directly or through an investor of a third State” 316–17,  
 318–22, 323–6, 330, 331–63  
 “any kind of asset invested or reinvested . . . in the territory of the other Party including  
 . . .” 374–6, 394–403, 413–23  
 “any other right to benefits or services with an economic value” 544  
 “any right of an economic nature granted by law or by contract” **31–2**
- applicable law  
 BIT provisions, *SGS v. Pakistan* 120  
 domestic law of Contracting State, rejection 741  
 ICSID 25(1) (absence of definition/as flexible concept) **26–8**
- approaches to/nature of concept: *see also* “investment” (ICSID 25) (overview) (“Subject  
 matter jurisdiction: the notion of investment” (Waibel))  
 “broad, asset-based” **29–30, 31–2, 63–5, 401, 535, 696**  
 dependence on context 533  
 object and purpose 533–5  
 evolution **35–9**
- arbitral awards and judgments **75–9**  
 “arising directly” requirement **76**  
 award and underlying investment distinguished **76–7**  
 commercial arbitral award **75–7**  
 investment arbitral awards **77**  
 judgments of host State’s national courts **77–8**  
 award compensating for an investment in the host State as a claim to money covered  
 by the BIT 748  
 unity of the investment and **5, 74–6**
- arbitral awards and judgments, jurisprudence  
*Gavazzi* **76**

**“investment” (ICSID 25), classification as (cont.)**

*GEA* **76**

*Romak* **76–7**

*Saipem* **75–6**

“claim to any performance having an economic value and associated with an investment”  
 450, 458–60, 465–71

claim to money **31–2**

“claim to money used to create an economic value” 450, 458–60, 465–71

“claim to money . . . associated with an investment”

*Deutsche Bank* (dissenting) 455–6, 466–9, 471

*Gavazzi* 748

*Global Trading* 304, 310–11, 470–1

“claims to money or any right relating to obligations . . . having an economic or financial value connected with investments” 734, 741

“claims to money, to other assets or to any performance having an economic value”  
 768–72

commercial/trade transaction vs investment **67–8**, 464, 517

mutual exclusiveness **67**

*Pahis* on **67–8**

commercial/trade transaction vs investment, jurisprudence

*Abaclat* (dissenting) **75**

*Alps Finance* **67**

*Ambiente Ufficio* **67–8**, 538–9

*Ambiente Ufficio* (dissenting) 517

*Deutsche Bank* 451, 462, 464

*Deutsche Bank* (dissenting) 456, 480–4

*Global Trading* **67**, **68**, 306, 309–13

*Joy Mining* **67**, 264–5, 311–12

*Malaysian Historical Salvors* (annulment: dissenting) **67**, 157

*Malaysian Historical Salvors* (annulment) 147, 483

*Nova Scotia Power* **67**

*Pantehniki* 464, 482–3

*Poštová banka* **67**

*Romak* **68**, **69–70**, 260, 264–5, 266

*Tenaris* **67**, **68**

determination of status as, at inception of “investment” 456, 461, 477–80

“every kind of asset” **31–2**

“every kind of asset . . . including claims to money” 116, 143–4, 265

“every kind of investment . . . owned or controlled directly or indirectly by [nationals or] companies of the other party” 430–2

departure from parties’ usual formulae 431, 440

financial instruments: *see* financial instruments, status as ICSID 25 investment

investment by a corporate entity in the host State in another corporate entity in the host State 322–3, 345–6

inward flow of capital for economic development 442–5

“loans, claims to money or to any performance under contract having a financial value”  
 705–21, 768–72

NAFTA 1139 (definitions) 175–7

“foreign investment”

absence of definition 177

ordinary meaning of Chapter XI provisions 177–8

- pre-contractual expenditure/development costs, right of recovery **44**  
*Mihaly* 119–20
- residual/catch-all clauses 544
- “right conferred by law or contract . . . licences and permits pursuant to law” 311
- “rights derived from shares” **70–1**, 637–8, 643–8
- “rights deriving from any type of investment made to create an economic value” 221–4
- “rights of a financial nature accruing by law or by contract” 741
- securities 401–3
- shares, bonds and other kinds of interests in companies 223, 637–8
- “shares and other kinds of participation in companies” 221–4
- “shares . . . in companies . . . incorporated in the territory” 741
- sovereign bonds: *see* financial instruments
- “investment” (ICSID 25), interpretation**
- applicable law, BIT/ICSID as interpreted by international law 734, 741
- applicable law/aids
- ICSID preamble 121
- precedent **47**
- rules/general principles of international law 234, 528
- VCLT 31 121, 528
- in case of “ambiguity or obscurity”
- resort to arbitral practice 260–1
- resort to *travaux préparatoires* (VCLT 32) 115–16, 143, 492–3, 500, 513, 528–9, 532
- in absence of ambiguity 115–16, 143
- evolution of meaning through interpretation (living-tree approach) (VCLT 31(3)) **35–9**:  
*see also travaux préparatoires* as supplementary means of treaty interpretation (VCLT 32)
- “inherent meaning” (ICSID jurisprudence): *see also* “investment” (ICSID 25) (*Salini*/*Salini*-type elements); outer limits/double-barrelled test (ICSID 25(2)(b))
- jurisprudence
- Abaclat* 398, 404–5
- Abaclat* (dissenting) 409–10
- Caratube* 431, 444–5
- Phoenix* 235–7
- Poštová banka* 699
- Romak* **69–70**, 260, 261, 271, 404–5
- relevance to determination of foreign ownership/control 431, 444–5
- “investment” and “investment dispute” distinguished **65**
- ordinary meaning (VCLT 31(1)) **66**, 115–16, 143, 263–4, 431, 532
- bonds/securities as 517–18, 532
- “commitment of money or other assets for the purpose of providing a return” **66**,  
 115–16, 143
- contribution, duration and risk as reflection of 293
- as “foreign investment” (NAFTA Chapter XI) 177–8
- “in context/in accordance with the object and purpose of the Convention” 513, 533–4
- Salini*/*Salini*-type criteria as aid 235–7
- as unqualified term “in context/in accordance with the object and purpose of the Convention” 115–16, 143
- travaux préparatoires* **39–42**, **43–6**, **66–7**, 115–16, 117, 143, 145–8, 151, 154, 159, 202,  
 312, 383, 410, 460, 532, 570–7, 580, 608: *see also travaux préparatoires* as  
 supplementary means of treaty interpretation (VCLT 32)
- arguments for and against inclusion of a definition **43–6**, 145–7

**“investment” (ICSID 25), interpretation (cont.)**

- consent as overriding condition for jurisdiction 145–8, 286
- failure to agree on given element, effect **66–7**
- ICSID 25(4), relevance **45–6, 64–6, 96–7, 119, 147–8, 153–4, 531–2**
- “[n]o attempt was made to define the term . . . investment” (Executive Directors’ Report) **40, 42, 64, 147–8, 153–4, 202, 529–32**
- outer limits/double-barrelled approach *114*, 118–19, 146–8: *see also* “investment” (ICSID 25) (overview) (“Subject matter jurisdiction: the notion of investment” (Waibel)); outer limits/double-barrelled test (ICSID 25(2)(b))
- rejection of proposals to prescribe
  - duration 145–7
  - minimum contribution 145–7

**“investment” (ICSID 25), requirements/relevant factors**

- origin of assets or funds: *see* risk (“investment”, requirement for classification as (*Salini* element))
- sources of investment
  - ADC* 443
  - Caratube* 431, 433, 443
  - Eudoro* 443
  - Saipem* 443
  - Siag* 443
  - Tokios Tokelés* 443
  - Tradex* 433
  - Wena Hotels* 443

**“investment” (ICSID 25) (*Salini/Salini*-type elements)**

- overview
  - Ambiente Ufficio* 539–41
  - as compensation for absence of ICSID 25 definition 399–400
  - Malaysian Historical Salvors* (Award) 121–30
  - Waibel **46–63**
- alternative formulae/terminology **52–6, 122–3, 413–14**
- additions to *Salini*/need for 230, 234–7, 286, 290–2
- alternatives
  - Fakes* 284–6, 290–4
  - Fedax* 201–2, 451, 473, 540, 554–5
  - Phoenix* 230, 235–7, 245, 444–5
  - Schreuer **47, 122, 125, 149**
- contribution, duration and risk 287, 291, 293, 295–6, 431, 444–5
  - as elements most frequently resorted to **71, 261, 271, 451, 461**
  - interdependence 433
  - as objective reflection of ordinary meaning 291
- criteria/characteristics/features/elements, interchangeability **47, 122**
- interpretation aids, BIT **54–5**
- jurisdiction *ratione materiae*, limitation to **55–6**
- tribunal approaches to **47**
  - ad hoc* approach 127
  - elements rejected **53, 293, 461**
  - elements relevant for investments **48–50**
  - empirical vs doctrinaire 122–3, 130–1, 150–1
  - flexible/pragmatic (*Biwater Gauff*) 42, **47–52, 116, 130, 150–1, 192, 202–3, 235–6, 268, 286, 290–1, 311–12, 460–1, 476, 541, 568, 574, 586–7**

- general negativity towards *Salini* **52–4, 56**
  - indispensable criteria (*Salini*) 291–2
  - interpretation “in their totality” 7, 129–30, 133, 235–6, 583
  - rejection, reasons for (*Abaclat*) 375, 403–4
- cases in date order addressing the question **48–51 (table 2)**
- contribution: *see* contribution
- duration 56
- interdependence 122–3, 129, 231, 245
  - unity of the investment principle **60**
  - VCLT 31/VCLT 32 **47**
- “investment”, tribunal approaches to interpretation, *Salini* criteria **47**
- profit and return **60**: *see also* profit and return (determination of “investment”)
- risk **56–8**: *see also* risk (“investment”, requirement for classification as (*Salini* element))
- territoriality **60–2**
- “typical characteristics” vs “jurisdictional requirements” **47**, 121–31, 149–51, 201–3, 539–41
  - summary 130
- “investment” (ICSID 25) (*Salini/Salini*-type elements), jurisprudence (general)**
  - Abaclat* (dissenting) 383
  - Ambiente Ufficio* 539–50
  - Bayindir* 129, 130, 475–6
  - Biwater Gauff* 150, 201–4, 268, 475
  - CMS* 268
  - CSOB* 268, 290
  - Deutsche Bank* 451, 460–4
  - Deutsche Bank* (dissenting) 72–6, 456, 472–6
  - Fakes* 290–4, 461
  - Jan de Nul* 129–30, 235–6
  - Joy Mining* 122, 125–6, 130, 286, 292–3, 473, 540
  - LESI* 236
  - LESI-DIPENTA* 126–7, 269, 461, 475
  - Malaysian Historical Salvors* (annulment) 148–51, 268 n. 170
  - Malaysian Historical Salvors* (Award) 118–42
  - MCI* 268, 291, 462–3, 589
  - Mitchell* (annulment) 125 n. 10, 127–8, 131, 236
  - MNSS* 765–72
  - Pey Casado* 269–70
  - Phoenix* 235–7, 475–6
  - Poštová banka* 699
  - Romak* 267–71
  - RSM* 290, 293 n. 72
  - Salini* **46–7**, 123–5, 267–8
    - as objective test 124
- “investor”/“foreign investor”**
  - “any natural or legal person . . . investing in the territory” (NAFTA 1101(1)) 179
  - control of company, relevance, indirect/passive ownership **54–5**, 485–94, 494–505
  - genuine link, relevance 757
  - “investment”, distinguishability **54–5**
  - jurisprudence
    - AAPL* 246 n. 87
    - Bayview* 178–82

**“investor”/“foreign investor”** (cont.)

- CMS* 246 n. 87
- Enron* 247
- Goetz* 246 n. 87
- Lanco* 246 n. 87
- Phoenix* 246–7
- SCB* 54, 55, 485–94, 494–505
- Vivendi I* 246

majority/minority shareholders 246–7

motivation for change of nationality, relevance 757–8

**issue estoppel:** *see* estoppel, categories; *res judicata, dispositif*, whether limited to

**Italy–Romania BIT (1995) by article:** *see also Gavazzi*

- 1(1)(b) (“shares, stocks, debentures, other forms of participation in companies . . . any other negotiable instrument of credit, as well as public securities in general . . .”) 741
- 1(1)(d) (“claims to money or any right relating to obligations . . . having an economic or financial value connected with investments”) 741
- 1(1)(f) (“rights of a financial nature accruing by law or by contract”) 741
- 2(3) (fair and equitable treatment) 731
- 2(5) (denial of justice) 731
- 4 (expropriation) 731–2
- 4(2)(c) (expropriation: compensation) 731–2
- 4(4) (expropriation: compensation: application of fair and equitable principles) 738–9
- 10(2) (umbrella clause) 731, 732

**Jamaica–US BIT (1994) by article**

- II(2)(b) (non-impairment) 652–3, 664–5
  - non-applicability to non-adjudicatory proceedings 694–5
- II(6) (effective means of asserting claims/enforcing rights) 652–3, 664–5

**jurisdiction (ICSID)**

- competence/duty of tribunal to determine (*compétence de la compétence*) (ICSID 41(1))
  - Ambiente Ufficio* 525–6, 528–9
  - Caratube I* 429
- objection to
  - burden/standard of proof
    - establishment of facts necessary to establish jurisdiction 229
    - prima facie claim on the merits 229, 231, 246, 390–1, 514: *see also* jurisdiction, prima facie legal case requirement (jurisprudence)
  - “manifestly without merit” claim (AR 41(5))
    - “clear and obvious” test 305
    - right to be heard 305
    - time-limit for Tribunal’s response 305
  - submission “as early as possible” (AR 41(1)), tribunal’s *ex proprio motu* powers and (AR 41(2)) 429
- parallel bases in treaty and contract
  - Abaclat* 391–4
    - classification as treaty claim, sovereign act engaging State responsibility outside contractual framework 374, 391–3, 394
    - contract-based claim irrelevant to the ICSID proceedings 393–4
  - subject matter: *see* “investment”; legal dispute arising directly out of investment (ICSID 25(1))

**jurisdiction (NAFTA)**, territoriality requirement (NAFTA 1101(1)(b)): *see* territoriality  
 (“investments of investors of another Party in the territory of the Party”) (NAFTA 1101(1)(b))

**jurisdiction, prima facie legal case requirement (jurisprudence)**

*Abaclat* 388, 389–91

*Ambiente Ufficio* 514

*Saipem* 388

**Kazakhstan**

Law on Electricity 1995/Tariff Amendment 2009 613–15

Law on Electricity 2012 613–14

Law on Foreign Investment 1994

protection of investors against illegal actions of State agencies 613

stabilization clause 613

**Kazakhstan–US BIT (1992)**, exhaustion of local remedies, absence of requirement for 617

**Kazakhstan–US BIT (1992) by article**

preamble (object and purpose)

“maximum effective utilization of economic resources” 42–3

“will stimulate the flow of private capital and the economic development” 431, 441–5

I(1)(a) (“investment means every kind of investment . . . owned or controlled directly or indirectly by [nationals or] companies of the other party”) 430–2, 439

formulae in other BITs concluded by the parties distinguished 431, 440

I(1)(b) (“company means any kind of corporation . . . constituted under the laws and regulations of a Party”) 439

I(1)(c) (“national . . . means a natural person who is a national of a Party under its applicable law”) 439

II(2)(a) (fair and equitable treatment/full protection and security/minimum standard of treatment) 613

VI (dispute settlement clause) 624

VI(8) (treatment of legal person as national of another contracting State (ICSID 25(2)(b))) 430, 432–4, 438–9

text 438–9

**legal dispute arising directly out of investment (ICSID 25(1))**

critical date (date of application/registration of application) 519

jurisprudence

*Ambiente Ufficio* 512

*Ambiente Ufficio* (dissenting) 519

**legality/accordance with the laws and regulations of host State** 772–3

overview (Waibel) 62–3

admissibility and jurisdiction distinguished 62–3

alleged misconduct by third parties, relevance 376, 408

BIT provision as determining factor 287, 294–6, 407, 416, 418, 548–50

absence of provision, relevance 231, 240–1

laws and regulations of the host State relating to investments as applicable law 549

limitation to compliance with laws and regulations relating to investments 287, 295

merits, issues reserved for 407, 408

as part of the definition of “investment” 376, 407

as test of validity of investment and definition distinguished 239, 240

**legality/accordance with the laws and regulations of host State, jurisprudence**

- Abaclat* 376, 407–8
- Abaclat* (dissenting) 416, 418
- Ambiente Ufficio* 548–50
- Ambiente Ufficio* (dissenting) 518
- Caratube* 432, 438–40, 445
- Fakes* 287, 294–6
- Fraport* 241–2
- MNSS* 772–3
- Philip Morris v. Australia* **63**
- Phoenix* **63**, 231, 232, 239–42, 250
- Plama* 241
- Salini* 240
- World Duty Free* 241

**legitimate expectations**

- burden of proof/source of expectation/requirements
  - clear and explicit representations to induce investments 617–18, 619
  - stabilization clause, relevance 617–19
- examples of expectations claimed
  - protection and security of investment (including predictability and stability) 618
  - reasonable application of competition laws 617–18
  - reasonable return on investment 621
  - respect for arbitration clause 617–18
- exclusion of expectation/State’s rights, exercise of State’s regulatory authority in pursuit of a public interest 617–18
- fair and equitable treatment and 196, 621–2
- treaty- and contract-based expectations distinguished 618

**Malaysian Historical Salvors: see Malaysian Historical Salvors** (“investment” (ICSID 25(1))) (background); **Malaysian Historical Salvors** (“investment” (ICSID 25(1))) (annulment); **Malaysian Historical Salvors** (“investment” (ICSID 25(1))) (annulment) (dissenting opinion (Shahabuddeen)); **Malaysian Historical Salvors** (“investment” (ICSID 25(1))) (Jurisdiction Award)

**Malaysian Historical Salvors (“investment” (ICSID 25(1))) (background)**

- facts
  - claimant’s allegations 112
  - contractual arrangements 112
  - salvage operation 111–12
- procedural history in date order 112
  - (domestic arbitration proceedings), application (July 1995) 112
  - sole arbitrator’s dismissal of claims (2 July 1998) 112
  - challenges to domestic arbitration award dismissed (3 July 1998) 112
  - application to CIA for internal review (December 2000) 112
  - dismissal of application for CIA review (January 2001) 112
  - submission of request for ICSID arbitration (20 September 2004) 112
  - provision at ICSID’s request of additional information (November 2004–June 2005) 112
  - registration of request for ICSID arbitration (14 June 2005) 111
  - constitution of tribunal with sole arbitrator (1 November 2005) 112
  - respondent’s objection to jurisdiction (23 December 2005) 112
    - claimant’s response 113
  - hearing on jurisdiction (25 May 2006) 113



- Award on jurisdiction (ICSID 52(1)(b)) (17 May 2007) 113
- application for annulment of Award on jurisdiction (7 September 2007) 113
- annulment hearing (3 December 2008) 113
  - parties' arguments 113
- Annulment Decision (16 April 2009) 113
- Malaysian Historical Salvors ("investment" (ICSID 25(1))) (annulment) 115–17, 142–52**
  - Committee's criticisms/decision (finding of manifest excess of power (ICSID 52(1)(b))) 115, 150–2
  - commercial/trade transaction vs investment 147, 483
  - failure to consider BIT definition of "jurisdiction" following finding of non-compliance with ICSID 25(1) definition 142–52
  - failure to consider *travaux préparatoires* 116–17, 145–51
  - improper addition of jurisdictional requirement for a significant contribution to the economy of the host State 116, 148–51
  - Salini* test, need for a flexible/pragmatic approach 116, 150–1
  - ICSID Convention (object and purpose)
    - provision of international methods of dispute settlement 143
    - stimulation of flow of private international capital 143
  - "investment" (ICSID 25(1)), interpretation
    - applicability of VCLT 31/VCLT 32 as customary international law 142–3
    - ordinary meaning (VCLT 31(1)) 115–16, 143
      - "commitment of money or other assets for the purpose of providing a return" 115–16, 143
      - as unqualified term "in context/in accordance with the object and purpose of the Convention" 115–16, 141, 143
    - resort to *travaux préparatoires* in case of ambiguity/obscurity (VCLT 32) 115–16, 143
      - in absence of ambiguity 115–16, 143
  - outer limits/double-barrelled test (ICSID 25(2)(b)) 116, 118–19
  - prioritization of ICSID 25(1) requirements, incompatibility with
    - intentions of parties to the BIT 116, 144–5
    - travaux préparatoires* (limited restrictions/requirements for qualification as "investment") 116, 143–5
- Malaysian Historical Salvors ("investment" (ICSID 25(1))) (annulment) (dissenting opinion (Shahabuddeen)) 152–67**
  - introduction/conclusion
    - the issue (contribution to the economic development of the host State: condition or not?) 152–3
    - summary of the arguments 153
    - unjustified move away from the objectivist view 166–7
  - commercial/trade transaction vs investment 67, 157
  - "contribution to the economic development of the host State"
    - as an essential element 155–60
    - Committee's finding against the claimant as improper assumption of appeal court functions 161
    - ICSID object and purpose (ICSID preamble) 156, 158–9
    - "positive impact"/"significant contribution", need for 160–1
      - good faith/proportionality/abuse of rights as test 160
      - "infinitesimally small development", exclusion 117, 160

- Malaysian Historical Salvors (“investment” (ICSID 25(1))) (annulment) (dissenting opinion (Shahabuddeen)) (cont.)**
- prioritization of BIT/acceptance of anything the parties may agree as illogical/counter to ICSID 25(1) 118, 161–3
  - review of the jurisprudence 158–9
  - travaux préparatoires* 159
  - outer limits/double-barrelled test (ICSID 25(2)(b)) 117
  - parties’ wide competence to determine qualifying “investment”
    - absence of ICSID 25 definition of “investment”, whether justified 153–5
    - failure to agree on definitions, effect 154–5
    - Pey Casado/Rompétrol* 154
    - Regional Consultative Meetings 155
    - Schreuer 154
  - outer limits to determine width of that competence, need for 153–5, 168
- Malaysian Historical Salvors (“investment” (ICSID 25(1))) (Jurisdiction Award)**
- 113–15, 118–42
  - costs 115
  - ICSID Convention (1965)
    - object and purpose
      - “international cooperation for economic development” (ICSID preamble) 121
      - “investment”, definition in accordance with 121
    - “investment”, interpretation
      - aids/applicable law
        - Executive Directors’ Report 121
        - ICSID preamble 121
        - precedent 119
        - VCLT 31 121
    - key cases
      - Alcoa* (contribution) 120
      - CSOB* 121
      - Mihaly* (pre-contractual expenditure) 119–20
      - SGS v. Pakistan* (focus on BIT) 120
    - teleological approach/object and purpose 121
  - investment as objective criterion 118–19
  - Salini/Salini*-type elements 118–42
    - overview 121–30
    - alternative formulae/terminology 121, 122–3
      - criteria/characteristics/features/elements, interchangeability 122
    - interpretation “in their totality”/“as a whole” 114, 129–30, 133
    - tribunal approaches to
      - empirical vs doctrinaire 122–3, 130–1
      - flexibility/discretion 130
    - “typical characteristics” or “jurisdictional requirements”? 121–31
      - review of the jurisprudence 122–30
      - summary 130–1
  - Salini/Salini*-type elements, applicability of the elements to facts of *Malaysian Historical Salvors*
    - contribution 114, 132
    - contribution to the economic development of the host State, need for “positive impact”/ “significant contribution” 114, 115, 137–41

- review of the jurisprudence 134–7, 139–40
  - Tribunal’s conclusion 141
- duration (quantitative and qualitative distinguished) 114, 132–3
- profit and returns 114, 130–1
- risk (commercial/investment risk distinguished) 114–15, 133–4
- Tribunal’s decision 113, 115, 142
- Malaysia–UK BIT (1981) by article**
- 1(1)(a)(iii) (“investment”: “every kind of asset . . . claims to money”) 116, 143–4
- 7 (dispute settlement (ICSID)) 144–5
- mass claims, admissibility:** *see also* multiparty claims, admissibility
  - absence of provision for as a reparable “gap” (ICSID 44) 27, 378, 385
    - balancing the parties’ interests 386
    - exclusion of rectifying measures 381–2
    - matters for consideration 378–9
    - “simplified procedure”, necessity/acceptability 378–9, 385–6
  - consent to jurisdiction distinguished 377–9
  - due process considerations 385–6
    - curtailment of respondent’s right to pursue individual examination of claims 386
  - explicit consent, need for 385, 516
  - jurisprudence
    - Abaclat* 73, 373–4, 377–9
    - Abaclat* (dissenting) 381–2, 384–6
    - Ambiente Ufficio* (dissenting) 515–16
  - representation of the parties, risks associated with (AR 18) 385–6
  - unilateral withdrawal of some claimants after registration of arbitration request, effect 380
- measure of compensation/valuation of company (with particular reference to expropriation claims) (including ILC(SR) 35/ILC(SR) 36), methodology**
  - applicable law
    - BIT/treaty provision 739
    - customary international law (CIL) 738–9
  - breach of contract and treaty distinguished 739
  - capital invested/increases in capital, inclusion 739
  - critical date (date of wrong) 738
  - equitable objective considerations 739
  - fair market value 739
  - going concern, counter-indications 738
  - Khan Resources* 23–4
  - unity of the investment principle and 23–4
  - “unlevered income” approach 738–9
- MFN (most favoured nation) treatment**
  - dispute settlement provisions, applicability to
    - Abaclat* 378, 380
    - Ambiente Ufficio* (dissenting) 519
    - Quasar de Valores* 214–15
  - eiusdem generis* rule 323
  - “like circumstances” (BIT) 763–4
  - “like circumstances” (NAFTA 1103)
    - burden/standard of proof 661
      - with identified domestic comparators 662
  - umbrella clause, in event of 391

**minimum standard of treatment in accordance with international law**

due process, whether a CIL element 664

“in accordance with international law”

CIL as reference point 663–4

State practice 663–4

jurisprudence

*Apotex* 662–4

NAFTA tribunals 664

standard of review, “very high threshold of severity and gravity” 664

***Mitchell***: see *Mitchell* (background); *Mitchell* (jurisdiction (“investment for purposes of”));  
*Mitchell* (tribunal’s findings)

***Mitchell* (background)**

facts 87

parties’ arguments

annulment proceedings 88

arbitration proceedings 87

procedural history in date order

request for arbitration (6 October 1999) 87

dissenting opinion (23 January 2004) 87

Award (9 February 2004) 87

application for annulment/stay of enforcement (7 June 2004) 88

constitution of *ad hoc* Committee (24 August 2004) 88

stay of enforcement (30 November 2004) 88

rejection of claimant’s request for bank guarantee 88

hearing on Annulment (11 May 2005) 88

decision on Annulment (1 November 2006) 88

***Mitchell* (jurisdiction (“investment for purposes of”))**, Tribunal’s analysis 88–90,  
 96–100

***Mitchell* (tribunal’s findings)**

costs 87

damages 87

jurisdiction 87

merits (expropriation in violation of BIT III(1)) 87

rejection of DRC’s counterclaim for reputational damage 87

***MNSS***: see *MNSS* (background); *MNSS* (jurisdiction/admissibility); *MNSS* (merits);  
 Netherlands–Yugoslavia [Montenegro] BIT (2002) by article

***MNSS* (background)**

costs 765

facts in date order

MN obtains 66.7 per cent of the share capital of ZN (8 November 2006) (PA) 752

MNSS’s purchase of MN’s ZN shares (8 February 2008) (SPA) 752

assignment of MN PA shares to claimant (28 February 2008) 752

difficulties with MNSS/ZN’s bank (Prva Banka) (June 2008–October 2009) 752

MNSS’s loans to ZN (September 2008–January 2011) 752

MNSS’s assignment of certain of its loan claims against ZN to RCA (30 October 2009)  
 752

ZN restructuring plan (4 March 2010) 752

claimants’ allegations of respondent’s negative behaviour 752

ZN workers’ occupation of management building (27 September to 4 October/13  
 December 2010) 752

- respondent's notification to MNSS of alleged breach of the PA (21 December 2010) 753
- MNSS's proposal to raise new financing (rejected by respondent) (February 2011) 753
- ZN's placement in bankruptcy/sale of assets to Tosçelik (April 2011) 753
- parties' positions (claimant)
  - alleged breaches of BIT 3(1), BIT 3(2), BIT 5(1)(c) and BIT 6(1) 753–4
  - attribution of responsibility to respondent 753
- parties' positions (respondent)
  - challenge to attempted attribution 754
  - defence on the merits 754
  - objections to the jurisdiction *ratione voluntatis*, *ratione personae* and *ratione materiae* 754
- procedural history in date order
  - approval of request for AF arbitration (7 November 2011) 751
  - approval of second request for AF arbitration (27 July 2012) 751
  - agreement to consolidate the two arbitrations (17 May 2013) 751
  - hearing on jurisdiction and the merits (10 June 2015) 754
  - Award (4 May 2016) 754
  - Tribunal's agreement to claimants' request for a supplementary decision (AR 57(1)) 754–5
- MNSS (jurisdiction/admissibility)**
  - summary of the Award 754, 755–6, 758
  - Additional Facility Rules/ICSID Convention, relationship, “investment” (ICSID 25(1)), requirement for AF 2(a) proceedings 758, 765–6
  - exhaustion of local remedies in absence of provision for 760
  - jurisdiction *ratione materiae* (“investment”), loans as **8 n. 37, 74**, 758–9, 768–72
    - “claims to money, to other assets or to any performance having an economic value” (BIT 1(a)) 768–72
  - contribution to the economy requirement 750, 769–71
  - overburdening of debt, relevance 769
  - parties' arguments (claimants) 767, 768–9
  - parties' arguments (respondent) 767, 768
  - unity of the investment **8**, 759, 770–1
  - jurisdiction *ratione materiae* (“investment”) (*Salini/Salini*-type elements) 758–9, 766–72
    - “contribution to the economic development of the host State” (Tribunal's analysis)
      - “contribution to the economy” as preferred formula **59**, 758–9, 767–8
      - flexible/pragmatic approach **47, 58**
  - legality/accordance with the laws and regulations of host State **19**, 772–3
    - absence of evidence to support respondent's claims 773
    - BIT provision as determining factor 772–3
    - Tribunal's conclusion 773
  - jurisdiction *ratione personae*
    - genuine link, relevance 757
    - “legal persons constituted under the law of that Contracting Party” (BIT 1(b)(ii)) 757–8
    - motivation for change of nationality, relevance 757–8
  - jurisdiction *ratione voluntatis* (alleged waiver of right to AF arbitration) 755–7
    - legislative consent to AF arbitration (MFI Law 2000/MFI Law 2011) 756–7
    - limitation of applicability to contractual claims 756

**MNSS (jurisdiction/admissibility)** (cont.)

- Privatisation Agreement (express provision for) 755–6
  - compatibility with public interest 756
- Tribunal's decision (lack of *ratione voluntatis* jurisdiction over contractual claims) 757
- umbrella clause (BIT 3(4)), exclusion of contractual claims 756

**MNSS (merits)**

- summary of the Award 754, 755
- BIT 3(1) (fair and equitable treatment/non-impairment) 760–3
  - breach of contract, rarity as breach of fair and equitable treatment requirement 760
  - standard of treatment (“unjust, arbitrary, discriminatory, or [in] violation of due process”) 760
- State responsibility for conduct of a bank directed or controlled by the State (ILC(SR) 8) 761
- Tribunal's consideration of impugned acts 760–3
- BIT 3(1) (most constant protection and security) 763
  - “most constant”, significance 763
- BIT 3(2), “like circumstances” (BIT), reasons for different treatment 763–4
- BIT 5 (free transfer of payments) 764
- BIT 8 (expropriation) 19, 764–5
- Montenegro:** *see also* MNSS; Netherlands–Yugoslavia [Montenegro] BIT (2002)
  - Foreign Investment Law 2000 as amended 2007 and 2010 (MFI Law 2011) 751
- multiparty claims, admissibility:** *see also* mass claims, admissibility
  - absence of a provision for, consequences/compensating factors
    - discussion of the issue at the conclusion of the ICSID Convention 510
    - ICSID practice 510
  - inclusion of bonds as indicative of openness to multiparty claims 510
  - “ordinary meaning”/singular words including their plurals 510, 516
  - claimants as individuals acting in their own names 510
  - class action/mass claims distinguished 383, 510, 515–16
  - exclusion of
    - limit on number 510–11
    - need for a contractual link 510–11
  - consent (respondent), need for a special approach to 510, 516
  - fairness and due process, possibility of measures to ensure 511, 516

**NAFTA (1992)**, applicability, investment/“foreign investment”: *see* “investment” (ICSID 25), classification as, NAFTA 1139 (definitions)

**NAFTA (1992) by article**

- Part V, Chapter 11, Section A (investment)
  - 1101(1) (measures covered: “in the territory”) 16 n. 92, 654
  - 1103 (MFN treatment) 652, 664–5
  - 1105(1) (minimum standard of treatment) 662–4
- Part V, Chapter 11, Section B (Settlement of Disputes)
  - 1131(2) (binding effect of FTC interpretation of NAFTA) 662–3
  - 1136(1) (binding force between parties/in respect of the particular case) 659, 673–4
- Part V, Chapter 11, Section C (Definitions)
  - 1139(g) (investment: real estate or other property, tangible or intangible, acquired for the purpose of economic benefit or other business purposes) 173, 180, 652, 653–4, 656, 660, 661, 683–7, 688–9
  - 1139(h) (investment: interests arising from the commitment of capital or other resources in the territory of a Party) 653–4, 660, 683–7

**national of another contracting State (juridical person) (ICSID 25(2)(b)), agreement to treat as**

- agreement of parties, need for 429–30
  - continuing effect of implicit contractual agreement in case of assignment to a third party 430
  - inclusion of arbitration clause in contract as implicit agreement 429–30
- burden of proof (*actori incumbit probatio*) 432–4, 512
- possibility of a shift 432, 433
- changes to corporate structure, for the sole purpose of acquiring an ICSID claim,
  - exclusion 230, 237–8
- evidence of, “documents or other evidence”, examples of 512
- foreign control, as outer limit/need for compliance with both ICSID 25(2)(b) and BIT 432–3
- genuine link, relevance 757–8
- jurisprudence
  - Banro* 238
  - Caratube* 429–30, 432–4
  - Mihaly* 238
  - MNSS* 757–8
  - Phoenix* 230, 237–8
- as objective element/outer limit 430
  - limitation of VCLT 31(3)(a) possibility for bilateral agreement on interpretation 430–2
- as preliminary question 429

**national of another contracting State (natural person) (ICSID 25(2)(a))**

- dual/multiple nationality
  - diplomatic protection and 284
  - dominant and effective nationality test
    - in absence of BIT requirement 283–4
  - exceptions to exclusion 284
  - ICSID tribunals’ rejection of 284
  - Iran–US Claims Tribunal practice distinguished 284
  - person holding *inter alia* nationality of host State, exclusion from protection 284
- dual/multiple nationality, jurisprudence
  - Fakes* 283–4
  - Iran–US Tribunal *Case A/18* 284
  - Nottebohm* 284
  - “other than the State party” 284

**national treatment**

- Apotex* 661–2
- differential treatment
  - burden/standard of proof 661
  - “treatment” 661
  - “like circumstances”/“like situations” with identified domestic comparators 661
- non-compliance (NAFTA 1102), required elements 661–2
  - burden/standard of proof 661
  - fact-specific analysis 661
  - less favourable treatment than comparators 661

**nationalization:** *see* expropriation/nationalization

**Netherlands–Poland BIT (1992) by article**

- 1(1) (definitions), text 643–4
- 1(1)(a) (“investment”) 635, 637–8

**Netherlands–Poland BIT (1992) by article** (cont.)

- “rights derived from shares” 70–1, 637–8, 643–8
- 1(1)(b) (“investor”) 635
- 1(1)(b)(ii) (“investor”: legal person constituted under the law of the contracting Party) 637
- 2 (promotion of investments) 639
- 3 (fair and equitable treatment etc.) 639, 640
- 3(1) (fair and equitable treatment) 642
- 3(5) (umbrella clause) 635
- 5 (measures depriving investors, directly or indirectly, of their investments) 639, 640–2
- 5(c) (expropriation: just compensation) 639, 640, 642
  - “just compensation”/“real value”, equivalence to “adequate, effective and prompt compensation” 641–2
- 8(1) (amicable settlement: “any dispute”), “relating to the effects of a measure” 635
- 8(2) (six-months rule) 635, 638–40

**Netherlands–Slovakia BIT (1991)**

by article: *see also Global Trading*

- preamble (object and purpose) 318–19, 333–4
  - 1(a) (“every kind of asset invested either directly or through an investor of a third State”) 316–17, 318–22, 323–6, 330, 331–63
  - 1(b) (“investors”) 330
  - 1(c) (“territory”) 330
  - 2 (promotion of investments by national of the other Contracting Party) 330–1
  - 3 (fair and equitable treatment) 330–1
  - 3(2) (MFN treatment) 323
  - 4 (expropriation) 330–1
  - 7 (insured investments: recognition of subrogation) 330–1
  - 8(2) (arbitration clause) 328
- uniformity of meaning across the versions/use of a single [English] version 329–30

**Netherlands–Turkey BIT (1986) by article:** *see also Fakes*

- 1(a)(i) (“investor”: “a natural person who is a national of a Contracting Party”) 283–4
- 1(b) (“investment”) 287–8, 296–302
  - text 289
- 1(b)(ii) (“investment”: shares in stock or other interests) 289
- 2(1) (promotion of economic cooperation through protection of investment) 281–2
- 2(2) (“in accordance with the laws and regulations in force” in host State) 287, 294–6
- 3(1) (fair and equitable treatment) 281–2
- 3(1) (non-discrimination) 281–2
- 3(2) (full security and protection/MFN treatment) 281–2
- 4 (transfer of payments resulting from an investment) 281–2
- 5 (expropriation; conditions) 281–2

**Netherlands–Yugoslavia [Montenegro] BIT (2002) by article**

- preamble (“stimulate the flow of capital and technology and the economic development”) 772
- 1(a) (“investment”) 766–72
  - “claims to money, to other assets or to any performance having an economic value” 768–72
  - text 766
- 1(b)(ii) (“investor”: “legal persons constituted under the law of that Contracting Party”) 757–8



- 2 (“within the framework of its laws . . . promote economic cooperation”) 772  
 3(1) (constant protection and security) 753  
 3(1) (fair and equitable treatment) 360–3, 753  
 3(2) (MFN treatment) 753, 763–4  
 3(4) (umbrella clause) 756  
 5(1) (transfer of payments) 753, 764  
 6(1) (expropriation) 753, 764
- outer limits/double-barrelled test (ICSID 25(2)(b)):** *see also* “investment” (ICSID 25), interpretation, “inherent meaning” (ICSID jurisprudence); “investment” (ICSID 25) (*Salini/Salini*-type elements)  
 applicability to non-ICSID tribunals 266, 270, 404–5  
 BIT/FTA definitions of “investment”/relative narrowness of modern treaties **29–35**  
 definition 374, 400  
 emergence of concept (ICSID negotiations) 410, 529–32  
   Broches (*History*) **41–2**, 146–7, 155, 565  
 evidence of principle  
   BIT provisions 400  
   ICSID preamble 400  
 “foreign control” as an outer limit 430  
 ICSID 25(1) as autonomous, overriding definition 285–6, 289–90, 527  
 incompatibility of prioritization of ICSID 25(1) requirements with intentions of parties to the BIT 116, 144–5, 202–3  
 justification for 153–5, 166–7  
 “outer limits”, limitation (*travaux préparatoires*) to  
   exclusion of simple sales and transient commercial transactions 116, 143–5  
   requirement for legal dispute/consent to jurisdiction 116, 143–5  
 parties’ freedom to define/consent, compliance of BIT/FTA with the objective limits of ICSID 25(1), need for 238–9, 308, 383  
 prioritization of BIT/acceptance of anything the parties may agree as illogical/counter to ICSID 25(1) 161–3, 230, 234, 286, 292  
 treatment as a foreign national, need for compliance with both ICSID 25(2)(b) and BIT 432
- outer limits/double-barrelled test (ICSID 25(2)(b)), jurisprudence**  
*Abaclat* 374, 398–400, 472  
*Abaclat* (dissenting) 383, 409–11  
*Alcoa* 308  
*Ambiente Ufficio* **29–32**, 513, 522–3, 526–7, 540  
*Ambiente Ufficio* (dissenting) 551, 563–9  
*Biwater* 239, 460–1  
*Caratube* **29 n. 10**, 430  
*Deutsche Bank* 451, 460–4  
*Deutsche Bank* (dissenting) 472–4  
*Fakes* 287, 296–302, 308  
*Gavazzi* 741  
*Global Trading* 305, 307–9  
*Joy Mining* 118–19, 149–50, 163, 308, 472  
*Malaysian Historical Salvors* 118–19, 233  
*Malaysian Historical Salvors* (annulment) 116, 144–8, 149–50  
*Malaysian Historical Salvors* (annulment) (dissenting opinion) 117–18, 152–63, 166–7

**outer limits/double-barrelled test (ICSID 25(2)(b)), jurisprudence (cont.)**

- Mitchell* 163
- Pey Casado* 154, 270, 308–9
- Phoenix* 29, 230, 233, 410
- Romak* 266, 270, 472
- Rompetrol* 154
- Salini* 118–19, 148–9, 308
- SGS v. Pakistan* 412, 472

**Phoenix:** *see Phoenix* (background); *Phoenix* (Award: jurisdiction)

**Phoenix (background)**

facts

- claimant's allegations 226–7
- Phoenix and related companies, description of 226
- procedural history in date order
  - notification of dispute to respondent, timing (2 March 2003) 226
  - request for arbitration (15 February 2004) 226
    - ICSID's request for further information 227
  - registration of request for arbitration (23 March 2006) 227
  - constitution of the Tribunal (8 January 2007) 227
  - request for provisional measures (25/27 January 2007) 227, 228–9
  - decision on provisional measures (6 April 2007) 227
  - hearing on jurisdiction (1 September 2008) 228
  - Award on jurisdiction 228
- provisional measures, decision on request for (15 April 2007) (rejection of request for) 228–9
  - excluded measures 229
  - purpose (avoidance of irreparable damage) 228
  - requirements
    - existing right 229–30
    - necessity/urgency 228

**Phoenix (Award: jurisdiction) 233–54**

- burden/standard of proof, requirements
  - establishment of facts necessary to establish jurisdiction 229
  - prima facie claim on the merits 229, 231, 246
- jurisdiction *ratione materiae* (analysis of the principles) 230, 233–45
  - changes to corporate structure for the sole purpose of acquiring an ICSID claim, exclusion 230, 237–8
  - “contribution to the economic development of the host State” 231, 239–40
    - “contribution to the economy” as inherent in contribution, duration and risk requirement 59, 230, 235–7
    - “contribution to the economy” as preferred formula 236
    - as flexible/discretionary criterion 236–7
    - interpretation “in their totality” 235–6
    - purpose “to intensify economic cooperation to the mutual benefit of both countries” (BIT preamble) 231, 239–40
  - good faith obligation 231, 242–5
    - as general principle of international law 231, 242–5
  - ICSID Convention, object and purpose
    - compliance with as essential element 230, 234
    - stimulation of flow of private international capital 230, 234, 237–9

- interpretation of ICSID/BIT, applicability of VCLT 31/general principles of law 233–4  
 legality/accordance with the laws and regulations of host State 231, 239–42  
   absence of provision in BIT, relevance 231, 240–1  
   as test of validity of investment and definition distinguished 239, 240  
 prioritization of BIT/acceptance of anything the parties may agree as illogical/counter to ICSID 25(1) 230, 234  
*Salini/Salini*-type elements 230, 235–7, 245  
   interdependence 231, 245  
   sufficiency of *Salini*/need for addition 230, 234–7  
 jurisdiction *ratione materiae* (application of the principles) 245–54  
   “contribution to the economic development of the host State”  
     majority/minority shareholdings 246–7  
     sufficiency of nominal purchase price to establish prima facie case 231, 246  
   duration 231, 247  
   good faith obligation 232, 250–4  
     absence of evidence of any intent to engage in economic activity 59–60, 232, 252–3  
     existence of claimed damages at time of “investment” 232, 250  
     “investment” as attempt to internationalize domestic disputes 59–60, 232, 253–4  
     “investment” as clear abuse of process 59–60, 253–4  
     lack of transparency/“investment” as redistribution of assets within the family 59–60, 232  
     timing of claim (immediately after “investment”) 251  
     wrongful claim of assignment 232, 250–1  
   intention/good faith attempts to engage in economic activity, sufficiency 231–2, 248–50  
   investment in accordance with Czech laws 232, 240  
   risk (rescue of bankrupt company) 231, 247–8  
   jurisdiction *ratione personae* (nationality) 229  
   jurisdiction *ratione temporis* (claims limited to BP and BG) 229  
   jurisdiction *ratione voluntatis* (consent to jurisdiction) 229  
   Tribunal’s decision 229, 254  
     costs (claimant to pay ICSID and respondents’ costs (abuse of process)) 232  
**portfolio investment, uncertain status as covered “investment”** 34–5, 46, 72, 412, 474, 517, 554, 555, 559, 562, 586, 594: *see also* financial instruments  
**Poštová banka**: *see Poštová banka* (annulment); *Poštová banka* (background); *Poštová banka* (jurisdiction)  
**Poštová banka (annulment)** 700–1  
   appeal distinguished 700  
   costs (applicant to pay arbitration costs/parties to pay own) 701  
   as extraordinary remedy/high threshold 700  
   grounds  
     alleged failure to give reasons (ICSID 52(1)(e)) 700  
     contradictory analysis 700–1  
**Poštová banka (background)**  
   facts in date order  
     2008 financial crisis leading to Greek public debt problem 691  
     claimant’s purchase of Greek Government Bonds (GGBs) maturing between 2012 and 2020 (early 2010) 691  
     value of GGBs 691  
   submission to European Commission of a three-year stability programme (15 January 2010) 691

**Poštová banka (background) (cont.)**

- EU agreement on financial support including IMF funds (April 2010) 691
- adjustment programme to increase financial support to Greece (May 2010) 691
- claimant's sale of three of its five series of GGBs replacing them at a different price (2011) 691–2
  - arrangements for trading of GGBs 692
  - claimant's assignment of some of its interests to a third party 692
- implementation of PSI (private sector involvement) in respondent's sovereign debt management (2011–12) 692
- Greek Bondholder Act 2012/exchange offer for existing GGBs (23 February 2012) 692
- claimant's rejection of exchange offer followed by removal of securities from account and replacement (April 2012) 692
- parties' positions 693
- procedural history in date order
  - request for arbitration (3 May 2013) 691
  - constitution of Tribunal (11 October 2013) 693
  - Tribunal's first meeting with parties/decision to bifurcate jurisdiction and merits (17 December 2013) 693
  - hearing on jurisdiction (8/9 September 2014) 693
  - Award (9 April 2015) 693
  - claimant's application for a partial annulment (ICSID 52(1)(e)/AR 50) (31 July 2015) 693
  - constitution of *ad hoc* committee (2 September 2015) 693
  - dismissal of application for partial annulment (16 September 2016) 693

**Poštová banka (jurisdiction)**

- costs (payment of own/equal shares of arbitration costs) 699
- Istrokapital's claims 694–7
  - parties' positions
    - claimant 694
    - respondent 694
  - Tribunal's analysis and decision (shareholder's rights in respect of claims related to assets of local company) 694–5, 701–5
- Poštová banka's claims, parties' arguments 706–7
  - claimant 699
  - respondent 699
- Poštová banka's claims, Tribunal's analysis and decision 696–8, 705–27
  - sovereign bonds as "investment" (BIT 1(1)) 695–8, 705–21
    - absence of "bonds" from BIT 698
    - bonds as loans and free-standing loans, distinguishability 73–5, 698
    - "claims for money" distinguished 698
    - private indebtedness or corporate debt distinguished 697–9
  - sovereign bonds as "investment" (ICSID 25(1)) 698–9, 721–7
    - commercial versus operational risk 699
    - contribution, duration and risk as test 54, 699
    - inherent meaning/objective test 699
    - process of creation, need for 699
- treaties, interpretation (VCLT 31(1)) (general rule: good faith, ordinary meaning, context, object and purpose) 696–7
  - effectiveness (*ut res magis valeat quam pereat*) (*effet utile*) 696

- restrictive/broad interpretation 696
- Tribunal's conclusion (lack of jurisdiction *ratione materiae*) 698
- precedent (ICSID arbitral tribunal)**
  - non-binding nature 119
  - previous ICSID tribunal decision as aid 119, 159, 260–1, 429, 556–7
  - tribunal's obligation to adopt principles established in series of consistent cases (*Bayindir*)
    - Fakes* 284, 290
    - Global Trading* 312
    - Pey Casado* 290
    - Saipem* 290
- precedent (NAFTA arbitral tribunal), *res judicata*** distinguished 674
- procedure (ICSID)**
  - multiparty proceedings, absence of special requirements 511
  - registration of Application with Secretary-General, acceptability of request “not manifestly outside the jurisdiction” (ICSID 36(3)) 511
- profit and return (determination of “investment”)**
  - jurisprudence
    - Ambiente Ufficio* 542–3
    - Biwater Gauff* 60
    - Caratube* 430, 432, 433, 440–1, 445
    - Deutsche Bank* 451, 461, 463
    - Helnan* 60
    - Joy Mining* 60, 120
    - Malaysian Historical Salvors* 60, 131–2
  - rejection as required element 451, 461, 463
  - risk, relationship with 445
  - as Schreuer characteristic 60
  - negligible resort to 60
- promissory notes**, status as ICSID 25 investment: *see also* financial instruments as “investment” 72
- protection and security of investment, State responsibility**
  - MNSS* 763
  - “most constant”, significance 763
- provisional measures (including ICSID 47)**
  - excluded measures
    - disclosure of documents 229
    - improvement on the status quo 229
    - measures identical with those requested for final award 229
  - purpose, avoidance of irreparable damage 228
  - rejection of request in view of undertaking to comply with requested actions 427
  - requirements
    - existing right 229–30
    - necessity/urgency 228
- provisional measures (including ICSID 47), jurisprudence**
  - Aegean Sea* 228
  - Caratube* 427
  - Maffezini* 228–9
  - Passage Through the Great Belt* 228
  - Phoenix* 228–9

- Quasar de Valors:** *see* *Quasar de Valors* (background); *Quasar de Valors* (jurisdiction); *Quasar de Valors* (merits); Russia–Spain BIT (1990)
- Quasar de Valors (background)**
- claimants (Spanish entities owning ADRs representing shares in Yukos)
    - at preliminary objections stage 207
    - remaining at the merits stage 207
  - measures allegedly amounting to expropriation 207–8
    - liquidation of Yukos’s remaining assets in bankruptcy proceedings 208–9
    - respondent’s comments on 209
    - seizure of Yukos’s prime producing asset (YNG) and its transfer to Rosneft 208
    - tax levies on Yukos 208
  - measures allegedly amounting to expropriation, respondent’s comments on 209
  - procedural history in date order
    - request for SCC arbitration (25 March 2007) 207
      - alleged dispossession of Yukos as basis for 207
    - respondent’s request for dismissal of request for arbitration for manifest lack of jurisdiction (16 May 2007) 210
      - SCC’s refusal of request 210
    - hearing on preliminary objections (27/28 September 2008) 210
    - hearing on the merits (17 to 25 October 2011) 210
    - Award (merits) (20 July 2012) 210
    - Stockholm District Court decision on jurisdiction (11 September 2014) 210–11
    - Svea Court of Appeal’s decision that the Tribunal did not have jurisdiction (18 January 2016) 211–12
    - Supreme Court’s refusal to hear a further appeal (14 December 2016) 212
    - Appeal Court’s decision setting aside the Award (17 June 2018) 212
- Quasar de Valors (jurisdiction) 212–17, 221–4**
- admissibility (alleged failure of claimants to deliver a “detailed report” (BIT 10(1))) 216
  - jurisdiction *ratione materiae* (ADRs)
    - “investment” (BIT 2)
      - “all types of assets and particularly . . .” 221–4
      - “rights deriving from any type of investment made to create an economic value” 221–4
      - “shares and other forms of participation in companies” 221–4
    - “made in the territory” requirement (BIT 2) 215–16, 224
      - determination of link by reference to types of investment covered 215–16, 224
  - ownership of ADRs
    - alleged misrepresentation of status of claimants 224
    - commercial transaction vs ownership interest 215, 222–3
    - inconsistency of respondent’s argument with previous position 215, 223
    - “shall pay the investor or his beneficiary” (BIT 6) 223
  - respondent’s arguments 215, 222
  - Tribunal’s conclusion 216
  - jurisdiction *ratione personae*
    - investor as “[a]ny corporate body established in accordance with the legislation of either Party” (BIT 1(b))
      - dissenting opinion (Brower) 216–17
      - parties’ arguments 215
      - Tribunal’s decision 215

- scope of arbitration clause (BIT 10) (“dispute . . . related to the amount or method of payment of compensation due [under BIT 6]”) 212–14
- alternatives to investor–State arbitration, problems with diplomatic protection 213
  - resort to respondent’s domestic courts 213
- Berschader* and *RosInvest* compared 213–14
- BLEU–Russia/Russia–UK BITs compared 213–14
- interpretation of BIT (VCLT 31)
  - intention of parties 214
  - object and purpose 214
- MFN treatment (BIT 5(2)), whether extending BIT 10 to dispute settlement 214–15
  - Denmark–Russia BIT compared 214–15, 216–17
  - dissenting opinion (Brower) 216–17
  - respondent’s arguments 212
  - Tribunal’s decision 212
- Quasar de Valores (merits)*** 217–21
  - abuse of process 217–18
  - compensation 220–1
  - costs 221
  - expropriation (tax measures)
    - arbitrary/discriminatory, whether 218–19
    - RosInvest/Yukos v. Russia* (ECtHR) compared 218–20
  - tax assessments/bankruptcy proceedings as alleged political pretext for seizure of Yukos’s assets 220
  - Yukos’s debts, respondent’s alleged prevention of payment 219–20
  - Tribunal’s decision 217, 220
- res judicata***
  - dispositif*, whether limited to 676–81
    - issue estoppel and 676–7
  - finality/binding force of decision and (NAFTA 1136(1)) 659, 673–4
    - ICJ/PCIJ 59 compared 674
  - finality/binding force of decision and (UNCITRAL 32(2)) 659, 681–2
  - as general principle of international law 674–81
  - as general principle of law 675
  - identity of parties and cause of action, need for 675–6, 736
  - issue estoppel distinguished 738
  - jurisprudence (including issue estoppel cases)
    - Amco II* 675, 676–7
    - Apotex* 673–87
    - Asteris* 680
    - Asylum Case* 680
    - BASF* 680
    - British–US Claims Arbitration* (1910) 676
    - Cambodia v. Thailand* 680–1
    - Chorzów Factory* (dissent (Anzilotti J)) 675, 679
    - Corfu Channel* 680
    - Deggendorf* 680
    - Delimitation of the Continental Shelf (UK v. France)* 679
    - Effect of Awards of Compensation Made by UNAT* 675

**res judicata** (cont.)*Gavazzi* 735–6*Gavazzi* (dissenting) 738*Grynberg* 677–8*Orinoco* 676–8*Pious Fund* 676, 679, 680*Polish Postal Service in Danzig* 679*stare decisis* distinguished 659, 674**risk (“investment”, requirement for classification as (*Salini* element))**

acceptance of any risk as criterion 57

affirmation as a criterion 58

commercial/investment risk distinguished 57–8, 67–8, 133–4, 261, 275, 542, 600, 745

financial instruments 72–3

operational risk 57

rejection as a criterion 58

rescue of bankrupt company as 247–8

sovereign risk, BIT limitation to 57

**risk (“investment”, requirement for classification as (*Salini* element)), jurisprudence***Alps Finance* 58*Deutsche Bank* 462*Gavazzi* 745*Joy Mining* 57–8, 126*Kardassopoulous* 462*Malaysian Historical Salvors* 133–4*Malaysian Historical Salvors* (annulment) 56, 57–8*Nova Scotia Power* 58*Phoenix* 231, 247–8*Poštová banka* 57–8*Romak* 57–8, 261–2, 275*Salini* 124–5**Romak:** *see Romak (background)*; *Romak* (“investment” (BIT 1(2)) (Tribunal’s analysis))**Romak (background)**

facts in date order

Romak’s trading relations following the dissolution of the USSR 256

Uzkhleboproduct’s Supply Contract with Odil (October 1995) 256

“Commission Agreement” to remedy Odil’s failure to supply (June/July 1996) 256

Supply Contract pronounced invalid (March 1997) 256

objections to the jurisdiction (parties’ arguments)

burden of proof 257

jurisdiction *ratione materiae*

alleged failure to establish “investment” (BIT 1(2)(c)) 257–8

burden/standard of proof 257

“in accordance with the law” (BIT 1(2)(e)) 258

respondent’s status 258–9

parties’ positions on the merits

applicable law 259

attribution to respondent of acts of

i. Uzbek courts in refusing to enforce the GAFTA Award 259–60

ii. Uzbek courts in refusing to enforce GAFTA Award as breach of New York Convention 259

iii. Uzdun and Uzkhleboproduct 259



procedural history in date order

- GAFTA Award (finding against Uzdon) (22 August 1997) 256–7
- refusal to extend time-limit for filing an appeal against the GAFTA Award 257
- High Court (England) challenge to GAFTA Award on failure to follow fair and equitable proceedings/rejection (28 August 1998/28 January 1999) 257
- notice of arbitration (29 March 2006) 256, 257
- constitution of Tribunal (5 July 2007) 257
- hearing (6 and 7 November 2008) 260
- Award (26 November 2009) 260

**Romak (“investment” (BIT 1(2)) (Tribunal’s analysis)) 260–2, 262–7**

applicable law

- UNCITRAL Rules, BIT and the applicable rules and principles of international law 260
- VCLT 31/VCLT 32 260–1
- as customary international law 260

classification as investment (BIT 1(2))

- claim to money 265
- commercial/trade transaction vs investment 68, 69–70, 260, 264–5, 266
- non-exhaustive nature of list 260, 263–4, 265, 271
- outer limits/double-barrelled test (ICSID 25(2)(b))
- non-applicability 266, 270
- prioritization of BIT/acceptance of anything the parties may agree as illogical/counter to ICSID 25(1) 270

classification as investment (BIT 1(2)) (*Salini/Salini*-type elements)

- contribution, duration and risk, frequency of 261, 271
- “contribution to the economy” as inherent in 207

- review of the jurisprudence
- pragmatic approach 268
- support for *Salini* 269–70

*Salini* formula 267–8

classification as investment (BIT 1(2)) (*Salini/Salini*-type elements), application to

- Romak* 261–2, 271–8
- contribution 261, 272–4
- duration 261, 274–5
- GAFTA Award as mere embodiment of underlying rights 261, 271–2
- unity of the investment and 261, 271–2
- territoriality (investment/expenditure in the territory)
- inclusion of “territorial” in the BIT, relevance 262, 276–8
- as inherent in “contribution, duration and risk” formula 262, 277–8

issues/aids to interpretation considered by the Tribunal

- context (signature of ATEC) (VCLT 32) 264
- decisions of other arbitral tribunals 266, 267
- in case of “ambiguity or obscurity” 260–1
- as evidence of practice (VCLT 31(2)(b)) 260–1
- literal meaning, disadvantages 260, 263–5
- object and purpose (intensified economic cooperation) (BIT preamble), insufficiency 260, 264
- risk of “a result which is manifestly absurd or unreasonable” (VCLT 32(b)) 260, 264–5
- Tribunal’s approach to 270

parties’ positions (narrow interpretation (claimant) vs broad (respondent)) 260, 263

text (BIT 1(2)) 262–3

Tribunal’s decision (absence of an “investment”) 260, 278

**Russia–Spain BIT (1990) by article**

- 1(2) (classification as investment) 215–16, 221–4
  - “all types of assets and particularly . . .” 221–4
  - “rights deriving from any type of investment made to create an economic value” 221–4
  - “shares and other forms of participation in companies” 221–4
  - text 221
- 2(4) (scope of agreement) 221–4
  - text 222
- 5(2) (MFN treatment) 214–15
- 6 (expropriation: compensation requirement), “shall pay the investor or his beneficiary” 223
- 10 (arbitration clause: dispute relating to method/amount of compensation for expropriation) 207–8
  - 10(1) (“with a detailed report”) 216
  - BLEU–Russia/Russia–UK BITs compared 213–14

**Salini criteria:** *see* “investment” (ICSID 25) (*Salini/Salini*-type elements)

**SCB (Standard Chartered Bank):** *see* SCB (background); SCB (jurisdiction) (investor status (passive ownership))

**SCB (background)**

- claimant’s status/relationship with subsidiaries 486, 494
- facts in date order
  - IPTL–TANESCO (Tanzanian Electric Supply Company) Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) (26 May 1995) 486
    - terms of PPA 486
    - Loan Agreement (28 June 1997) 486
    - refinancing of the Loan Agreement (2001/2003) 487
    - SCB HK’s Sale and Purchase Agreement (SPA) (August 2005) 487
    - SPC HK–Danaharta SPA (August 2005) 486, 487
    - IPTL’s failure to make payments due under the Loan Agreement (2006) 488
- parties’ positions
  - claimant (merits) 488–9
  - respondent’s objections to the jurisdiction as restructured by the Tribunal 489
    - claimant’s response 489
- procedural history in date order
  - TANESCO Award (12 July 2001) (contractual dispute) 486–7
  - VIP’s High Court petition for winding-up proceedings (2 February 2002) 487
  - LCIA Award ordering discontinuance of winding-up proceedings (26 August 2003) 487
  - application for interpretation of 2001 ICSID Award (2008) 488
    - discontinuance (19 August 2010) 488
  - SCB HK’s application to the High Court to restrain winding-up 488
  - High Court’s appointment of a provisional liquidator (16 December 2008) 488
  - High Court’s appointment of an official administrator over IPTL (27 January 2009) 488
  - appointment of administrator set aside by the Court of Appeal (9 April 2009) 488
  - notification of an event of default (December 2009) 488
  - request for arbitration (11 June 2010) 486
  - agreement to bifurcation of proceedings (23 November 2010) 489
  - hearing on jurisdiction (13 to 15 December 2011) 490

- Award on jurisdiction (2 November 2012) 490
- withdrawal of winding-up petition over IPTL/Court order to transfer IPTL affairs to PAP (2013) 490
- SCB Malaysia/SCB HK proceedings in the High Court (England) (December 2013) 490
- ICSID 2016 Award (12 September 2016) 488
- ICSID 2019 Award (implementation of ICSID 2001 Award) (11 October 2019) 491
- SCB (jurisdiction) (investor status (passive ownership))**
- active contribution, need for (Tribunal's analysis of the law)
  - "any legal dispute . . . concerning an investment of [a UK company] in the territory of [Tanzania]" (BIT 8(1)) as "key phrase" 492, 496–8
- factors considered
  - absence of control/direction 491
  - indirect cross-border chain of ownership 491
  - shareholdings as such 491
- jurisprudence considered
  - CEMEX* 502–3
  - Kardassopoulos* 502–3
  - Mobil* 502–3
  - Sedlmayer* 503
  - SGS v. Pakistan* 503
  - Siemens* 503
  - Tribunal's dismissal as irrelevant 493, 503–4
  - Tza Yap Shum* 503
  - Waste Management* 503
- key BIT provisions (texts)
  - preamble 495
  - 1(a) ("investment") 495
  - 8(1) (dispute settlement: "any legal dispute . . . concerning an investment") 495–6
- object and purpose of BIT 492, 499
  - cause-and-effect relationship (preamble) 492, 499
  - creation of favourable conditions for companies *to invest* (BIT 2(1)) 492, 499
  - "investment by nationals and companies" (preamble) 492, 499
- ordinary meaning in context
  - "by" (preamble/BIT 11), ambiguity deriving from the omission of verb "held/owned" or "made" 492, 498
  - "of" as focal point in determining relations between investor and investment 492, 497
  - "of" ordinary meaning in context, equivocal result 492, 497–8
  - repeated use in BIT of "made"/absence of "own" or "held", implications 492, 498
- other comparable treaties 493, 501
  - use of "indirect" and "indirectly" distinguished 492–3, 500–1
- supplementary means of interpretation in case of ambiguity/obscurity (VCLT 32), applicability 492–3, 500
- Tribunal's conclusion (requirement for active involvement) 492, 498, 499–500
- costs
  - parties to bear own/equal division following dismissal of claims for want of jurisdiction 490, 491
  - parties' positions 490
- parties' positions

- SCB (jurisdiction) (investor status (passive ownership))** (cont.)  
 agreement that investment must be “of” the claimant 496  
 differences over meaning of “of”/indirect vs direct ownership 492, 496–7  
*ratione materiae* or *ratione personae* jurisdiction, whether 54–5  
 treaty interpretation, applicable law  
   VCLT 31 (good faith/ordinary meaning/context/object and purpose) 491, 496–7  
   VCLT 32 (supplementary means in case of ambiguity/obscurity) 491, 496–7  
 Tribunal’s decision (dismissal of claims) (failure to meet active contribution requirement)  
   54, 490, 491, 494–5  
 failure to demonstrate compliance 495, 504–5
- seat of arbitration, factors determining choice** 657
- securities:** *see* financial instruments
- sovereign bonds:** *see* financial instruments
- stabilization clause**  
 legislative changes, protection from  
   predictable changes 619  
   right to stabilization in the absence of a clear commitment 619  
   withdrawal of offer of consent to jurisdiction 616, 628: *see also* consent to ICSID  
     jurisdiction, withdrawal  
 legitimate expectations and 618–19
- standard of treatment of alien**  
 jurisprudence  
   *Biwater Gauff* 195–7  
   *Waste Management* 195–6  
 “most constant/full protection and security”, as State’s guarantee of physical, commercial  
 and legal stability in a secure environment 198
- standing:** *see also* “investor”/“foreign investor”; jurisdiction (ICSID); national of another  
 contracting State (juridical person) (ICSID 25(2)(b)), agreement to treat as;  
 national of another contracting State (natural person) (ICSID 25(2)(a))  
 jurisprudence  
   *Ambiente Ufficio* 512, 525–6  
   *Poštová banka* 694  
 parallel proceedings in domestic courts, as matter for the merits (ICSID) 52  
 shareholder’s rights in respect of claims related to assets of local company (BITs  
 provisions) 694–5, 701–5
- State responsibility**  
 for conduct directed or controlled by the State (ILC(SR) 8)  
   “direct order or control” 761  
   *MNSS* 761  
   State-owned corporation 452  
 for conduct of State organ/entity (ILC(SR) 4)  
   central bank 452  
   judicial authorities (ILC(SR) 4(1)) 452  
 elements/requirements, breach of contract and treaty distinguished 374, 391–3, 394
- Switzerland–Uzbekistan BIT (1993) by article:** *see also Romak*  
 preamble (object and purpose: intensified economic cooperation) 260, 264  
 1(2) (“investment”) 262–78  
   text 262–3  
 1(2)(c) (“investment”: claims to money) 257–8, 263  
 1(2)(e) (investment: “in accordance with the law”) 258, 263

- 3(2) (MFN treatment) 259  
 11 (observance of commitments) 259

**Tanzania–UK BIT (1994) by article:** *see also Biwater Gauff; SCB*

- preamble 492, 499  
 cause-and-effect relationship 492, 499  
 “investments by” 492, 497–8  
 text 495  
 1(1) (“investment”: “every kind of asset”), text 495  
 2(1) (creation of favourable conditions for nationals to invest) 499  
 2(2) (fair and equitable treatment) 187, 188, 195–7  
 2(2) (full protection and security) 186, 188, 189, 198  
 2(2) (unreasonable or discriminatory measures) 187, 188, 197–8  
 5(1) (expropriation) 187, 188, 193–4  
 6 (unrestricted transfer of capital and returns) 187, 188, 198  
 8(1) (jurisdiction: “any legal dispute . . . concerning an investment of the [national or company] in the territory”) 494  
 text 495–6  
 11 (national/MFN treatment)  
 “investments by” 492, 497–8  
 text 497 n. 171

**territoriality (investment/expenditure in the territory)**

- overview  
 Schreuer 16–19  
 Waibel 60–2  
 absence of inclusion as element of ICSID 25 definition of investment 60  
 expenditure in host country necessary to perform obligations  
 as inherent in “contribution, duration and risk” formula 61–2, 262, 277–8  
 “territoriality” as express prerequisite, need for 62  
 “in the territory” (BIT/FTA provision) as basis for discussion of territorial link 61, 224,  
 418–19, 514, 545–8  
 determination of link by reference to types of investment covered 224  
 place of investment, criteria  
 ability to exercise sovereign rights, relevance 514, 547–8  
 financial investment distinguished 376, 405–6  
 forum selection clauses in contractual documents, relevance 374, 376, 406–7, 416–17  
 linkage to specific economic enterprise in host State, exclusion of need for 406, 417,  
 547  
 where and/or for the benefit of whom the funds are ultimately used 376, 405, 419, 450,  
 459–60, 545–7  
 rejection as an independent element 61–2  
*situs* of debt (sovereign bonds): *see* financial instruments, status as ICSID 25 investment,  
 sovereign bonds

**territoriality (investment/expenditure in the territory), jurisprudence**

- Abaclat* 60, 61, 405–7, 459, 546, 547  
*Abaclat* (dissenting) 60, 383–4, 460  
*Ambiente Ufficio* 61, 514, 545–8  
*Ambiente Ufficio* (dissenting) 518  
*Apotex* 61, 62, 666–72  
*Bayview* 61, 62, 171–3, 173–82, 667, 668

**territoriality (investment/expenditure in the territory), jurisprudence (cont.)**

- Cargill* 667–8
- CSOB* 546 n. 259
- Deutsche Bank* 60, 459–60
- Fedax* 61, 405, 420–1, 459–60, 546 n. 259
- Methanex* 178, 667, 668, 670–1
- Quasar de Valores* 60, 61, 224
- Romak* 61–2, 276–8
- SGS v. Pakistan* 405, 421, 459–60, 546 n. 259
- SGS v. Philippines* 405, 421, 546 n. 259

**territoriality (“investments of investors of another Party in the territory of the Party”)**

- (NAFTA 1101(1)(b)) 16 n. 90, 61, 172–3, 176–7, 658, 660, 665–72
- applicability to NAFTA 1102/NAFTA 1105 and NAFTA 1110, distinguishability 172
- “investment” (NAFTA 1139) 176–7
- “relating to”, need for a legally significant connection 667–72
- travaux préparatoires* 172

**time-limits**

- institution of claim (ICSID)
  - absence of provision for in Convention/AR 735
  - applicable law 735

**transparency (standard of treatment of alien) 196*****travaux préparatoires* as supplementary means of treaty interpretation (VCLT 32)**

- ICSID 25(1) (“investment”): *see* “investment” (ICSID 25), classification as, absence of an ICSID 25(1) definition, effect
- jurisprudence
  - HICEE* 319, 325–6, 335–46, 349–50
  - Malaysian Historical Salvors* 115–17, 145–51, 159
- NAFTA (“foreign investment”) requirement 172, 177
- supplementary nature/use, in case of ambiguity 115–16, 143, 318, 319, 334–5

**treaties, interpretation (general considerations)**

- aids
  - arbitral and judicial decisions 266, 267
  - other treaties concluded by the parties 431, 440
  - writings of publicists 266
- applicable law, VCLT (1969) 496–7

**treaties, interpretation (VCLT 31(1)) (general rule: good faith, ordinary meaning, context,**

- object and purpose) 696
- effectiveness (*ut res magis valeat quam pereat*) (*effet utile*) 696
- every element of treaty to be given effect 466–7

## jurisprudence

- Abaclat* 696–7
- CSOB* 121
- HICEE* 318–19, 324–5, 331–5, 346–54
- Malaysian Historical Salvors* 121–3
- Poštová banka* 696–7

literal approach/adherence to the terms of the treaty (including disadvantages) 260, 263–5

multiple ordinary meanings 318–19, 331–5

as an ambiguity justifying resort to supplementary means (VCLT 32) 318, 334–5

[natural and] ordinary meaning

dictionary definitions 532

as starting point 431, 440–1

- “investment”: *see* “investment” (ICSID 25), interpretation
  - singular/plural usage, significance 510
- object and purpose
  - “direct” 318–19, 324–5, 331–5, 346–54
  - preamble as evidence of 121, 431
  - ordinary meaning in context and taking account of object and purpose 264–6, 318–19, 331–5
  - restrictive/broad interpretation 696
- treaties, interpretation (VCLT 31(2))** (context)
  - similar terms in different treaties 467, 696–7
  - similar terms in same treaty 318, 330–1
- treaties, interpretation (VCLT 31(3))** (points to be taken into account together with context)
  - parties’ intention at time of conclusion (contemporaneity) vs intertemporal law (evolutionary/“living-tree” principle) (VCLT 31(3)) 35–9
  - statements and conduct of parties 179–80
  - subsequent agreement between the parties regarding the interpretation or application of the treaty (VCLT 31(3)(a)), conformity of bilateral interpretation with treaty under consideration 430–2
- treaties, interpretation (VCLT 31(4))** (special meaning of term by agreement of parties) 440, 532 n. 194
- treaties, interpretation (VCLT 32)** (supplementary means)
  - examples
    - Agreed Minutes of negotiations 320, 336
    - evidence from officials in office at time of negotiation 319–20, 336
    - explanatory notes by one of the parties 322, 325, 337–44, 355–63, 422
    - other treaties concluded by the same party 322, 344–5
  - manifestly unreasonable or absurd result as justification for resort to (VCLT 32(b)) 319, 334–5
  - as non-exhaustive list 319, 334–5
- treaties, interpretation (VCLT 33)** (multilingual treaties/treaties authenticated in two or more languages)
  - jurisprudence
    - Abaclat* (dissenting) 413, 414
    - Ambiente Ufficio* 514, 543–4
  - parties’ agreement to uniformity of meaning across the versions/use of a single [English] version 329–30
- Ukraine–US BIT (1994) by article:** *see also* *Global Trading*
  - I(1)(a) (“investment”), text 309
  - I(1)(a)(v) (“right conferred by law or contract . . . licences and permits pursuant to law”) 311
- umbrella clause**, entitlement under MFN clause 391, 394
- UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2013) by article**
  - 22 (amendment to claim or defence) 636
    - avoidance of prejudice to other parties 636
  - 29 (experts) 634–5
  - 32(2) (“award shall be final and binding on the parties”) 659, 681–2
  - 32(3) (“shall state the reasons”) 659, 681–2
- unilateral declaration, effect**, unilateral withdrawal of consent 625–9

**United States of America (USA)**

Restatement of the Law of Foreign Relations (Second), s 181 (customary international law) 663–4

treaties, judicial deference 657

**unity of the investment principle (jurisdiction) 3–20**

overview

advantages 24

definition 526–7

frequency of use 24

activity outside the host State

BIT/FTA references to the territory of the host State 16

jurisprudence

*Abaclat* (dissenting) 419–20

*Ambiente Ufficio* 17, 512, 513, 525–6, 547

*Ambiente Ufficio* (dissenting) 552–63

*BIVAC* 17

*Inmaris* 18

*SGS v. Paraguay* 18

*SGS v. Philippines* 17

unity of investment principle as substantiation of the nexus with the host State 17–18

ancillary or related services (including loan agreements) 8–10

automatic extension of jurisdiction to every implementing agreement, exclusion 10

different parties to different agreements 10

incidental activities, examples 10

jurisprudence

*Alpha Projektholding* 8

*CSOB* 9–10, 552, 556, 769–70

*Enron* 10, 552

*H&H Enterprises Investments* 10

*Holiday Inns* 8, 271–2, 771

*Mamidoil* 10

*MNSS* 8, 759, 770–1

*Niko Resources* 10

*Romak* 271–2

*SOABI* 10

*Tenaris* 8–9

*Tulip Real Estate* 8

consideration, need for and 55

extension of arbitration clauses to associated documents 11–12

*Cambodia Power* 11–12

*Duke Energy* 11

identification of an investment 3–8

illegality of an investment and 19–20

*Anderson* 19

*Blusun* 19

*Fraport* 19–20

*Inceysa* 19

*Mamidoil* 20

*Spentex* 19

*TSA* 19



- von Pezold* **19**
- Yukos* **19**
- multiple assets and activities **5–8**
  - jurisprudence
    - AIY* **5**
    - Ambiente Ufficio* **6**
    - Ambiente Ufficio* (dissenting) 552–63
    - Electrabel* **5**
    - Gavazzi* **76, 748**
    - GEA* **5**
    - ICS* **6**
    - Joy Mining* **6–7**
    - Mitchell* **7–8**
    - Oko Pankki Oyj* **5–6**
    - Saipem* **5, 75–6**
    - Unión Fenosa Gas* **6**
    - White Industries* **5**
  - lip-service **6–8, 24**
  - qualification of individual assets as an investment, relevance **6**
- multiple instruments **4–5**
  - ADC* **4**
  - Arif* **5**
  - İçkale* **4**
  - Inmaris Perestroika* **5**
  - Mytilineos* **4**
- post-investment activity, qualification as part of the investment **14–16**
  - ATA* **15**
  - Chevron and Texaco* **14–15**
- pre-investment activity, qualification as part of the investment **12–14**
  - ACP Axos* **12**
  - AD* **12**
  - Arif* **13–14**
  - Bear Creek* **14**
  - Blusun* **13**
  - Bosca* **12**
  - CC/Devas* **12**
  - F-W Oil* **12**
  - Generation Ukraine* **12**
  - Lemire* **13**
  - Malicorp* **12**
  - Mihaly* **12**
  - Nagel* **12**
  - Nordzucker* **13**
  - PSEG* **12**
  - RSM* **13**
  - Zhinvali* **12**
- temporal dimension of an investment and **12–16**
- unity of the investment principle (merits) 20–4**
  - domestic Award qualifying as a covered investment as part of the overall investment 748
  - expropriation/possibility of partial expropriation **20–3**

**unity of the investment principle (merits) (cont.)***Burlington* 21*Cargill* 23*Electrabel* 21*EnCana* 23*Eureko* 22*Feldman* 22*GAMI* 23*Grand River* 22*Merrill* 22, 212*Middle East Cement* 22*Philip Morris* 21*Telenor* 21*Waste Management* 22

fair and equitable treatment 23

independence of decision on jurisdiction, *Duke Energy* 11

quantum of damages 23–4

*Khan Resources* 23–4**US–Zaire BIT (1984) by article**

I(c) (“investment”) 88–9

III (expropriation) 88, 90, 95

**VCLT (1969)**, as customary international law 142–3, 260, 331**waiver of right to initiate ICSID [AF] proceedings**

contractual waiver, limitation to identified scope 757

explicit waiver 756–7

**waiver of treaty rights, requirements**

agreement freely given 756

compatibility with public interest 756

express waiver 756

**written consent to arbitration:** *see* consent to ICSID jurisdiction, written consent, need for