

INDEX

Pages from the commentaries by Meg Kinnear and Jorge E. Viñuales are indicated by *italics*.

- AAPL v. Sri Lanka* (ICSID), 78, 521
Abaclat v. Argentina (ICSID), 233
acta jure imperii and *gestionis*. *See* sovereign and commercial acts distinction
Almås v. Poland (PCA)
 on attribution. *See Almås v. Poland* (PCA), on attribution
 digest, 294
 on jurisdiction, 300–1
 on *puissance publique*, absence of, 304
 summary, 295–300
Almås v. Poland (PCA), on attribution
 commentary, 9, 48–9, 53, 71–2
 exercise of governmental functions (ILC Articles, Article 5), 301–3, 308–10
 termination of lease, whether authorised, 310–19
 termination of lease, whether exercise of unlawful authority, 319–24
 instructions of the State (ILC Articles, Article 8), 303–4, 324–5
Ortiz v. Algeria (ICSID) citing, 575, 585
 State organ status (ILC Articles, Article 4), 301–4, 306–8
Unión Fenosa v. Egypt (ICSID) citing, 561, 563–4
Ambatielos case (ICJ), 38
Ambiente v. Argentina (ICSID), 228
Ampal-American Israel Corp. v. Egypt (ICSID)
 on attribution. *See Ampal-American Israel Corp. v. Egypt* (ICSID), on attribution
 decision on heads of loss, 423
 decision on jurisdiction, 411–16
 decision on liability for specific conduct, 419–23
 digest, 406–7
Strabag SE v. Libya (ICSID) citing, 625
 summary, 408–10
Ampal-American Israel Corp. v. Egypt (ICSID), on attribution
 breach of contract and attribution, 20, 23, 83
 claimants' position, 426–33
de facto State organs, 48
 failure to act, 77
Ortiz v. Algeria (ICSID) citing, 587
 relevance of attribution, 423–6
 summary, 417–19
 tribunal's analysis, 435–8
Unión Fenosa v. Egypt (ICSID) citing, 565, 567
Amtó v. Ukraine (SCC), 211
 Articles on the Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts. *See* ILC Articles
 on State Responsibility

Asian Agricultural Products Ltd (AAPL) v. Sri Lanka (ICSID), 78, 521

attribution

BIT provisions on, 11–12

determinations of, 4

domestic law governing, 19–20, 22–6, 80–1

to European Union and other regional economic integration organisations, 11, 68

five questions, 16–19

five recurrent problems, 18–19, 69–70

contractual matters. *See* contractual matters and attribution

failure to act cases, 59–60, 77–80

official capacity vs private acts. *See* official capacity and private acts distinction

sovereign vs commercial acts. *See* sovereign and commercial acts distinction

ultra vires acts. *See* *ultra vires* acts

ILC Articles. *See* ILC Articles on State Responsibility

international law governing. *See* international law on attribution

procedural phase when addressed,

determinations of, 35–7

prima facie tests, 37–40

Azinian v. Mexico (ICSID), 538–9

Bayindir Insaat Turizm Ticaret Ve Sanayi AS v. Pakistan (ICSID)

Almås v. Poland (PCA) citing, 306

on attribution. *See* *Bayindir Insaat Turizm Ticaret Ve Sanayi AS v. Pakistan* (ICSID), on attribution

on costs, 111

decision on jurisdiction, 104–7

on expropriation, 111

on fair and equitable treatment, 108–10

on national treatment and MFN, 110–11

on treaty claim, 108

Saint-Gobain v. Venezuela (ICSID) citing, 383

summary, 102–4

Tulip Real Estate v. Turkey (ICSID) citing, 232

Bayindir Insaat Turizm Ticaret Ve Sanayi AS v. Pakistan (ICSID), on attribution

extract from award, 112–17

failure to act claim, 77

ILC Articles, Article 8 interpretation, 31–2, 58–9, 62, 71, 86

ISDS application, 16–17, 26

sovereign and commercial acts distinction, 70–1

State interference with third-party contract, 85–6

summary, 107–8

Beijing Urban Construction Group Co. Ltd v. Yemen (ICSID)

commentary on, 30–1, 72

decision on jurisdiction, 442–7

digest, 439

summary, 440–2

bilateral investment treaties (BITs)

expropriation claims under. *See* expropriation

FET standard. *See* fair and equitable treatment (FET)

full protection and security clauses, 78, 235, 376, 625–6

- national and MFN treatment. *See* most-favoured-nation (MFN) treatment; national treatment
- State responsibility provisions, 11–12
- umbrella clauses. *See* umbrella clauses, implications for attribution
- Bosh v. Ukraine* (ICSID), 84–5, 258, 344, 347, 358–9
- Bosnian Genocide* case (ICJ)
 - Ampal v. Egypt* (ICSID) citing, 433
 - on attribution generally, 34, 58, 87
 - on *de facto* State organs, 44–7, 48, 186
 - on effective control test, 32, 55–6, 605–6
 - Ortiz v. Algeria* (ICSID) citing, 583–4, 605–6
 - Unión Fenosa v. Egypt* (ICSID) citing, 561
- breach of contract and attribution, 19–20, 23–4, 53
- Broches test, 30–1, 72, 440–3, 447
- burden of proof
 - attribution and burden allocation, 39–40, 55–6
 - failure to act cases, 77–80
 - Tethyan Copper v. Pakistan* (ICSID) on, 472–3
 - UNCITRAL Article 24(1) on, 273
- CC/Devas (Mauritius) Ltd v. India* (PCA), 25–6
- Cengiz v. Libya* (ICC), 69
- Československá Obchodní Banka v. Slovak Republic* (ICSID), 347, 442, 449
- coherence of ISDS jurisprudence, 8–11
- commercial vs sovereign acts. *See* sovereign and commercial acts distinction
- Consortium RFCC v. Morocco* (ICSID), 33, 35
- “conspiracy” definition, 109
- Consutel Group SpA v. Algeria* (PCA), 34–5
- contractual matters and attribution
 - breach of contract, 19–20, 23–4, 53
 - State interference with third-party contracts, 24–6, 80–6
 - termination of contracts, 53, 70–1
 - Tethyan Copper v. Pakistan* (ICSID) on, 501
 - umbrella clause. *See* umbrella clauses, implications for attribution
- corruption, 75, 523–4. *See also* *ultra vires* acts
- customary international law on attribution, 5, 49. *See also* ILC Articles on State Responsibility
- de facto* State organs, 44–9, 54–5
- Desert Line Projects LLC v. Yemen* (ICSID), 443, 451–2
- Deutsche Bank v. Sri Lanka* (ICSID), 47, 340
- Devas v. India* (PCA), 25–6
- discriminatory or unreasonable measures, 130
- “dispute” definition, 259
- domestic law
 - attribution governed by, 19–20, 22–6, 80–1
 - State organs identified by, 42–4
- Draft Articles on State Responsibility (ILC). *See* ILC Articles on State Responsibility
- duty to give reasons, 255–6

EDF v. Romania (ICSID)

Almås v. Poland (PCA) citing, 306–7

on attribution. *See* *EDF v. Romania* (ICSID), on attribution

on costs (and dissenting opinion), 131–2

digest, 118–19

on expropriation, 130–1

on fair and equitable treatment, 126–30

Procedural Order No. 2, 122

Procedural Order No. 3, 123

Procedural Order No. 4, 123–4

summary, 119–22

Tulip Real Estate v. Turkey (ICSID) citing, 230, 243

on unreasonable or discriminatory measures, 130

EDF v. Romania (ICSID), on attribution

commentary, 24, 57, 61, 82–3, 84

extract from award, 132–40

summary, 124–6

umbrella clause, 131

effective control test. *See also* ILC Articles on State Responsibility, Article 8

Bosnian Genocide case (ICJ) on, 32, 55–6, 605–6

“control” element, 55–60

“effective” element, 60–3

generally, 32, 55

Electrabel SA v. Hungary (ICSID), 11, 67–9, 605

equality of arms, 253–5

Eureko BV v. Poland (UNCITRAL), 43, 174, 193–4

European Court of Human Rights

on attribution of failures to act, 79

on fair trial rights, 253, 255

jurisdiction of, 21–2, 30

European Union, attribution to, 11, 68

expropriation

Bayindir v. Pakistan (ICSID) on, 111

EDF v. Romania (ICSID) on, 130–1

Flemingo v. Poland (PCA) on, 334–5

Gavrilović v. Croatia (ICSID) on, 526

Hamester v. Ghana (ICSID) on, 179–80, 214–19

Kardassopoulos v. Georgia (ICSID) on, 154–5

Saint-Gobain v. Venezuela (ICSID) on, 372–5, 384–96

termination of contracts as, 23, 70–1

Tethyan Copper v. Pakistan (ICSID) on, 493–4

Tulip Real Estate v. Turkey (ICSID) on, 234–5

failure to act, 59–60, 77–80

fair and equitable treatment (FET)

Bayindir v. Pakistan (ICSID) on, 108–10

EDF v. Romania (ICSID) on, 126–30

Flemingo v. Poland (PCA) on, 334

Gavrilović v. Croatia (ICSID) on, 526–7

Kardassopoulos v. Georgia (ICSID) on, 155

- Ortiz v. Algeria* (ICSID) on, 576–8
Saint-Gobain v. Venezuela (ICSID) on, 375
Tethyan Copper v. Pakistan (ICSID) on, 485–6
Tulip Real Estate v. Turkey (ICSID) on, 233–4
Unión Fenosa v. Egypt (ICSID) on, 554–6, 558–9
Flemingo DutyFree v. Poland (PCA)
 on attribution. *See Flemingo DutyFree v. Poland* (PCA), on attribution
 on costs, 337
 digest, 326–7
 on expropriation, 334–5
 on fair and equitable treatment, 334
 on jurisdiction, 330–2
 remedies, 335–7
 summary, 327–30
Flemingo DutyFree v. Poland (PCA), on attribution
 adverse inferences from non-disclosure, 333, 347–53
 exercise of governmental functions (ILC Articles, Article 5), 333, 343–7, 357–9
 State organ status (ILC Articles, Article 4), 332–3, 338–43, 354–7
 summary, 47–8, 332–3, 337–8
 tribunal’s general approach, 353–4
Foremost Tehran v. Iran (Iran–US Claims Tribunal), 139
 full protection and security clauses, 78, 79–80, 235, 376, 625–6
F-W Oil Interests v. Trinidad and Tobago (ICSID), 70, 72–3, 594–5

Gavrilović v. Croatia (ICSID)
 admissibility, 521–2
 on applicable law, 522
 on attribution. *See Gavrilović v. Croatia* (ICSID), on attribution
 on costs, 528
 decision on bifurcation, 518–19
 decision on claimants’ request for provisional measures, 519–20
 decision on claimants’ urgent application for provisional measures, 519
 decision on respondent’s scheduling request, 520
 digest, 512–13
 on exhaustion of domestic remedies, 525
 on expropriation, 526
 on fair and equitable treatment, 526–7
 on jurisdiction, 520–1
 on national treatment, 527–8
 on purchase agreement enforceability, 522, 525
 on quantum, 528
 summary, 514–18
 on umbrella clause, 527
Gavrilović v. Croatia (ICSID), on attribution
 acts of Bankruptcy Council, Court or judge, 534–9
 acts of bankruptcy liquidator, 529–34
 acts of Croatian Fund, 539–41
 acts of holding company, 541–4
 effective control test, 61
 international rules of attribution, 20–1, 22–3

- Gavrilović v. Croatia* (ICSID), on attribution (cont.)
Ortiz v. Algeria (ICSID) citing, 606
 purpose of attribution findings, 528–9
 State organs, 43–4
 summary, 522–5
ultra vires acts, 74–5, 76
 umbrella clause, 83, 85
 “governmental authority” definition, 51–3, 72–3, 74
 governmental vs commercial acts. *See* sovereign and commercial acts distinction
Gustav F W Hamester GbmH & Co KG v. Ghana. *See* *Hamester v. Ghana* (ICSID)
- Hamester v. Ghana* (ICSID)
 on attribution. *See* *Hamester v. Ghana* (ICSID), on attribution
 on costs, 183
 digest, 164–5
 on fraudulent investment, 170–1
Gavrilović v. Croatia (ICSID) citing, 525
 on international legality of acts attributed to State, 180–1, 219
 on international legality of acts not attributed to State, 181–2
 summary, 165–70
- Hamester v. Ghana* (ICSID), on attribution
Almås v. Poland (PCA) citing, 307–9
 attribution generally, 9, 36, 39–40
 claimant’s position, 185–8, 199, 211–12, 214
 effective control test, 57, 59
 GCB/Cocobod’s status, 174–5, 192–8, 309
 jurisdiction to consider attribution, 171–2, 183–5
Mesa Power v. Canada (PCA) citing, 284–5
Ortiz v. Algeria (ICSID) citing, 594
 respondent’s position, 188–9, 199–200, 212–13, 215–16
 sovereign and commercial acts distinction, 52–3
 specific claims, 198
 2001 Price Agreement, 175–8, 199–211
 expropriation of claimant’s rights of management, 179–80, 214–19
 non-delivery of cocoa beans, 178–9, 211–14
 State organs, 43
 tribunal’s general approach, 172–4, 189–92
Tulip Real Estate v. Turkey (ICSID) citing, 228, 241–2, 257–8
 Harvard Articles (Draft Convention on State Responsibility), 483, 499, 503
- ICS Inspection v. Argentina* (PCA), 445
- ICSID Arbitration Rules (2006)
 Rule 26, time limits, 470–1
 Rule 34, evidence, general principles, 123, 255
 Rule 38(2), reopening of proceedings, 124
 Rule 39, provisional measures, 122, 466
 Rule 40(1), counterclaims, 495–6
 Rule 41, preliminary objections, 470
 transparency provisions, 10
- ICSID Convention 1965
 Article 14, arbitrator selection, 369

- Article 25. *See* jurisdiction of ICSID
- Article 36, request for arbitration, 228
- Article 46, counterclaims, 495–6
- Article 47, provisional measures, 122, 466
- Article 48(3), duty to give reasons, 255
- Article 52, grounds for annulment, 237–8
- Article 57, arbitrator disqualification, 369
- New York Convention, potential conflict with, 106
- ILC Articles on State Responsibility
 - adoption of, 3–4
 - Article 2 (elements of an internationally wrongful act of a State), 173, 190, 259–60
 - Article 3 (characterisation of act of State as internationally wrongful), 356–7
 - Article 4. *See* ILC Articles on State Responsibility, Article 4
 - Article 5. *See* ILC Articles on State Responsibility, Article 5
 - Article 6 (conduct of organs placed at a State's disposal by another State), 67–9, 72
 - Article 7. *See* ILC Articles on State Responsibility, Article 7
 - Article 8. *See* ILC Articles on State Responsibility, Article 8
 - Article 10 (conduct of insurrectional or other movements), 63, 69
 - Article 11. *See* ILC Articles on State Responsibility, Article 11
 - Article 25 (necessity), 556
 - Article 31 (reparation), 335
- ISDS cases applying, 4–5, 26, 31–4
 - coherence of decisions, 8–11, 14–15, 86–7
 - critiques of decisions, 6–8
 - future directions, 11–12
 - scope of application, 16, 19–20
 - summary of, 6, 40–1
- ILC Articles on State Responsibility, Article 4 (conduct of State organs)
 - Almås v. Poland* (PCA) on, 301–4, 306–8
 - Ampal v. Egypt* (ICSID) on, 426, 428–9, 432–3
 - Bayindir v. Pakistan* (ICSID) on, 107, 114–15
 - commentary on, 41–9, 55, 62, 74
 - EDF v. Romania* (ICSID) on, 124, 133–4
 - Flemingo v. Poland* (PCA) on, 332–3, 338–43, 354–7
 - Gavrilović v. Croatia* (ICSID) on, 523–4, 535–9
 - Hamester v. Ghana* (ICSID) on, 173–4, 190, 192–4
 - Mesa Power v. Canada* (PCA) on, 276, 285–7
 - Ortiz v. Algeria* (ICSID) on, 575, 581–92
 - Tethyan Copper v. Pakistan* (ICSID) on, 483–4, 497–500, 502, 504–5
 - Tulip Real Estate v. Turkey* (ICSID) on, 229–30, 242–4
 - Unión Fenosa v. Egypt* (ICSID) on, 554, 560–6
- ILC Articles on State Responsibility, Article 5 (conduct of State instrumentalities)
 - Almås v. Poland* (PCA) on, 301–3, 308–10
 - termination of lease, whether authorised, 310–19
 - termination of lease, whether exercise of unlawful authority, 319–24
 - Ampal v. Egypt* (ICSID) on, 426–7, 429–30, 432–4
 - Bayindir v. Pakistan* (ICSID) on, 107, 115
 - Broches* test and, 448
 - commentary on, 49–54, 55, 71, 74
 - EDF v. Romania* (ICSID) on, 124–5, 134–6
 - Flemingo v. Poland* (PCA) on, 333, 343–7, 357–9

- ILC Articles on State Responsibility, Article 5 (conduct of State instrumentalities) (cont.)
Gavrilović v. Croatia (ICSID) on, 524, 540
Hamester v. Ghana (ICSID) on, 173–5, 178, 190–1, 194–8, 211, 309
Mesa Power v. Canada (PCA) on, 276–7, 287–93
Ortiz v. Algeria (ICSID) on, 575–6, 592–603
Saint-Gobain v. Venezuela (ICSID) on, 374, 388–9
Tethyan Copper v. Pakistan (ICSID) on, 484–5, 500, 502, 505–11
Tulip Real Estate v. Turkey (ICSID) on, 230, 244–5
Unión Fenosa v. Egypt (ICSID) on, 554, 566
- ILC Articles on State Responsibility, Article 7 (excess of authority or contravention of instructions). See also *ultra vires* acts
 commentary on, 54, 65, 75–6
Kardassopoulos v. Georgia (ICSID) on, 160
Ortiz v. Algeria (ICSID) on, 606
Tethyan Copper v. Pakistan (ICSID) on, 484, 498, 505
- ILC Articles on State Responsibility, Article 8 (conduct directed or controlled by a State)
Almás v. Poland (PCA) on, 303–4, 324–5
Ampal v. Egypt (ICSID) on, 418, 427, 430–2, 434
Bayindir v. Pakistan (ICSID) on, 107–8, 115–17
Broches test and, 448
 commentary on, 31–2, 54–63, 71, 86
EDF v. Romania (ICSID) on, 125–6, 136
Gavrilović v. Croatia (ICSID) on, 524–5, 543–4
Hamester v. Ghana (ICSID) on, 173–4, 178–9, 197–8, 211
Ortiz v. Algeria (ICSID) on, 576, 603–10
Saint-Gobain v. Venezuela (ICSID) on, 373–4, 385–6
Tulip Real Estate v. Turkey (ICSID) on, 230–2, 236–7, 245–9, 250–2, 261–2, 264–6
Unión Fenosa v. Egypt (ICSID) on, 554, 566–7
- ILC Articles on State Responsibility, Article 11 (conduct acknowledged and adopted by a State)
 acknowledged and adopted conduct, 58–9, 63–7
Ampal v. Egypt (ICSID) on, 418–19, 427–8, 431–2, 434
 commentary on, 58–9, 63–7
Saint-Gobain v. Venezuela (ICSID) on, 374–5, 389–92
Unión Fenosa v. Egypt (ICSID) on, 567–8
- immunities, 70
Impregilo v. Pakistan (ICSID)
 attribution determinations at jurisdiction phase, 38–9
Bayindir v. Pakistan (ICSID) citing, 106
Hamester v. Ghana (ICSID) citing, 182
Tethyan Copper v. Pakistan (ICSID) citing, 501
Tulip Real Estate v. Turkey (ICSID) citing, 232
- inaction, 59–60, 77–80
 India Model BIT, 11–12
 instrumentalities. See State instrumentalities
 International Bar Association Rules on the Taking of Evidence in International Arbitration 2010, 348–9
 international law on attribution
 customary international law, 5, 41, 49

- generally, 20
- ILC Articles. *See* ILC Articles on State Responsibility
- international law for non-State responsibility purposes, 20–2
- special treaty-based rules, 27–31
- InterTrade v. Czech Republic* (PCA), 29–30
- ISDS jurisprudence, coherence of, 8–11
- Jan de Nul NV v. Egypt* (ICSID)
 - Almås v. Poland* (PCA) citing, 301–4, 307–9, 324
 - on attribution determinations at jurisdiction phase, 35, 38, 184
 - Hamester v. Ghana* (ICSID) citing, 184, 186, 188
 - Mesa Power v. Canada* (PCA) citing, 284, 291
 - Ortiz v. Algeria* (ICSID) citing, 594, 606
 - on *puissance publique* acts, 198, 291, 594
 - Unión Fenosa v. Egypt* (ICSID) citing, 564–5
- judicial decisions, State responsibility for, 523–4, 537–9
- jurisdiction
 - attribution and jurisdiction rules, interaction of, 21–2, 30–1, 258–9
 - attribution determinations at jurisdiction phase, 34–7
 - Beijing Urban Construction v. Yemen* (ICSID), 30–1, 72, 442–7
 - prima facie* tests, 37–40
 - umbrella clause application. *See* umbrella clauses, implications for attribution
 - to consider attribution, 171–2, 183–5
- jurisdiction of ICSID (ICSID Convention Article 25)
 - and attribution rules, 21–2, 30–1, 258–9
 - Broches* test, 30–1, 72, 440–3, 447
 - requirements of Article 25, 183, 228, 370–1, 480
 - Salini* test. *See* *Salini v. Morocco* (ICSID) (and *Salini* test)
- jurisprudence constante* doctrine, 9–10
- Kardassopoulos v. Georgia* (ICSID)
 - on attribution. *See* *Kardassopoulos v. Georgia* (ICSID), on attribution
 - on causation, 155
 - on costs, 157
 - decision on jurisdiction and liability, 149–52
 - decision to suspend annulment proceedings, 157
 - digest, 141–2
 - on expropriation, 154–5
 - on fair and equitable treatment, 155
 - Flemingo DutyFree v. Poland* (PCA) citing, 339–40, 342
 - on jurisdiction and equitable prescription, 153
 - on preliminary matters, 152–3
 - on quantum and interest, 155–7
 - on scope of GTI joint venture’s rights, 154
 - summary, 144–9
- Kardassopoulos v. Georgia* (ICSID), on attribution
 - commentary, 32–3, 76
 - extract from award, 158–63
 - summary, 153–4

- Khan Resources Inc. v. Mongolia* (PCA), 24–5
Kotov v. Russia (ECTHR), 532–3
- La Générale des Carrières et des Mines v. F.G. Hemisphere Associates LLC (Jersey)* (UKPC), 343
lex specialis principle and attribution, 27–31, 276–8, 287–91
Lighthouses arbitration (France and Greece), 66–7
- Maffezini v. Spain* (ICSID)
Almàs v. Poland (PCA) citing, 307–9
Beijing Urban Construction v. Yemen (ICSID) citing, 450
Flemingo v. Poland (PCA) citing, 343, 347, 354–5
 generally, 33
Hamester v. Ghana (ICSID) citing, 188–9, 196–7
 jurisdiction and attribution, interaction of, 36–7, 39–40
 “State entities”, tests to identify, 33, 47–8, 158–9
Tulip Real Estate v. Turkey (ICSID) citing, 229–30, 243
- Maritime International Nominees Establishment v. Guinea* (ICSID), 239
 Mauritius Convention on Transparency 2014, 11
Mavrommatis Palestine Concessions case (PCIJ), 38, 259
- Mesa Power v. Canada* (PCA)
 on applicable law, 273
 on attribution. *See Mesa Power v. Canada* (PCA), on attribution
 on costs, 281
 digest, 267–8
 headnote, 272–3
 on jurisdiction, 274–6
 memorandum opinion upholding, 282–3
 on minimum standard of treatment, 279–82
 on procurement exception of NAFTA Article 1108, 278–9, 282–3
 on submission of claim under NAFTA, 273–4
 summary, 269–72
- Mesa Power v. Canada* (PCA), on attribution
 commentary, 27–9, 37
 extract from award, 284–93
 summary, 276–8
- most-favoured-nation (MFN) treatment. *See also* national treatment
Bayindir v. Pakistan (ICSID) on, 110–11
Beijing Urban Construction v. Yemen (ICSID) on, 445
- NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement 1992)
 Article 201, “State enterprise” definition, 277, 288–9
 Article 1105, minimum standard of treatment, 279–82
 Article 1108, procurement exception, 278–9, 282–3
 Article 1131, governing law, 273
 Article 1503(2), special rule of attribution, 27–9, 276–8, 287–91
 submission of claims under, 273–6
- national treatment. *See also* most-favoured-nation (MFN) treatment
Bayindir v. Pakistan (ICSID) on, 110–11
Gavrilović v. Croatia (ICSID) on, 527–8

- Nicaragua* case (ICJ), 32, 45, 186, 433, 567
Noble Ventures v. Romania (ICSID), 187, 502, 524, 539, 541
Nykomb Synergetics Technology Holding AB v. Latvia (SCC), 33, 187, 583
- official capacity and private acts distinction. See also *ultra vires* acts
 corrupt acts in official capacity, 74–5, 523–4
 effective control test and, 60, 62
 generally, 18, 73–5
 sovereign and commercial acts distinction and, 42
- Oil Platforms* case (ICJ), 37–8
 omissions, 59–60, 77–80
Oostergetel v. Slovakia (UNCITRAL), 532
Ortiz Construcciones y Proyectos SA v. Algeria (ICSID)
 on attribution. See *Ortiz Construcciones y Proyectos SA v. Algeria* (ICSID), on attribution
 digest, 571–2
 summary, 572–8
- Ortiz Construcciones y Proyectos SA v. Algeria* (ICSID), on attribution
 claimant’s position, 578–81
 delegated authority, 51–2, 61–2
 exercise of governmental functions (ILC Articles, Article 5), 575–6, 592–603
 ILC Articles, Article 8, 62–3, 76–7
 instructions of the State (ILC Articles, Article 8), 576, 603–10
 international rules of attribution, 33–4
 State organ status (ILC Articles, Article 4), 575, 581–92
 summary, 575–6, 610
- Osman v. United Kingdom* (ECtHR), 79
- Pantehniki SA v. Albania* (ICSID), 79
Pey Casado v. Chile (ICSID), 238
Plama v. Bulgaria (ICSID), 532
- private acts
 official capacity acts distinguished. See official capacity and private acts distinction
ultra vires acts distinguished, 74, 76
- puissance publique* acts. See also sovereign and commercial acts distinction
Almås v. Poland (PCA) on, 304
Ampal v. Egypt (ICSID) on, 433
Bayindir v. Pakistan (ICSID) on, 106
Hamester v. Ghana (ICSID) on, 175, 177, 179, 195–6, 198, 209, 211
Jan de Nul NV v. Egypt (ICSID) on, 198, 291, 594
Strabag SE v. Libya (ICSID) on, 620, 632–3
Tulip Real Estate v. Turkey (ICSID) on, 232, 244–5
- Regional Economic Integration Organizations (REIOs), 11
RFCC v. Morocco (ICSID), 33, 35
 right to be heard, 253–5
Ruiz Torija v. Spain (ECHR), 255
- Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Europe v. Venezuela* (ICSID)
 concurring and dissenting opinion of Judge Brower, 379–80

- Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Europe v. Venezuela* (ICSID) (cont.)
 decision on claimant's proposal to disqualify arbitrator, 369–70
 decision on liability and the principles of quantum. *See Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Europe v. Venezuela* (ICSID), decision on liability and the principles of quantum
 digest, 360–2
 Procedural Order No. 2, 381–2
 summary, 65, 363–8
- Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Europe v. Venezuela* (ICSID), decision on liability and the principles of quantum
 admissibility, 371–2, 382–4
 attribution, 373–5, 385–6, 388–92, 396–405
 damages, criteria for calculation, 376–7, 377–9
 expropriation, 372–5, 384–96
 fair and equitable treatment, 375
 full protection and security, 376
 headnote, 370
 interest award, 379
 jurisdiction, 370–1
- Salini v. Morocco* (ICSID) (and *Salini* test). *See also* jurisdiction
Almås v. Poland (PCA) on, 308
Bayindir v. Pakistan (ICSID) on, 105
Beijing Urban Construction v. Yemen (ICSID) on, 446
Strabag SE v. Libya (ICSID) on, 617–18
Tulip Real Estate v. Turkey (ICSID) on, 229–30, 243
- Saluka v. Czech Republic* (UNCITRAL), 233
Sanum Investments v. Laos (Sing. CA), 444
SGS v. Pakistan (ICSID), 619, 630–1
SGS v. Paraguay (ICSID), 521–2
SGS v. Philippines (ICSID), 619–20, 631
Southern Pacific Properties v. Egypt (ICSID), 151, 160–1
- sovereign and commercial acts distinction
 generally, 43, 52, 70–3
 “governmental authority” definition, 51–3, 72–3, 74
 ILC Articles, Article 11, no attribution under, 66
 official capacity and private acts distinction and, 42
puissance publique acts. *See puissance publique* acts
- Standard Chartered Bank v. Tanzania* (ICSID), 331–2
- State instrumentalities. *See also* ILC Articles on State Responsibility, Article 5
 qualifying entities, 51–3
 State organs distinguished, 50
ultra vires acts of. *See ultra vires* acts
- State organs. *See also* ILC Articles on State Responsibility, Article 4
de facto organs, 44–9, 53–4, 55
 generally, 42–4
 State instrumentalities distinguished, 50
ultra vires acts of. *See ultra vires* acts
- State responsibility. *See* attribution; ILC Articles on State Responsibility
 State succession and attribution, 63–4
Strabag SE v. Libya (ICSID)

- commentary, 77, 79, 84
- on compensation for conflict-related losses, 623–5
- on costs, 629
- digest, 611–12
- on full protection and security, 625–6
- headnote, 616–17
- on jurisdiction *ratione materiae*, 617–18
- on jurisdiction *ratione personae*, 618–19
- on jurisdiction *ratione voluntatis*, 623
- partial dissenting opinion, 630
- on standing to bring shareholder claims, 618–21
- summary, 613–16
- on umbrella clause, 626–9
- on umbrella clause and attribution, 619–23, 638
- sub-national entities, 41–2

- Tecmed v. Mexico* (ICSID), 233
- Tehran Hostages* case (ICJ), 59–60, 66–7, 77–80
- Teinver SA v. Argentina* (ICSID), 35–6, 40
- termination of contracts and attribution, 53, 70–1
- Tethyan Copper Co. Pty Ltd v. Pakistan* (ICSID)
 - on attribution. *See Tethyan Copper Co. Pty Ltd v. Pakistan* (ICSID), on attribution
 - on costs, 497
 - counterclaims, 495–7
 - decision on respondent’s application to dismiss claims, 469–80
 - digest, 453–4
 - on expropriation, 493–4
 - on fair and equitable treatment, 485–6
 - headnote, 480
 - on legitimate expectations
 - alleged breaches, 488–93
 - existence and content, 486–8
 - on non-impairment of investment, 494–5
 - on objections to admissibility, 482
 - on objections to jurisdiction, 480–2
 - summary, 455–69
- Tethyan Copper Co. Pty Ltd v. Pakistan* (ICSID), on attribution
 - claimant’s position, 497–500
 - commentary, 41–2, 43, 76
 - exercise of governmental functions (ILC Articles, Article 5), 484–5, 500, 502, 505–11
 - respondent’s position, 500–3
 - State organ status (ILC Articles, Article 4), 483–4, 497–500, 502, 504–5
- Toto v. Lebanon* (ICSID), 446, 637–8
- transparency of ISDS, 10–11
- treaty-based rules of attribution, 27–31
- Tulip Real Estate v. Turkey* (ICSID)
 - annulment decision, 237–40
 - on attribution. *See Tulip Real Estate v. Turkey* (ICSID), on attribution
 - costs, 236
 - decision on annulment, 252–66

Tulip Real Estate v. Turkey (ICSID) (cont.)

- digest, 220–1
- on expropriation, 234–5
- on fair and equitable treatment, 233–4
- on full protection and security, 235
- on jurisdiction and admissibility, 227–8
- on promotion and protection of investments, 236
- summary, 222–6
- on treaty vs contract claims, 232–3
- on umbrella clause, 235–6

Tulip Real Estate v. Turkey (ICSID), on attribution

- commentary, 37, 40, 51, 56, 61
- extract from award, 241–9
- separate opinion, 236–7, 250–66
- summary, 228–32

Tza v. Peru (ICSID), 444

ultra vires acts. *See also* ILC Articles on State Responsibility, Article 7; official capacity and private acts distinction

- conduct acknowledged and adopted by State, 66
- corrupt acts, whether *ultra vires*, 74–5, 523–4
- generally, 42, 75–7
- ILC Articles, Article 11, no attribution under, 76
- ILC Articles, Article 8, no attribution under, 62–3, 76–7
- “private” acts distinguished, 74, 76

Ulysseas v. Ecuador (UNCITRAL), 258, 562

umbrella clauses, implications for attribution

- EDF v. Romania* (ICSID) on, 131
- generally, 24, 81–3, 84–5, 86
- Hamester v. Ghana* (ICSID) on, 182
- Strabag SE v. Libya* (ICSID) on, 619–23, 638
- Tulip Real Estate v. Turkey* (ICSID) on, 235–6

UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules

- Article 24(1), burden of proof, 273
- Article 40, costs, 337

UNCITRAL Rules on Transparency, 10–11

Unión Fenosa v. Egypt (ICSID)

- on attribution. *See Unión Fenosa v. Egypt* (ICSID), on attribution
- on compensation, 556–7
- on corruption allegations, 553
- digest, 546–7
- dissenting opinion, 558–9
- on fair and equitable treatment, 554–6
- headnote, 551–2
- on improper claim-splitting allegation, 552
- on jurisdiction, 552
- on necessity defence, 556
- Ortiz v. Algeria* (ICSID) citing, 586
- summary, 548–51

INDEX

653

- Unión Fenosa v. Egypt* (ICSID), on attribution
commentary, 43, 51, 83–4
extract from award, 560–70
summary, 554
unreasonable or discriminatory measures, 130
UPS v. Canada (ICSID), 175, 195–6
- Vigotop Ltd v. Hungary* (ICSID), 71, 302–3, 319–24
Vivendi v. Argentina (ICSID), 108, 156, 232, 498, 501
- Wena Hotels v. Egypt* (ICSID), 77, 78–9, 80, 113, 235
White Industries v. India (UNCITRAL), 303–4, 324
Wintershall v. Qatar (*ad hoc*), 565–6
- Yeager v. Iran* (IUSCT), 523, 536