

CONTENTS

<i>Foreword by Michael Wood</i>	<i>page xv</i>
<i>Preface</i>	xix
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xxiii
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	xxv
Introduction	1
I.1 The scope of this book	1
I.2 The structure of this book	11
1 The concept of customary international law	14
1.1 Introductory remarks: this book examines custom in the context of general international law	15
1.2 The nature of custom	18
1.2.1 Custom is one of the sources of international law	18
1.2.2 The informal (and mysterious) way by which customary rules emerge	21
1.2.3 The role of consent in the development of customary rules	24
1.2.4 Is there such a thing as ‘tacit’ consent?	26
1.3 The double requirement of State practice and <i>opinio juris</i>	30
1.3.1 The traditional and modern approaches regarding the relevance of these two elements	30
1.3.2 The position adopted by investor-State arbitration tribunals and States	35
1.4 A customary rule needs to be proven by the party that alleges it	39
1.5 The role of judges in the formation and identification of customary rules	42
1.5.1 A role in revealing the existence of customary rules	43
1.5.2 A role in the development of customary rules	44
1.5.3 The practice of investment tribunals	47
1.6 The role of scholars in the identification of custom	55

2	Dancing with the sources: the fascinating story of the relative importance of custom and treaties at different times in the evolution of international investment law	60
	Introduction	60
2.1	The origin and the development of basic investment protections under custom	61
2.1.1	The historical foundation of the minimum standard of treatment	61
2.1.2	The emergence of a general prohibition against expropriation without compensation	67
2.2	Challenges to existing customary rules on investment protection	69
2.2.1	A concerted attack led by newly independent States in the 1960s and 1970s	70
2.2.2	An impact assessment of the attack on existing rules	74
2.2.3	One war casualty: the Hull formula	77
2.3	From a lack of consensus on existing custom to the proliferation of BITs	79
2.3.1	Combat fatigue or the sorry state of custom after the attacks	79
2.3.2	The roaring 1990s or the 'treatification' of international investment law	81
2.3.3	Change of heart: the paradox of why developing States started signing BITs	84
2.4	Does custom still matter today in this age of treatification?	87
2.5	The 'return' of custom?	91
2.6	A brief outline of existing customary rules of international investment law	92
2.6.1	Scholarship on the existence of any such customary rules	92
2.6.2	Minimum standard of treatment	96
2.6.2.1	A firmly established rule	97
2.6.2.2	... with an imprecise content	104
2.6.3	General prohibition against expropriation without compensation	110
3	State practice	116
	Introduction	116
3.1	Whose practice matters?	117
3.1.1	Non-State actors do not directly participate in the creation of customary rules	118
3.1.2	The international legal personality of corporations and their international law-making powers	125
3.2	The basic requirements of State practice	128

CONTENTS

ix

3.2.1	Uniform and consistent practice	129
3.2.2	Extensive and representative practice	133
3.2.3	The time requirement	138
3.2.4	One illustration: Is the fair and equitable treatment standard uniformly and consistently found in BITs?	140
3.2.4.1	The position adopted by tribunals and scholars on the customary status of the FET standard	140
3.2.4.2	State practice is general, widespread and representative	145
3.2.4.3	State practice is not uniform and consistent	148
3.3	Manifestations of State practice	152
3.3.1	Introductory remarks	152
3.3.1.1	The publicity requirement	152
3.3.1.2	Omissions count as practice	153
3.3.2	The various forms of State practice and their relative weight	155
3.3.3	International treaties	159
3.3.3.1	Interaction between custom and treaties under general international law	160
3.3.3.1.1	Treaties can contribute to the formation of new rules of customary international law	163
3.3.3.1.2	A treaty can codify existing customary rules	168
3.3.3.2	Interaction between custom and treaties under international investment law	171
3.3.3.2.1	Can rules contained in BITs transform into customary rules?	172
3.3.3.2.1.1	The position of tribunals and scholars	172
3.3.3.2.1.2	The necessary conditions for such a transformation to occur	176
3.3.3.2.1.3	One illustration: Has the fair and equitable treatment standard clause transformed into a customary rule?	182
3.3.3.2.2	When taken together do all BITs represent the new custom?	188
3.3.3.2.2.1	The arguments advanced by those supporting the proposition equalling custom and BITs	189

	3.3.3.2.2.2	A few basic arguments against the proposition	192
	3.3.3.2.2.3	BITs do not fulfil the double requirements of uniform and consistent State practice and <i>opinio juris</i>	196
	3.3.3.2.2.4	States reject the proposition that BITs represent custom	200
	3.3.3.2.2.5	Conclusion	202
3.3.4	Statements by States		205
3.3.4.1	Statements under international law		205
3.3.4.1.1	Are statements evidence of State practice?		206
3.3.4.1.2	The relative weight to be given to statements depends on the circumstances		210
3.3.4.1.3	Typology of different statements		211
3.3.4.2	Statements in Investor-State arbitration		216
3.3.4.2.1	Introductory remarks: Some types of statements that are important in international law are less relevant in investor-State arbitration		217
3.3.4.2.2	State pleadings in arbitration proceedings		220
	3.3.4.2.2.1	The relative weight to be given to pleadings depends on the circumstances	221
	3.3.4.2.2.2	Arbitral awards examining pleadings	224
3.3.4.2.3	Interventions of non-disputing treaty parties during arbitration proceedings		227
	3.3.4.2.3.1	The relative weight to be given to such interventions depends on the circumstances	229
	3.3.4.2.3.2	Arbitral awards examining such interventions	231
3.3.4.2.4	Official statements made by parties to a treaty		235

CONTENTS xi

3.3.4.2.4.1	The relative weight to be given to official statements depends on the circumstances	235
3.3.4.2.4.2	Arbitral awards examining such statements	237
3.3.4.2.5	Joint statements by parties to a treaty on matters of interpretation	245
3.3.4.2.5.1	The relative weight to be given to joint statements depends on the circumstances	247
3.3.4.2.5.2	Arbitral awards examining such statements	248
3.3.4.2.6	Model BITs adopted by States	251
3.3.5	Activities within international organizations	257
3.3.5.1	State conduct within international organizations can be evidence of State practice	258
3.3.5.2	The practice of international organizations and the formation of customary rules	261
3.3.6	Internal national practice of States	267
3.3.6.1	Executive	268
3.3.6.2	Legislative	268
3.3.6.3	Judiciary	273
3.3.6.3.1	International law	273
3.3.6.3.2	Investor-State arbitration	279
3.4	Investment arbitration arbitral awards	283
4	<i>Opinio juris</i>	292
	Introduction	292
4.1	<i>Opinio juris</i> under International law	293
4.1.1	A well-recognized requirement but nevertheless difficult to assess	293
4.1.2	Scholarly battle on the relevance of <i>opinio juris</i>	297
4.1.3	The chronological paradox . . . and one possible solution	302
4.1.4	The reasons why it is necessary to demonstrate <i>opinio juris</i>	305
4.1.5	Manifestations of <i>opinio juris</i>	309
4.1.5.1	<i>Opinio juris</i> can be demonstrated by State practice	311
4.1.5.2	The problem of 'double-counting'	316
4.2	<i>Opinio juris</i> in investor-State arbitration	321
4.2.1	The practice of arbitral tribunals and the position of States	322

4.2.2	The role played by <i>opinio juris</i> in the transformation of treaty-based norms into custom	325
4.2.2.1	Which States' <i>opinio juris</i> matters and what needs to be demonstrated	326
4.2.2.2	Examples of where to find States' <i>opinio juris</i>	330
4.2.3	Do States have any <i>opinio juris</i> when they sign BITs?	334
4.2.3.1	States sign BITs to protect their own interests, not out of any sense of obligation	335
4.2.3.2	Other reasons given by scholars to explain States' lack of <i>opinio juris</i>	337
4.2.3.3	Alternative theories put forward by scholars in support of the claim that States have an <i>opinio juris</i> when signing BITs	340
4.2.3.3.1	States' <i>opinio juris</i> is embodied in their practice	341
4.2.3.3.2	States' <i>opinio juris</i> exists because it represents their general interests	346
5	The fundamental importance of customary rules in international investment law	351
	Introduction	351
5.1	Traditional reasons for the remaining importance of custom	352
5.1.1	Custom is the applicable legal regime in the absence of any BIT	352
5.1.2	Many BITs make explicit reference to custom	354
5.1.3	Custom plays a gap-filling role	364
5.2	Arbitral tribunals always have to take into account custom to resolve disputes	368
5.2.1	Arbitration under a State contract	369
5.2.2	Arbitration under the host State's law	374
5.2.3	Arbitration under an investment treaty	376
5.3	The limits of custom: no access to international arbitration without the host State's consent	383
5.4	Can a State claim the status of persistent objector?	392
5.4.1	The concept of persistent objector in international law	393
5.4.2	The application of the concept of persistent objector in the context of international investment law	396
5.4.2.1	Arbitration cases where the argument was raised	397
5.4.2.2	Reasons for rejecting the application of the concept in arbitration proceedings	401

CONTENTS

xiii

<i>General conclusion</i>	406
C.1 The remaining fundamental importance of custom in the present age of ‘treatification’	406
C.2 The importance of the question of the formation and identification of customary rules	409
C.3 Comparing custom formation and identification in investment arbitration and general international law	411
C.3.1 The basic principles regarding the formation of customary rules in investment arbitration are not different from those applicable in general international law	412
C.3.2 Some aspects regarding the identification of customary rules in investment arbitration are different from international law while others are similar	414
C.3.2.1 The role played by treaties in the formation of customary rules is the same in both fields	415
C.3.2.2 States’ <i>opinio juris</i> manifests itself in the same way in both fields	417
C.3.2.3 The conduct of States within international organizations and the internal national practice of States only play a limited role in the creation of custom in investment arbitration	420
C.3.2.4 The types of statements by States that matter as evidence of State practice are different in investment arbitration	422
<i>Bibliography</i>	425
<i>Index</i>	474