

INDEX

Abbreviations used in the index

- 1966 Act (Arbitration (International Investment Disputes) Act 1966)
- AJA (Administration of Justice Act 1969)
- BIT (bilateral investment treaty)
- CJEU (Court of Justice of the European Union)
- EFDG/EFDC (European Food and Drinks Group/European Food and Drinks Companies)
- EGO 24/1998 (Emergency Government Ordinance No 24/1998 (Romania))
- FET (fair and equitable treatment)
- FSIA (US Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act)
- GCEU (General Court of the European Union)
- IAA (International Arbitration Act)
- ICSID (International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes)
- ILC(SR) (ILC Articles on State Responsibility for Internationally Wrongful Acts)
- New York Convention (New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (1958))
- PA (Paris Agreement on Climate Change (2015))
- PIC (Permanent Investor Certificate)
- ROC (Rules of Court/Regulations of Court)
- TEU (Lisbon Treaty on the European Union (2007))
- TFEU (Lisbon Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (2007))

amicus curiae brief: *see* ICSID arbitral tribunal, procedural matters

arbitral award, annulment: *see* ICSID award, annulment (ICSID 52)

Australia

- International Arbitration Act 1974 (IAA)
 - ambiguity in use of “recognition” and “enforcement” (s 35) 610-14
 - as implementation of ICSID Convention (1966) 609
 - presumption of intention to comply with treaty obligations 611
- International Arbitration Act 1974 (IAA) by section (Part II (enforcement of awards))
 - New York Convention awards, applicability to 613
 - Part IV (ICSID awards) distinguished 613
 - treatment “as if it were a final judgment of a court in that State” (ICSID 54(1)) 610-14
- International Arbitration Act 1974 (IAA) by section (Part IV (application of ICSID))
 - 32 (ICSID “shall have the force of law”) 611-12
 - 34 (“ICSID awards to prevail over other laws”), interrelationship with IAA 35 610-11
 - 35 (recognition of award) 609-14
 - conflict between heading (“recognition”) and text (“enforcement”) 610-14
 - purpose of recognition 612-13
 - 35(4) (“may be enforced . . . as if the award were a judgment . . . of that court” (ICSID 54(1))) 598-9, 610-14

BITs (bilateral investment treaties)

- applicable law (VCLT 31/VCLT 32) 186, 215-16
- dispute settlement provisions, compliance with as essential to jurisdiction 26

BITs (bilateral investment treaties) (cont.)

EU Treaties, compatibility with/termination of BIT consequent on conclusion of later EU Treaty (VCLT 59(1)) 587-9

Eurekol/Achmea 694-9

“umbrella” clause

applicable law (law applicable to the obligation) 187-8

jurisprudence

Burlington 186, 187-8

Enron 186

Eureko 186-7

Micula 168-201

SGS v. Paraguay 186

SGS v. Philippines 186, 188

“obligation”

as capacious term 186-7

ordinary meaning 186-7

specific obligation towards claimant, need for 186-8

causation/causal link as requirement for finding of breach of State responsibility/ liability for reparation (ILC(SR) 31(2))

burden/standard of proof 342

concurrent causes (ILC(SR) 31 Commentary 13) 343

contributory fault (ILC(SR) 39) 343-4

“injury . . . caused by the internationally wrongful act” as basis for full reparation (ILC(SR) 31 Commentary 9) 343

Micula 342-4

multiple violations arising from the same cause, sufficiency of a single demonstration of causality 344

test for remoteness

ILC(SR) 31 Commentary 10 343

variety of formulae 343

compensation for damage caused by internationally wrongful act as alternative to restitution (including ILC(SR) 36/*Chorzów Factory* principle)

burden/standard of proof (“insofar as it is established” (ILC 36(2))) 341-2

jurisprudence

Biwater Gauff 342

ELSI 342

GAMI 342

Lauder 342

Micula 341-2

costs (ICSID 61(2))

ad hoc Committee proceedings for annulment of arbitral award (ICSID 61(1)) 590-2

arbitration/tribunal costs 547

Micula 486-7

parties’ costs, each to pay own 487

relevant factors, complexity of issues 487

Energy Charter Treaty (1994) (ECT), dispute settlement, waiver of immunity, whether 600-1, 626-7

EU law, annulment of a measure, effect on preparatory acts 645-6, 700-2

- EU Member States, rights and obligations under agreements entered into before accession/entry into force of the Treaty of Rome (TFEU 351 [TEC 307])**
 applicability to any treaty capable of affecting the application of the EU Treaties 667, 669-70
 existence of obligations towards non-Member States in multilateral treaty, sufficiency to engage TFEU 251 670
 ICSID 54/ICSID 69 as examples of ICSID obligation owed by all Contracting States to the community of Contracting States 670-4
 EU/EC obligations under, obligation not to impede Member States' obligations under a prior agreement 667-8, 677-8
 jurisprudence
 Budějovický Budvar 669
 Burgoa 667-8
 Commission v. Slovak Republic (Case C-264/09) 669
 Deserbais 671
 Evans Medical 667, 675
 Italian Duties on Radio Valves 667, 668, 671
 Levy 667, 669-70, 675
 Luksan 671
 Micula v. UK 665-76
 Open Skies 667
 RTE 668, 671
 T Port 669
 national courts' responsibility for determination of existence and extent of obligations 665-6, 675-6
 preliminary ruling reference (TFEU 267), exclusion 669
 obligations to Member States and non-Member States distinguished 668
 permissive and compulsory provisions distinguished 668
European Commission, as organ of State (FSIA) 700
- fair and equitable treatment of alien (including in particular BITs provision for):** *see also Micula*
 standard/classification as, relevant factors
 assessment taking account of all the facts/circumstances, need for 218-19, 223, 225-6
 balanced evaluation of treaty aims 219
 as disciplined standard based on State practice/judicial practice 217
 Europe Agreement/general context of EU accession, relevance 218-19
 as flexible/elusive concept 216-17, 219-20
 legitimate expectation and 223-328: *see also* legitimate expectation
 object and purpose as reflected in preamble 215-18
 reasonableness of host State's actions 285-313
 stable and predictable economic framework/regulatory stability 223-328
 justified legislative changes 224, 269
 transparency 224-6, 316-28
 VCLT 31/VCLT 32 as applicable law 215-16
 outrageous or egregious test, rejection 223-4
 substantively improper conduct
 bad faith, relevance 215-16, 314-16
 conduct that is arbitrary, manifestly unreasonable, discriminatory or in bad faith 221-2
 “unreasonable”, dual nature of test 222-3

fair and equitable treatment of alien, jurisprudence

- ADF* 217
- AES* 222-3
- Bayindir* 220
- Chemtura* 222
- CMS v. Argentina* 216-17
- Duke Energy* 220, 226
- EDF* 227
- Genin* 220
- Lauder* 216-17, 229
- LG&E* 223-4
- MCI* 216
- Metalclad* 220, 224
- Micula* 202-328: *see also* *Micula*
- Mondev* 216, 217, 222
- MTD* 216
- Noble Ventures* 216-17
- Occidental v. Ecuador* 227
- Parkerings* 227, 246
- PSEG* 227
- Saluka* 216-17, 219, 222, 225, 227
- SD Myers* 216
- Tecmed* 225-6
- Total* 219-20
- Waste Management II* 216-17, 221-2

FSIA 1976 (USA), as sole basis for jurisdiction over foreign State or instrumentality (28 USC 1330) 694

FSIA 1976 (USA) by section

- 28 USC 1603(b)(2) (“organ of foreign State or political subdivision . . . or majority of shares or ownership interest owned by”), European Commission as 700
- 28 USC 1605(a)(6) (enforcement of foreign arbitral award against foreign State) (New York Convention (“arbitration exception”))
 jurisprudence
 - Blue Ridge* 695
 - Micula*: *see* *Micula v. Romania* (US District Court)
 - Phoenix Consulting* 695

FSIA 1985 (Australia)

- as sole basis for immunity 600
- text (extracts) 602

FSIA 1985 (Australia) by section

- 3(1) (definitions), “proceeding” 602
- 10(1) (submission to the jurisdiction) 602
- 10(2) (submission “by agreement or otherwise”), accession to ICSID, whether: *see* *Infrastructure Services* (Australia)

good faith and abuse of rights/pacta sunt servanda (UNCLOS 300)

- definition/classification as 314-16
 - Black’s Law Dictionary 315
 - as flexible concept 314
 - Restatement (Second) of Contracts* (1981) 315

jurisprudence
Canfor 315
Europe Cement 315
Micula 314-16
Phoenix Action 315
Plama 315
Waste Management II 316

ICSID: *see* ICSID Convention (1965)

ICSID arbitral tribunal, procedural matters
 ICSID award, annulment (ICSID 52)
 ICSID award, annulment (ICSID 52), grounds
 ICSID award, recognition and enforcement (ICSID 53-5)
 ICSID jurisdiction (ICSID 25)
 ICSID Rules (Arbitration) (2003) by rule
 ICSID Rules (Arbitration) (2006) by rule
 ICSID Rules (Institution) (1968/1984/2006)

ICSID Convention (1965)

compliance obligation (ICSID 69), as obligation of all Contracting States to the community of Contracting States 674
 disputes concerning the interpretation or application of (ICSID 64), reference to the ICJ 674
 implementing legislation/incorporation, need for: *see also* Australia, International Arbitration Act 1974 (IAA); United Kingdom, Arbitration (International Investment Disputes) Act 1966
 non-self-executing status 685
travaux préparatoires, ICSID 69 (compliance obligation) 673-4

ICSID arbitral tribunal, procedural matters

applicable law (ICSID 42(1)) 153-68
 customary international law (CIL) 52
 jurisprudence
LG&E 154
Micula 52, 162-4
Santa Elena 154
 law of the host State, conflict with international law, primacy 154
 “such rules of law as may be agreed by the parties” 52
 “supplemented by such rules of international law as may be applicable” 52, 162-4
 EU law, relevance 162-4
 burden of proof, whether a fundamental rule of procedure 574
 intervention as a non-disputing party/*amicus curiae* (AR 37(2)) 71-3, 74-6, 77-9
 criteria (*Vivendi*)
 appropriate subject-matter 515
 procedural fairness 515
 suitability to act as *amicus curiae* 515
 non-pecuniary reparation, Tribunal’s power to award
 jurisprudence
Enron 483-4
Micula 55-6, 478-86
 limitation of enforcement obligations to compensation (ICSID 54(1)), relevance 482-3
travaux préparatoires 482-3

ICSID arbitral tribunal, procedural matters (*cont.*)

- omission from BIT, effect 56, 482
- omission from claimant's request for arbitration, effect 56, 482
- post-award/definitive injunctive relief 478-86
 - cautious approach to 486
 - preferred terminology 484
- request for as ancillary claim (ICSID 46/AR 40) 476-8, 484
- restitution 55-6
- time limits 477, 481, 484-5
- resignation of arbitrator (ICSID 56) 73-4

ICSID award, annulment (ICSID 52)

- ad hoc Committee
 - Arbitration Rules, applicability *mutatis mutandis* (ICSID 52(4)) 505-6, 510-11, 575, 591
- intervention as a non-disputing party/*amicus curiae* (ICSID 52(4))
 - Micula* 513-16
 - special conditions attached to 515-16
- task/powers
 - appeal court distinguished 528-9
 - determination by the parties/nature and purpose of mandate 482, 492
 - limitation to annulment on grounds set out in ICSID 52, 550-1, 560
 - provision of an effective remedy 482
- task/powers, jurisprudence
 - CDC* 528
 - CMS v. Argentina* 528
 - Micula* 528-9: *see also Micula*

ICSID award, annulment (ICSID 52), grounds

- failure to state reasons (ICSID 52(1)(e))
 - burden/standard of proof 533-4
 - contradictory reasons 575
 - ICSID 48(3) ("deal with every question"/"state reasons") as basis 533
 - quality of reasons, relevance 533
- failure to state reasons (ICSID 52(1)(e)), jurisprudence
 - Amco I* 577
 - Azurix* 534
 - Caratube* 577
 - CDC* 534
 - CMS v. Argentina* 534
 - Continental Casualty* 534
 - Daimler* 534
 - Fraport* 534
 - Impregilo* 533
 - Klöckner* 575, 577
 - Micula* 540-2, 545-6, 551-2, 554-5, 557-8, 560-1, 565-7, 571-3, 574-80
 - MINE* 533-4, 551
 - Mitchell* 577
 - Rumeli* 534
 - Soufraki* 534
 - Vivendi I* 533, 534, 577
 - Wena* 533, 534
- manifest excess of powers (ICSID 52(1)(b)) 528, 529-31
 - failure to apply the law as provided for in ICSID 42(1) (applicable law) 530-1

- error of interpretation of law distinguished 531
- gross or egregious error of law as 531
- failure to apply the law as provided for in ICSID 42(1) (applicable law), jurisprudence
 - AES v. Hungary* 531
 - Azurix* 531
 - Caratube* 531
 - Daimler* 531
 - Enron* 530, 531, 547
 - MCI* 531, 547
 - Micula* 535-52
 - MTD* 530
 - Soufraki* 531
- jurisdiction-related issues
 - adjudication *infra petita* 530
 - lack of ICSID 25 jurisdiction *ratione personae*, *ratione materiae* or *ratione voluntatis* 529-30
 - “manifest” (“evident, obvious, clear or easily recognizable”) 529
- jurisdiction-related issues, jurisprudence
 - AES v. Hungary* 529
 - Alapli* 529
 - Azurix* 530
 - Caratube* 529
 - CDC* 529
 - Daimler* 529
 - Helnan* 529
 - Lucchetti* 530
 - MCI* 529
 - Micula* 529-31
 - Mitchell v. Congo* 529
 - MTD* 530
 - Rumeli* 529, 530
 - SGS v. Paraguay* 530
 - Soufraki* 529, 530
 - Vivendi* 530
 - Wena Hotels* 529
- serious departure from a fundamental rule of procedure (ICSID 52(1)(c)) 531-2
 - “fundamental”
 - rules of natural justice concerning essential fairness, limitation to 532
 - UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration, Article 18 532
 - “serious”/“fundamental as dual requirements” 531
 - burden/standard of proof 532
 - substantial departure from rule sufficient to negate intended protection 532
- serious departure from a fundamental rule of procedure, jurisprudence
 - Adapli* 532
 - CDC* 532
 - Daimler* 531
 - Fraport* 532
 - Impregilo* 532
 - Micula* 531-2, 562-5, 568-71, 573-80
 - MINE* 531-2
 - Repsol* 532
 - Wena* 531, 532

- ICSID award, recognition and enforcement (ICSID 53-5):** *see also* *Micula v. Romania* (UK); *Micula v. Romania* (UK Supreme Court); *Micula v. Romania* (US District Court)
- enforcement (ICSID 54(1))
 - “enforcement” (ICSID 54)/“execution” (ICSID 55)
 - distinguishability 654
 - English, French and Spanish versions compared 599, 618-22
 - as synonyms 598, 599, 602-5, 606, 618-24, 659, 661
 - enforcing State’s obligation in respect of an authenticated award 659
 - adjustment of award to take account of any settlement/partial settlement, possibility of 702-6
 - incorporation of defences available under domestic law 657-9
 - New York Convention distinguished 655
 - re-examination of award on merits 655
 - refusal on grounds of national or international public policy, exclusion 655-9
 - travaux préparatoires* 655-9
 - treatment “as if it were a final judgment of a court in that State” (ICSID 54(1)) 165-6, 598-9, 613-14, 656-8, 685-6
 - inappropriateness of a decision anticipating post-award actions 167
 - risk of conflict with EU law 164-8, 649-50
 - exequatur, role 599, 614
 - alternatives equivalent to 599, 609, 614
 - Benvenuti* 609
 - jurisprudence
 - Infrastructure Services* (Australia) 597-628: *see also* *Infrastructure Services* (Australia) *Micula* (Award) 164-7
 - Micula v. Romania* (UK) 651-63: *see also* *Micula v. Romania* (UK Supreme Court)
 - stay of enforcement proceedings 659
 - proceedings relating to interpretation (ICSID 50(2)), revision (ICSID 51(4)) and annulment (ICSID 52(5)) distinguished
 - interpretation of “enforcement” to include “recognition” 607-8
 - stay of enforcement proceedings 659
 - recognition
 - obligation to recognize authenticated award (ICSID 54(1)) 605-6, 607
 - purpose 612-13
 - recognition and enforcement, distinguishability
 - conflation of procedures/use of “confirm” (US courts) 703-4, 688 n1
 - ICSID 54(1) 606
 - examples of extension of “enforcement” to include recognition 607-8
 - ICSID 54(2) 605-8
 - legislative ambiguity: *see* Australia, International Arbitration Act 1974 (IAA)
 - possibility of seeking recognition without enforcement 606
 - recognition proceedings
 - classification as 609-10
 - lack of guidance 609
 - “competent court” (ICSID 54(2)) 603-8
 - jurisprudence (State immunity)
 - Benvenuti* 609
 - Infrastructure Services* 608-9
 - Lahoud* 609
 - LETCO* 609
 - SOABI* 609

- State immunity, exclusion 607-9
 - submission to the proceedings (ICSID 54(2)) 608-17
- State immunity (ICSID 55)
 - preservation of national law in relation to execution 605, 656-7
 - recognition proceedings
 - exclusion 607-9, 617-27
 - ICSID 54(2) as submission to 608-9
- State practice: *see* Australia, International Arbitration Act 1974 (IAA); United Kingdom, Arbitration (International Investment Disputes) Act 1966
- stay of enforcement proceedings 641-77
 - in case of proceedings relating to interpretation (ICSID 50(2), revision (ICSID 51(4)) and annulment (ICSID 52(5)) 659
 - TFEU 351 obligations and 670-7
- ICSID jurisdiction (ICSID 25)**
 - competence/duty of tribunal to determine (*compétence de la compétence*) (ICSID 41), *ex proprio motu/ex officio* (AR 41(2)) 27
 - consent to jurisdiction
 - BIT, entry into force, applicability to disputes arising prior to and acts preceding distinguished 49-54
 - compliance with, need for 26
 - written, need for 26
 - incidental or additional claims/counterclaims (ICSID 46), “arising directly out of the subject matter of the dispute” 476-8
 - jurisdiction *ratione materiae*
 - compensable harm, need for 46-9
 - existence of an investment 44-6
 - jurisdiction *ratione personae*: *see also* “national of another Contracting State” *below*
 - jurisprudence, *Micula* 28-43
 - relevant law
 - BIT provisions (“any natural person who is a citizen of a Contracting Party in accordance with its Laws”) 33
 - ICSID 25(1) (“national of another Contracting State”) 33
 - jurisdiction/merits, importance of maintaining the distinction 27-8
 - jurisprudence
 - Micula* 10-16
 - Telenor* 28
 - legal dispute arising directly out of investment
 - “investment” 44-6
 - need for 26, 47-9
 - “national of another Contracting State”
 - applicable law
 - compliance with international law, need for 34
 - Soufraki* 33-4
 - State’s right to determine who is a national as general principle of international law 33-4
 - burden of proof 36-8
 - definition (ICSID 25(2)) 33
 - genuine link requirement (*Nottebohm*)—relevance in ICSID proceedings/absence of dual nationality considerations 38-42
 - nationality as objective jurisdictional requirement calling for determination regardless of positions of the parties 35

ICSID jurisdiction (ICSID 25) (cont.)

“national of another Contracting State”, agreement to treat as (ICSID 25(2)(b)) 42-3
 critical date 33-42

positive/negative requirements 33

prima facie legal case, sufficiency 27-8, 48-9

requirements 26

ICSID Rules, determination of applicability (*Micula* (annulment)) 505-6**ICSID Rules (Arbitration) (2003) by rule**

6(1) (constitution of the tribunal: notification of arbitrators’ acceptance of appointment as date of) 15

37 (site visits) 73

38(1) (closure of proceedings) 101

40(2) (ancillary claims: time limits) 477, 481, 484-5

41(2) (preliminary objections: Tribunal’s right to consider jurisdiction at any stage) 27

41(4) (preliminary objections: as preliminary question vs joinder to the merits) 16

43 (ancillary claims) 476-7, 480

44 (discontinuance at request of a party) 458-9

46 (extension of period for rendering of award) 101

ICSID Rules (Arbitration) (2006) by rule

37(2) (leave to intervene as a non-disputing party) 513-16

41(5) (preliminary objections: claim manifestly without legal merit), as new rule 505

50(1)(c) (application: “state in detail”) 574-5

ICSID Rules (Institution) (1968/1984/2006)

5 (acknowledgement of request) 14

10(1) (procedure during vacancy: notification of procedure) 73-4

10(2) (procedure during vacancy: suspension of proceedings) 73-4

7 (notice of registration) 14

8(2) (incapacity/resignation of arbitrator: procedure) 73

11(1) (vacancy on the tribunal: standard procedure) 74, 76

11(3) (vacancy on the tribunal: relevant Rules) 76

ICTY jurisdiction

admissibility/jurisdiction distinguished 26-7

loss or damage, sufficiency of prima facie case 48-9

incidental or additional claim: *see* ICSID jurisdiction (ICSID 25), incidental or additional claims/counterclaims (ICSID 46)

Infrastructure Services (Australia) 594-628

application for leave to intervene (European Commission), reasons for rejection 627-8

Court’s decision/orders 628

opinions

Allsop J 597-9

Moshinsky J 628

Perram J 600-28

recognition and enforcement

distinguishability 605-8

“enforcement” (ICSID 54) and “execution” (ICSID 55) as synonyms 599, 602-5,

606, 618-24

recognition proceedings, classification as 609-12

treatment “as if it were a final judgment of a court in that State” (ICSID 54(1))

613-14

State immunity, Spain’s claim to 600-4

ECT 26, whether 600-1, 626-7

FSIA (Australia) provisions 600-5

preservation of national law in relation to execution (ICSID 55) 605
 recognition proceedings, exclusion 607-9, 617-27
 submission to the jurisdiction, ICSID 54(2) as 601, 608-17

legislation, interpretation

conformity with international obligations including CIL 655
 presumption of 611, 655

legitimate expectation

fair and equitable treatment and 202-328
Micula 202-328, 489-90
 requirements
 clear promise
 attributable to competent organ of State 268
 explicit/implicit formulation 268
 giving rise to reasonable expectation 267-9
 State's intention, relevance 268
 detrimental reliance on 267
 legal commitment 489-90
 reasonableness of expectation 267, 268-9
 as objective test 268-9
 specificity 489
 stabilization clause-type commitment 490

measure of damages/compensation including valuation of company/property/assets

lost opportunity 357, 359-63
 burden/standard of proof 356-7
 “sufficient certainty” test 362
 lost profit (including ILC(SR) 36(2))
 damages actually suffered, limitation to (ILC(SR) 34 Comment 5) 370
 “insofar as it is established” (ILC(SR) 36(2)) 341-2, 364, 369-70
 jurisprudence
 Lemire 368-70
 Micula 364-430
 “sufficient certainty” test 369-70, 375-6, 389-90, 392, 394, 397-8, 402, 406, 407,
 414-17, 526

Micula: see *Infrastructure Services* (Australia)

Micula cases (overview including facts and procedural history)
Micula (ICSID) (annulment), background
Micula (ICSID) (annulment), application of the legal standards (parties' positions/
 Committee's analysis and decision)
Micula (ICSID) (Award), costs
Micula (ICSID) (Award), damages, overview/preliminary matters
Micula (ICSID) (Award), damages, analysis of claimants' damages claims
Micula (ICSID) (Award), damages, claimants' requests for allocation
Micula (ICSID) (Award), damages, interest
Micula (ICSID) (Award), damages, parties' requests for relief other than
Micula (ICSID) (Award), damages, respondent's defence that accession to the EU
 benefited the claimants
Micula (ICSID) (Award), fair and equitable treatment (BIT 2(3))
Micula (ICSID) (Award), preliminary matters

Micula (*cont.*)

- Micula* (ICSID) (Award), separate opinion (Abi-Saab)
- Micula* (ICSID) (Award), umbrella clause (BIT 2(4))
- Micula* (ICSID) (jurisdiction and admissibility), general matters (parties' positions)
- Micula* (ICSID) (jurisdiction and admissibility), general matters (Tribunal's analysis)
- Micula* (ICSID) (jurisdiction and admissibility), jurisdiction *ratione materiae*
- Micula* (ICSID) (jurisdiction and admissibility), jurisdiction *ratione personae*
- Micula* (ICSID) (jurisdiction and admissibility), jurisdiction *ratione temporis*
- Micula* (ICSID) (jurisdiction and admissibility), Tribunal's power to order restitution
- Micula v. Romania* (UK Supreme Court) (background)
- Micula v. Romania* (UK Supreme Court) (Court's analysis and decision)
- Micula v. Romania* (US District Court)

Micula cases (overview including facts and procedural history) *Note:* included here is information relevant at all or most stages of proceedings relating to *Micula*. For matters limited to a single stage see the relevant entry. abbreviations 65-7

facts

- Accession Treaty, entry into force (1 January 2007) 143
- claimants' investment 19-21, 110-15
 - initial investments in reliance on previous incentive regimes 110-12
 - investments in reliance on the EGO 24 incentives 112-16, 685
 - Permanent Investor Certificates 114-15
- EC Guidelines on National Regional Aid for 2007-13 (4 March 2006) 143
- events leading to revocation 138-41
- formal accession negotiations, start of 127
- Romania's accession to the EU (2007) 116-43
 - accession negotiations 2000 129-35
 - Accession Treaty, signature (25 April 2005) 142-3
 - consequential changes to the law 21-2, 122-7
 - EC–Romania Europe Agreement (1 February 1993) 116-43
 - EU developments (2002) 136-8
 - Romania's application for membership (22 June 1995) 118-22
 - Romania's efforts to attract investment prior to EGO 24/1998 103-8
 - Romania's investment incentives (EGO 24/1998) 18-19, 102, 105-7
 - amendments in response to EU membership requirements 127-9, 135-8
 - designation of Ștei-Nucet as disadvantaged region (25 March 1999)/extension to include Drăgănești (29 November 2000) 19, 107-8
- parties (ICSID proceedings)
 - claimants
 - corporate claimants 13, 68
 - individual claimants (Messrs Micula) 12-13, 67-8
 - respondent (Romania) 13, 68
 - parties' position (overview)
 - claimants 143-9
 - respondent 149-53
- procedural history in date order
 - request for arbitration (2 August 2005) 14, 69
 - claim for relief 14
 - Romania–Sweden BIT (2002) as relevant legal instrument 14
 - acknowledgement of request (IR 5) 14, 69
 - supplementary statement on the entry into force of the BIT (21 September 2005) 14
 - notification of registration (IR 7)/invitation to constitute arbitral tribunal (13 October 2005) 14, 69-70

- registration of request as supplemented (13 October 2005) (ICSID 36(3)) 14, 69
 claimants' choice of a three-person tribunal (10 January 2006) 14, 70
 appointment of arbitrators (10 January/7 February 2006) 14
 notification of agreement of arbitrators to serve (12 September 2006) (AR 6(1)) 15,
 70
 Tribunal's agreement on procedural issues including the applicable arbitration rules
 (AR 2003) (10 November 2006) 15, 70
 statement of claim (9 March 2007) 15-16
 claim for relief 15-16
 objections to the jurisdiction (10 September 2007) 16
 agreement to treat objections as a preliminary question (AR 41(4))/suspension of
 proceedings on the merits (9 October 2007) 16
 claimants' counter-memorial on jurisdiction (1 February 2008) 16
 respondent's reply on jurisdiction and admissibility (28 March 2008) 16
 claimants' rejoinder on jurisdiction (30 May 2008) 16
 hearing on jurisdiction (19-20 June 2008) 17-18
 agreement to Romania raising objection to claimant 2 on nationality 18
 Decision on Jurisdiction and Admissibility/notification to the parties (24/
 25 September 2008) 70-2
 invitation to parties to prepare proposals for proceedings on the merits (29 September
 2008) 71
 agreement on procedural arrangements (18 November/2 December 2008) 71
 agreed time extensions/revise schedule (25/27 March 2009) 71-2
 EC request to file as non-disputing party (2 April 2009) 72
 written phase (merits) (6 April-24 September 2009) 72-84
 agreement to EC's participation as a non-disputing party *amicus curiae* (15 May
 2009) 72-3
 exchanges relating to 71-2, 74-6, 77-9
 partial lifting of suspension of proceeding to deal with 74-5
 Tribunal's perception of advantages 73
 claimants' request for site visit (AR 37) (18 May 2009) 73
 respondent's objection to (25 May 2009) 73
 resignation of arbitrator/notification to parties (AR 8(2)/AR 10(1) and (2)) (25 May
 2009) 73-4
 request to respondent for early appointment of new arbitrator (AR 11(1)) 74
 suspension of proceedings (AS 10(2)) 74
 exchanges regarding the EC's *amicus curiae* participation including disclosure of
 documents (16 June 2009-8 April 2010) 74-80
 appointment of *Abi-Saab* as replacement arbitrator (16 July 2009) 76
 agreement on procedural timetable (14 September 2009) 76-7
 respondent's request for disclosure of documents/Procedural Order/report on
 production (9 April/27 May/10 June 2010) 80
 claimants' renewed request for a site visit/Tribunal's rejection of request as untimely
 80-1
 final rejection of request (20 January 2011) 98
 discussions of arrangements for EC participation at the hearing (5 October-3
 November 2010) 85
 claimants' request for provisional measures/emergency temporary order/Tribunal's
 rejection of request (5 November 2010) 85-6
 hearing on the merits and quantum (8-19 November 2010) 86-9
 Procedural Order ruling on outstanding evidentiary and procedural matters
 (24 November 2010) 89

***Micula* cases (overview including facts and procedural history) (cont.)**

post-hearing briefs and closing arguments (25 November 2010-7 June 2011) 99-101
 claimants' revised request for relief (20 December 2010)/Tribunal's ruling (6 April 2011) 98

Decision on Provisional Measures (2 March 2011) 90-1

enforcements measures/Decisions on Provisional Measures Nos 3-5 (5 April 2013) 90-8

Supplemental Decision on Provisional Measures (27 May 2011) 91-2

post-hearing hearing (2-7 June 2011) 99-100

claimants' request to submit additional witness statements (21 July 2011)/Tribunal's agreement (21 July 2011) 81-2

closure of proceedings (AR 38(1)) (14 June 2013) 101

submissions on costs (AR 38(1)) (19 July 2013) 101

extension of period for rendering of award (AR 46) (7 October 2013) 101

***Micula* (ICSID) (annulment), background**

Award, Committee's summary

i. legal framework for disfavoured regions including EGO 24 (paras. 137-55) 521-2

ii. claimants' investment in Romania (paras. 156-77) 522-3

iii. Romania's accession to the EU (paras. 178-249) 523-4

iv. applicable law (paras. 286-329) 524

v. jurisdiction (paras. 284-5) 524

vi. enforceability of an Award under EU law (paras. 330-41) 524

vii. umbrella clause (paras. 343-459) 525

viii. FET (paras. 460-872) 525

ix. treaty claims other than FET (paras. 873-4) 525

x. damages (paras. 875-1248) 526

xi. allocation of damages (paras. 1184-248) 526-7

xii. interest (paras. 1249-76) 527

xiii. non-pecuniary requests for relief (paras. 1277-322) 527

xiv. costs (paras. 1323-8) 527

xv. *dispositif* (para. 1329) 527

separate opinion (Abi-Saab) 527-8

legal standards applicable to annulment: *see also* ICSID award, annulment (ICSID 52), grounds

failure to state reasons (ICSID 52(1)(e)) 533-4

manifest excess of powers (ICSID 52(1)(b)) 528, 529-31

failure to apply the law as provided for in ICSID 42(1) (applicable law) 530-1
 jurisdiction-related issues 529-30

serious departure from a fundamental rule of procedure (ICSID 52(1)(c)) 531-2

procedural history in date order *Note:* for earlier procedural history *see Micula* cases (overview including facts and procedural history)

respondents' application for annulment (ICSID 52/AR 50)(9 April 2014) 502-3

notification of registration of request (18 April 2014) 503

notification of appointment of committee (AR 52(2)) 503

request for a continued stay of enforcement (ICSID 52(5)/AR 52(4)) (14 May 2014) 503, 506-9

respondents' observations on the stay request (20 June 2014) 506

Committee's conditional decision (7 August 2014) 508-9

applicant's rejection of request for written undertaking confirming obligation to enforce the Award (ICSID 53) (8 September 2014) 509, 512

notification of automatic termination of stay as of 7 September (15 September 2014) 509, 512-13

- draft Procedural Order No 1, circulation with request for comments (2 June 2014) 503
- respondent on annulment's request for provisional measures (10 June 2014) 509-10
 - applicant's observations on (20 June 2014) 510-11
 - respondent's reply (27 June 2014) 511
 - applicant's rejoinder (9 July 2014) 511
- preliminary objections (respondents) (11 June 2014) 503
- applicant's request for dismissal of preliminary objections (16 June 2014) 504
 - change of applicable arbitration rules from AR 2003 to AR 2006 503
- parties' positions on applicable rules and other procedural matters (19 June 2014) 504
- ad hoc Committee's opening session (23 June 2014) 504
- parties' submission of comments on procedural matters. 504
- Decision on Applicable Arbitration Rules and on Preliminary Objections (25 June 2014) 505
 - AR (2003) vs AR (2006) as applicable rules 505-6
 - ICSID 44/ICSID 52(4) (arbitration rules applicable to annulment proceedings) 505-6
 - rejection of preliminary objections 506
- exchanges related to enforcement of the Award and final EC decision (16 July 2014-15 September 2015) 516-19
 - Procedural Order no 2 denying admissibility of claimants' new submissions as irrelevant to the grounds for annulment (21 September 2014) 519
- Committee's dismissal of request for provisional measures (18 August 2014) 511-12
- EC request to file as non-disputing party (15 October 2014) 513-16
 - Committee's decision agreeing to EC's application (3 December 2014)/limitation to a single submission 515, 516
 - criteria for determining (*Vivendi*)/special annulment proceedings considerations 515-16
 - exchanges relating to 513-15
- hearing on annulment (21/22 September 2015) 519
- closure of proceedings (AR 38(1)/AR 53) (13 January 2016) 521
- Micula* (ICSID) (annulment), application of the legal standards (parties' positions/ Committee's analysis and decision) 535-90: see also *Micula* (ICSID) (annulment), background, legal standards applicable to annulment**
- failure to apply the applicable law (applicant's position) (full acceptance of EC position) 584
- failure to apply the law as provided for in ICSID 42(1) (applicable law), applicant's position
 - summary of applicant's position including relevant extracts from the Award 535-9
 - failure to apply applicable law as identified by the Tribunal
 - failure to state reasons as required by ICSID 48(3) (ICSID 52(1)(e)) 540-2
 - as manifest excess of powers (ICSID 52(1)(b)) 539-40
- failure to apply the law as provided for in ICSID 42(1) (applicable law), claimants' position
 - summary of claimants' position including relevant extracts from the Award 542-5
 - failure to apply applicable law as identified by the Tribunal
 - failure to state reasons as required by ICSID 48(3) (ICSID 52(1)(e)) 545-6
 - as manifest excess of powers (ICSID 52(1)(b)) 545
- failure to apply the law as provided for in ICSID 42(1) (applicable law), Committee's analysis

Micula (ICSID) (annulment), application of the legal standards (parties' positions/ Committee's analysis and decision) (cont.)

- failure to apply applicable law as identified by the Tribunal as manifest excess of powers (ICSID 52(1)(b)) 546-51
 - applicant's claim relating to lawfulness of EGO 24 as a matter of interpretation outside the Committee's competence 550-1
 - MCI/Enron* distinguished 547
 - Tribunal's correct application of VCLT 551
 - Tribunal's correct identification of sources of international law/proper application of the ICSID 42(1) residual rule 542-5
- failure to state reasons as required by ICSID 48(3) (ICSID 52(1)(e)) 551-2
 - sufficiency of reasons to understand how the Tribunal's conclusions were reached 551-2
 - Tribunal's clear reasons for deciding there was no conflict of treaties 552
- failure to decide on the enforceability of the Award (applicant's position)
 - summary of applicant's position including relevant extracts from the Award 552-4
 - failure to state reasons 554-5
 - as manifest excess of powers 554
- failure to decide on the enforceability of the Award (claimants' position)
 - summary of claimants' position including relevant extracts from the Award 555-6
 - failure to state reasons 557-8
 - as manifest excess of powers 557
- failure to decide on the enforceability of the Award (Committee's analysis)
 - failure to state reasons
 - "necessary to the Tribunal's decision" requirement (*Vivendi I*) 560-1
 - sufficiency of reasons to understand how the Tribunal's conclusions were reached 561
 - manifest excess of powers 558-60
 - summary of parties' arguments 558-9
 - Committee's incompetence to speculate on the merits as requested by applicant 560
 - "plain from the face of the Award" that Tribunal dealt with the issue 558-60
- failure to require proof of harm/award compensation only for harm proved (applicant's position)
 - summary with extracts from the Award 561-2
 - failure to state reasons 565-7
 - serious departure from a fundamental rule of procedure 562-5
- failure to require proof of harm/award compensation only for harm proved (claimants' position)
 - summary with extracts from the Award 567-8
 - failure to state reasons 571-3
 - applicant's arguments 575-6
 - serious departure from a fundamental rule of procedure 568-71
- failure to require proof of harm/award compensation only for harm proved (Committee's analysis)
 - failure to state reasons
 - applicant's power to avoid and contradictory consequences of allocation 580
 - Committee's conclusion 580
 - contradictory reasons (*Klöckner*) 575-80
 - existence of established standard 575
 - sufficiency of detail in application (AR 50(1)(c)) 574
 - sufficiency of reasons to understand how the Tribunal's conclusions were reached 577-80

- serious departure from a fundamental rule of procedure 573-80
 - burden of proof of damages as “fundamental procedure”, absence of ad hoc Committee evidence for 574
 - deviation from rule/serious of as twin requirements 573
 - right to be heard, parties’ full opportunity for 574
 - Tribunal’s explanation for decision 574
- non-disputing party submission
 - Committee’s confirmation of its conclusion not to annul on the grounds challenged by the EC 585, 587, 590
 - failure to apply the applicable law (EC position) 581-4
 - summary 581
 - applicability of EU law on State aid post-200 582
 - applicability of the Europe Agreement post-1995 581-2
 - contradictory reasons 582-3
 - manifest misinterpretation and misapplication of State aid law 583
 - Tribunal’s failure to address the conflict of Romania’s international law obligations 584
 - failure to apply the applicable law (parties’ positions)
 - applicant’s full acceptance of the EC position 584
 - claimants’ reiteration of arguments in reply to applicant on this ground 584-5
 - failure to consider the Award’s enforceability (EC position) 585-6
 - failure to consider the Award’s enforceability (parties’ positions)
 - applicant’s full acceptance of the EC’s position 586
 - claimants’ rejection on grounds of irrelevance/factual inaccuracy 586-7
 - Tribunal’s lack of jurisdiction (EC position)
 - summary 587
 - applicant’s absence of comment 589
 - claimants’ arguments (novelty of claim not made/endorsed by the parties/absence of *ex proprio motu* obligation) 589-90
 - termination of BIT (VCLT 59(1)) 647-8
- Micula (ICSID) (Award), costs** 486-7
 - annulment costs
 - annulment proceedings (applicant to pay) 591-2
 - parties’ legal costs (each to pay own) 591-2
 - relevant factors
 - claimants’ mixed success 487
 - complexity of issues 487
 - Tribunal’s decision 487
- Micula (ICSID) (Award), damages, overview/preliminary matters** 328-50
 - legal standards
 - burden/standard of proof (“insofar as it is established” (ILC 36(2))), burden/standard of proof (“insofar as it is established” (ILC 36(2))) 341-2
 - causation/causal link as requirement for finding of breach of State responsibility/liability for reparation (ILC(SR) 31(2))
 - burden/standard of proof 342
 - concurrent causes, effect 333-4, 340-2, 343-4
 - contributory fault, effect (ILC(SR) 39) 343-4
 - “injury . . . caused by the internationally wrongful act” as basis for full reparation (ILC(SR) 31 Commentary 9) 343
 - multiple violations arising from the same cause, sufficiency of a single demonstration of causality 344
 - test for remoteness 343

- Micula (ICSID) (Award), damages, overview/preliminary matters** (*cont.*)
- restitution/*restitutio in integrum* (ILC(SR) 31(1), ILC(SR) 35 and ILC(SR) 36/*Chorzów Factory* principle) 340-2
 - non-State actors, applicability to 340 n172
 - overview of claimants' damages case
 - a. original case 329-30
 - request 330
 - b. claimants' damages case in their reply 330-2
 - request 331-2
 - overview of respondent's position
 - 1 (general criticisms) 337
 - 2 (legal standards as bar)
 - i. applicability of *Chorzów Factory* principle 338
 - ii. burden of proof 338
 - iii. causation 338-9
 - 3 (false assumptions as basis of quantum case) 339
 - 4 (exclusion of losses by non-Claimant companies/individual claimants' shareholdings in such companies) 339-40
 - 5 (rejection of request for all damages to be awarded to individual claimants) 340
 - 6 (revocation of provisional measures: request for set-off of tax debts against any damages awarded) 340
 - scope of Tribunal's considerations 328-9
 - Tribunal's jurisdiction over claims for damages relating to the non-claimant companies of the EFDG 344-50
 - claimants' development of their claim during the proceedings adding new information 345
 - findings (Decision on Jurisdiction and Admissibility) 345
 - claimants' development of their claim during the proceedings adding new information, timeliness of modifications 345-6
 - open questions 345
 - as non-jurisdictional issue relating to claimants' entitlement to seek remedy for non-claimant companies owned by them 346
 - claimants' dilatory approach to the presentation of evidence 349
 - evidence of ownership of non-claimant companies 346-51
 - Tribunal's conclusion (affirmation of right) 346
 - Micula (ICSID) (Award), damages, analysis of claimants' damages claims**
 - 1. choice of method of computation
 - method A, Tribunal's preference for 351-3
 - reasons for rejection of method B 351-3
 - reasons for rejection of method C 353
 - summary of claims under 333-4
 - 2. claims for actual losses (*damnum emergens*) (increased cost of raw materials) 353-63
 - increased cost of other raw materials (Tribunal's acceptance of claim) 358-9
 - increased cost of PET packaging 356-8
 - Tribunal's rejection of claim (PET equipment located outside the Ştei-Nucet region/credibility of claimed intentions) 357-8
 - increased cost of sugar 353-6
 - Tribunal's acceptance of claim 356
 - lost opportunity to stockpile sugar 359-63
 - evidentiary gaps 361-2
 - Tribunal's acceptance of claim with modifications 362-3
 - 3a. claims for lost profits (standard for an award of lost profits (ILC(SR) 36(2)))

- parties' positions
 - claimants 367-9
 - respondent 364-7
- Tribunal's analysis
 - "damage actually suffered as a result of the internationally wrongful act", limitation to (ILC(SR) 34 Comment 5) 370
 - "sufficient certainty" test (*Lemire*) 369-70
- 3b. claims for lost profits (sales of finished goods) (expert's report) 370-82
 - respondent's criticisms 374-5, 378-9
 - Tribunal's analysis
 - i. causation 374-6
 - ii. quantification of lost profits related to lost sales of soft drinks 375-6
 - iii. extrapolation of lost profits on soft drinks sales to all EFDG products 377-8, 379-80
 - iv. increase of original calculation by 67% on basis of "subjective expert opinion" 378, 380-1
 - v. Tribunal's valuation 381-2
- 3c. lost profits on sales of sugar-containing products (SCPs) 382-92
 - summary of experts' reports underlying the claim 382-3
 - respondent's criticism of 383-4
 - Tribunal's rejection of claim
 - i. absence of sales of SCPs to industrial third parties 384-5
 - ii. failure to prove intention to pursue SCP opportunity 386-92
- 3d(i). lost profits incurred as a result of claimants' inability to complete the Incremental Investments (parties' positions)
 - claimants 392-3
 - explanation for absence of evidence 398
 - respondent 393-4
- 3d(ii). lost profits incurred as a result of claimants' inability to complete the Incremental Investments (Tribunal's analysis)
 - can manufacturing plant (parties' positions)
 - claimants 403-4, 406
 - respondent 404-5
 - can manufacturing plant (Tribunal's rejection of claim: reasons)
 - i. lack of evidence of firm plans or steps to take project forward 405
 - ii. multi-purpose nature of acquired components 405-6
 - iii. failure to prove with sufficient certainty intention to build can manufacturing plant 406
 - co-generation plan (parties' positions)
 - claimant 407-14
 - respondent 413
 - co-generation plan (Tribunal's rejection of claim: reasons)
 - i. absence of documentary evidence of internal planning for project 407-10
 - ii. doubt that the project was nearly as advanced as the claimants' expert claim 410-13
 - iii. false claims on authorizations to operate a co-generation facility 313-14
 - iv. consequences of not having a turbine 414
 - v. failure to demonstrate with sufficient certainly likelihood of implementing a co-generation plant 414-15
- integrated business model—advance planning for the Integrated Investments
 - claimants' arguments 395-7

Micula (ICSID) (Award), damages, analysis of claimants' damages claims (cont.)

- Tribunal's conclusion (absence of contemporaneous evidence of advance planning) 397-8
- malt manufacturing plant (parties' arguments)
 - claimants 398-9
 - respondent 399-400
- malt manufacturing plant (Tribunal's rejection of claim: reasons)
 1. claimants' failure to establish that components had been purchased exclusively for the malt plant 400-1
 - ii. missing key elements for a malt plant 401-2
 - iii. failure to prove with sufficient certainty intention to build malt plant prior to expiry of incentives 402
- Tribunal's conclusion (claimants' failure to demonstrate with sufficient certainty likelihood of implementing Incremental Investments) 415-17
 - lack of contemporaneous documentary evidence of intention to build projected facilities/claimants' explanation for 415-16
 - site visit, reasons for refusal of 416
- Tribunal's decision (claimants' failure to demonstrate with sufficient certainty likelihood of implementing Incremental Investments) 416-17
 - calculations in support of claims 418
- 4a. financial penalties for failure to pay taxes (parties' positions)
 - claimants
 - financial penalties under consideration 417
 - grounds for claim 417
 - response to respondent's criticisms 421-3
 - respondent 418-21
- 4b. financial penalties for failure to pay taxes (Tribunal's analysis)
 - i. causality, required proof
 - insufficiency of funds to pay taxes after revocation of incentives 423
 - insufficiency of funds as sole reason for not paying taxes 423
 - revocation of incentives as cause of lack of funds 423
 - ii. establishment of amount of EFDG's principal unpayable tax debts 424-6
 - iii. availability of financing for payment of tax debts (parties' arguments)
 - claimant 420-8
 - respondent 420, 428
 - iv. availability of financing for payment of tax debts (Tribunal's conclusion)
 - claimants' prioritization of business expenditure over payment of taxes 428-30
 - dismissal of claim 460
 - non-payment of taxes at a time when money was available as break of chain of causation 430
- claimants' request for damages to be awarded net of tax
 - parties' positions
 - claimants 436-7
 - respondent 436-7
 - Tribunal's rejection of request, reasons
 - existence of tax dispute between respondent and claimant 437-8
 - part of damages unrelated to profits 437
 - use of gross profit margins for claimant's calculations 437
- Micula (ICSID) (Award), damages, claimants' requests for allocation***
 - claimants' alternative requests 438-9
 - Tribunal's request for parties' views on implications (6 May 2011) 439
 - parties' positions

- impact of claimants' requested allocation on factual or legal bases for damages or their quantification
 - claimants 453, 454-6, 457-8
 - respondent 453-4, 456-7
 - individual claimants' rights to claim damages as shareholders
 - claimant 440-2, 444-5, 446-7
 - respondent 442-4, 445-6, 447-9
 - possibility of designating individual claimants as sole or principal claimants at this stage of proceedings
 - claimants 448-50
 - respondent 450-3
 - Tribunal's analysis (allocation of damages to all five claimants)
 - impossible options
 - allocation of damages between all five claimants (absence of any indication by claimants to indicate how damages might be split) 461-2
 - allocation of entirety of the damages to the corporate claimants (association of a portion of the damages with other companies) 461
 - allocation of entirety of damages to individual claimants 461
 - separate awards to corporate claimants and individual claimants for direct damages (impossibility of distinguishing/risk of double recovery) 463
 - Tribunal's decision
 - payment of any damages, interest and costs to all five Claimants collectively 463-4
 - Tribunal's obligation not to pass judgment on what has not been claimed 464
 - Tribunal's analysis (claimants' request for all damages to be awarded to the individual claimants)
 - corporate claimants' non-waiver/continuance of claims 459-60
 - non-applicability of AR 44 (discontinuance), reasons 458-9
 - rejection of request 460
 - Suez v. Argentina* (AR 44) distinguished 458-60
- Micula (ICSID) (Award), damages, interest**
 - claimants' request (revised request for relief) 464-5
 - parties' positions
 - compound interest
 - claimants 465-6
 - respondent 469-70
 - date of commencement
 - claimants 467-8
 - respondent 470
 - rate (ROBOR+5% vs LIBOR+2%)
 - claimants 466-7
 - respondent 468-9
 - Tribunal's analysis
 - compound interest as norm
 - ILC(SR) 38 Commentary distinguished 470-1
 - as means of restoring claimant to same position as if breach had not occurred 470
 - recent investment tribunal practice/*Wena* 471
 - date of calculation 472-3
 - interest on damages for lost profits/risk of double recovery (ILC(SR) 38 Commentary) 473
 - avoidance of 473
 - rate (ROBOR+5%), arguments in favour of 471-2
 - Tribunal's decision 472

Micula (ICSID) (Award), damages, interest (cont.)

Tribunal's decision 473-4

Micula (ICSID) (Award), damages, parties' requests for relief other than

claimants' request for post-award injunctive relief

parties' positions

claimants 478-80

respondent 480-1

Tribunal's analysis of the law

cautious approach to 486

lapse of provisional measures on issuance of award 481

limitation of enforcement obligations to compensation (ICSID 54(1)), relevance 482-3

omission from BIT, effect 482

omission from claimant's request for arbitration, effect 482

preferred terminology 484

Tribunal's application to specific case

dismissal of claim 486

dismissal of tax penalties claim on the merits as termination of right to injunctive relief 485-6

timeliness as ancillary claim (AR 40) 484-5

set-off of the amounts awarded against the EFDG's tax debts

parties' positions

claimant 475-6

respondent 474-5

Tribunal's analysis

right to set-off as matter of host State's law/enforcement 477-8

time limits (AR 40), parties' failure to meet 477

treatment as ancillary claims (ICSID 46/AR 40) 476-7

Micula (ICSID) (Award), damages, respondent's defence that accession to the EU benefited the claimants

parties' positions

claimant 432-3

respondent 430-2

Tribunal's analysis

irrelevance of any benefit accruing to the claimants 435

questionable methodology of respondent's expert 430-5

Micula (ICSID) (Award), fair and equitable treatment (BIT 2(3)) 202-328

analysis of the law (parties' positions)

claimants 203-9

respondent 209-15

analysis of the law (Tribunal)

standard/classification as, relevant factors 215-16

assessment taking account of all the facts/circumstances, need for 218-19, 223, 225-6

balanced evaluation of treaty aims 219

conduct, examples of relevant obligations 220-1

as disciplined standard based on State practice/judicial practice 217

Europe Agreement/general context of EU accession 218-19

as flexible/elusive concept 216-17, 219-20

legitimate expectation 223-4

object and purpose as reflected in preamble 216-18

ordinary meaning 216-17

- review of the jurisprudence 216-17
 - transparency 224-6
 - VCLT 31/VCLT 32 as applicable law 215-16
- substantively improper conduct
 - bad faith, relevance 222
 - conduct that is arbitrary, manifestly unreasonable, discriminatory or in bad faith 221-2
 - outrageous or egregious test, rejection 223
 - “unreasonable”, dual nature of test 222-3
- Romania’s compliance with stability and legitimate expectation requirements (parties’ arguments)
 - i. standard for determining breach of legitimate expectation
 - claimants 226-9
 - respondent 248-51
 - ii. Romania’s alleged promise giving rise to legitimate expectation
 - claimant 227-9
 - respondent 251-8
 - iii. claimants’ reliance on promise or assurance
 - claimants 229-32
 - respondent 258-66
 - iv. reasonableness of claimants’ reliance on promise 233-46
 - v. Romania’s alleged violation of legitimate expectation 246-8
- Romania’s compliance with stability and legitimate expectation requirements (Tribunal’s analysis and decision) 266-328
 - i. standard for determining breach of legitimate expectation 266-9
 - clear promise by competent organ 268
 - detrimental reliance on promise 267
 - irrelevance of State’s intention 268
 - legitimate expectation/regulatory stability, interrelationship 266-7
 - objective reasonableness of expectation 268-9
 - ii. Romania’s alleged promise giving rise to legitimate expectation 269-74
 - effective elimination of all but one EGO 24/1998 incentives/retention of commitments requirements 272-4
 - legislative framework (1998-2002), EU law considerations, PICS and Romania’s conduct, purpose behind 270
 - requirement for long-term commitments and investments as *quid pro quo* 271-2
 - Romania’s concealment of risk of elimination of EGO 24 incentives 270-1
 - standard of proof for umbrella clause and fair and equitable treatment distinguished 269-70
 - Tribunal’s conclusion (creation by Romania of legitimate expectation of 10-year continuation of the regime to which claimants had subscribed) 273-4
 - iii. reasonableness of expectation 274-82
 - in the context of Romania’s accession to the EU 274-9
 - under Romanian law 279-82
 - iv. claimant’s reliance on promise or assurance 282-4
 - investments prior to date of incentives 282
 - reasons other than the incentives for claimants’ investments 282-3
 - iv. claimant’s reliance on promise or assurance, Tribunal’s conclusions
 - credibility of claimants’ evidence 284
 - limitation of protection to period of legitimate expectation 283-4
 - objective reasonableness of claimants’ expectation 284
 - significant part of investments made in reliance on incentives 283

Micula (ICSID) (Award), fair and equitable treatment (BIT 2(3)) (cont.)

- Romania's conduct, bad faith
 - parties' positions
 - claimants 314
 - respondent 314
 - Tribunal's analysis
 - definition/classification of, as flexible concept 314
 - jurisprudence 315-16
 - Tribunal's decision 316
- Romania's conduct, reasonableness (claimants' allegations) (Tribunal's analysis)
 - parallel encouragement to investors to participate in scheme and negotiation for termination of scheme 306-7
 - pursuit of a rational policy/EU imperatives 292-306
 - revocation of benefits while retaining the commitments requirement 310-13
 - revocation of incentives unnecessarily and without attempting to mitigate damages 307-10
 - Tribunal's conclusion 313-14
- Romania's conduct, reasonableness (parties' positions)
 - claimants 285-6
 - respondent 286-92
 - motivation for amending ECO 34 (EU accession) 287-9
 - reasonable balance of conflicting policies 289-90
 - relevance of claimants' alternative suggestions 290-2
- Romania's conduct, transparency
 - parties' positions (claimants) 316-17
 - parties' positions (respondent) 317-25
 - claimants' failure to exercise due diligence 318
 - claimants' unreasonable expectation that respondent should disclose information about diplomatic negotiations 318
 - respondent's compliance with reasonable standards of transparency/consistency in the circumstances 320-5
 - respondent's reasonable balancing of confidentiality and openness 319-20
 - respondent's violation of claimants' legitimate expectation 328
 - Tribunal's analysis and conclusion 325-8
 - respondent's failure to inform PIC holders in timely fashion of early termination of EGO 24 regime 325-7, 328

Micula (ICSID) (Award), preliminary matters

- applicable law (ICSID 42(1)) 154-67
 - parties' arguments
 - overview 154-5
 - claimants 155-8
 - EU Commission 161-2
 - respondent 158-61
 - Tribunal's analysis (relevant rules of international law applicable to the dispute) 162-4
 - BIT 162
 - Europe Agreement 74, relevance 163-4
 - Europe Agreement (entry into force: 1 February 1995) 162
 - relevance of EU law 172-4
 - Tribunal's analysis (relevant rules of international law applicable to the dispute) (interpretation of) 162-3
- enforcement of the arbitral award and EU law (ICSID 54(1)), risk of conflict
 - parties' positions

- EU Commission 165-6
 - respondent 164-5
 - Tribunal's analysis
 - applicability of ICSID 53/ICSID 54 167
 - inappropriateness of a decision anticipating post-award actions 167
 - Jurisdiction (Decision on Jurisdiction and Admissibility (as part of the Award)) 153-4
- Micula* (ICSID) (Award), separate opinion (Abi-Saab)**
 - legitimate expectation
 - EGO 24 as such, insufficiency 489-90
 - issue of PIC as/limitations 490
 - requirements
 - identifiable legal commitment 489-90
 - specificity 489
 - stabilization clause-type commitment 490
 - possible remedies including compensation 490-2
 - respondent's liabilities
 - behaviour as
 - negligent 492
 - reasonable, in good faith and in pursuit of national interest 491
 - transparent 492
 - conclusion 492
 - early withdrawal of incentives causing skewed legal relationship possibly giving rise to liability 490-1
 - limitation of responsibility to actual sustained loss 492
 - necessity (ILC(SR) 25) as possible defence not raised by respondent 491
- Micula* (ICSID) (Award), umbrella clause (BIT 2(4))** 168-202
 - claimants' position
 - EGO 24 as specific obligation vis-à-vis claimants 171-7
 - nature and scope of clause 168-71
 - respondent's position
 - alleged breach of the umbrella clause 184-5
 - EGO 24 as specific obligation vis-à-vis claimants 178, 180-4
 - inconsistency of claimants' position with BIT 2(4)/umbrella clause jurisprudence 178
 - nature and scope of clause 178-80
 - Tribunal's analysis 186-251
 - EGO 24 as specific obligation vis-à-vis claimants 188-201
 - nature and scope of clause
 - applicable law (law applicable to the obligation) 187-8
 - "obligation", as capacious term 186-7
 - "obligation", ordinary meaning 186-7
 - specific obligation towards claimant, need for 186-8
 - specific obligation towards claimants, existence of
 - content of claimants' entitlement 189-96
 - undertaking as an "obligation" under Romanian law/alleged breach of 196-202
- Micula* (ICSID) (jurisdiction and admissibility), general matters (parties' positions)**
 - applicable standard for determination of jurisdiction/requirements
 - claimants 26
 - respondent 25-6
 - main contentions on jurisdiction
 - claimant 23-4
 - respondent 22-3

- Micula (ICSID) (jurisdiction and admissibility), general matters (Tribunal's analysis)**
 admissibility/jurisdiction, distinction 26-7
 applicable standard for determination of jurisdiction/requirements (ICSID 25) 26-8
 compliance with BIT 26
 consent in writing 26
 legal dispute 26
 between a Contracting State and a national of another Contracting State 74
 prima facie case, sufficiency 27-8
 status of parties as ICSID members 24-5
 Telenor 28
 competence/duty of tribunal to determine jurisdiction (*compétence de la compétence*)
 27
 ex proprio motu/ex officio (AR 41(2)) 27
 relevant legal provisions
 BIT 7 (text) 25
 ICSID 25 (jurisdiction) 24-5
- Micula (ICSID) (jurisdiction and admissibility), jurisdiction *ratione materiae***
 alleged absence of compensable harm
 parties' arguments
 claimants 47
 respondent 46-7
 Tribunal's analysis
 alleged hypothetical nature of claim 48
 as argument relating to the existence of a dispute 47
 existence of legal dispute arising directly out of an ICSID 25 investment/failure to
 settle amicably (BIT 7(1)/BIT 7(2)) 48
 prima facie case, sufficiency 48-9
 existence of an investment
 parties' positions (claimants) 44
 parties' positions (respondent) 44
 existence of an investment (Tribunal's analysis) (factors confirming status as investment
 for ICSID purposes) 43-6
- Micula (ICSID) (jurisdiction and admissibility), jurisdiction *ratione personae***
 nationality of corporate claimants (Tribunal's analysis)
 critical date for determination of nationality (date of consent) 43
 evidence of corporate claimants' status 43
 "national of another Contracting State" (BIT 1(2)(b))/(BIT 1(2)(c)) 42-3
 "national of another Contracting State" (juridical person) (BIT 7(3)), agreement to
 treat as 43
 "national of another Contracting State" (juridical person) (ICSID 25(2)(b)),
 agreement to treat as 42
 Tribunal's conclusion 33
 nationality of individual claimants (parties' positions)
 claimants 31-3
 respondent 29-31
 Ioan Micula, acceptance of status as Swedish national 34-5
 Viorel Micula, objections to claimed status as Swedish national 34, 35-8
 nationality of individual claimants (Tribunal's analysis)
 applicable rules
 "any natural person who is a citizen of a Contracting Party in accordance with its
 Laws" (BIT 1(2)(a)) 33
 "national of another Contracting State" (ICSID 25(2)) 33

- burden of proof, respondent's failure to meet 36-8
 - Tribunal's conclusion 38
- genuine link requirement (*Nottebohm*)—relevance in ICSID proceedings/absence of dual nationality considerations 38-42
- “national of another Contracting State” (ICSID 25(2)), determination
 - compliance with international law, need for 34
 - critical date (positive/negative requirements) 33-42
 - State's right to determine who is a national as general principle of international law 33-4
- nationality as objective jurisdictional requirement calling for determination regardless of positions of the parties 35
- Viorel Micula's acquisition of Swedish nationality 35-8
 - review of the facts 35-8
- Micula* (ICSID) (jurisdiction and admissibility), jurisdiction *ratione temporis***
 - parties' positions
 - claimants 51-2
 - respondent 49-50
 - Tribunal's analysis
 - applicable law (ICSID 42) 52-3
 - entry into force of BIT, applicability to disputes arising prior to and acts preceding distinguished 53-4
- Micula* (ICSID) (jurisdiction and admissibility), Tribunal's power to order restitution**
 - parties' arguments
 - claimant 55
 - respondent 54-5
 - Tribunal's analysis 55-6
 - limitation of BIT 4 to compensation, effect 56
 - non-enforceability (ICSID 54), relevance 55-6
- Micula v. Romania* (UK Supreme Court) (background)**
 - facts and non-UK procedural history in date order
 - Europe Agreement (1993) (key provisions) 633
 - European Commission's encouragement to Romania to pursue privatization, foreign direct investment and regional development (1997-8) 633
 - Romania's adoption of EGO 24/2008/designation of Ștei-Nucet region as disfavoured region (1999) 633
 - designation of Ștei-Nucet region as disfavoured region (1 April 1999) 633
 - adoption of Law No 143/1999 (State aid) (30 June 1999) 633-4
 - EU–Romania accession negotiations (2000-4)/requirement to bring Romanian law into alignment with EU *acquis* 634
 - EGO 75/2000 modifying EGO 24/1998 (16 June 2000) 634
 - claimants' incentives—dependent investments in Ștei-Nucet region (early 2000s) 625
 - Romania–Sweden BIT (29 May 2002) 634
 - Government Ordinance No 96/2004 eliminating EGO 24/1998 incentives (31 August 2004) 634
 - request for arbitration (28 July 2005) 634-5
 - Romania's accession to the EU (1 January 2007) 635
 - Decision on Jurisdiction and Admissibility (24 September 2008) 635
 - Tribunal's Award (breach of BIT obligations (fair and equitable treatment, legitimate expectations and transparency)) 635
 - compensation and interest 635
 - decision not to address effect of EU State aid rules on its enforceability 635

Micula v. Romania (UK Supreme Court) (background) (cont.)

- Romania's application for annulment (9 April 2014) 635
- EU Commission's injunction ordering Romania to suspend execution of the Award (25 May 2014) 635
- ad hoc Committee's conditional agreement to continuation of stay of enforcement (7 August 2014) 635
- termination of stay following Romania's refusal to give requested undertaking (7 September 2014) 635
- Commission's decision formally opening State aid investigation (1 October 2014) 635
- Final Decision 2015/1470 determining that payment of the Award would constitute State aid under TFEU 107(1) (30 March 2015) 636
 - prohibition on payment of the Award/order to recover any payments made 630
 - requirement that claimants repay any sums received as part payment of the Award 636
- commencement of GCEU proceedings for annulment of Commission Decision 2015/1470 (November 2015) 630
- ad hoc Committee's rejection of Romania's application for annulment (26 February 2016) 636
- Commission's confirmation that payment into court of security would breach the Commission Decision (7 September 2018) 637
- Commission's decision empowering it to take infringement proceedings against Romania (7 December 2018) 637
- Brussels Court of Appeal's reference to the CJEU including principle of sincere cooperation (TEU 4(3)) 636
- GCEU's annulment of Commission Decision 2015/1470 on grounds of retroactivity (18 June 2019) 636, 644-5, 647
- Commission's decision to appeal against the GCEU's decision/notification to UK Court and the parties (31 July 2019) 636
 - grounds of appeal 636
- facts and UK procedural history in date order
- registration of the Award (17 October 2014) 637
- Romania's application to the Commercial Court to vary or set aside the registration order (28 July 2015) 637
- claimants' request for an order for payment of security in the event of a stay of execution 637
- judgment (Blair J) dismissing Romania's application to set aside registration/grant of stay of enforcement pending GCEU decision (20 January 2017) 637, 654
 - summary of judgment 637-8, 654
- judgment (Blair J) rejecting claimants' application for security (15 June 2017) 638
- Court of Appeal's dismissal of appeal against order for a stay/reversal of order against security (27 July 2018) 638-9, 654
 - summary of opinions 638-9, 654
- Supreme Court's partial permission for appeal (31 October 2018) 639
- Supreme Court's grant of permission to claimants to cross-appeal in relation to the order for a stay (11 April 2019) 638-9
- schedule for hearing of appeal (18-20 June)/GCEU decision annulling the Commission Decision (18 June 2019) 640
 - adjournment of hearing to 7-9 October 2019 640
 - lapse of stay order 640
- hearings on applications for renewal of stay and security in respect of stay (Phillips J) (9 September 2019) 640

- order for stay of enforcement/payment of security (10 September 2010) 640
- grant of certificate for a leapfrog appeal to the Supreme Court (AJA 1969) 640
- grounds of appeal (appeal) 640-1
- grounds of appeal (cross-appeal against stay)
 - new ground (sincere cooperation (TEU 4(3))) 641
 - original grounds 641
- Micula v. Romania* (UK Supreme Court) (Court's analysis and decision)**
 - cross-appeal against stay: grounds 1 and 2 (power to stay under ICSID/1966 Act) 651-63
 - parties' arguments (claimants) 654
 - procedural history (Blair J and Court of Appeal) 654
 - relevant ICSID provisions
 - ICSID 50-2 (interpretation, revision and annulment of award) 652-3
 - ICSID 53-5 (recognition and enforcement of award) 652-3
 - relevant UK law
 - 1966 Act 2 (effect of registration of an award) 653
 - CPR 62.21(5) (circumstances justifying a stay of enforcement) 654
 - cross-appeal against stay: ground 4 (TFEU 351) 665-76
 - Romania's objection to consideration of, rejection 666-7
 - TFEU 351, analysis
 - applicability to any treaty capable of affecting the application of the EU Treaties 667, 677-8
 - applicability in case of potential conflict between EU Treaty obligations and pre-accession treaty obligations 667-8
 - EU obligation not to impede Member States' obligations under a prior agreement 667-8, 677-8
 - existence of obligations towards non-Member States in multilateral treaty, sufficiency to engage TFEU 251 670
 - national courts' responsibility for determination of the existence and extent of obligations 665-6, 675-6
 - obligations to Member States and non-Member States distinguished 668
 - permissive and compulsory provisions distinguished 668
 - preliminary ruling reference (TFEU 267), exclusion 669
 - TFEU 351, applicability to the UK's relevant obligations under ICSID 670-6
 - duty of sincere cooperation (TEU 4(3)), relevance 674-6
 - ICSID 54/ICSID 69 as examples of ICSID obligation owed by all Contracting States to the community of Contracting States 670-4
 - TFEU 351, jurisprudence
 - Budějovický Budvar* 669
 - Burgoa* 667-8
 - Commission v. Slovak Republic* (Case C-264/09) 669
 - Evans Medical* 667, 668, 669-70
 - Italian Duties on Radio Valves* 667, 668, 671
 - Levy* 667, 669-70, 675
 - Luksan* 671
 - Open Skies* 667
 - RTE* 668
 - T Port* 669
 - cross-appeal against stay: new ground (sincere cooperation (TEU 4(3)))
 - annulment decision/effect of annulment of an EU measure on preparatory acts:
 - see* initiating and injunction decisions, effect of GCEU's annulment decision *below*

***Micula v. Romania* (UK Supreme Court) (Court's analysis and decision) (cont.)**

context

- decisions of Blair J and Court of Appeal 642
- GCEU annulment decision (18 June 2019) (summary) 643-5
- presumption of lawfulness of acts of Community institutions (*Masterfoods*) 642
- TFEU 4(3) (scope) (*Deutsche Lufthansa*) 642
- TFEU 4(3) (text) 641-2

Court's dismissal of appeal 651

initiating and injunction decisions, effect of GCEU's annulment decision, Court's analysis and conclusions

Commission's scope for reconfiguring investigation to avoid disqualifying errors 648

effect of annulment of an EU measure on preparatory acts (CJEU jurisprudence) 645-6

insufficiency of error in initiating decision to prevent Commission relying on duty of sincere co-operation 648-9

relevant considerations 647

parties' arguments (claimants)

absence of CJEU action to suspend enforcement (TFEU 278) 643

absence of CJEU interim measures (TFEU 279) 643

extension of finding of taint in main decision to preparatory decisions 646-7

GCEU's annulment of Commission Decision as termination of presumption of validity 642-3

Masterfoods 650

pending appeal, risk of conflict between EU courts and UK courts if successful 650

parties' arguments (Commission/Romania)

limited effect of GCEU's decision/remaining possibility of vindication of the impugned decision 642-3

Masterfoods 649-50

pending appeal, risk of conflict between EU courts and UK courts if successful 649-50

restoration to the situation prior to the impugned decision 645

pending appeal against GCEU's annulment decision, effect on sincere cooperation obligation (Court's analysis)

Crehan 651

Delimitis 651

Emerald Supplies 651

Kernkraftwerke Lippe-Ems 651

Masterfoods 650-1

purpose of duty of sincere cooperation 651

real prospect of successful appeal/conflict between EU and UK courts 651

***Micula v. Romania* (US District Court) 678-708**

background (factual)

Commission's State aid decision 687-8

GCEU's annulment of decision (18 June 2019) 692

petitioners' appeal to the GCEU 688

events leading to ICSID arbitration 695-6

ICSID

annulment proceedings 688

binding effect/lack of authority of domestic courts to review merits of a tribunal decision 684

- enforcement of an award, dependence on Contracting States (ICSID 54(1)) 684-5
- non-self-executing status 685
- summary of key provisions 684
- ICSID arbitration
 - events leading to 685-6
 - parties' positions/tribunal's award 687
 - rejection of Romania's annulment application/resultant conflict with Commission's State Aid decision 688
- procedural history (US courts)
 - Commission's entry into proceedings in support of Romania citing *Achmea* (11 December 2019) 691
 - initial efforts to confirm [recognize] award (11 April 2014-23 October 2017) 688-9
 - renewal of efforts to confirm (6 November 2017) 690
 - Romania's motion to stay proceedings/parties' arguments/denial of motion 690-3
- Romania's accession to the EU (1 January 2007) 687
 - suspension of EGO 24 incentives 688
- Court's conclusion and Order 706-7
- GCEU's annulment of Commission's State aid decision
 - effect on preparatory acts 700-2
 - risk of reversal of decision 703
- jurisdiction *ratione materiae* 694-9
 - burden of proof 694
 - Court's decision 699
 - endorsement by the Court of Appeals 707-8
 - dependence on existence of an exception (28 USC 1605(a)) 694
 - FSIA 1605(a)(6) ("arbitration exception")
 - Achmea*, effect/reasons for rejection of Romania's arguments 695-9
 - text 694-5
 - FSIA as sole basis for jurisdiction over a foreign State (28 USC 1330) 694
- recognition/enforcement of ICSID arbitral award (22 USC 1650a)
 - conflation of "recognition" and "enforcement" procedures/use of "confirm" 703-4, 688 n1
 - consideration of merits, compliance with international law or tribunal's jurisdiction, exclusion 693
 - exclusive jurisdiction of federal courts (1650a(b)) 685, 693
 - "as if the award were a final judgment of a court" (1650a(a)) 685, 693
 - as non-protected process 703
- settlement/partial settlement of award, possibility of adjustment to reflect
 - Court's assessment of the merits
 - alleged conflict of part of ICSID award with EU law as matter for ICSID tribunal 705-6
 - establishment of State-controlled account in petitioners' name, ineffectiveness 705
 - payment received by petitioners from forced executions, as legitimate deduction from award 705
 - Romanian court's declaration of unlawfulness of tax set-offs 704
 - preliminary matters
 - applicable law 704
 - Court's acceptance in principle 703-4
 - petitioners' objections to claim 703-4

nationality

applicable law, international law, role 34-5
 right to (UDHR 15(1)) 34
 State's right to determine/accord 33-4

preliminary ruling (CJEU/ECJ/CJEC) (TFEU 267 [TEC 234]), admissibility/
 requirements, pre-accession agreements with non-Member States, exclusion 669

recognition/enforcement of foreign arbitral award

exequatur proceedings: *see also* ICSID award, recognition and enforcement (ICSID
 53-5), exequatur

“recognition” and “enforcement” distinguished 605

restitution/restitutio in integrum (including ILC(SR) 31(1), ILC(SR) 35 and ILC(SR) 36/Chorzów Factory principle)

“caused by the internationally wrongful act” (ILC(SR) 31(2)): *see* causation/causal
 link as requirement for finding of breach of State responsibility/liability for
 reparation (ILC(SR) 31)

Chorzów Factory formula 341

non-State actors, applicability to 340 n172

restitution/restitutio in integrum/measure of compensation (including ILC(SR) 31(1), ILC(SR) 35 and ILC(SR) 36/Chorzów Factory principle), Micula 340-2

Romania, investment in including EGO 24/1998: *see Micula*

Romania–Sweden BIT (2002)

fair and equitable treatment (Art. 2(3)) 202-328

“umbrella” clause (undertaking to observe domestic commitments) (Art. 2(4)) 168-202

sincere cooperation/good faith obligation (TEU 4(3)), *Micula v. Romania* (UK) 641-51,
 662-3, 674-7

State immunity, waiver, treaty provision as 600-1, 626-7

travaux préparatoires as supplementary means of interpretation (VCLT 32)

in respect of

ICSID 655-9

ICSID 54(1) 482-3

ICSID 69 673-4

treaty interpretation

VCLT 31(1) ([natural and] ordinary meaning)

“fair and equitable treatment” 216-17

“obligation” 186-7

United Kingdom

Arbitration (International Investment Disputes) Act 1966

as implementation of ICSID Convention (1966) 653

interpretation

in context of the ICSID Convention 655

presumption of intention to comply with treaty obligations 655

Arbitration (International Investment Disputes) Act 1966 by section

- 1(2) (right to register ICSID award) 653
- 2 (effect of registration), text 653
- 2(1) (effect of registration: “shall be of the same force and effect for the purposes of execution as if it had been a judgment of the High Court”) 639, 654, 659-61
 - circumstances in which there might be a stay 639, 654
 - CPR 62.21(5) (circumstances justifying a stay of enforcement) (text) 659, 653
 - “enforcement” and “execution” distinguished 654
 - as impediment to stay of enforcement of an ICSID award 637, 639, 654
 - non-enforceability of domestic judgment/ICSID award in conflict with EU law 654
 - possible ICSID defences against enforcement (ICSID 54(1)/ICSID 55/*travaux préparatoires*) 659
- 2(1)(c) (“same control over the execution of the award [as if it had been] a judgment of the High Court”) 661
- legislation, interpretation, conformity with international obligations 655
- stay of proceedings, enforcement of an ICSID arbitration award 651-63
- United States of America (USA)**
 - recognition/enforcement of ICSID arbitral award (22 USC 1650a)
 - conflation of “recognition” and “enforcement” procedures/use of “confirm” 688 n1, 703-4
 - consideration of merits, compliance with international law or tribunal’s jurisdiction, exclusion 693
 - exclusive jurisdiction of federal courts (1650a(b)) 685, 693
 - FSIA plenary action requirement 688-9, 691-2
 - “as if the award were a final judgment of a court” (1650a(a)) 685, 693
 - jurisprudence
 - Medellín* 685
 - Micula v. Romania*: see *Micula v. Romania* (US District Court)
 - Mobil Cerro Negro* 693
 - TECO Guatemala Holdings* 693
 - as non-protected process 703
 - treatment of the award as final (ICSID 53) 693
- State immunity, procedural aspects
 - burden/standard of proof 694
 - presumption of 694