

Table of contents

Preface	5
----------------------	---

INTRODUCTION

1. Host States' right to regulate against the right of protection of foreign investors	11
1.1. How far does States' right to regulate go and how far do the State's contracting parties' (the investors) rights to be protected go?	11
1.2. Particular perspective of this work.....	14
1.2.1. Energy and infrastructure are of national interest	14
1.2.2. Energy and infrastructure are part of the new economic diplomacy.....	15
1.2.3. Energy and infrastructure are between the public and private interests	16
1.3. Are the outcomes of arbitral awards always unpredictable?	16
1.4. Due diligence and expert witnesses	17
1.5. Structure and approach of the book.....	19
1.6. Acknowledgements	22

PART I ISSUES ON JURISDICTION AND ADMISSIBILITY

2. General considerations on jurisdiction and admissibility: The level of duty of care of arbitrators	25
--	----

2.1. General considerations, objections and level of duties . . .	25
2.2. Jurisdiction proceeds admissibility and merits	25
2.2.1. Duty of care of arbiter: excess of powers	26
2.2.2. Relevance of previous awards	28
3. Lack of jurisdiction due to the absence of “protected investments”	33
3.1. The required link with the investment.	34
3.2. Whether the dispute arises out of an “investment” within the meaning of Article 25(1) of the ICSID Convention . . .	35
3.2.1. Applicable test for determining the meaning of investment: the relevance of the <i>Salini</i> test	35
3.2.2. The nature of dispute: “Investment” under Article 25 of the ICSID Convention The <i>Salini</i> Test – prescriptive or indicative criteria?	36
3.2.3. Commercial risks v. investment risks	38
3.2.4. Consent of the parties to submit their dispute to ICSID – as a component of the “investment” test . . .	40
3.2.5. Are Power Purchase Agreements (PPAs) “protected investments”?	42
4. Tax carve-out: Scope and limits of <i>bona fide</i> taxation	47
4.1. Tax as an expression of sovereignty	47
4.2. What is a “taxation measure”: the <i>SunReserve</i> Test	49
4.3. The presumption of <i>bona fide</i> taxation measures: the burden of proof of <i>mala fide</i> bears on the claimant. . . .	54
4.4. Compatibility of carve-out and taking into consideration	57
5. Jurisdictional issues related to EU law: The principles of EU autonomy and primacy (the “<i>Achmea</i> rule”)	59
5.1. Context and issues	59

5.2. EU membership of ECT and absence of disconnection clause or reservation.	62
5.3. Absence of conflict of treaties under Articles 30 and 59 VCLT	65
5.4. Effect of the “Agreement for the Termination of Bilateral Investment Treaties between the Member States of the European Union” on the intra EU BITs and pending arbitration cases.	70
5.4.1. To what extent will this EU Termination Agreement impact BIT arbitral proceedings?	72
6. Contract claims defence	73
6.1. The applicable test: were the alleged breaches act of sovereign authority?	74
6.2. The <i>prima facie</i> or “as formulated” test	75
7. Objection to jurisdiction due to the “fork in the road” clause	79
7.1. The “fundamental basis” test	79
7.2. The triple identity test	81

PART II

THE MERITS – STANDARDS OF PROTECTION OF FOREIGN INVESTMENTS

8. The level of arbitrators’ duties when addressing evidence and stating reasons – due process of law	87
8.1. Failure to state reasons	87
8.2. Serious departure from fundamental rule of procedure. .	90
9. Expropriation.....	93
9.1. Lawful expropriation and unlawful expropriation	94

9.1.1. Rules on expropriation.	94
9.1.2. Reversionary assets and expropriation	97
9.1.3. Can any illegal conduct give rise to a claim for expropriation? Could a legal conduct lead to unlawful expropriation?.....	97
9.2. Substantial deprivation as prerequisite condition for expropriation.	99
9.3. Indirect expropriation	103
9.3.1. Definition of indirect expropriation	103
9.3.2. Examples of indirect expropriation.....	107
9.3.3. Can omissions lead to indirect expropriation?.....	109
9.3.4. Is the test for expropriation applicable for a collection of interests in an investment like PPAs?	109
9.4. Creeping expropriation	110
9.5. Could a tax policy constitute indirect expropriation?	111
9.5.1. The “different treatment” test	115
10. Standard of protection of investments in international law ..	117
10.1. Fair and equitable treatment (FET) and legitimate expectations.....	119
10.1.1. General Considerations over FET and legitimate expectations.....	119
10.1.2. Scope of standards of fair and equitable treatment ..	120
10.1.3. FET and standards under customary international law: Evolution from outrageous and bad faith to frustration of investors’ expectations (<i>Tecmed</i> standard)..	121
10.1.4. Variety of essential elements composing the FET standard	126
10.1.5. Investors’ legitimate expectations	131
10.1.5.1. Legitimate expectations as important factor in the FET standard and the host State’s commitment, representation or guarantee.	131

10.1.5.2. The legitimate expectation of stability and the right for the host State to regulate: the balancing exercise	135
10.1.5.3. The legitimate expectation of consistency related to rational policy	140
10.1.5.4. Legitimate expectations of transparency and due process.....	142
10.1.6. Legitimate expectations “at the time of the investment” and duty of the tribunal to assess it.....	145
10.1.7. Standard of care of executive or legislative bodies and for composite/cumulative breaches toward investors .	147
10.1.8. Duty of the investors to perform due diligence “at the time of the investment” and the level of care of investors.....	149
10.1.9. Legitimate expectation and stabilisation clauses.....	152
10.1.9.1. Stabilisation clauses and acquired rights	152
10.1.9.2. Business risk and reduced legitimate expectations in absence of stabilization clause.....	154
10.1.10. Reduced expectations in presence of change in law or hardship clause	155
10.2. Unreasonable or discriminatory measures: the impairment clause	156
10.2.1. Is impairment significant enough?.....	157
10.2.2. The unreasonable or discriminatory treatment.....	158
10.3. The Full Protection and Security (FPS) standard	162
10.3.1. FPS as a separate ground of protection	162
10.3.2. Scope of FPS: Only physical security/police protection or, in addition, commercial and legal protection?	164
10.3.3. FPS does not create a “strict liability” but requires from the host State to act with due diligence	169
10.4. Umbrella clause	170
10.4.1. History and examples of umbrella clauses	170
10.4.2. Restrictive scope of protection of umbrella clause: limited to stabilization clause.....	172

10.4.3. Actual trend of scope of protection of the umbrella clause: Contractual obligations and unilateral legislative or regulations act directed at a small and well-defined category of investors and/or investments	174
10.4.4. The difference between “contract claim” and “treaty claim” protected by the umbrella clause and the relevance of domestic law	181
10.5. Most Favoured Nation (MFN) clauses	182
10.5.1. Definition and general considerations over MFN	182
10.5.2. MFN clauses extend protection to FET and umbrella clause of other investment treaties	184
10.5.3. Limited scope of certain MFN clauses	186
10.5.4. Controversial application of MFN for the purpose of establishing jurisdiction and public order policy considerations	188
10.5.4.1. Conservative view: No import of arbitration consent through MFN	188
10.5.4.2. Can a MFN clause waive a condition precedent to the exercise of jurisdiction?	192
10.5.4.3. Evolutionary interpretation: MFN can import a consent to arbitration	193
11. The three applicable tests and different reasonings of arbitrators	197
11.1. The <i>Saluka</i> test: representations and warranties as well as legitimacy and reasonableness of expectations	198
11.1.1. Legitimacy and reasonableness of Saluka’s expectations: The construction of the Saluka test <i>per se</i> and the FET	203
11.1.2. Application of the <i>Saluka</i> test	209
11.1.3. Representations/commitments/warranties creating legitimate expectations	213
11.1.4. Behaviour or representation not creating legitimate expectations	215

11.2. <i>The Tecmed test</i> – radical or drastic change in the ordinary level of business or regulatory risk at the time of investment	221
11.3. <i>AES Summit</i> : the “luxury profits” test.....	227
12. Host State’s crisis or public health situations: Defences based on police powers and state of necessity and the impact on damages	233
12.1. Safeguard clause and the doctrine of state of necessity	234
12.2. Defences based on the exercise of public policy powers and public health protection.....	237
12.2.1. The police powers doctrine and its recognition.....	237
12.2.2. The defence based on public health protection.....	239
12.2.3. Host States’ measures taken to combat Covid-19 and investment protection issues	241
12.3. Content of plea of necessity.....	241
12.4. Major crisis, state of necessity and the impact on the valuation of compensation.....	246
12.5. Absence of defence based on the limited scope of the BIT or MIT “excluding” economic activities for reasons of public security, public order, public health or morality.....	249

PART III

QUANTUM OF DAMAGES

13. Legal principles of compensation on state responsibility	253
13.1. Restitution as primary remedy for reparation	253

13.2. The <i>Chorzów</i> standard of reparation: The reparation must wipe out all consequences of the illegal act and re-establish the situation which would have existed had that act not been committed	254
13.3. Burden of proof of damages: the “sufficient certainty” test	256
13.4. Standard of compensation in case of expropriation: the “but for” scenario through FMV and DCF	257
13.4.1. The lost cash flows	258
13.4.2. How to compute DCF, the past and future cash flows and discount rate	259
13.5. Choice of valuations methods for the breach of the standards of protection other than expropriation: DCF, ABV, or IRR?	260
13.6. Discounted Cash Flow (DCF) Method	263
13.7. Internal role of the return IRR method in case of breach of standard of protection	267
13.7.1. Is the IRR concluded on the portfolio investments or for each individual power plant?	267
13.7.2. Is the project IRR based on the lifetime of the power plant?	268
13.7.3. What are the components of the IRR project model and the allocated compensation?	268
13.7.3.1. Post-tax figures	268
13.7.3.2. Cost of money and WACC	269
13.8. Valuation of lost opportunity or loss of chance	269
13.9. Full recovery versus compensation taking into account reasonable change applicable to the investment	271
13.10. Claw-back of past remuneration	272
13.11. Tax gross-up and foreign taxation	274

13.12. Final “reality check”	275
13.13. Post-award interests	275

PART IV COSTS OF ARBITRATION

14. The Costs	279
14.1. The underlying principles: the tribunal has wide discretionary powers to award the costs as it deems appropriate	279
14.2. The costs follow the event.....	280
14.3. Each party bears its own cost or 50/50 share	283
14.3.1. What are the principles in the case of an annulment procedure?	284
Conclusion	287
Table of cases	291
Bibliography	307
Index	309