

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/74364> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

**Author:** Prislán, V.

**Title:** Domestic courts in investor-state arbitration : partners, suspects, competitors

**Issue Date:** 2019-06-27

# Domestic Courts in Investor-State Arbitration

*Partners, Suspects, Competitors*

PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van  
de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,  
op gezag van Rector Magnificus prof. mr. C.J.J.M. Stolker,  
volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties  
te verdedigen op donderdag 27 juni 2019  
klokke 10.00 uur

*door*

Vid Prislan

geboren te Šempeter pri Gorici, Slovenië

in 1981

Promotor: prof. dr. N.J. Schrijver

Promotiecommissie: prof. dr. Y.E. Schuurmans  
prof. dr. M.C.E.J. Bronckers  
prof. dr. U. Kriebaum (University of Vienna, Austria)  
prof. dr. S.W. Schill (Universiteit van Amsterdam)





## Acknowledgments

Writing a doctoral dissertation is a long and lonely business. During the inevitable moments of disappointment and confusion, I luckily have been blessed with the support of many people. My gratitude to them is beyond words, so to avoid inordinately extending what is already a lengthy manuscript, I shall confine myself to the following acknowledgments.

I wish first to sincerely thank my supervisor and friend, Professor Nico Schrijver, with whom I had the pleasure to work with for many years, on a number of interesting projects. I am grateful for the liberty he granted me in developing my research topic and for the guidance he subsequently provided while I executed it. Most importantly, I am grateful to Nico for never doubting in my ability to bring this project to an end.

I would also like to sincerely thank the members of the dissertation committee, Professor Ursula Kriebaum, Professor Ymre Schuurmans, Professor Marco Bronckers, and Professor Stephan W. Schill for their incisive and critical feedback. I am further grateful for the valuable comments provided by Cecily Rose and Sophie Schiettekatte, who were kind enough to read parts of the dissertation, as well as for the support of Sarah Mead, who assisted with the ungratifying task of organizing the abundant footnote references. It is further appropriate to acknowledge here the generous support of the Leiden University Fund for financially supporting my LERU research exchange at the University of Milan in 2015 (LUF-grant 5414/4-6-2015/Mm), during which I was able to write Chapter 8 of this dissertation.

Special appreciation then goes to the many close colleagues and friends at the Grotius Centre for International Legal Studies who, over the course of the years, continuously reminded me about the importance of a good working environment and the 'role' that it plays in one's successful completion of a dissertation. My brother-and-sisters-in-arms, Andrea, Hanna, and Ruben, provided a constant source of friendship, but also much needed support in times of hardship. Our many discussions not only shaped my thinking, but helped solve many of the impasses that I incurred in putting my thoughts on paper. There is further a lot I owe to Cecily, Erik, Franke, Sergey, and Thea; for their friendship, but especially for the many conversations that helped me stay sane throughout the writing process. Last but not least, I am grateful to the varied group of coffee (and warm water) drinkers, including (but not limited to) Emilie, Emma, Floris, Hilde, LinLin, Mette, Sofia, Sophie, and Yudan who contributed, each in their own way, to an unforgettable time in Leiden.

In writing the dissertation, I was fortunate to be supported by my wonderful family. I am grateful to my parents, Jana and Sašo, for their love and understanding, and to my Dutch 'in-laws', Sita and Bibi, and Donya and Chris, for making me feel at home in The Netherlands. To all of you I owe an enormous debt, not the least for the help you provided in caring for my children when I was writing yet another chapter.

This project would have not come to an end was it not for Beau and Ole, who relentlessly reminded me that there are more important things in life than writing a dissertation. Above all, it would not have succeeded without the enduring patience, tireless motivation and unconditional love of Amel: your companionship and faith in me have made all the difference.

*Hvala vam za vse!*



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>1. SETTING THE STAGE.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1. THE SCOPE OF THE INQUIRY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.2. BY WAY OF INTRODUCTION: THE CHEVRON-ECUADOR DISPUTE         CONCERNING THE <i>LAGO AGRIO</i> LITIGATION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1.3. THE METHOD OF THE INQUIRY .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.4. THE ANALYTICAL TOOLS EMPLOYED AND THEIR LIMITATIONS .....</b>	<b>6</b>
1.4.1. Monism, Dualism and the Principle of Supremacy of International Law.....	6
1.4.1.1. <i>Monism and Dualism</i> .....	7
1.4.1.2. <i>The Principle of Supremacy of International Law</i> .....	9
1.4.2. <i>Res Judicata, Lis Pendens</i> and other Jurisdiction/Conflict-Regulating Principles.....	12
1.4.2.1. <i>Res Judicata (finality of adjudication)</i> .....	12
1.4.2.2. <i>Lis Alibi Pendens and Related Conflict-Regulating Principles and Rules</i> .....	16
1.4.3. The Concepts of “Standard of Review” and Deference .....	18
1.4.3.1. <i>The Different Standards of Review</i> .....	21
1.4.3.2. <i>The Notion of Deference and Reasons for its Application</i> .....	23
<b>1.5. ORGANIZATION OF THE INQUIRY.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>2. THE HISTORICAL FRAME OF REFERENCE.....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>2.1. THE FUNCTIONAL SHIFT: INVESTOR-STATE ARBITRATION ESTABLISHES         ITSELF AS PROCEDURAL ALTERNATIVE TO DOMESTIC LITIGATION .....</b>	<b>27</b>
2.1.1. The “Legalization” of Dispute Settlement and the Emergence of the Law of International Claims ...	28
2.1.2. The Rise of Individuals’ Private Right of Action and the Advent of Contract-Based Arbitrations.....	30
2.1.3. The Establishment of ICSID as a Decisive Step in the De-Politicization of Investment Disputes ....	34
2.1.4. Investor-State Arbitration as an Exclusive Remedy.....	36
2.1.5. The Onset of Bilateral Investment Treaties and the Entrenching of Direct Recourse to Treaty-Based Investment Arbitration .....	39
<b>2.2. THE SUBSTANTIVE SHIFT: THE RISE OF INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS OF         TREATMENT AND DOMESTIC LAW’S DECLINING IMPORTANCE TO THE         ADJUSTMENT OF INVESTMENT DISPUTES.....</b>	<b>42</b>
2.2.1. Initial Standard-Setting through Early Treaties of Commerce.....	42
2.2.2. The Emergence of Minimum Standard(s) of Treatment under Customary International Law .....	45
2.2.3. The Challenges to International Standards: From Calvo to CERDS .....	48
2.2.4. The Move Towards the Internationalization of Investment Contracts.....	51
2.2.5. The “Treatification” of Investment Law in the Twentieth century .....	53
<b>2.3. REASONS FOR AVOIDING DOMESTIC COURTS: FROM THE STANDARD OF CIVILIZATION         TO THE PROBLEM OF IMPARTIALITY AND EFFICIENCY OF DOMESTIC PROCEDURES .....</b>	<b>56</b>
2.3.1. Measuring Legal Systems through the Lens of Civilization.....	56
2.3.2. Colonial Rule and the Introduction of Western Systems of Administration of Justice.....	59
2.3.3. Regimes of Extraterritoriality and the Administration of Justice by Means of Consular and Mixed Courts .....	60
2.3.4. Governance through International Law: Minimum Standards of Administration of Justice and the Doctrine of Denial of Justice.....	63
2.3.5. From the Problem of Civilization to the Quest for a Neutral and Efficient Forum .....	64



2.4. CONCLUSIONS.....	69
<b>PART I .....</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>I. INTRODUCTION INTO PART I .....</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>I.1. FORMAL FUNCTIONS PERTAINING TO THE ASSISTANCE IN, AND SUPERVISION OF,         THE ARBITRAL PROCESS AND ITS OUTCOME.....</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>I.2. INFORMAL ROLES IN THE LAW- AND FACT-ASCERTAINMENT PROCESS .....</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>I.3. THE DUAL EFFECTS OF DOMESTIC JUDICIAL PRONOUNCEMENTS.....</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>3. THE ROLE OF DOMESTIC JUDICIAL DECISIONS IN THE ASCERTAINMENT     OF LAW AND FACTS BEFORE INVESTMENT TRIBUNALS .....</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>3.1. THE UNREMITTING RELEVANCE OF DOMESTIC LAW IN INVESTMENT ARBITRATION.....</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>3.2. THE RELEVANCE OF DOMESTIC JUDICIAL DETERMINATIONS IN THE         LAW-ASCERTAINMENT PROCESS.....</b>	<b>81</b>
3.2.1. Reliance on Domestic Judgments to Ascertain the Law Applicable to the Arbitration Agreement.....	82
3.2.1.1. <i>Law Governing the Agreement to Arbitrate before the ICSID Centre .....</i>	<i>82</i>
3.2.1.2. <i>Law Governing the Agreement to Arbitrate in non-ICSID Arbitrations .....</i>	<i>84</i>
3.2.1.3. <i>Ascertainment of the Law Governing the Agreement to Arbitrate.....</i>	<i>84</i>
3.2.2. Reliance on Domestic Judgments to Ascertain the Law Applicable to the Cause of Action.....	86
3.2.3. Reliance on Domestic Judgments to Ascertain the Law Applicable by Virtue of <i>Renvoi</i> .....	88
3.2.3.1. <i>The Nationality of Natural Persons .....</i>	<i>91</i>
3.2.3.2. <i>The Nationality of Corporate Entities .....</i>	<i>92</i>
3.2.3.3. <i>Attribution of Corporate or other Entities' Conduct to the State.....</i>	<i>95</i>
3.2.3.4. <i>The Existence of a Protected Investment.....</i>	<i>96</i>
3.2.3.5. <i>The Legality of an Investment .....</i>	<i>99</i>
3.2.3.6. <i>Existence of Obligations (for the Purposes of Umbrella Clauses).....</i>	<i>101</i>
3.2.3.7. <i>Other Potential Instances of Renvoi.....</i>	<i>103</i>
3.2.4. Reliance on Domestic Judgments to Ascertain the Law Relevant to Determining the Factual Predicate of the Claim .....	103
3.2.4.1. <i>Contractual Matters relevant to the Treaty Claim.....</i>	<i>105</i>
3.2.4.2. <i>Other Instances where the Domestic Legal Framework is Relevant to the Treaty Claim.....</i>	<i>108</i>
3.2.4.3. <i>Questions of Restitution and Compensation .....</i>	<i>110</i>
3.3. Factual Import of Domestic Judicial Determinations.....	111
<b>3.4. CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>4. THE LEGAL EFFECTS OF SPECIFIC JUDICIAL DETERMINATIONS .....</b>	<b>113</b>
<b>4.1. RELEVANCE OF THE CONTEXT? MAPPING THE CIRCUMSTANCES IN WHICH         WEIGHT WAS (NOT) ACCORDED TO DOMESTIC JUDICIAL PRONOUNCEMENTS .....</b>	<b>113</b>
4.1.1. Domestic Court's Findings of Domestic Law.....	114
4.1.1.1. <i>Judicial Pronouncements Relevant to Determining the Existence or Scope of Tribunal's Jurisdiction.....</i>	<i>114</i>
4.1.1.2. <i>Judicial Pronouncements Relevant to the Determining the Merits of the Claim .....</i>	<i>116</i>
4.1.2. Domestic Courts' Findings of Fact.....	118
4.1.2.1. <i>Judgments as Relevant Facts .....</i>	<i>118</i>
4.1.2.2. <i>Judicial Findings of Fact.....</i>	<i>119</i>
4.1.2.3. <i>Conduct of Parties in Domestic Litigation .....</i>	<i>120</i>

4.1.3. Is the Context thus Relevant? .....	120
<b>4.2. ARGUMENTS FOR DENYING EFFECT TO DOMESTIC JUDICIAL DETERMINATIONS.....</b>	<b>121</b>
4.2.1. Arguments based on, or building on the Idea of Supremacy of International Law .....	121
4.2.1.1. <i>Superiority of International Adjudicatory Bodies over Domestic Judicial Organs</i> .....	121
4.2.1.2. <i>Preventing Abuse of Domestic Law and the Principle Against Self-Judging</i> .....	122
4.2.2. Arguments Based on Categorical Distinctions between International and Domestic Law and the Resulting Differences between International and Domestic Adjudicatory Bodies .....	123
4.2.2.1. <i>The Argument on the “Separate and Distinct” Dispute Settlement Arrangements</i> .....	124
4.2.2.2. <i>The Separateness of Legal Orders Argument</i> .....	125
4.2.3. Reliance on Specific Powers, Duties, or (the Absence of) Obligations.....	125
4.2.3.1. <i>Kompetenz-Kompetenz principle</i> .....	125
4.2.3.2. <i>Rules Pertaining to the Appreciation of Evidence</i> .....	127
4.2.3.3. <i>Absence of Specific Obligations</i> .....	128
4.2.4. Arguments Pertaining to Identity of Actions in the Formal Sense .....	129
4.2.5. Supporting Argumentation .....	130
4.2.6. Policy Rationale(s) Against Granting Legal Effects to Domestic Pronouncements .....	133
<b>4.3. ARGUMENTS SUPPORTING ACCEPTANCE OF DOMESTIC JUDICIAL PRONOUNCEMENTS .....</b>	<b>134</b>
4.3.1. <i>Res Judicata</i> on Points of Domestic Law .....	134
4.3.2. Acceptance of, and Deference to, Domestic Courts’ Decisions .....	136
4.3.3. Doctrine of Collateral Estoppel.....	137
4.3.4. Policy Rationales in Favour of Granting Legal Effects to Domestic Pronouncements.....	138
<b>4.4. FACTORS AFFECTING RECEPTION OF SPECIFIC JUDICIAL DETERMINATIONS ON THE PART OF INVESTMENT TRIBUNALS .....</b>	<b>140</b>
4.4.1. Factors Determining the Evidentiary Value of Judicial Determinations.....	140
4.4.1.1. <i>Domestic Courts’ Expertise in Domestic Law</i> .....	140
4.4.1.2. <i>Attitude of the Litigating Parties towards the Judgment</i> .....	141
4.4.1.3. <i>Quality of the Domestic Judgment</i> .....	141
4.4.2. Standard of Review Applicable to the Scrutiny of Judicial Determinations .....	145
<b>4.5. CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>146</b>
<b>5. DOMESTIC JURISPRUDENCE AS AN AID TO THE INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION OF DOMESTIC LAW .....</b>	<b>149</b>
<b>5.1. REASONS FOR RESORTING TO DOMESTIC JURISPRUDENCE IN THE LAW ASCERTAINMENT PROCESS .....</b>	<b>149</b>
5.1.1. Uncertainties Concerning the Applicable Statute .....	150
5.1.2. Uncertainties Concerning the Law in General .....	151
5.1.3. Factual Relevance .....	153
<b>5.2. THE SCOPE OF INVESTMENT TRIBUNALS’ LAW-ASCERTAINMENT DUTIES.....</b>	<b>154</b>
5.2.1. The Legal Weight of Domestic Jurisprudence: From Sources of Law to Evidence of Interpretation and Application of Domestic Law .....	154
5.2.2. Duty to Consider Domestic Jurisprudence in the Interpretation and Application of Domestic Law.....	155
5.2.3. Duties pertaining to the Possession, Acquisition, and Application of Knowledge of Domestic Jurisprudence .....	157
5.2.3.1. <i>Duty to Know Domestic Jurisprudence</i> .....	157
5.2.3.2. <i>Duty to Become Acquainted with Domestic Jurisprudence</i> .....	160
5.2.3.3. <i>Duty to Pursue Proprio Motu Research into Relevant Domestic Jurisprudence</i> .....	162
5.2.3.4. <i>Duty to Seek Parties’ Views on Relevant Jurisprudence</i> .....	164
5.2.3.5. <i>Duty to Apply Accurate Law and Jurisprudence</i> .....	166

5.3. FACTORS AFFECTING RECEPTION OF DOMESTIC JURISPRUDENCE IN THE LAW-ASCERTAINMENT PROCESS.....	168
5.3.1. Factors Determining the Evidentiary Value of Domestic Jurisprudence.....	169
5.3.1.1. <i>Bias of the Judicial Decision-Maker</i> .....	169
5.3.1.2. <i>Propriety of the Domestic Judicial Process</i> .....	170
5.3.2. The Standard of Review Applicable to Tribunals’ Scrutiny of Domestic Jurisprudence.....	171
5.4. THE LAW ASCERTAINMENT PROCESS: LEGAL METHODS AND TECHNIQUES.....	173
5.4.1. Methods of Jurisprudential Analysis: Analogies and Adverse Inferences.....	173
5.4.2. Obstacles to law ascertainment – Issue not Addressed by Courts.....	175
5.4.3. Obstacles to Law Ascertainment – Issue not Addressed by Legislator.....	176
5.4.4. Obstacles to Law Ascertainment – Jurisprudence Unsettled or Contradictory.....	178
5.4.4.1. <i>Refusal to Take Position on Unsettled or Contradictory Jurisprudence</i> .....	179
5.4.4.2. <i>Picking and Choosing from Available Jurisprudence</i> .....	181
5.4.4.3. <i>Assessment</i> .....	182
5.5. CONCLUSIONS.....	183
 <b>PART II.....</b>	 <b>185</b>
 <b>II. INTRODUCTION INTO PART II.....</b>	 <b>187</b>
II.1. RESPONSIBILITY OF THE STATE FOR THE CONDUCT OF JUDICIAL ORGANS.....	187
II.2. OBLIGATIONS OF STATES WITH REGARD TO JUDICIAL ORGANS.....	189
 <b>6. STATE RESPONSIBILITY FOR DENIAL OF JUSTICE.....</b>	 <b>191</b>
6.1. THE CUSTOMARY INTERNATIONAL LAW “DELICT” OF DENIAL OF JUSTICE.....	191
6.1.1. Attempting to Define Denial of Justice – An Indeterminate Standard?.....	191
6.1.2. Responsibility for Domestic Judicial Decisions.....	195
6.1.2.1. <i>In Search of a Test for a Wrongful Judgment</i> .....	196
6.1.2.2. <i>The Standard of Review</i> .....	199
6.2. DENIAL OF JUSTICE IN INVESTMENT TREATY ARBITRATION.....	201
6.2.1. Denial of Court Access.....	204
6.2.1.1. <i>The Question of Actual Availability of Domestic Procedures</i> .....	205
6.2.1.2. <i>Refusal to Judge in Disguise</i> .....	205
6.2.1.3. <i>The Problem of Inconsistencies between Judicial Remedies</i> .....	206
6.2.1.4. <i>Restrictions on the Right of Access to Courts</i> .....	207
6.2.2. Denial of Justice for Undue Delays.....	208
6.2.2.1. <i>Assessing by Comparing</i> .....	209
6.2.2.2. <i>Towards a Multi-Factor Methodology</i> .....	210
6.2.3. Fundamental Breaches of Due Process in the Conduct of Proceedings.....	212
6.2.3.1. <i>Impact on Investors’ Rights</i> .....	214
6.2.3.2. <i>Consequences on the Judicial Outcome</i> .....	214
6.2.3.3. <i>Assessing Irregularities on their Own Terms</i> .....	215
6.2.3.4. <i>Possibility of Rectification</i> .....	216
6.2.3.5. <i>Proving Lack of Judicial Independence and Impartiality</i> .....	217
6.2.4. Denial of Justice arising out of Content of the Judgment.....	218
6.2.4.1. <i>Focus on Procedural Failures as a Way to Avoiding Direct Review</i> .....	221
6.2.4.2. <i>An Assessment of a Judgment on its Formal Qualities</i> .....	222

6.2.5. Evaluating the Modern Standard of Denial of Justice.....	224
<b>6.3. STANDARDS OF REVIEW APPLIED TO DETERMINING THE PROPRIETY OF THE JUDICIAL OUTCOME .....</b>	<b>225</b>
6.3.1. Scrutiny of Courts' Treatment of Points of Domestic Law .....	225
6.3.1.1. <i>Points of Domestic Law Relevant to the Claim</i> .....	225
6.3.1.2. <i>Points of Domestic Law Relevant to the Powers of the Judicial Organ</i> .....	229
6.3.2. Scrutiny of Courts' Treatment of Points of Fact.....	231
6.3.3. Scrutiny of Courts' Exercise of Discretionary Powers .....	233
6.3.4. Technique for Discounting the Relevance of Improprieties .....	235
<b>6.4. CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>236</b>
<b>7. STATE RESPONSIBILITY FOR VIOLATIONS OF SPECIFIC TREATY STANDARDS .....</b>	<b>239</b>
<b>7.1. DENIAL OF JUSTICE DISTINGUISHED FROM VIOLATIONS OF OTHER TREATY STANDARDS .....</b>	<b>239</b>
<b>7.2. OBLIGATIONS TO PROVIDE A SYSTEM OF ADEQUATE JUDICIAL PROTECTION .....</b>	<b>241</b>
7.2.1. The <i>Unglaube</i> Case: The Duty to Provide “Adequate Legal Remedies” as part of the Fair and Equitable Treatment Standard .....	243
7.2.2. The Duty to Make a Functioning System of Courts and Legal Remedies Available to the Investor as Part of the Full Protection and Security Standard.....	244
7.2.3. The <i>Belokon</i> Case: Unavailability of Judicial Remedies as a Breach of the Non-Impairment Clause ..	246
7.2.4. The <i>ADC</i> Case: Availability of an “Actual and Substantive Legal Procedure” as a Condition for Lawful Expropriations .....	247
7.2.5. The <i>Chevron</i> Case: Free-Standing Treaty Obligation to Provide “Effective Means for Asserting Claims and Enforcing Rights” .....	248
7.2.6. One and the Same Systemic Obligation? .....	252
<b>7.3. THE OBLIGATION NOT TO EXPROPRIATE WITHOUT COMPENSATION AND THE PROBLEM OF JUDICIAL TAKINGS.....</b>	<b>253</b>
7.3.1. Predicating an Expropriation Claim upon Judicial Conduct .....	254
7.3.2. Wrongfulness of Judicial Conduct as a Predicate of Expropriation Claims .....	256
7.3.2.1. <i>Judicial Expropriations Predicated Upon the Existence of a Denial of Justice</i> .....	256
7.3.2.2. <i>Judicial Expropriations Predicated Upon Other Violations of International Law</i> .....	258
7.3.2.3. <i>Judicial Expropriations Predicated Upon Violations of Domestic Law</i> .....	260
7.3.2.4. <i>Factual or Legal Predicate?</i> .....	261
7.3.3. The Relevance of the Origin of the Injury.....	263
7.3.3.1. <i>Judicial Injuries resulting from Legislative Failure</i> .....	264
7.3.3.2. <i>Judicial Injuries resulting from Wrongful Acts of other Organs</i> .....	265
7.4.3.3. <i>Judicial Decisions Forming Part of Composite Wrongful Acts</i> .....	266
7.3.3.4. <i>What Role for the Sole Effects Doctrine?</i> .....	268
<b>7.4. OTHER TREATY OBLIGATIONS AIMED AT PROVIDING LEGAL AND ECONOMIC SECURITY TO INVESTMENTS .....</b>	<b>269</b>
7.4.1. Umbrella Clauses .....	269
7.4.2. Protection of Legitimate Expectations .....	271
<b>7.5. OTHER OBLIGATIONS POTENTIALLY REQUIRING JUDICIAL TREATMENT OF A DEFINED KIND .....</b>	<b>274</b>
7.5.1. More of the Same? Clauses Prohibiting Discriminatory and Arbitrary Treatment .....	275
7.5.2. No-Less-Favourable-Treatment Obligations – Value-Added Standards?.....	276
7.5.3. Judicial Violations of the FET Standard Otherwise than Through Denial of Justice.....	277
7.5.3.1. <i>Can the FET Standard be Engaged on Account of Lesser Judicial Improprieties than those Required for Denial of Justice?</i> .....	277

7.5.3.2. <i>Is Divergent Application of the Same Standard to Different State Organs Possible?</i> .....	281
<b>7.6. OBLIGATIONS REQUIRING A PARTICULAR JUDICIAL RESULT .....</b>	<b>282</b>
7.6.1. Provisions Requiring Non-Discriminatory Outcomes .....	282
7.6.2. Compensation Provisions .....	285
7.6.3. Transfers Provisions .....	285
7.6.4. Specific Provisions relating to the Operation of the Investment .....	286
<b>7.7. STANDARDS OF REVIEW APPLIED TO DETERMINING VIOLATIONS OF     DISCRETE TREATY STANDARDS .....</b>	<b>286</b>
7.7.1. Standards of Review Applied to Establishing the Wrongfulness of Judicial Conduct as a Predicate of Expropriation Claims .....	287
7.7.2. Standards of Review Applied to Determining Failures to Provide a System of Adequate Judicial Protection .....	288
7.7.3. Standards of Review Applied to Determining the Arbitrariness of Judicial Decisions .....	288
<b>7.8. CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>289</b>
<b>8. THE JUDICIAL FINALITY REQUIREMENT .....</b>	<b>293</b>
<b>8.1. JUDICIAL FINALITY AS A SUBSTANTIVE CONDITION OF CLAIMS OF DENIAL OF JUSTICE .....</b>	<b>293</b>
8.1.1. The <i>Loewen</i> Case and the Endorsement of the Judicial Finality Rule .....	294
8.1.2. The Rationale for the Judicial Finality Rule in the Context of Denial of Justice .....	296
8.1.3. Application of Judicial Finality to All Claims of Denial of Justice .....	297
<b>8.2. JUDICIAL FINALITY FOR VIOLATIONS OF OTHER TREATY STANDARDS     PREMISED ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT .....</b>	<b>299</b>
8.2.1. Judicial Finality, NAFTA, and Measures “Adopted or Maintained” .....	299
8.2.2. Judicial Finality and the “Effective Means” Provision .....	300
8.2.3. Judicial Finality and Expropriation Claims .....	301
<b>8.3. JUDICIAL FINALITY AND CLAIMS PREMISED ON THE CONDUCT OF NON-JUDICIAL ORGANS .....</b>	<b>302</b>
<b>8.4. JUDICIAL FINALITY – IS A CONSISTENT APPROACH ACTUALLY POSSIBLE? .....</b>	<b>307</b>
8.4.1. Judicial Finality as a Condition Relating to Determining Breaches of the Primary Obligation .....	307
8.4.2. Judicial Finality as a Condition Attaching to the Special Nature of Judicial Activity.....	311
<b>8.5. THE APPLICATION OF THE JUDICIAL FINALITY RULE IN PRACTICE .....</b>	<b>315</b>
8.5.1. Scope of the Judicial Finality Requirement.....	316
8.5.2. Exceptions to the Judicial Finality Requirement.....	317
8.5.2.1. <i>Reasonable Prospect of Success</i> .....	319
8.5.2.2. <i>Reasonable Possibility of an Effective Remedy</i> .....	319
8.5.2.3. <i>Obvious Futility</i> .....	320
8.5.3. Standard of Review Adopted in Determining the Applicability of Exceptions to the Judicial Finality Requirement.....	321
<b>8.6. CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS.....</b>	<b>323</b>
<b>PART III .....</b>	<b>327</b>
<b>III. INTRODUCTION INTO PART III .....</b>	<b>329</b>
<b>III.1. THE DEMISE OF THE LOCAL REMEDIES RULE AS A GENERAL ORDERING PRINCIPLE .....</b>	<b>331</b>
<b>III.2. WAYS TO REGULATE JURISDICTIONAL COMPETITION .....</b>	<b>333</b>

<b>9. REGULATION AS A QUESTION OF ARBITRAL TECHNIQUE: THE APPROACH OF INVESTMENT TRIBUNALS TO REGULATING JURISDICTIONAL COMPETITION .....</b>	<b>335</b>
<b>9.1. AVOIDING JURISDICTIONAL OVERLAPS THROUGH THE EXERCISE OF DISCRETION IN THE PROCESS OF INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION OF RELEVANT NORMS.....</b>	<b>335</b>
9.1.1. Removing Potential Jurisdictional Overlaps at the Stage of Interpretation of the Applicable Norm.....	336
9.1.1.1. <i>Interpretation of Umbrella Clauses</i> .....	336
9.1.1.2. <i>Interpretation of Treaty Dispute Settlement Clauses</i> .....	338
9.1.1.3. <i>Interpretation of Contractual Dispute Settlement Clauses</i> .....	340
9.1.2. Removing Potential Jurisdictional Overlaps at the Stage of Application of Specific Treaty Terms – The Problem of Counterclaims.....	341
<b>9.2. AVOIDING JURISDICTIONAL OVERLAPS THROUGH CLAIM SPLITTING.....</b>	<b>345</b>
9.2.1. Application of the Contract/Treaty Distinction in Practice.....	351
9.2.2. When Both Worlds Collide: Applying the Contract/Treaty Distinction to Claims under Umbrella Clauses .....	355
9.2.3. Avoidance of Forum Selection through Simple Redressing of Claim?.....	358
<b>9.3. REGULATING INTERACTIONS IN CASES OF JURISDICTIONAL OVERLAP .....</b>	<b>360</b>
9.3.1. Denial of Jurisdiction.....	361
9.3.2. Inadmissibility of the Claim as a Bar to the Exercise of Jurisdiction.....	362
9.3.3. Assertion of Jurisdiction Irrespective of the Jurisdiction of the Domestic Forum.....	366
<b>9.4. CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS.....</b>	<b>369</b>
<b>10. REGULATING INTERACTIONS THROUGH SPECIFIC TREATY PROVISIONS.....</b>	<b>371</b>
<b>10.1. TREATY PROVISIONS REGULATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL REMEDIES .....</b>	<b>371</b>
10.1.1. Choice-of-Forum Provisions .....	372
10.1.1.1. <i>Fork-in-the-Road Clauses</i> .....	372
10.1.1.2. <i>Reversible Choice-of-Forum Provisions</i> .....	372
10.1.1.3. <i>No U-Turn Clauses</i> .....	373
10.1.1.4. <i>Provisions Relating to Previously Agreed Contractual Remedies</i> .....	373
10.1.2. Sequencing Clauses .....	373
10.1.2.1. <i>Mandatory Local Litigation Requirements</i> .....	373
10.1.2.2. <i>Other Provisions Preventing Concurrent Recourse to Different Procedures</i> .....	374
<b>10.2. REVERSING THE IRREVERSIBLE: STRATEGIES FOR AVOIDING FORKS IN THE ROAD .....</b>	<b>374</b>
10.2.1. Triple Identity Requirement as a Condition for Triggering the Fork? .....	375
10.2.2. In Search for a Balanced Approach to the Application of Forks in the Road.....	377
10.2.2.1. <i>Fundamental Basis Test for Determining Identity of Actions</i> .....	378
10.2.2.2. <i>Factual Test for Determining Identity of Parties</i> .....	380
10.2.3. Relevance of Treaty Language .....	381
<b>10.3. SKIPPING THE UNNECESSARY: STRATEGIES FOR AVOIDING LOCAL LITIGATION REQUIREMENTS .....</b>	<b>382</b>
10.3.1. Avoidance of Mandatory Litigation Clauses through Reliance on MFN Clauses .....	384
10.3.2. Release from Mandatory Litigation due to Futility .....	388
10.3.2.1. <i>The Legal Basis for the Futility Exception</i> .....	388
10.3.2.2. <i>The Standard for Assessing Futility</i> .....	389
10.3.3. Is There a Proper Approach to the Application of the Mandatory Litigation Requirements? .....	391
10.3.3.1. <i>Towards a Balanced Approach to Their Interpretation?</i> .....	392

10.3.3.2. <i>Towards a Non-Formalistic Approach to Their Application?</i> .....	393
<b>10.4. CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS</b> .....	<b>395</b>
<b>11. REGULATING INTERACTIONS AT THE LEVEL OF THE INVESTOR:     WAIVERS AND OTHER RENOUNCEMENTS OF TREATY REMEDIES..</b>	<b>397</b>
<b>11.1. REGULATING JURISDICTIONAL CONFLICTS BY MEANS OF AGREEMENT         BETWEEN INVESTOR AND HOST-STATE</b> .....	<b>397</b>
11.1.1. Forum Selection Clauses .....	398
11.1.1.1. <i>The Question of Material Scope</i> .....	399
11.1.1.2. <i>Competence of Domestic Forum over Treaty Claims</i> .....	400
11.1.1.3. <i>Exclusive Nature of Treaty Tribunal's Jurisdiction</i> .....	400
11.1.2. Contractual Waiver of Treaty Rights .....	401
11.1.2.1. <i>Disposability</i> .....	402
11.1.2.2. <i>Permissibility of Waivers</i> .....	405
11.1.2.3. <i>Conditions for Waivers to be Effective</i> .....	408
11.1.3. Agreements Post-Dating the Emergence of an Investment Dispute .....	411
<b>11.2. RESOLUTION OF JURISDICTIONAL CONFLICTS AS A RESULT OF THE LITIGANTS' CONDUCT</b> .....	<b>411</b>
11.2.1. Waiver by Conduct .....	412
11.2.2. Estoppel.....	414
<b>11.3. CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS</b> .....	<b>416</b>
<b>12. FINAL CONCLUSIONS AND REFLECTIONS</b> .....	<b>419</b>
<b>12.1. DOMESTIC COURTS AS PARTNERS</b> .....	<b>419</b>
<b>12.2. DOMESTIC COURTS AS SUSPECTS</b> .....	<b>420</b>
<b>12.3. DOMESTIC COURTS AS COMPETITORS</b> .....	<b>422</b>
<b>12.4. THE RISE OF ARBITRAL POWER OVER DOMESTIC COURTS – FINAL REFLECTIONS</b> .....	<b>423</b>
12.4.1. Between Authority and Competence: Who Ultimately Decides?.....	424
12.4.2. Regulation, Co-Ordination: Return to the Local Remedies Rule? .....	425
12.4.3. Domestic Courts, Investment Arbitration, and the Rule of Law .....	428
<b>SAMENVATTING (SUMMARY IN DUTCH) – NATIONALE RECHTSPRAAK IN INVESTERINGSARBITRAGE:         PARTNERS, VERDACHTEN, CONCURRENTEN</b> .....	<b>433</b>
<b>SUMMARY – DOMESTIC COURTS IN INVESTOR-STATE ARBITRATION: PARTNERS, SUSPECTS,         COMPETITORS</b> .....	<b>441</b>
<b>LIST OF LITERATURE</b> .....	<b>447</b>
Academic .....	447
Other Documents .....	461
<b>LIST OF CASES</b> .....	<b>465</b>
Awards and Decisions by Investment Arbitral Tribunals.....	465
Judgments, Awards, and other Decisions by Other International Adjudicatory Bodies.....	478
Judgments and other Decisions of Domestic Courts.....	483
<b>LIST OF TREATIES, CONVENTIONS, AND OTHER INSTRUMENTS         (INCLUDING DRAFTS AND MODEL TEXTS)</b> .....	<b>485</b>
Conventions .....	485
International Investment Agreements (including Drafts and Model Texts) .....	485
Arbitration Rules .....	486
<b>CURRICULUM VITAE</b> .....	<b>489</b>