

Peter Ratz

International and European Law Problems of Investment Arbitration involving the EU



Nomos

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Acknowledgements	23
Abstract	27
1. Introduction	29
1.1 Relevance of the research topic	29
1.2 Definition of the research question and key terms	30
1.2.1 Definition of the research question	30
1.2.2 Definitions of key terms	31
1.2.2.1 "Investment agreement"	31
1.2.2.2 "Implementation", "compliance", "enforcement" " and "execution"	34
1.3 Envisaged course of the analysis	35
1.4 Envisaged style of the analysis	37
2. Lack of protection due to problems relating to the binding nature of relevant legal obligations for the EU?	39
2.1 The EU and customary international law	39
2.1.1 Customary international law and investment law	40
2.1.2 The binding nature of customary international law for the EU	43
2.1.2.1 The principle of "equal sovereignty"	43
2.1.2.2 The "consent theory"	44
2.1.2.3 Relevant case-law	47
2.1.2.4 General principles of law	49
2.1.2.5 The "succession argument"	50
2.1.2.6 Arguments based on art. 24 of the UN Charter, the emergence of customary rules on privileges of international organizations and the international legal personality of the EU	52
2.1.2.7 International organizations as second-rate subjects of international law	54

2.1.2.8	The concept of “estoppel”	57
2.1.2.9	Result	57
2.2	Mixed agreements: Union, Member State or joint responsibility	58
2.2.1	The (prevailing) view that all parties to a mixed agreement are bound by all provisions of the agreement	62
2.2.2	The view that not all parties to a mixed agreement are bound by all provisions of the agreement	65
2.2.3	Distinguishing between international investment agreements that include references to the division of competences and international investment agreements that do not	71
2.2.3.1	The “procedural approach” and the EC declaration to the ECT	73
2.3	Excursus: Responsibility of EU Member States for non-compliance of other Member States with their obligations under mixed agreements	75
3.	Lack of protection due to ineffective mechanisms of attribution of conduct to the EU?	81
3.1	Focus on the ILC draft articles on the responsibility of international organizations	81
3.2	General rules on the attribution of wrongful conduct to international organizations	83
3.2.1	Relevant provisions of the ILC draft articles and the “control link”	83
3.2.1.1	International organizations assisting or directing member states in wrongful acts	87
3.2.1.2	Double attributability	88
3.2.2	The “institutional link” and the “territorial link”	89
3.2.3	Relevant practice and case-law	91
3.2.3.1	Case-law based on the control criterion	91
3.2.3.2	Case law base not based on the control criterion	94
3.2.3.2.1	The “transfer of control” theory	94
3.2.3.3	From the “transfer of control” theory to the member states’ or the international organization’s institutional responsibility?	98

3.3	EU responsibility for the conduct of EU organs	100
3.4	The four scenarios of potential EU responsibility for the conduct of EU Member States	100
3.4.1	EU responsibility for the implementation of EU legislation by Member States	101
3.4.1.1	Member State organs as EU organs? Voices in the literature	101
3.4.1.2	Relevant case law	103
3.4.1.3	ILC draft articles	107
3.4.1.4	Result	111
3.4.2	EU responsibility for the “incorrect” implementation of EU legislation by Member States	112
3.4.3	EU responsibility for the enactment and implementation of legislation by EU Member States when EU legislation grants discretion to the Member States concerning its implementation	113
3.4.4	EU responsibility for the enactment and implementation of legislation by EU Member States when there is no relevant EU legislation	113
3.4.5	EU Financial Responsibility Regulation	114
3.4.5.1	The substantive provisions of the Financial Responsibility Regulation	115
3.4.5.2	The Financial Responsibility Regulation and the autonomy of the EU legal order	121
3.5	Member States, but not the EU being bound by international law – responsibility gap 1?	125
3.5.1	The hierarchy between international law and EU law from an international law perspective	126
3.5.2	The hierarchy between international law and EU law from a European law perspective	129
3.5.2.1	Obligations of the EU under international law	129
3.5.2.1.1	Preliminary result	134
3.5.2.1.2	Kadi and Solange	134
3.5.2.1.2.1	Kadi: Case summary	135
3.5.2.1.2.2	Kadi and Solange: Analysis	137
3.5.2.1.3	The position of international law in the EU legal order after Kadi	141

3.5.2.2	Obligations of the EU Member States	142
3.5.3	Result	145
3.5.3.1	How should Member States deal with arbitral awards that find Member States to have violated international law in order to comply with EU law?	146
3.6	The EU, but not Member States being bound by international law – responsibility gap 2?	149
4.	Lack of protection due to ineffective dispute settlement mechanisms?	153
4.1	Dispute settlement mechanisms provided for in “traditional” BITs	153
4.1.1	State-to-state dispute settlement mechanisms	156
4.1.2	Investor-to-state dispute settlement mechanisms	159
4.2	Dispute settlement mechanisms provided for in EU IIAs	161
4.2.1	Historical development of EU approach to dispute settlement in IIAs: From diplomatic to legalistic	161
4.2.1.1	Explanations for the shift of EU preferences from political to legalistic dispute settlement	163
4.2.2	Three types of relevant EU agreements: trade and association agreements, ECT and full-fledged investment agreements	166
4.2.3	State-to-state dispute settlement mechanisms in EU IIAs	168
4.2.3.1	State-to-state dispute settlement mechanisms in EU trade and association agreements	168
4.2.3.1.1	Historical development	172
4.2.3.2	State-to-state dispute settlement mechanisms in full-fledged EU IIAs	176
4.2.3.2.1	Singapore	176
4.2.3.2.2	CETA	179
4.2.3.3	State-to-state dispute settlement mechanisms under the ECT	181
4.2.3.4	Duty of cooperation as a limitation to the right to initiate SSDS?	183

4.2.4	Investor-to-state dispute settlement mechanisms under EU IIAs	184
4.2.4.1	In the absence of ISDS under EU trade and association agreements: Seeking redress for investors under EU trade and association agreements.	185
4.2.4.1.1	Availability of state-to-state dispute settlement mechanisms?	185
4.2.4.1.2	Exercise of diplomatic protection?	186
4.2.4.1.3	Having recourse to courts?	190
4.2.4.2	Investor-to-state dispute settlement in full-fledged EU IIAs	191
4.2.4.2.1	Availability of arbitration fora	191
4.2.4.2.2	Singapore	196
4.2.4.2.3	CETA	202
4.2.4.3	Investor-to-state dispute settlement mechanisms under the Energy Charter Treaty	216
4.2.4.3.1	EU cases under the ECT – why have no claims been brought against the EU under the ECT?	219
4.2.4.3.2	Admissibility of claims of EU investors against the EU?	219
4.2.4.3.3	Alleged unlawful conduct	222
4.2.4.3.4	Availability of arbitration fora	230
4.2.4.3.5	Tactical reasons	230
4.3	Result	231
4.3.1	SSDS	231
4.3.1.1	SSDS in “classical” BITs vs SSDS in the ECT	231
4.3.1.2	SSDS in “classical” BITs vs SSDS in EU trade and association agreements	231
4.3.1.3	SSDS in “classical” BITs vs SSDS in full-fledged EU IIAs	233
4.3.2	ISDS	233
4.3.2.1	ISDS in “classical” BITs vs ISDS in the ECT	234
4.3.2.2	ISDS in “classical” BITs vs ISDS in full-fledged EU IIAs	234
4.3.2.2.1	Singapore	235
4.3.2.2.2	CETA	239

4.3.2.2.3	Result	242
4.4	The EU approach to investor-to-state dispute settlement	243
4.4.1	Is there such a thing as an EU approach to investor-to-state dispute settlement?	243
4.4.1.1	Pre-CETA: A genuinely European (EU) approach or a general trend?	243
4.4.1.2	The EU-CETA approach to investor-to-state dispute settlement	245
4.4.2	Explaining the EU approach to ISDS	246
4.4.2.1	Criticism against ISDS	246
4.4.2.2	Driving force behind the pre-CETA EU approach to ISDS	255
4.4.2.3	Will the EU approach do the trick?	259
4.4.2.3.1	Could the pre-CETA approach have done the trick?	259
4.4.2.3.2	Will the EU-CETA approach do the trick?	264
5.	Lack of protection due to ineffective enforcement mechanisms?	267
5.1	Enforcement of awards issued pursuant to “classical” BITs	267
5.1.1	Enforcement of awards made in investor-to-state proceedings pursuant to “classical” BITs	267
5.1.2	Enforcement of awards made in state-to-state proceedings pursuant to “classical” BITs	270
5.2	Enforcement of awards made in EU trade and association agreements	271
5.2.1	Enforcement of awards made in state-to-state proceedings pursuant to EU trade and association agreements	271
5.2.2	Relationship of enforcement mechanisms provided for under EU trade and association agreements with enforcement mechanisms available under general international law	273
5.2.2.1	Self-help measures as a means of enforcing international responsibility (of international organizations)	279

5.2.2.2	Self-help measures as a means of enforcing the international responsibility of the EU	283
5.3	Enforcement of awards issued pursuant to full-fledged EU IIAs	288
5.3.1	Enforcement of awards made in state-to-state proceedings pursuant to EU IIAs	288
5.3.1.1	Singapore	288
5.3.1.2	CETA	288
5.3.2	Enforcement of awards made in investor-to-state proceedings pursuant to EU IIAs	289
5.3.2.1	Singapore	289
5.3.2.2	CETA	289
5.4	Applicability of the New York Convention	290
5.4.1	Arguments in favor of the applicability of the New York Convention	290
5.4.2	Arguments against the applicability of the New York Convention	292
5.4.2.1	The EU as a “legal person” within the meaning of art. 1 para. 1 of the New York Convention?	292
5.4.2.1.1	The reciprocity argument pursuant to art. 14 of the New York Convention	294
5.4.2.2	Applicability of the New York Convention to arbitral awards issued by the CJEU in disputes involving the EU	297
5.4.2.3	Conclusion and recommendation for bilateral agreements to solve enforceability issues	299
5.4.2.3.1	Remaining issues with bilateral agreements as the solution to enforceability issues	300
5.4.2.4	Grounds for refusal of recognition and enforcement under the New York Convention	302
5.5	“State immunity”	303
5.5.1	Immunity of international organizations?	303
5.5.2	Existence of EU assets abroad that could be confiscated?	307
5.5.3	Potential solutions to enforcement issues due to the immunity of the EU	309

5.6	Enforcement of awards issued pursuant to the ECT	310
5.6.1	Enforcement of awards made in state-to-state proceedings pursuant to the ECT	310
5.6.2	Enforcement of awards made in investor-to-state proceedings pursuant to the ECT	311
5.7	Result	311
5.7.1	Enforcement of “classical” SSDS-awards vs. enforcement of SSDS-awards under EU trade and association agreements	311
5.7.2	Enforcement under “classical” arbitral awards vs. enforcement under full-fledged EU IIAs	313
5.7.2.1	Enforcement of awards made in investor-to-state dispute settlement proceedings	313
5.7.2.2	Enforcement of arbitral awards made in state-to-state dispute settlement proceedings	314
5.7.3	Enforcement under “classical” arbitral awards vs. enforcement under the ECT	315
5.7.3.1	Enforcement of arbitral awards made in investor-to-state dispute settlement proceedings	315
5.7.3.2	Enforcement of arbitral awards made in state-to-state dispute settlement proceedings	315
6.	Lack of protection due to EU IIAs not being compatible with the case law of the CJEU?	317
6.1	Constitutional principles of the EU legal order	318
6.2	Opinion 1/91	321
6.2.1	Case summary	321
6.2.2	Analysis	323
6.2.2.1	Interpretation of internal competences by arbitral tribunals	323
6.2.2.2	Interpretation of EU law by arbitral tribunals	324
6.2.2.3	Spillover effects	331
6.2.2.3.1	De jure spillover effects	331
6.2.2.3.2	De facto spillover effects	334
6.2.2.3.2.1	By-passing of the CJEU in the case of overlapping provisions	335

	6.2.2.3.2.2 Limitation of remedies to the payment of damages	336
	6.2.2.3.2.3 Preliminary result	337
	6.2.2.4 Result	338
6.3	Kadi	339
6.3.1	Respect for human rights as a condition for the lawfulness of Community acts	339
6.3.2	Relevant human rights and relevance of the jurisprudence of the ECtHR	341
6.3.3	Art. 6 of the ECHR	343
6.3.3.1	Applicability of art. 6 of the ECHR to arbitration proceedings	343
6.3.3.2	The impact of art. 6 of the ECHR on arbitration proceedings	346
6.3.4	Art. 47 of the European Charter of Fundamental Rights	351
6.4	Opinion 1/00	353
6.4.1	Case summary	353
6.4.2	Analysis	354
6.5	Mox Plant	356
6.5.1	Case summary	356
6.5.2	Analysis	357
6.6	Opinion 1/09	361
6.6.1	Case summary	361
6.6.2	Analysis	362
6.6.2.1	The importance of the preliminary ruling procedure	362
6.6.2.2	Requirements for arbitral tribunals to be in a position to request a preliminary ruling from an EU law perspective	364
6.6.2.2.1	Compulsory jurisdiction	365
6.6.2.2.2	“Sufficiently close link”	368
6.6.2.2.3	Other key criteria, including permanency	370
6.6.2.2.4	Conclusion	372
6.6.2.3	Tribunals “of a Member State” – requests for preliminary rulings from arbitral tribunals whose seat is outside of the EU?	372

6.6.2.4	Permissibility of making requests for preliminary rulings from the tribunal's perspective	375
6.6.2.5	Providing for an obligation of arbitral tribunals to request a preliminary ruling – the nature of the functioning of the CJEU	376
6.6.2.6	“Exhaustion of local remedies” as a substitute for preliminary reference procedure?	378
6.6.2.7	National courts as “ordinary courts” and the “quantitative argument” made in Opinion 1/09	378
6.6.2.8	Result	380
6.7	Fiamm and Fedon and the potential de-facto-undermining of the EU legal order	381
6.7.1	Case Summary	381
6.7.2	Analysis	383
6.7.2.1	EU liability regime: requirements and “fault” as a requirement	384
6.7.2.2	The EU liability regime as a part of EU constitutional law?	387
6.7.2.3	De facto undermining of the EU legal order	389
6.7.2.3.1	De facto suspension of EU law by way of indemnification?	389
6.7.2.3.2	De facto suspension of EU law by way of suspension of EU liability regime?	390
6.7.2.3.3	Result	392
6.8	Opinion 2/94	392
6.8.1	Case summary	392
6.8.2	Analysis	393
6.9	Opinion 2/13	393
6.9.1	Case Summary	394
6.9.2	Analysis	394

6.10 Preliminary result and summary of the guidelines developed by the CJEU	402
6.10.1 Summary of the guidelines developed by the CJEU	402
6.10.1.1 The allocation of tasks and competences to the institutions of the Union, including the system of judicial supervision, as foreseen in the Treaties must not be affected.	404
6.10.1.2 The uniform interpretation of Union law throughout the Union must be secured.	406
6.10.1.3 Dispute settlement mechanisms must be structured in a way that protects relevant fundamental rights in the light of relevant CJEU jurisprudence.	407
6.11 Compatibility of dispute settlement mechanisms in EU IIAs with the guidelines developed by the CJEU	408
6.11.1 Compatibility of dispute settlement mechanisms in EU trade and association agreements with the guidelines developed by the CJEU	408
6.11.2 Compatibility of the ECT with the relevant guidelines developed by the CJEU	411
6.11.2.1 Applicability of the relevant guidelines developed by the CJEU to the ECT	411
6.11.2.2 Compatibility of the ECT with the relevant guidelines developed by the CJEU	412
6.11.2.3 Early Commission warnings about the ECT not being compatible with EU law	418
6.11.2.4 Result	419
6.11.3 Compatibility of dispute settlement mechanisms in full-fledged EU investment agreements with the guidelines developed by the CJEU	420
6.11.3.1 Singapore	420
6.11.3.2 CETA	422
6.12 Impact of the CJEU's relevant case law on negotiations with third parties and potential approaches to remedy the situation	425
6.12.1 Likelihood of third parties accepting the requirements developed by the CJEU	425

6.12.2 Potential solutions not requiring an amendment of the European Treaties	427
6.12.2.1 Separating the internal dimension of disputes from their external dimension?	427
6.12.2.2 More defensive approach to be taken by the CJEU?	429
6.12.2.3 Special chambers within the CJEU, expansion of direct rights of action before / of the jurisdiction of the CJEU, stand-alone European investment court?	430
6.12.2.4 Purely international law basis for dispute settlement / “Multi-level governance” approach	431
6.12.2.5 Dispute settlement within the framework of the CFSP?	434
6.12.2.6 State-to-State dispute settlement only?	435
6.12.3 Proposal for an amendment of the European Treaties in order to overcome the resistance of the CJEU	436
6.13 Excursus: Potential consequences of the EU approach to ISDS on arbitration as a form of peaceful dispute settlement	438
7. Conclusion	443
Bibliography	447