

CONTENTS

<i>List of Figures</i>	<i>page xiii</i>
<i>Foreword</i>	<i>xv</i>
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	<i>xviii</i>
<i>Table of Cases</i>	<i>xix</i>
<i>Table of Treaties</i>	<i>xxx</i>
<i>Abbreviations and Acronyms</i>	<i>xxxvi</i>

Introduction: International Investment Law's Narrative and Shareholders' Claims for Reflective Loss 1

1	Shareholders in International Investment Law	14
1.1	The Shareholder as a Vector for Change	14
1.2	The Multinational Corporation's Stakeholders: Diverging Interests at Play in International Investment Law	21
1.2.1	Diverging Interests among the MNC's Shareholders	21
1.2.2	Diverging Interests among the MNC's Shareholders and Creditors	27
2	International Investment Law's Shareholders' Claims for Reflective Loss: A Clash of Policies	32
2.1	Shareholders' Claims for Reflective Loss and Considerations of Applicable Law	32
2.2	Shareholders' Claims for Reflective Loss – Clash of Policies: Systemic versus Regime-Specific Policy	40
2.2.1	The Policy Considerations Weighing against Shareholders' Claims for Reflective Loss	41

2.2.2	The Policy Consideration Weighing in Favor of Shareholders' Claims for Reflective Loss: The Protection of Shareholders in International Investment Law as a Policy	44
3	Shareholders' Claims for Reflective Loss in Domestic Regimes, Customary International Law of Diplomatic Protection, and Human Rights Law	54
3.1	The Strict and Well-Established Approach Adopted by Domestic Regimes with Respect to Shareholders' Claims for Reflective Loss	54
3.1.1	The General Prohibition of Claims Based on Reflective Loss	54
3.1.2	Shareholder Derivative Actions in the Domestic Context: The Alternate Route	63
3.2	The International Court of Justice on the Standing of Shareholders	65
3.2.1	The International Court of Justice's Case Law and Shareholders: Understanding the General Prohibition of Shareholders' Claims for Reflective Loss and Identifying Its Limits through Its Contextualization	66
3.2.1.1	<i>Barcelona Traction</i> : The Rule at Customary International Law	66
3.2.1.2	<i>Elettronica Sicula</i> : Defining the Contours of the Rule	70
3.2.1.3	<i>Diallo</i> : Affirming the Rule	72
3.2.2	A Critical Assessment of the International Court of Justice's Case Law Regarding Shareholder Protection under International Law	76
3.2.3	The Limited Relevance of the International Court of Justice's Case Law Regarding Shareholder Protection under International Investment Law	82
3.3	The Standing of Shareholders under the European Convention on Human Rights and the Inter-American Convention on Human Rights: Human Rights Courts Navigating Tumultuous Waters	86
4	International Investment Law on the Standing of Shareholders	93
4.1	International Investment Agreements on the Standing of Shareholders	93

4.1.1	Shares as “Investments”	94
4.1.2	Shareholders as “Investors”	98
4.2	Investor-State Tribunals on the Standing of Shareholders	102
4.2.1	The Jurisdiction of ICSID Tribunals	104
4.2.1.1	Article 25(1) of the ICSID Convention: The General Jurisdictional Requirements	104
4.2.1.2	Article 25(2)(b) of the ICSID Convention and Corporate Structures	110
4.2.2	The Case of Derivative Claims on Behalf of the Company: The Alternate Route in the International Investment Law Context – The NAFTA Example	125
4.3	The Interplay between the ICSID Convention and International Investment Agreements	134
4.3.1	The Interaction between Article 25(1) of the ICSID Convention and International Investment Agreements	134
4.3.2	The Interaction between Article 25(2)(b) of the ICSID Convention and International Investment Agreements	135
4.4	A Critical Analysis of the Broad Acceptance of Shareholders’ Claims for Reflective Loss under International Investment Agreements: The Notion of “Investment” as the Key Criteria	137
4.4.1	The Autonomy of Shareholders’ Claims for Reflective Loss: The Recognition of the Separate Cause of Action of Shareholders and of the Consequent Autonomous Nature of Shareholders’ Claims for Reflective Loss	137
4.4.2	The Irrelevance of the Notion of “Control”	144
4.4.2.1	The Legal Standing of the Majority Shareholder of the Locally Incorporated Corporation	145
4.4.2.2	The Legal Standing of the Minority Shareholder of the Locally Incorporated Corporation	149
4.4.2.3	The Legal Standing of Intermediate Corporations and of Indirect Shareholders (Holding Interests through an Intermediate Corporation) of the Locally Incorporated Corporation	153
5	Legal Uncertainty and Inconsistency Militating against Shareholders’ Claims for Reflective Loss: The Unpredictability of Investment Disputes Involving Shareholders	164

5.1	Shareholders' Claims for Reflective Loss as a Disincentive to Settle the Dispute and Potential Floodgates	164
5.1.1	Shareholders' Claims for Reflective Loss as a Disincentive to Settle	164
5.1.2	Shareholders' Claims for Reflective Loss and Potential Opening of the Floodgates	178
5.2	Treaty Shopping and Forum Shopping	181
5.2.1	Treaty Shopping as a Phenomenon That Is Not Inherently Illegitimate	182
5.2.2	Regulating Illegitimate Treaty Shopping through the Concept of Abuse of Process: Treaty Standard or Principle of International Law?	193
5.2.2.1	Fighting Illegitimate Treaty Shopping on the Basis of the Applicable Treaty	194
5.2.2.2	Fighting Illegitimate Treaty Shopping on the Basis of the International Law Principle of Abuse of Process	195
6	Shareholders' Claims for Reflective Loss and the Dangers of Parallel Proceedings	206
6.1	Judicial Economy and Costs	207
6.2	Risk of Inconsistencies	208
6.3	The Risks of Double Recovery and of Interference with the Fair Distribution of the Recovery	215
6.4	Domestic and International Parallel Proceedings: The Inefficiency of Claim-Limiting Provisions	219
6.4.1	Exhaustion of Local Remedies	222
6.4.2	Fork-in-the-Road	226
6.4.3	Waivers	231
7	International Res Judicata as a Solution to Parallel Proceedings Arising from Shareholders' Claims for Reflective Loss in International Investment Law	238
7.1	Domestic Res Judicata: The Blatant Lack of Consistency	244
7.1.1	The Civil Law Approach	244

7.1.2	The Common Law Tradition as Illustrated by the US Approach	245
7.2	International Res Judicata: A Surprising Consistency	248
7.2.1	Proceedings Conducted before International Courts or Arbitration Tribunals	249
7.2.2	Identity of the Parties: The Prevalence of the Realistic Attitude	253
7.2.3	Identity of the Object and of the Cause	257
7.2.4	International Res Judicata Exemplified: The Apotex Decision	260
7.3	For a Broader Application and Understanding of International Res Judicata	271
7.3.1	The Broad Application of International Res Judicata: The Affirmation of a Rule of Customary International Law	271
7.3.2	The Broad Understanding of International Res Judicata: The Affirmation of a Functional Concept of Res Judicata Inspired by the Common Law Notion of Issue Estoppel	275
8	The Consolidation of Proceedings and Mass Claims in International Investment Law and Arbitration	283
8.1	The Consolidation of Proceedings in International Investment Law and Arbitration	283
8.1.1	The Feasibility of Consolidation in Investment Treaty Arbitration	285
8.1.1.1	Consolidation under International Investment Agreements	285
8.1.1.2	Conditions for Consolidation in International Investment Arbitration	293
8.1.2	The Desirability of Consolidation in Investment Treaty Arbitration with Respect to Shareholders' Claims for Reflective Loss	298
8.1.2.1	The Efficiency of Consolidation and Shareholders' Claims for Reflective Loss	298
8.1.2.2	Avoiding Inconsistent and Contradictory Awards	301
8.1.3	The Dangers of Consolidation Alleviated	303
8.1.3.1	The Parties' Consent	303
8.1.3.2	Procedural Issues, Due Process, and Confidentiality	307

8.1.3.3	The Apportionment of the Costs of Arbitration and Enforcement Considerations	317
8.2	Mass Claims in International Investment Law and Arbitration	319
8.2.1	Mass Claims in International Investment Arbitration	319
8.2.2	Difficulties Arising from Mass Claims and Shareholders' Claims for Reflective Loss	322
8.2.2.1	A Jurisdictional Issue Based on the Lack of Consent	322
8.2.2.2	An Admissibility Issue Based on the Procedural Aspects of Multiparty Proceedings and Due Process	326
8.3	The Law Applicable to the Merits in Mass Claims and Consolidated Proceedings: Toward Greater Consistency	333
9	Calculating Damages in Shareholders' Claims for Reflective Loss	337
9.1	Calculating Damages in Consolidated Proceedings and Mass Claims Involving Numerous Claimants	338
9.1.1	The Protected Investment: The Underlying Business Unit or the Share(s)?	338
9.1.2	Flow-Through of Damage in the Practice of Investment Tribunals	340
9.2	Enhanced Cooperation among Courts and Tribunals to Avoid Double Recovery	342
9.3	Creative Remedies to Avoid Double Recovery: The Share Purchase Option	344
	Conclusion	350
	<i>Bibliography</i>	356
	<i>Index</i>	387