

Table of Contents

<i>AGIP v. CONGO (APPLICATION OF THE HOST STATE'S LAW TESTED AGAINST INTERNATIONAL LAW)</i>	21
(vii) <i>Concluding remarks</i>	24
(b) Choice of law in treaties	25
(i) <i>Choice of law clauses in multilateral treaties</i>	26
(ii) <i>Choice of law clauses in BITs</i>	27
(iii) <i>Arbitral practice</i>	29
<i>MAFFEZINI v. SPAIN (APPLICATION OF THE HOST STATE'S LAW ONLY)</i>	29
<i>ANTOINE GOETZ v. BURUNDI (APPLICATION OF BOTH THE HOST STATE'S LAW AND INTERNATIONAL LAW)</i>	32
<i>CME v. THE CZECH REPUBLIC (REFUSAL TO APPLY THE HOST STATE'S LAW)</i>	39
(iv) <i>Concluding remarks</i>	56
(c) Choice of law provisions in domestic legislation	56
3 Explicit or Implicit Choice of Law?	57
(a) Expression of implicit choice of law	57
(b) Arbitral practice	59
(i) <i>SPP v. Egypt (reference in the parties' agreement to domestic law as implicit choice of law)</i>	59
(ii) <i>LETCO v. Liberia (reference in the parties' agreement to domestic law as implicit choice of law)</i>	64
(iii) <i>AAPL v. Sri Lanka (the parties' conduct and submissions as proof of an implicit choice of law)</i>	66
(iv) <i>Wena Hotels v. Egypt (the parties' conduct and submissions as proof of an implicit choice of law)</i>	74
(c) Concluding remarks	79
4 Subsequent Choice of Law	80
(a) Overview of the arbitral practice	80
(b) Concluding remarks	83
5 Stabilization Clauses	84
a) Meaning and types	84
b) Arbitral practice	85
(i) <i>TOPCO v. Libya (stabilization clauses valid and binding under international law)</i>	85
(ii) <i>AMINOIL v. Kuwait (breach of a stabilization clause does not lead to unlawfulness of nationalization as long as it is not expressly prohibited)</i>	86

(iii) AGIP v. Congo (<i>breach of a stabilization clause leads to unlawfulness of nationalization</i>)	91
(iv) LETCO v. Liberia (<i>in the presence of a stabilization clause nationalization is justified if it meets required criteria</i>)	92
(v) Amoco v. Iran (<i>breach of a stabilization clause does not lead to unlawfulness of nationalization as long as it is not expressly prohibited</i>)	93
c) Concluding remarks	96
6 Limitations on the Parties' Freedom to Choose the Applicable Law	98
(a) Relevance of mandatory norms and public policy	98
CHAPTER III: ABSENCE OF AGREED CHOICE OF LAW	103
1 Methods for Determining the Absence of the Parties' Agreement on Choice of Law	103
2 Application of the Residual Rule of Article 42(1) of the ICSID Convention	106
(a) Arbitral practice	107
(i) Amco v. Indonesia (<i>parallel application of the host state's law and international law</i>)	107
(ii) SOABI v. Senegal (<i>application of the host state's law only</i>)	113
(iii) Tradex v. Albania (<i>international law used as guidance for the interpretation of the host state's law</i>)	116
(iv) CDSE v. Costa Rica (<i>in the event of concurrence between the two legal systems international law may be applied only</i>)	119
(b) Concluding Remarks	122
3 Absence of the Parties' Agreement on Choice of Law in Other Arbitration Systems	123
(a) Arbitral practice	127
(i) Sapphire v. National Iranian Oil Company (<i>the parties' intention excludes the application of any national legal system</i>)	127
(ii) Wintershall v. Qatar (<i>application of the closest connection test led to the applicability of the host state's law only</i>)	133
(iii) The Rakoil Case (<i>a-national law determined as the applicable law</i>)	139

(iv) Amoco v. Iran (<i>even in case of a contractual choice of domestic law an expropriation claim will be examined under international law only [Including the Treaty of Amity]</i>)	142
(v) Mobil Oil v. Iran (<i>even in case of a contractual choice of domestic law an expropriation claim will be examined under international law only</i>)	149
(vi) Phelps Dodge Corp. and OPIC v. Iran (<i>international law and the Treaty of Amity apply to the issue of expropriation</i>)	151
(b) Concluding remarks	152
CHAPTER IV: THE ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL LAW AND ITS RELATION TO DOMESTIC LAW	155
CHAPTER V: ISSUES OF ANNULMENT	165
1 Necessity of the Review Process	165
2 Annulment Under the ICSID Convention	166
(a) Generally	166
(b) Manifest excess of powers and the Non-application of the proper law	168
(c) Arbitral Practice	169
(i) Klöckner v. Cameroon (<i>failure to rely on specific legal source led to annulment</i>)	169
(ii) Amco v. Indonesia (<i>failure to apply one important provision led to annulment</i>)	174
(iii) MINE v. Guinea (<i>technical error does not warrant annulment</i>)	178
(iv) Wena Hotels v. Egypt (<i>in case of collision between the two legal systems international law prevails</i>)	181
(d) Concluding remarks	185
3 Setting Aside of Arbitral Awards in Non-ICSID Investment Arbitration	187
(a) Generally on review of non-ICSID arbitral awards	187
(b) Proper law and nullity	190
(c) Arbitral practice	192
(i) The Czech Republic v. CME (<i>decision based on part of applicable law only does not warrant annulment</i>)	192
(ii) Mexico v. Metalclad (<i>a mere reference to the wrong provision of the applicable treaty led to annulment</i>)	201
(iii) Mexico v. Feldman (<i>no reference to the provision of the applicable treaty does not warrant annulment</i>)	207
(d) Concluding remarks	214

CHAPTER VI: PROHIBITION OF A <i>NON-LIQUET</i>	217
CHAPTER VII: DECISION <i>EX AEQUO ET BONO</i>	219
1 Generally	219
2 <i>Amiable Composition</i> or <i>ex aequo et bono</i>	221
3 Express Agreement on a Decision <i>ex aequo et bono</i>	222
(a) Original agreement	222
(b) Subsequent agreement	223
(c) Possibility of <i>dépeçage</i>	223
4 No Authorization to decide <i>ex aequo et bono</i>	224
(a) <i>Klöckner v. Cameroon</i>	224
5 Application of Both Law and Equity	226
(a) <i>Benvenuti & Bonfant v. Congo</i>	226
6 Equity within the Law	228
7 Limits on Decision <i>ex aequo et bono</i>	229
8 Concluding Remarks	229
CHAPTER VIII: SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS	231
TABLE OF CASES	239
OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS	245
BIBLIOGRAPHY	247