

**INVESTMENT TREATY
ARBITRATION AND
INTERNATIONAL LAW**

Kabir Duggal
Rekha Rangachari
Todd J. Weiler
Editors

Camilla Gambarini
Associate Editor

Volume 16

JURIS

Questions About This Publication

For assistance with shipments, billing or other customer service matters,
please email us at: subscriptions@arbitrationlaw.com

For editorial assistance, please email us at: editorial@jurispub.com

To obtain a copy of this book, please visit:
www.arbitrationlaw.com/allbooks/

To learn more about Juris ArbitrationLaw, please visit:
www.arbitrationlaw.com

COPYRIGHT © 2024
by JurisNet, LLC

All Rights Reserved.

Printed in the United States of America
ISBN: 978-1-944825-71-3

JurisNet, LLC
www.arbitrationlaw.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Profiles..... vii

PART I

THE ONLY VALID BASIS FOR TREATY CLAIMS INVOLVING JUDICIAL ACTION OR INACTION IS THE CIL THEORY OF DENIAL OF JUSTICE; TRUE OR FALSE?

CHAPTER 1

Customary International Law as the Source of Denial of Justice Treaty Claims

César Rivière.....3

CHAPTER 2

Justice Denied: Why Treaty Claims Involving Judicial Action Are Not Limited to the CIL Theory of Denial of Justice

Myriam Seers, Ryan Pistorius and Sebastián Melo29

CHAPTER 3

The Only Valid Basis for Treaty Claims Involving Judicial Action or Inaction is the CIL Theory of Denial of Justice; True or False?

César Rivière
Myriam Seers
Nicole Silver
Michael A. Fernandez
Camilla Gambarini
James Hosking
Caline Mouawad

PANEL DISCUSSION.....51

PART II

YES OR NO: THE UNCITRAL WGIII PROPOSAL ON LIMIT ON MULTIPLE ROLES IS A GOOD IDEA?

CHAPTER 4

The UNCITRAL WGIII Proposal on Limit on Multiple Roles Is Not a Good Idea: The Case Against the Proposal

Laura Yvonne Zielinski71

CHAPTER 5
UNCITRAL Working Group III Proposal on Limit on Multiple Roles Is a Good Idea
Yusuf Kumtepe95

CHAPTER 6
Yes or No: The UNCITRAL WGIII Proposal on Limit on Multiple Roles is a Good Idea?
Laura Yvonne Zielinski
Yusuf Kumtepe
Kathleen Claussen
Marinn Carlson
Kiran Nasir Gore
Miriam Harwood
Amanda J. Lee
PANEL DISCUSSION.....123

PART III
THE STATE ENTERPRISE AS INVESTOR: A SPECIAL THREAT REQUIRING SPECIAL RULES OR NOT?

CHAPTER 7
Keynote Address
Frédéric G. Sourgens151

CHAPTER 8
The State Enterprise as Investor: A Special Threat Requiring Special Rules or Not? The Case for Special Rules
David S. Blackman161

CHAPTER 9
State Enterprises Do Not Constitute a Special Threat Requiring Special Rules
Jack Busby.....181

CHAPTER 10**The State Enterprise as Investor: A Special Threat Requiring Special Rules or Not?***David Blackman**Jack Busby**Teddy Baldwin**José Antonio Rivas**Charles Kotuby**Mahnaz Malik**Kirsten Teo*

PANEL DISCUSSION211

PART IV**THE U.S. WILL MAINTAIN ITS CURRENT BIT POLICY. IT WILL NOT CHANGE EVEN IF THE U.S. LOSES THE PENDING NAFTA CASES; TRUE OR FALSE?****CHAPTER 11****Why Losing the Keystone XL Pipeline Case Won't be a Pipeline to XL-Sized Change in U.S. Bilateral Investment Policy***Laura R. Zimmerman*239**CHAPTER 12****Investor-State Arbitration Under NAFTA Chapter Eleven: The Case for Reforming the United States' International Investment Law Policy***Zeïneb Bouraoui*259**CHAPTER 13****The U.S. Will Maintain its Current BIT Policy. It Will Not Change Even if the U.S. Loses the Pending NAFTA Cases; True or False?***Laura R. Zimmerman**Zeïneb Bouraoui**Timothy G. Nelson**Andrew Behrman**Ian Laird**Floriane Lavaud**Ankita Ritwik*

PANEL DISCUSSION291

TABLE OF CASES313

INDEX317

