

Table of Contents

<i>Table of Cases</i>	xvii
<i>Table of Treaties</i>	xxvii
<i>Table of Abbreviations</i>	xxxv

Introduction	1
---------------------	---

PART I. PLACING TREATY SHOPPING IN CONTEXT

1. Understanding the Practice of Treaty Shopping	7
1.1 Defining Treaty Shopping in International Investment Law	7
1.1.1 Perceptions and definitions of treaty shopping used in academic literature and arbitral jurisprudence	7
1.1.2 Possible scenarios of treaty shopping	12
1.1.2.1 Treaty shopping by natural persons	12
1.1.2.2 Treaty shopping by corporate structuring or restructuring	13
1.1.2.3 Treaty shopping by transfer of claims	14
1.1.3 The distinction between treaty and forum shopping	15
1.2 Reasons for the Occurrence of Treaty Shopping	19
1.2.1 Proliferation of investment treaties	20
1.2.2 Change from diplomatic protection to direct standing paradigm	27
1.2.3 Ease of incorporation of legal entities and high fungibility of shareholding	32
1.2.4 Absence of a doctrine of precedent?	32
1.3 Preliminary Conclusions	33
2. Is Anything Wrong with Treaty Shopping?	34
2.1 Introduction	34
2.2 Considerations in Favour of a ‘Treaty Shopping-permissive’ Approach	34
2.2.1 Sovereign consent	34
2.2.2 Access to justice?	37
2.3 Policy Concerns Against Treaty Shopping	39
2.3.1 Reciprocity	39
2.3.1.1 Reciprocity in public international law	40
2.3.1.2 Reciprocity in international investment law	42
2.3.2 Legitimacy concerns	49
2.3.2.1 The meaning of legitimacy in international law	49
2.3.2.2 Legitimacy concerns in international investment law	52
2.3.2.3 Legitimacy concerns and treaty shopping	58
2.3.3 Sustainable development	59
2.3.4 Regulatory chill	62
2.3.5 Lack of a ‘level-playing’ field	63
2.4 Preliminary Conclusions	65

PART II. SYSTEMATIC APPROACHES TO THE VALIDITY OF A CLAIM INVOLVING TREATY SHOPPING	
3. The Customary International Law Relative to Changes of Nationality	69
3.1 Introduction	69
3.2 The Concept of Nationality	69
3.2.1 Natural persons	71
3.2.1.1 <i>Nottebohm</i> case	71
3.2.1.2 Discussion	72
3.2.2 Legal persons	74
3.2.2.1 Domestic law theories on the creation of legal persons	74
3.2.2.1.1 Incorporation theory	74
3.2.2.1.2 Seat theory	75
3.2.2.1.3 Control theory	77
3.2.2.2 Customary international law	77
3.2.2.2.1 <i>Barcelona Traction</i> case	77
3.2.2.2.2 Discussion	80
3.2.2.2.3 <i>Diallo</i> case	84
3.2.2.2.4 ILC 2006 Draft Articles on Diplomatic Protection	85
3.3 Continuous Nationality Requirement	86
3.4 Relevance of Customary International Law for the Practice of Treaty Shopping	88
3.5 Preliminary Conclusions	90
4. Jurisdiction <i>Ratione Personae</i>	92
4.1 Introduction	92
4.2 Natural Persons	92
4.2.1 ‘Genuine link’ requirement in international investment law?	93
4.2.1.1 Single nationality	93
4.2.1.2 Dual nationality	95
4.2.2 Dual nationality of a natural person exercising ‘foreign control’	97
4.2.3 Discussion	98
4.3 Legal Persons	99
4.3.1 Formal approach v ‘piercing of the corporate veil’	101
4.3.1.1 So-called ‘round-tripping’	102
4.3.1.2 So-called mailbox or shell companies	108
4.3.1.3 Discussion	111
4.3.2 Substantive link requirements	114
4.3.3 Denial of benefit clauses	116
4.3.3.1 Prospective or retrospective effect?	117
4.3.3.2 Discussion	119
4.3.4 Definition and scope of ‘control’	120
4.3.4.1 Notion of ‘foreign control’ in the ICSID Convention	121
4.3.4.1.1 Which criteria can be used to define control?	122
4.3.4.1.2 Legal v effective control	123
4.3.4.1.3 Discussion	125

Table of Contents

xiii

4.3.4.2	Level of control	127
4.3.4.2.1	First qualifying nationality found or ultimate controller?	127
4.3.4.2.2	Discussion	131
4.3.4.3	Notion of control in IIAs	134
4.3.4.3.1	Legal or effective control	134
4.3.4.3.2	Discussion	136
4.4	Preliminary Conclusions	138
5.	Jurisdiction <i>Ratione Materiae</i>	140
5.1	Introduction	140
5.2	Notion of Investment in IIAs	140
5.2.1	Shareholding as investment	141
5.2.2	Indirect investments	142
5.2.2.1	Inclusion of indirect investments when the treaty text is silent?	143
5.2.2.2	Discussion	144
5.2.2.3	Exceptions	145
5.3	Notion of Investment in the ICSID Convention	147
5.4	Specific Problems Related to Treaty Shopping	150
5.4.1	Contribution requirement	150
5.4.1.1	Economic motivation	150
5.4.1.2	Transactions at nominal price or for free	151
5.4.2	Risk requirement	155
5.4.3	'Active contribution' requirement?	155
5.4.3.1	Cases	155
5.4.3.2	Discussion	158
5.4.4	Good faith as an element of the notion of investment?	160
5.4.4.1	Cases	160
5.4.4.2	Discussion	163
5.5	Preliminary Conclusions	164
6.	Jurisdiction <i>Ratione Temporis</i>	166
6.1	Introduction	166
6.2	Timing of Nationality Requirement	167
6.2.1	ICSID Convention	167
6.2.2	Other investment treaties	168
6.3	Continuous Nationality Requirement	169
6.3.1	<i>Loewen Group Inc and Raymond Loewen v United States</i>	169
6.3.2	Discussion	171
6.4	Exclusion of Pre-existing Disputes	175
6.4.1	Why should a pre-existing dispute be excluded?	176
6.4.1.1	Treaty-based exclusion clauses	177
6.4.1.2	No treaty-based exclusion clauses	177
6.4.2	When has the dispute arisen?	182
6.4.2.1	Importance of the notion of dispute for a claim following a corporate restructuring	182

6.4.2.2	PCIJ and ICJ jurisprudence on the notion of ‘dispute’	184
6.4.2.2.1	Cases	185
6.4.2.2.2	Discussion	187
6.4.2.3	Notion of ‘dispute’ in international investment law	188
6.4.2.3.1	Definition of dispute	188
6.4.2.3.2	‘Objective’ or ‘subjective’ approach to the notion of dispute?	190
6.4.2.3.3	<i>Philip Morris Asia v Australia</i>	194
6.4.2.3.4	Identity of disputes?	196
6.4.2.4	Discussion	199
6.5	Preliminary Conclusions	201
7.	Objections on Grounds of an Abuse of Rights or Abuse of Process	202
7.1	Introduction	202
7.2	The Abuse of Rights or Abuse of Process Doctrine	202
7.3	The Timing of the Corporate Structuring or Restructuring and the Existence or Foreseeability of a Dispute	205
7.3.1	Cases	206
7.3.1.1	<i>Société Générale v Dominican Republic</i>	206
7.3.1.2	<i>Cementownia v Turkey</i>	207
7.3.1.3	<i>Phoenix Action v Czech Republic</i>	207
7.3.1.4	<i>Aguas del Tunari v Bolivia</i>	208
7.3.1.5	<i>Mobil v Venezuela</i>	208
7.3.1.6	<i>Pac Rim v El Salvador</i>	210
7.3.1.7	<i>Tidewater v Venezuela</i>	211
7.3.1.8	<i>ConocoPhillips v Venezuela</i>	213
7.3.1.9	<i>Lao Holdings v Laos</i>	215
7.3.1.10	<i>Cervin Investissements & Rhone Investissements v Costa Rica</i>	215
7.3.1.11	<i>Renée Rose Levy and Gremcitel SA v Peru</i>	216
7.3.1.12	<i>Philip Morris Asia v Australia</i>	217
7.3.2	Discussion	219
7.3.2.1	Distinction between jurisdiction <i>ratione temporis</i> and abuse of process	219
7.3.2.2	The existence of an actual dispute and the foreseeability of a future dispute	222
7.3.2.3	The ‘sole purpose’ doctrine	227
7.3.2.4	Other factors that may influence whether a tribunal will be prepared to accept a corporate (re)structuring as ‘legitimate corporate planning’ or not	228
7.4	<i>Nemo Dat Quod Non Habet</i>	229
7.4.1	Cases	229
7.4.2	Discussion	231
7.5	Preliminary Conclusions	232
	Conclusions of Part II	234

PART III. POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS TO THE INCONSISTENT
APPROACHES TOWARDS TREATY SHOPPING

8. What States Can Do to Curb Treaty Shopping	239
8.1 'Political' Approaches to Treaty Shopping	239
8.1.1 Negotiation of a multilateral investment framework	239
8.1.2 Prescription of mailbox companies	240
8.1.3 Investment treaties without ISDS clauses	241
8.2 'Treaty Drafting' Approaches to Treaty Shopping	242
8.2.1 Joint interpretations	243
8.2.2 The role of the preamble	244
8.2.3 Notion of investor	246
8.2.3.1 Natural persons	246
8.2.3.1.1 Inclusion of the effective nationality principle	246
8.2.3.1.2 Exclusion of claims by host State nationals	248
8.2.3.1.3 Permanent residents as protected investors	248
8.2.3.2 Legal persons	249
8.2.3.2.1 'Anti-treaty shopping' nationality criteria found in IIAs	250
8.2.3.2.2 Denial of benefits clauses	251
8.2.3.2.3 Discussion	256
8.2.3.3 Notion of control	256
8.2.3.4 Foreign control as in Article 25(2)(b) ICSID Convention	260
8.2.4 Notion of investment	261
8.2.4.1 Protection of indirect investments	262
8.2.4.2 Specific criteria pertaining to the notion of investment	264
8.2.4.2.1 Specifications of the contribution requirement	264
8.2.4.2.2 Good faith requirement	264
8.2.4.2.3 'Active contribution' requirement	265
8.2.4.2.4 Origin of capital requirement	268
8.2.5 Temporal jurisdiction	269
8.2.5.1 Principle of non-retroactivity	269
8.2.5.2 Exclusion of disputes that have arisen prior to the entry into force of the IIA	270
8.2.5.3 Exclusion of acts or facts giving rise to a later dispute	271
8.2.5.4 Dispute settlement clause: notion of dispute	272
8.2.6 Inclusion of conditions under which a corporate restructuring is accepted	272
8.2.7 Inclusion of the abuse of process doctrine	274
8.2.8 Inclusion of the 'pre-existing/foreseeable dispute' jurisprudence	274
8.3 Preliminary Conclusions	276
9. The Role of the Principle of Good Faith in Treaty Shopping	278
9.1 Introduction	278
9.2 The Normative Status of the Principle of Good Faith and its Functions	279

9.3	The Interpretative Approach Towards Treaty Shopping	283
9.3.1	Ordinary meaning	284
9.3.2	Context	285
9.3.3	Object and purpose	285
9.3.4	Special case: <i>Phoenix Action v Czech Republic</i>	287
9.3.5	Discussion	290
9.4	Application of the Principle of Good Faith or One of its Concretizations	291
9.4.1	'Genuine link' theory	291
9.4.2	'Piercing of the corporate veil' doctrine	292
9.4.3	Fraud	298
9.4.4	The abuse of rights/abuse of process doctrine	301
9.5	A (More) Systematic Approach Towards the Use of the Principle of Good Faith and its Emanations in Cases of Treaty Shopping	303
9.6	Preliminary Conclusions	307
	Conclusions	309
	<i>Annex</i>	317
	<i>Bibliography</i>	331
	<i>Index</i>	351