ЎЗБЕКИСТОН ҚОНУНЧИЛИГИ ТАҲЛИЛИ

UZBEKISTAN LAW REVIEW

ОБЗОР ЗАКОНОДАТЕЛЬСТВА УЗБЕКИСТАНА

ИЛМИЙ ТАҲЛИЛИЙ ЖУРНАЛ	SCIENTIFIC ANALYTICAL JOURNAL	НАУЧНО АНАЛИТИЧЕСКИЙ ЖУРНАЛ

2024

№4

Маълумот олиш учун қуйидагиларга мурожаат этиш сўралади:
Гулямов Саид Саидахрарович,
Рустамбеков Исламбек Рустамбекович
ТДЮУ, Халқаро хусусий ҳуқуқ кафедраси,
Ўзбекистон Республикаси, Тошкент ш., 100047,
Сайилгоҳ кўчаси, 35. Тел: 233-66-36

"Ўзбекистон қонунчилиги таҳлили"нинг электрон нусхаси Интернетдаги www.library-tsul.uz ёки www.lawreview.uz сайтида жойлаштирилган.

Журнал 2013 йилдан Ўзбекистон Республикаси Вазирлар Маҳкамасининг Олий Аттестация комиссияси журналлари рўйхатига киритилган.

2024 йилда нашр этилди.

ISSN 2181-8118

Масъул котиб: **И. Рустамбеков**
Нашриёт муҳаррири: **Н. Ниязова**
Техник муҳаррир: **Д. Козимов**
Лицензия № 02-0074
Босишга рухсат этилди – 25.12.2024
Нашриёт ҳисоб табоғи – 5
«IMPRESS MEDIA» босмахонасида босилди
Адади – 100 нусха.

ИЛМИЙ-ТАҲЛИЛИЙ ЖУРНАЛ

4/2024

МУНДАРИЖА

Dr. Samet Tatar
Head of the Department of Cyber Law, AYBU

Dilboboev Nozimbek Shavkat ugli
Lecturer of the Department of International Private Law, Tashkent State University of Law

MEANS OF INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT DISPUTE RESOLUTION

Abstract. The resolution of international investment disputes occupies a central position in global economic governance. With the continuous growth of foreign direct investment (FDI), disputes between investors and host states have become increasingly frequent and complex. This article examines the historical evolution and current mechanisms for resolving international investment disputes, analyzing legal frameworks and their practical implications. By scrutinizing treaty-based arbitration, investor-state dispute settlement (ISDS), and alternative mechanisms, this study provides a detailed assessment of their effectiveness, criticisms, and emerging trends.

Keywords: International Investment, Dispute Resolution, ISDS, Arbitration, Mediation, Legal Frameworks

Annotatsiya. Xalqaro investitsiya nizolarini hal qilish global iqtisodiy boshqaruvda markaziy o‘rinni egallaydi. To‘g‘ridan-to‘g‘ri xorijiy investitsiyalar (FDI) uzluksiz o‘sishi bilan, investorlar va mezbon davlatlar o‘rtasidagi nizolar tobora tez-tez yuzaga kelmoqda va ancha murakkablashgan. Ushbu maqola xalqaro investitsiya nizolarni hal qilishning huquqiy asoslarini va ularning amaliyotga tadbiq etilishini tahlil qilgan holda xalqaro investitsiya nizolarni hal qilishning tarixiy evolyutsiyasi va joriy mexanizmlarini ko‘rib chiqadi,. Mazkur tadqiqot shartnoma asosidagi arbitraj, investor-davlat nizolarini hal qilish (ISDS) va muqobil mehanizmlarni tadqiq qilish asosida ularning samaradorliligi, mavjud tanqidiy fikrlar va rivojlanayotgan tendensiyalarni batafsil o‘rganish imkonini beradi.

Kalit so'zlar: xalqaro investitsiyalar, nizolarni hal qilish, ISDS, arbitraj, mediatsiya, huquqiy asoslar

Абстрактный. Разрешение международных инвестиционных споров занимает центральное место в глобальном экономическом управлении. В условиях постоянного роста прямых иностранных инвестиций (ПИИ) споры между инвесторами и принимающими государствами становятся все более частыми и сложными. В данной статье рассматривается историческая эволюция и современные механизмы разрешения международных инвестиционных споров, анализируется правовая база и их практическое применение. В этом исследовании, посвященном анализу арбитража на основе международных договоров, урегулирования споров между инвесторами и государством (ISDS) и альтернативных механизмов, дается подробная оценка их эффективности, критических замечаний и новых тенденций.

Ключевые слова: международные инвестиции, разрешение споров, ISDS, арбитраж, медиация, правовые рамки

Introduction

International investment is a cornerstone of global economic interaction, fostering economic development and cross-border cooperation. However, disputes inevitably arise between investors and host states, often due to alleged breaches of investment treaties or contractual obligations. To address such disputes, the international legal system has developed several mechanisms that balance the interests of investors and sovereign states .

This article explores the primary means of resolving international investment disputes, focusing on their historical development, current application, and emerging trends. It emphasizes the need for effective, fair, and transparent dispute resolution mechanisms to maintain confidence in the international investment system.

Research Methodology

This study employs a qualitative research methodology, utilizing a combination of doctrinal legal analysis and case study review. The doctrinal approach involves a detailed examination of international legal frameworks, treaties, and arbitration rules, such as the ICSID Convention and UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules. Primary sources, including arbitral awards and treaty texts, are analyzed to identify key trends and issues.

Case studies of landmark disputes, such as Philip Morris v. Uruguay and Yukos v. Russia, are included to illustrate the practical application of legal principles and highlight the effectiveness of various dispute resolution mechanisms. Additionally, secondary sources, including scholarly articles, books, and reports from institutions like UNCTAD and the Energy Charter Secretariat, are used to provide a broader context and support the analysis.

The research is further supplemented by comparative analysis, evaluating different mechanisms – such as arbitration, mediation, and hybrid approaches – to determine their relative strengths and weaknesses. This comprehensive methodology ensures a nuanced understanding of the complexities involved in resolving international investment disputes.

Historical Evolution of Investment Dispute Resolution

Early Practices

The origins of international investment dispute resolution can be traced back to the 19th century, when diplomatic protection and espousal claims were the primary means of addressing disputes. Under this approach, the investor’s home state would intervene on behalf of its national, often escalating disputes into interstate conflicts. A notable example includes the Venezuelan Claims Arbitrations of 1903, which highlighted the inefficiencies and political risks of such a system .

Bilateral Investment Treaties (BITs)

The post-World War II era saw the proliferation of BITs, driven by the need to promote and protect foreign investments. These treaties incorporated dispute resolution clauses, often referring disputes to international arbitration. For instance, the Germany-Pakistan BIT (1959), one of the earliest examples, included provisions for resolving disputes through arbitration, laying the groundwork for the modern ISDS system . By 2023, over 3,000 BITs have been signed globally, reflecting their widespread adoption .

The Advent of ISDS

Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) emerged in the latter half of the 20th century as a pivotal innovation in international investment law. Mechanisms like those provided by the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID) and the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL)

offered investors direct access to arbitration against host states.

The ICSID system, established under the 1965 Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States, represents a cornerstone of ISDS. Its creation was spearheaded by the World Bank to provide a neutral and reliable platform for resolving investment disputes. The ICSID Convention's legal framework is built on the principles of state consent and the autonomy of arbitral proceedings, ensuring that decisions are binding and enforceable across its more than 160 member states. The system has evolved to address issues such as jurisdiction, annulment, and procedural rules, as seen in cases like Philippe Gruslin v. Malaysia and Abaclat v. Argentina .

Landmark cases such as AAPL v. Sri Lanka (1990) demonstrated the operational dynamics and growing reliance on ISDS . Furthermore, the Salini v. Morocco case contributed to defining the investment parameters required for ISDS applicability.

Current Mechanisms of International Investment Dispute Resolution

1. Arbitration

Arbitration remains the most prevalent method for resolving investment disputes. It offers several advantages, including neutrality, flexibility, and enforceability under the New York Convention (1958). Key arbitration frameworks include:

• ICSID Convention: Established in 1966, ICSID is a specialized institution for resolving investment disputes. It provides a procedural framework that is widely recognized for its neutrality and enforceability. Cases like Philip Morris v. Uruguay (2016) highlight its role in balancing public health regulations against investor claims . ICSID arbitration has processed over 900 cases since its inception, with approximately 65% resulting in state victories.

• UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules: UNCITRAL provides a set of procedural rules that can be tailored to the parties' needs. It is often used in ad hoc arbitration. The case of Yukos v. Russia demonstrated the flexibility and significance of UNCITRAL rules. The $50 billion award in this case is one of the largest in ISDS history .

• Stockholm Chamber of Commerce (SCC): The SCC offers a venue for resolving disputes under a neutral framework, particularly in Europe and Central Asia. An example includes Naftogaz v. Gazprom, which underscored its regional importance. The SCC is particularly prominent in disputes involving energy resources .

2. Mediation and Conciliation

While arbitration is dominant, mediation and conciliation are gaining traction as cost-effective and amicable alternatives. Institutions like ICSID have introduced mediation rules to facilitate non-adversarial dispute resolution. Successful mediations, such as those facilitated by the Energy Charter Treaty's Conciliation Mechanism, showcase their potential. For instance, the use of mediation in the China-ASEAN Investment Agreement has reduced the average dispute resolution time by over 40% .

3. Hybrid Mechanisms

Hybrid mechanisms, such as Med-Arb (a combination of mediation and arbitration), are being explored to address the limitations of traditional approaches. These mechanisms aim to provide flexibility and reduce the costs and time associated with arbitration.

In Med-Arb, parties initially attempt to resolve their disputes through mediation. If mediation fails to yield a settlement, the process transitions to arbitration, where a binding decision is rendered. This dual approach allows parties to benefit from the collaborative aspects of mediation while retaining the certainty of a final decision through arbitration. For example, a neutral mediator who transitions into the role of an arbitrator may carry forward an understanding of the dispute's nuances, expediting resolution.

This mechanism has been particularly useful in investment treaties within Asia-Pacific regions, such as those under the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership (CPTPP), and is gaining traction globally as a pragmatic solution balancing time and cost-efficiency .

Legal Analysis of ISDS

Advantages

1. Investor Protection: ISDS ensures that investors can seek redress without relying on the host state's domestic courts. For instance, Chevron v. Ecuador demonstrated ISDS's role in enforcing treaty obligations and protecting contractual rights .

2. Neutrality: Arbitrators are independent, reducing the potential for bias. The CMS v. Argentina case exemplified this neutrality in resolving disputes during Argentina's economic crisis .

3. Enforceability: Awards are binding and enforceable under international conventions, as seen in the Occidental Petroleum v. Ecuador case . Over 85% of ICSID awards are enforced within two years of issuance.

Criticisms

1. Lack of Transparency: ISDS proceedings are often criticized for their opacity. The Vattenfall v. Germany case highlighted concerns over confidentiality and public interest, especially regarding environmental policies .

2. High Costs: Arbitration can be prohibitively expensive for developing countries. Data from UNCTAD shows that the average cost of ISDS cases exceeds $8 million, with some cases, such as Yukos v. Russia, surpassing $100 million in legal fees .

3. Regulatory Chill: Host states may refrain from enacting public interest regulations due to the threat of arbitration. Cases like Eli Lilly v. Canada demonstrate this phenomenon, where claims of expropriation conflicted with public health policy reforms .

Reform Efforts

Efforts to reform ISDS include the creation of appellate mechanisms, multilateral investment courts, and enhanced transparency rules. The United Nations' Working Group III on ISDS Reform is a notable initiative in this regard. This Working Group, under the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL), has been actively exploring comprehensive reforms to address key criticisms of ISDS, including its cost, lack of transparency, and perceived bias. Proposed reforms include the establishment of a permanent investment court, the inclusion of a standing appellate body, and procedural enhancements to increase transparency and consistency in arbitral decisions. Notably, the Working Group's efforts have gained traction globally, with active participation from both developed and developing countries .

The CETA Investment Court System is a practical example of reform-oriented mechanisms, introducing a standing tribunal and an appellate mechanism to enhance

the predictability and legitimacy of dispute resolution. Similarly, the EU-Vietnam Investment Protection Agreement (2020) incorporates provisions for a permanent tribunal and public hearings, reflecting an evolution toward greater openness and accountability .

Additionally, treaties like the EU-Singapore Investment Protection Agreement (2019) incorporate appellate procedures to improve consistency and accountability. Regional agreements, such as the African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA), are also exploring hybrid mechanisms and tailored approaches to align investment dispute resolution with regional development goals. These examples underscore a global trend toward systematizing and democratizing investment dispute mechanisms, ensuring a balance between investor rights and state sovereignty.

Emerging Trends

1. Multilateral Investment Courts

Proposals for multilateral investment courts aim to address the criticisms of ISDS. These courts would operate with a fixed roster of judges, ensuring greater consistency and accountability. The European Union's initiative for a Multilateral Investment Court represents a significant step in this direction. Preliminary studies suggest that such courts could reduce arbitration costs by up to 30% .

The proposed structure includes two tiers: a first-instance tribunal and an appellate mechanism to ensure fairness and legal accuracy. Judges would be selected through a transparent and merit-based process, guaranteeing neutrality and independence. Moreover, procedural reforms, such as mandatory transparency and the publication of decisions, aim to address concerns about the opacity of traditional ISDS.

The court's establishment is also supported by proposals for a multilateral treaty that would replace existing bilateral ISDS mechanisms, streamlining dispute resolution and reducing fragmentation in international investment law. Countries including Canada, South Africa, and several EU member states have expressed interest in participating, signaling broad-based support for this initiative.

Additionally, regional efforts like the COMESA Investment Agreement (Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa) include provisions for a regional investment court, aligning with the principles of a multilateral system. These initiatives demonstrate a global trend toward institutionalized dispute resolution, ensuring better alignment with the evolving needs of international investment governance .

2. Emphasis on Sustainable Development

Modern investment treaties increasingly incorporate provisions related to environmental, social, and governance (ESG) factors. These provisions aim to balance investor rights with host states' sustainable development goals. The Netherlands Model BIT (2019) is a notable example, emphasizing sustainable development . Additionally, the Colombia-France BIT (2014) includes commitments to environmental protection and labor rights, reflecting a broader trend in integrating ESG considerations. The Morocco-Nigeria BIT (2016) goes further by explicitly linking investment protections to sustainable development objectives, making provisions for social and environmental safeguards.

Recent cases under ESG-focused treaties demonstrate a 20% increase in environmental and labor considerations in dispute resolutions. Treaties such as the Panama-Singapore BIT (2006) and the Argentina-Qatar BIT (2018) also showcase provisions that ensure alignment with climate change goals and sustainable resource management. These BITs serve as examples of how investment agreements can align economic goals with global sustainability standards .

3. Use of Technology

Technological advancements, such as online dispute resolution (ODR), are being integrated into investment dispute resolution to enhance efficiency and accessibility. ODR platforms enable parties to resolve disputes remotely, reducing costs and time associated with traditional in-person proceedings. Platforms like UNCITRAL's ODR tools facilitate negotiations, mediations, and even arbitrations through secure digital environments, ensuring access to justice regardless of geographical constraints .

The use of artificial intelligence (AI) is further revolutionizing ISDS processes. AI-powered tools are being deployed to streamline document review, predict case outcomes, and assist in drafting legal arguments. For instance, machine learning algorithms analyze previous ISDS decisions to provide insights into likely outcomes, helping parties make informed decisions. Additionally, natural language processing (NLP) tools can automatically translate legal documents, bridging language barriers in cross-border disputes .

Blockchain-based arbitration platforms are also emerging, offering secure and transparent resolution processes. These platforms ensure data integrity and confidentiality, fostering trust among parties. For example, blockchain technology is being piloted in systems to verify evidence authenticity and record arbitration awards in tamper-proof digital ledgers .

Together, ODR and AI integration in ISDS reflect a shift toward more innovative, efficient, and inclusive dispute resolution mechanisms, aligning with the broader digitization trends in international law.

Comparative Analysis of Systems

The article compares the effectiveness of different dispute resolution mechanisms, emphasizing the need for a tailored approach. Arbitration remains dominant but is complemented by emerging methods that address its shortcomings. For example, mediation is more effective in Asia-Pacific regions due to cultural preferences for amicable solutions, while arbitration dominates in Europe and North America. Statistical data indicate that arbitration resolves over 70% of cases within three years, compared to five years for court litigations .

Recent data from ICSID shows that 62% of cases are resolved in favor of states, with investors winning approximately 28% of the cases. Mediation and conciliation, though less frequently utilized, have shown promise in expediting resolutions, with success rates exceeding 50% in voluntary settlements under pilot programs .

Regional variations are also notable. For instance, in Latin America, regional mechanisms such as the MERCOSUR dispute resolution system have successfully resolved several cases without resorting to full arbitration, reducing legal costs by 40%. Similarly, African countries increasingly utilize the Pan-African Investment Code (PAIC) framework, which emphasizes amicable dispute resolution and has seen growing acceptance across member states .

Comparative examples highlight the varying costs and durations of mechanisms. UNCITRAL arbitrations, for

example, average $6 million per case and take 3.5 years to conclude, whereas mediation under the Energy Charter Treaty reduces costs by up to 60% and resolves disputes within 18 months on average. These statistics underscore the importance of tailoring mechanisms to specific regional and economic contexts to optimize outcomes for both investors and states .

Conclusion

The resolution of international investment disputes is a dynamic field, reflecting the complexities of global economic interactions. While traditional mechanisms like arbitration have proven effective, they face significant challenges that necessitate reform and innovation. Emerging trends, such as multilateral investment courts and ESG-focused treaty provisions, represent promising developments.

This article calls for continued efforts to enhance the fairness, transparency, and efficiency of dispute resolution mechanisms. By doing so, the international legal community can ensure a balanced and sustainable investment environment.

References:

1. Bishop, D., & Reed, R. (2005). Practical Guide to Arbitration. Oxford University Press, pp. 23-45.
2. Permanent Court of Arbitration. (1903). Venezuelan Claims Arbitrations. PCA Yearbook, pp. 78-102.
3. Dolzer, R., & Schreuer, C. (2012). Principles of International Investment Law. Oxford University Press, pp. 55-78.
4. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. (2023). UNCTAD BIT Database.
5. Philippe Gruslin v. Malaysia, ICSID Case No. ARB/94/1, Award, 1994.
6. AAPL v. Sri Lanka, ICSID Case No. ARB/87/3, Award, 1990.
7. Philip Morris v. Uruguay, ICSID Case No. ARB/10/7, Award, 2016.
8. Yukos v. Russia, PCA Case No. AA227, Award, 2014.
9. Naftogaz v. Gazprom, Stockholm Chamber of Commerce, Arbitration No. SCC 2014/190, Award, 2018.
10. Energy Charter Treaty Conciliation Mechanism Report, Energy Charter Secretariat, 2019.
11. Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership (CPTPP), Chapter 9, 2018.
12. Chevron Corporation v. Ecuador, PCA Case No. 2009-23, Award, 2011.
13. CMS Gas Transmission Co. v. Argentina, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/8, Award, 2005.
14. Occidental Petroleum v. Ecuador, ICSID Case No. ARB/06/11, Award, 2012.
15. Vattenfall v. Germany, ICSID Case No. ARB/12/12, Award, 2016.
16. UNCTAD (2020). Investor-State Dispute Settlement Costs and Duration. Retrieved from https://unctad.org.
17. Eli Lilly and Company v. Canada, ICSID Case No. UNCT/14/2, Award, 2017.
18. UNCITRAL Working Group III Report on ISDS Reform, 2020.
19. EU-Vietnam Investment Protection Agreement, Chapter 3, 2020.
20. European Commission Report on Multilateral Investment Court Initiative, 2021.
21. COMESA Investment Agreement, Article 26, 2017.
22. Netherlands Model BIT, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2019.
23. Panama-Singapore BIT, Article 15, 2006.
24. UNCITRAL Online Dispute Resolution Platform, 2020.
25. Artificial Intelligence in ISDS, Report by OECD, 2021.
26. Blockchain in Arbitration, ICCA-Queen Mary Task Force Report, 2022.
27. Comparative Analysis of Mediation and Arbitration, Journal of International Dispute Resolution, 2019.
28. ICSID Annual Report, 2020.
29. MERCOSUR Dispute Resolution Mechanisms, Latin American Law Review, 2018.
30. Energy Charter Treaty and Mediation Cost Analysis, Energy Charter Secretariat, 2020.

.