215 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE • Washington, D.C. 20003 • 202/546-4996 • www.citizen.org

Case Studies: Investor-State Attacks on Public Interest Policies

The investor-state dispute settlement (ISDS) system, included in various "free trade" agreements (FTAs) and bilateral investment treaties (BITs), fundamentally shifts the balance of power among investors, States and the general public, creating an enforceable global governance regime that formally prioritizes corporate rights over the right of governments to regulate. ISDS provisions elevate individual foreign corporations and investors to the same status as sovereign governments, empowering them to privately enforce a public treaty by skirting domestic courts and directly "suing" signatory governments over public interest policies before extrajudicial tribunals.

The tribunals deciding these cases are composed of three private attorneys, unaccountable to any electorate. Some attorneys rotate between serving as "judges" and bringing cases for corporations against governments – such dual roles would be deemed unethical in most legal systems. Tribunals are not bound by precedent or the opinions of States, and their rulings cannot be appealed on the merits.

ISDS-enforced pacts provide foreign corporations broad substantive "rights" that even surpass the strong property rights afforded to domestic firms in nations such as the United States. This includes the "right" to a regulatory framework that conforms to foreign investors' "expectations," which ISDS tribunals have interpreted to mean that governments should not change regulatory policies once a foreign investment has been established.[1]

Claiming such expansive rights, foreign corporations have used ISDS to attack an increasingly wide array of tobacco, climate, financial, mining, medicine, energy, pollution, water, labor, toxins, development and other non-trade domestic policies. The number of such cases has been soaring. While treaties with ISDS provisions have existed since the 1960s, just 50 known ISDS cases were launched in the regime's first three decades combined.[2] In contrast, corporations launched at least 50 cases *each year* from 2011-2013 (and 42 in 2014).[3]

If a tribunal rules against a challenged policy, there is no limit to the amount of taxpayer money that the tribunal can order the government to pay the foreign corporation. Such compensation orders are based on the "expected future profits" an ISDS tribunal surmises that an investor would have earned in the absence of the public policy it is attacking. Even when governments win cases, they are often ordered to pay for a share of the tribunal's costs. Given that the costs just for defending a challenged policy in an ISDS case total $8 million on average, the mere filing of a case can create a chilling effect on government policymaking, even if the government expects to win.[4]

Under U.S. FTAs alone, foreign firms have already pocketed more than $440 million in taxpayer money via investor-state cases. This includes attacks on natural resource policies, environmental protections, health and safety measures and more. Tribunals have ordered more than $3.6 billion in compensation to investors under all U.S. BITs and FTAs. More than $34 billion remains in pending ISDS claims under these pacts, all of which relate to environmental, energy, financial regulation, public health, land use and transportation policies.[5] What follows is a sample of the many investor-state attacks on public interest policies to date.

Health: Medicines, Tobacco and Toxins

Eli Lilly v. Canada (medicine patents), ***pending***

Eli Lilly and Company, the fifth-largest U.S. pharmaceutical firm,[6] launched a $481 million claim against Canada in September 2013 under the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA).[7] Eli Lilly is challenging Canada's patent standards after Canadian courts invalidated the firm's patents for Strattera and Zyprexa, drugs used to treat attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, schizophrenia and bipolar disorder. Canadian federal courts ruled that Eli Lilly had failed to meet the utility standard required to obtain a patent under Canadian law. Namely, the firm had failed to demonstrate or soundly predict that the drugs would provide the benefits that the company promised when applying for the patents' monopoly protection rights.[8] The resulting invalidations of the patents paved the way for Canadian drug producers to produce less expensive, generic versions of the drugs.

Eli Lilly is asking a NAFTA tribunal to second-guess not only the courts' decisions, but Canada's entire legal basis for determining patents' validity. Eli Lilly argues that Canada's standard – that a patent holder is required to provide substantiation for its promises of a drug's utility in order to obtain or maintain a patent – is "arbitrary, unfair, unjust, and discriminatory."[9] The company claims Canada's legal standard violates the NAFTA guarantee of a "minimum standard of treatment" for foreign investors and resulted in a NAFTA-prohibited expropriation.[10] A tribunal has been formed and the first procedural order was issued in May 2014.[11]

Philip Morris v. Australia (tobacco regulation), ***pending;*** **and Philip Morris v. Uruguay (tobacco regulation),** ***pending***

In November 2011, a Hong Kong subsidiary of the U.S.-based tobacco corporation Philip Morris International launched an investor-state case against a landmark anti-smoking law in Australia.[12] Philip Morris is challenging Australia's plain packaging law that requires tobacco products to be sold in packaging that is dominated by health warnings with the brand name of the product in standard font size at the bottom of the package.[13] Phillip-Morris has not yet specified the amount of compensation it is demanding from the government, but has stated that the law could spell losses "potentially amounting to billions of dollars."[14] Philip Morris argues that the public health law "expropriated[] its valuable intellectual property" (by prohibiting the display of its logo, brand colors and the like) and violated its right to "fair and equitable treatment" as guaranteed under the Australia-Hong Kong BIT.[15] Philip Morris' Hong Kong subsidiary had acquired shares in an Australian holding company at the same time the plain packaging policy was announced. The Australian government argues that the corporation's "investment" was merely a tool for launching the BIT claim against Australia.[16]

Philip Morris also attacked the law in Australia's domestic courts and pursued its challenge through the nation's highest court. In 2012, Australia's High Court ruled that the plain packaging law did not result in an unconstitutional acquisition of property and was justified as a public health measure.[17] Regardless, Philip Morris continues to pursue its demand for compensation under the BIT. The plain packaging initiative was one of a number of strengthened tobacco policies the government introduced to meet its public health objectives.[18] It has been lauded by the World Health Organization as a leading public health example for other countries to follow.[19]

At Philip Morris's request, the ongoing proceedings will be largely non-transparent, with public hearings prohibited and the public release of most documents left up to the discretion of each party. While Australia had argued for open hearings and transparent filings, Philip Morris refused, arguing that even releasing documents after the conclusion of the arbitration "would be a time-consuming process with minimal gains for the public interest."[20]

Meanwhile, a Swiss subsidiary of Philip Morris International launched a similar case against Uruguay in February 2010 under the Switzerland-Uruguay BIT. Uruguay also implemented a slate of anti-smoking measures that featured a requirement that packaging for tobacco products include large, graphic public health warnings. Philip Morris is seeking compensation for lost profits, arguing that the labeling policies violate the BIT as expropriations of its trademarks and as "unreasonable" measures with no rational relationship to public health objectives. In July 2013, the investor-state tribunal in this case ruled that it had jurisdiction over the case and it is now weighing the merits of the tobacco corporation's arguments.[21]

Regardless of the final outcomes in these cases, already the investor-state system has had a chilling effect on tobacco control policies. In February 2013, New Zealand's Ministry of Health announced that the government planned to introduce its own plain packaging legislation, but that it would wait until the investor-state case against Australia is resolved, and that enactment of New Zealand's legislation could be delayed as a result.[22] And, in 1994 R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company threatened to bring a claim under NAFTA's investment chapter as part of its successful lobbying campaign against Canada's proposed "plain packaging" legislation, which would have required that all cigarettes be sold in standardized packaging without logos or trademarks. The firm sent a memorandum to the House of Commons arguing that plain packaging would constitute an illegal expropriation of a legally protected trademark, requiring Canada to pay hundreds of millions of dollars in compensation.[23]

Ethyl v. Canada (ban of toxic fuel additive), ***settled (investor paid $13 million, ban reversed)***

Ethyl Corporation, a U.S. chemical company, launched a NAFTA investor-state case in 1997 over a Canadian ban of MMT, a toxic gasoline additive used to improve engine performance.[24] MMT contains manganese − a known human neurotoxin.[25] Canadian legislators, concerned about MMT's public health and environmental risks, including its interference with emission-control systems, banned MMT's intra-provincial transport and importation in 1997.[26] Given that Canadian provinces have jurisdiction over most environmental matters, such actions are how a national ban of a substance could be enacted in Canada. When the law was being considered, Ethyl explicitly threatened that it would respond with a NAFTA challenge.[27] MMT is not used in most countries outside Canada. It is banned by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in reformulated gasoline.[28] Making good on its threat, Ethyl initiated a NAFTA claim against the toxics ban, arguing that it constituted a NAFTA-forbidden "indirect" expropriation of its assets.[29]

Though Canada argued that Ethyl did not have standing under NAFTA to bring the challenge, a NAFTA tribunal rejected Canada's objections in a June 1998 jurisdictional decision that paved the way for a ruling on the substance of the case.[30] Less than a month after losing the jurisdictional ruling, the Canadian government announced that it would settle with Ethyl. The terms of that settlement required the government to pay the firm $13 million in damages and legal fees, post advertising saying MMT was safe, and reverse the ban on MMT.[31] As a result, today Canada depends largely on voluntary restrictions to reduce the presence of MMT in gas.[32]

Environment: Climate Change

Vattenfall v. Germany I (coal-fired electric plant/climate change), *settled (environmental conditions rolled back)*

Vattenfall, a Swedish energy firm, launched a $1.9 billion investor-state claim against Germany in 2009 under the Energy Charter Treaty over permits delays for a coal-fired power plant in Hamburg.[33] According to Vattenfall, delays of required government permits started when the state's environmental ministry established "very clear requirements" for the plant, due to "the reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change having alerted the public to the impending climate change."[34] Public opposition to the proposed plant focused on prospective carbon emissions and water pollution. Further delays, according to Vattenfall, occurred when the Green Party – which opposed the plant on environmental grounds – formed a coalition with the Christian Democrats after state elections in 2008. After Vattenfall litigated in domestic courts, the coalition government issued the permits to Vattenfall, but with additional requirements to protect the Elbe River.[35]

Rather than comply with these requirements, Vattenfall launched its investor-state claim against Germany, arguing that Hamburg's environmental rules amounted to an expropriation and a violation of Germany's obligation to afford foreign investors "fair and equitable treatment."[36] In response, Michael Müller, then Germany's deputy environment minister, stated, "It's really unprecedented how we are being pilloried just for implementing German and European Union (EU) laws."[37] To avoid the uncertainty of a prospective investor-state tribunal ruling ordering payment of a massive amount of compensation, the German government reached a settlement with Vattenfall in 2010. The settlement obliged the Hamburg government to drop its additional environmental requirements and issue the contested permits required for the plant to proceed. The settlement also waived Vattenfall's earlier commitments to mitigate the coal plant's impact on the Elbe River.[38] Any monetary payment extracted from German taxpayers in the settlement has not been disclosed. Vattenfall's coal plant in Hamburg began operating in February 2014.[39]

Energy and Public Safety

Vattenfall v. Germany II (nuclear energy), *pending*

In May 2012, Vattenfall launched a second investor-state claim under the Energy Charter Treaty against Germany, demanding a reported $5 billion in taxpayer compensation for Germany's decision to phase out nuclear power.[40] The government made that decision in response to widespread German public opposition to nuclear power generation in the wake of Japan's 2011 Fukushima nuclear power disaster. The German Parliament amended the Atomic Energy Act to roll back a 2010 extension of the lifespan of nuclear plants, and to abandon the use of nuclear energy by 2022.[41]

Vattenfall claims Germany's policy change violates its obligations to foreign investors under the Energy Charter Treaty. Press reports and inquiries from the German Parliament indicate that the corporation is demanding about 4.7 billion euros (more than $5 billion) from German taxpayers for claimed losses relating to two Vattenfall nuclear plants affected by the phase-out.[42] Though Germany attempted to halt Vattenfall's claim as one "manifestly without merit," the investor-state tribunal decided in 2013 to allow the claim to proceed.[43] It is pending.

Lone Pine v. Canada (fracking), ***pending***

In September 2013, Lone Pine Resources, a U.S.-based oil and gas exploration and production company, launched a $241 million challenge against Canada under NAFTA to challenge Quebec's suspension of oil and gas exploration permits for deposits under the St. Lawrence River as part of a wider moratorium on the controversial practice of hydraulic fracturing, or fracking.[44] The provincial government had declared a moratorium in 2011 so as to conduct an environmental impact assessment of the extraction method widely known for leaching chemicals and gases into groundwater and the air.[45]

Lone Pine had plans and permits to engage in fracking on over 30,000 acres of land directly beneath the St. Lawrence Seaway – the province's largest waterway.[46] According to Lone Pine, the moratorium contravened NAFTA's protection against expropriation and guarantee of a "minimum standard of treatment."[47] The case is pending.

Occidental Petroleum v. Ecuador (oil concession), ***investor win (awarded $2.3 billion)***

In 2006, Occidental Petroleum Corporation (Oxy) launched a claim against Ecuador under the U.S.-Ecuador BIT after the government terminated an oil concession due to the U.S. oil corporation's breach of the contract and Ecuadorian law.[48] Oxy illegally sold 40 percent of its production rights to another firm without government approval, despite a provision in the concession contract stating that sale of Oxy's production rights without government pre-approval would terminate the contract.[49] The contract explicitly enforced Ecuador's hydrocarbons law, which protects the government's prerogative to vet companies seeking to produce oil in its territory – a particular concern in the environmentally sensitive Amazon region where Oxy was operating.[50] Oxy launched its BIT claim two days after the Ecuadorian government terminated the oil concession, claiming that the government's enforcement of the contract terms and hydrocarbons law violated its BIT commitments, including the obligation to provide the firm "fair and equitable treatment."[51]

The tribunal acknowledged that Oxy had broken the law,[52] that the response of the Ecuadorian government (forfeiture of the firm's investment) was lawful, and that Oxy should have expected that response.[53] But the tribunal then concocted a new obligation for the government (one not specified by the BIT itself) to respond proportionally to Oxy's legal breach as part of the "fair and equitable treatment" requirement. Deeming themselves the arbiters of proportionality, the tribunal determined that Ecuador had violated the novel investor-state obligation.[54]

The tribunal majority ordered Ecuador to pay Oxy $2.3 billion (including compound interest) – one of the largest investor-state awards to date.[55] To calculate this penalty, the tribunal estimated the amount of future profits that Oxy would have received from full exploitation of the oil reserves it had forfeited due to its legal breach, including profits from not-yet-discovered reserves.[56] Using logic that a dissenting tribunalist described as "egregious," the tribunal determined that the damages should be based on the entire value of Oxy's original contract even though the firm had sold a 40 percent share – because the sale violated Ecuadorian law and therefore could not be recognized.[57] And the tribunal arbitrarily concluded that Ecuador was 75 percent responsible for the conflict and thus should pay 75 percent of the projected losses to Oxy,[58] even though the conflict arose from Oxy selling unauthorized rights under a contract that explicitly stipulated that doing so could cause forfeiture of the investment. Ecuador has filed a request for annulment of the award, and a decision on annulment is pending.[59]

Environment: Toxic Pollution

Chevron v. Ecuador (Amazonian oil pollution), *pending*

In 2009, Chevron Corporation – one of the largest U.S. oil corporations – launched a case against Ecuador under the U.S.-Ecuador BIT seeking to evade payment of a multi-billion dollar court ruling against the company for widespread pollution of the Amazon rainforest.[60] For 26 years, Texaco, later acquired by Chevron, performed oil operations in Ecuador. Ecuadorian courts have found that during that period the company dumped billions of gallons of toxic water and dug hundreds of open-air oil sludge pits in Ecuador's Amazon,[61] poisoning the communities of some 30,000 Amazon residents, including the entire populations of six indigenous groups (one of which is now extinct).[62] After a legal battle spanning two decades and two countries, in November 2013 Ecuador's highest court upheld prior rulings against Chevron for contaminating a large section of Ecuador's Amazon and ordered the corporation to pay $9.5 billion to provide desperately needed clean-up and health care to afflicted indigenous communities.[63]

Instead of abiding by the rulings, Chevron asked an investor-state tribunal to challenge the decision produced by Ecuador's domestic legal system. Chevron has asked the tribunal to order Ecuador's taxpayers to hand over to the corporation any of the billions in damages it might be required to pay to clean up the still-devastated Amazon, plus all the legal fees incurred by the corporation in its investor-state pursuit.[64] In its investor-state claim, Chevron is seeking to re-litigate key aspects of the lengthy domestic court case, including whether the effected communities even had a right to sue the corporation. Chevron is claiming that its special foreign investor rights under the BIT have been violated.[65] This, despite the fact that Texaco's investment in Ecuador ended in 1992,[66] the BIT did not take effect until 1997,[67] and the BIT is not supposed to apply retroactively to cover past investments.[68]

The investor-state tribunal in this case has granted several of Chevron's requests. It has ordered Ecuador's government to violate its own Constitution and block enforcement of a ruling upheld on appeal in its independent court system.[69] And in a decision in September 2013, the tribunal took it upon itself to offer an interpretation of the Ecuadorian Constitution, which conflicted with that of Ecuador's own high court, and declare that rights granted by Ecuadorian law do not actually exist.[70] The tribunal has not yet concluded its findings, and a final decision is pending.

Renco v. Peru (metal smelter pollution), *pending*

The Renco Group, a corporation owned by Ira Rennert,[71] notified Peru in 2010 that it intended to launch an $800 million investor-state claim against the government. Renco argues that Peru had violated the U.S.-Peru FTA by not granting the company a *third* extension on its overdue commitment to install pollution abatement equipment in a metal smelter[72] it owned in La Oroya, Peru – one of the world's most polluted sites.[73] Doe Run Peru, Renco's Peruvian subsidiary, had agreed to various environmental requirements when it acquired the facility in 1997.[74] The Peruvian government granted two extensions of the 2007 date by which Doe Run was to have built a sulfur oxide treatment facility – a commitment that the corporation repeatedly failed to fulfill.[75] In 2007 and 2008, Doe Run was challenged in class action lawsuits in Missouri courts, claiming damages to children for toxic emissions, including extremely high lead emissions, from the smelter since its acquisition by Renco.[76]

In its brief launching the investor-state case against Peru, the firm claimed a violation of fair and equitable treatment and blamed Peru for not granting a third extension on its unfulfilled 1997 environmental commitments. The firm also claimed that Peru, not Renco, should have assumed liability for the Missouri cases.[77] In more recent filings, Renco has clarified that it is asking the tribunal to hold Peru responsible for all losses and costs from the Missouri suits, and to order compensation for "moral damages arising from harm to Claimant's reputation."[78] While Doe Run, Renco's Peruvian subsidiary, has gone bankrupt and was taken over by creditors that plan to sell the firm this year,[79] Renco has continued to advance its investor-state claim.[80]

Meanwhile, the mere filing of the investor-state case achieved Renco's goals with respect to the Missouri state court cases seeking compensation for La Oroya's children. Renco had tried unsuccessfully three times to remove the case to federal court.[81] A Missouri jury pool was likely to be skeptical of Renco after its highly publicized pollution in Missouri.[82] But a week after launching its investor-state claim, Renco tried a fourth time to remove the case and succeeded. The same judge that had denied the previous requests cited the filing of the investor-state claim as the basis.[83]

Metalclad v. Mexico (toxic waste), *investor win (awarded $16.2 million)*

In 1997 Metalclad Corporation, a U.S. waste management firm, launched a NAFTA investor-state dispute against Mexico over the decision of Guadalcazar,[84] a Mexican municipality, not to grant a construction permit for expansion of a toxic waste facility amid concerns of water contamination and other environmental and health hazards.[85] Studies indicated that the site's soils were very unstable, which could permit toxic waste to infiltrate the subsoil and carry contamination via deeper water sources.[86] The local government had already denied similar permits to the Mexican firm from which Metalclad acquired the facility.[87] Metalclad argued that the decision to deny a permit to it, as a foreign investor operating under NAFTA's investor rights, amounted to expropriation without compensation, and a denial of NAFTA's guarantee of "fair and equitable treatment."[88]

The tribunal ruled in favor of the firm, ordering Mexico to compensate Metalclad for the diminution of its investment's value.[89] The order to compensate for a "regulatory taking" was premised on the tribunal's finding that the denial of the construction permit unless and until the site was remediated amounted to an "indirect" expropriation.[90] The tribunal also ruled that Mexico violated NAFTA's obligation to provide foreign investors "fair and equitable treatment,"[91] because the firm was not granted a "transparent and predictable" regulatory environment.[92] The decision has been described as creating a duty under NAFTA for the Mexican government to walk a foreign investor through the complexities of municipal, state and federal law and to ensure that officials at different levels never give different advice.[93] After a Canadian court slightly modified the compensation amount ordered by the investor-state tribunal,[94] Mexico was required to pay Metalclad more than $16 million.

S.D. Myers v. Canada (toxic waste), *investor win (awarded $5.6 million)*

In 1998 S.D. Myers, a U.S. waste treatment company, launched a NAFTA investor-state challenge against a temporary Canadian ban on the export of a hazardous waste called polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB).[95] Canada banned exports of toxic waste to the United States absent explicit permission from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. And, as a signatory to the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal, Canadian policy generally limited exports of toxic waste.[96] Meanwhile, the U.S. Toxic Substances Control Act banned imports of hazardous waste, with limited exceptions such as waste from U.S. military bases.[97] The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has determined that PCBs are harmful to humans and toxic to the environment.[98] However, in 1995 the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency decided to allow S.D. Myers and nine other companies to import PCBs into the United States for processing and disposal.[99] Canada issued a temporary ban on PCB shipment, seeking to review the conflicting laws and regulations and its obligations under the Basel Convention.[100] S.D. Myers argued that the Canadian ban constituted "disguised discrimination," was "tantamount to an expropriation" and violated NAFTA's prohibition of performance requirements and obligation to afford a "minimum standard of treatment."[101]

A tribunal upheld S.D. Myers' claims of discrimination and found the export ban to violate NAFTA's "minimum standard of treatment" obligation because it limited the firm's plan to treat the waste in Ohio.[102] The panel also stated that a foreign firm's "market share" in another country could be considered a NAFTA-protected investment and eschewed Canada's argument that S.D. Meyers had no real investment in Canada.[103] The tribunal ordered Canada to pay the company $5.6 million.

Abengoa v. Mexico (toxic waste), ***investor win (awarded $40 million plus interest)***

In December 2009, Abengoa, a Spanish technology firm, filed a claim against Mexico under the Spain-Mexico BIT for preventing the company from operating a waste management facility that the local community of Zimapan strongly opposed on environmental grounds.[104] The plant was to be built on a geological fault line across from a dam and the Sierra Gorda biosphere reserve – an UNESCO World Heritage site and home to Nanhu and Otomi indigenous communities. The region was already contaminated with arsenic from previous mining operations. The community contended that building a waste facility on a fault line, by a dam, in an area contaminated with arsenic, near indigenous communities and an environmental reserve posed a significant environmental threat.[105]

As a result of substantial public opposition, Abengoa's land use permit was not renewed in December 2007, although construction continued anyway. In April 2009, clashes broke out between a group of people from Zimapan and the Mexican federal police over the plant. As a result, the company's operating license was revoked several days later. Despite this, the situation escalated as Mexican federal police were accused of abuses against the indigenous population and federal government officials declared the plant could open without municipal authority. In March 2010, the municipality of Zimapan declared that the operating license was invalid because it was not collectively issued by the city council and did not comply with the public interest.[106]

Abengoa alleged that the government actions impeding the operation of its waste plant violated its BIT-protected investor rights.[107] In April 2013 a tribunal ruled in favor of Abengoa, deciding that the denial of an operating license for the controversial hazardous waste facility amounted to an indirect expropriation of Abengoa's investment and that the local government's actions violated the corporation's guarantee of a "minimum standard of treatment."[108] The tribunal ordered Mexico to pay Abengoa more than $40 million, plus interest, as compensation for its expected future profits from the waste plant and to cover half of the corporation's own tribunal and legal costs.[109]

Environment: Mining

Bilcon v. Canada (quarry mining), ***investor win (award amount pending)***

In May 2008, members of the U.S.-based Clayton family – the owners of a concrete company – and their U.S. subsidiary, Bilcon of Delaware, launched a NAFTA challenge against Canadian environmental requirements affecting their plans to open a basalt quarry and a marine terminal in Nova Scotia.[110] The investors planned to blast, extract and ship out large quantities of basalt from the proposed 152-hectare project,[111] located in a key habitat for several endangered species, including one of the world's most endangered large whale species.[112] Canada's Department of Fisheries and Oceans determined that blasting and shipping activity in this sensitive area required a rigorous assessment given environmental risks and socioeconomic concerns raised by many members of the local communities.[113] A government-convened expert review panel concluded that the project would threaten the local communities' "core values that reflect their sense of place, their desire for self-reliance, and the need to respect and sustain their surrounding environment."[114] On the recommendation of the panel, the government of Canada rejected the project.[115] The Clayton family argued that the assessment and resulting decision was arbitrary, discriminatory and unfair, and thus a breach of NAFTA's "minimum standard of treatment," national treatment and most favored nation obligations.[116]

In a March 2015 ruling, two of the three ISDS tribunalists decided that the environmental assessment's concern for "community core values" was "arbitrary" and frustrated the expectations of the foreign investors. This, they asserted, violated a broad interpretation of the "minimum standard of treatment" obligation, which they imported from another ISDS tribunal (*Waste Management*).[117] The tribunal majority also declared a national treatment violation.[118] The tribunal has yet to determine the final amount it will order Canadian taxpayers to pay to the quarry investors, who are seeking $300 million.[119]

The dissenting tribunalist explicitly warned of the chilling effect the decision would have: "Once again, a chill will be imposed on environmental review panels which will be concerned not to give too much weight to socio-economic considerations or other considerations of the human environment in case the result is a claim for damages under NAFTA Chapter 11. In this respect, the decision of the majority will be seen as a remarkable step backwards in environmental protection."[120]

Infinito Gold v. Costa Rica (gold mining), *pending*

In February 2014 Infinito Gold, a Canadian mining firm, filed a $94 million claim against Costa Rica under the Costa Rica-Canada BIT for a Costa Rican court decision to revoke Infinito's Las Crucitas open-pit gold mining concession on environmental grounds.[121] The mining license was secured in 2008 from then-President Oscar Arias and his environment minister. The Costa Rican Administrative Appeals Court later ordered a criminal investigation of Arias for having signed off on the project while environmental studies were still incomplete.[122] The concession raised significant environmental concerns, including deforestation of 153 acres of pristine tropical rainforest. It also posed a significant health concern related to the leaching of chemicals used in the mining process that could contaminate drinking water near the San Juan river system.[123]

A Costa Rican court revoked the concession in 2010 on the basis of environmental damage caused by the project.[124] Polls indicated that more than 75 percent of the Costa Rican population opposed the proposed mine, due in part to environmental concerns.[125] Several weeks before the court ruling revoking Infinito's concession, the Costa Rican legislature voted unanimously to ban new open-pit metal mines.[126] Infinito appealed to Costa Rica's Supreme Court, which upheld the lower court ruling against the firm in 2011.[127] In its investor-state claim, Infinito asks a three-person tribunal to second-guess the rulings of Costa Rica's courts and rule that Costa Rica's prohibitions on new open-pit mining permits are an "unlawful expropriation" of Infinito's investment and a violation of the firm's BIT-protected right to "fair and equitable treatment." "As a result of the new ban on open-pit mining, Industrias Infinito cannot apply for any new mining rights over the project area," the firm noted in its brief.[128] The case is pending.

Financial Stability

Saluka v. Czech Republic (bank bailout), *investor win (awarded $236 million)*

Saluka Investments, a Netherlands investment company, filed an investor-state claim in 2001 under the Netherlands-Czech Republic BIT against the Czech government for not bailing out a private bank, in which the company had a stake, in the same way that the government bailed out banks in which the government had a major stake.[129] The bailouts came in response to a widespread bank debt crisis.[130] Investicni a Postovni Banka (IPB), the first large bank to be fully privatized in the Czech Republic,[131] along with three large banks in which the government retained significant ownership, had been suffering from significant debt and borderline insolvency, threatening the Czech banking sector.[132] Consequently, the government placed IPB into forced administration in 2000 and then sold the bank for one crown to another bank.[133]

Saluka, a minority shareholder in IPB,[134] claimed the Czech government violated the BIT's "fair and equitable treatment" provisions because the government did not give IPB the same degree of assistance as it gave to the banks in which the government possessed a large stake.[135] The government argued that rectifying IPB's debt problems was the responsibility of private shareholders, while the problems of the large banks in which the government had a major shareholding interest were the government's responsibility.[136]

The investor-state tribunal decided that the Czech Republic had violated the BIT's "fair and equitable" treatment obligation and acted discriminatorily by giving greater government aid to banks in which the government was a major stakeholder.[137] The tribunal ordered the government to pay Saluka $236 million.[138]

CMS Gas v. Argentina (emergency stability measures), *investor win (awarded $133 million plus interest)*

In July 2001, CMS Gas Transmission Company, a U.S. energy firm, filed a claim against Argentina under the U.S.-Argentina BIT for financial rebalancing policies enacted in response to a 2001 economic meltdown spurring social and political unrest.[139] The case particularly targeted the government's limitations on gas utility rate increases – an effort, as part of Argentina's Economic Emergency Law, to stem runaway inflation.[140]

While utility rates were frozen, the international value of the Argentine peso, which had been pegged to the dollar, dropped precipitously. CMS claimed large revenue losses, argued that the freezing of consumers' rates violated the BIT's expropriation and "fair and equitable treatment" obligations, and demanded taxpayer compensation.[141] The Argentine government contended that the reforms were non-discriminatory and that domestic investors also had to face economic losses as a result of the emergency measures.[142]

Argentina further argued that the measures were necessary, given that it faced a national emergency.[143] The U.S.-Argentina BIT states, "This Treaty shall not preclude the application by either Party of measures necessary for the maintenance of public order, the fulfilment of its obligations with respect to the maintenance or restoration of international peace or security, or the protection of its own essential security interests."[144] But the tribunal decided that that the economic crisis in Argentina was not sufficiently severe for Argentina to be able to use this defense. It ruled that the government had denied

CMS "fair and equitable treatment" and that Argentina's taxpayers owed the company $133 million, plus interest.[145] A year and a half later, a tribunal in another investor-state case came to a different conclusion, accepting Argentina's "necessity defense" for the same economic crisis.[146] In that case, also brought under the U.S.-Argentina BIT, three U.S. energy companies known collectively as LG&E challenged Argentina's emergency measures, alleging the same BIT violations that CMS alleged. But in contrast to the tribunal in the *CMS* case, the *LG&E* tribunal concluded that Argentina's actions were permissible under the BIT's "necessity defense" because Argentina "faced an extremely serious threat to its existence, its political and economic survival, to the possibility of maintaining its essential services in operation, and to the preservation of its internal peace."[147]

In response to the tribunal's contrasting decision in the *CMS* case, Argentina's Minister of Justice Horacio Rosatti noted that it was obvious to every Argentine citizen that consumer rates for public utility services should not be decided by a foreign tribunal.[148] CMS eventually sold the "financial claim" resulting from its investor-state award to a "vulture fund" subsidiary of Bank of America.[149] The bank subsidiary, Blue Ridge Investment, purchased from CMS the rights to collect on the investor-state tribunal's award and has since sought to enforce the award in U.S. courts.[150]

Eureko v. Poland (insurance privatization), ***settled (investor obtained $1.6 billion)***

In 2003, Eureko, a Netherlands-based company, filed a claim against Poland under the Netherlands-Poland BIT for prohibiting it from taking a controlling stake in PZU, Poland's first and largest insurance company.[151] Facing significant public and political opposition to a previous administration's decision to sell a controlling share of Poland's public insurance firm to a foreign corporation, the Polish government reversed its privatization plans.[152]

Eureko argued that the government's actions amounted to a violation of its BIT-mandated obligation to provide "fair and equitable treatment." While divided, the majority of the tribunal held in a 2005 decision that Poland indeed violated that obligation, in addition to the prohibition against uncompensated expropriation.[153] The tribunal also decided that the government's actions had violated a private contract with Eureko, and that this alleged contractual violation itself constituted a violation of the BIT. The tribunal determined that it was able to use the BIT to enforce the terms of a private contract through what is known as an 'umbrella clause' – a BIT provision that empowers foreign investors to elevate contractual disputes to BIT investor-state cases.[154] The dissenting tribunal member noted that empowering a firm to transform a contractual dispute into a BIT case "created a potentially dangerous precedent."[155]

Poland also took issue with the appointment by Eureko of the arbitrator Judge Stephen Schwebel, who had a working relationship with a law firm that was launching other investor-state cases against Poland. After Poland's attempt to challenge the appointment of Schwebel failed, the arbitration was expected to proceed to the damages phase, when a settlement was reached instead.[156] Under the settlement, Eureko obtained a reported $1.6 billion for Poland's decision to maintain domestic control of the country's largest insurance firm.[157]

Essential Services

Azurix v. Argentina (water), ***investor win (awarded $165 million plus interest)***

U.S. water company Azurix Corp. (an Enron subsidiary) filed a claim against Argentina under the U.S.-Argentina BIT in 2001 over a dispute related to its controversial water services contract in the province of Buenos Aires.[158] During a 1999 water privatization deal, the company won a 30-year concession to provide water and sewage treatment to 2.5 million people.[159] Within a few months, residents complained of foul odors coming from the water. Local governments advised against drinking or paying for tap water and street protests against the water service were held.[160] After the problem was identified as algae contamination of a reservoir, Azurix alleged the algae was the government's responsibility and demanded compensation for associated costs.[161] The government argued that Azurix had a contractual responsibility to ensure clean drinking water.[162] In the following year, residents experienced a series of water outages and were repeatedly over-billed by Azurix for water, resulting in government fines.[163] Azurix withdrew from its contract in 2001.[164]

Azurix then launched its claim under the BIT, claiming that the government had expropriated its investment and denied the firm "fair and equitable treatment" by not allowing rate increases and not investing sufficient public funds in the water infrastructure.[165] In its deliberations, the tribunal weighed whether legitimate public interest policies could constitute BIT violations. The three tribunalists decided, "the issue is not so much whether the measure concerned is legitimate and serves a public purpose, but whether it is a measure that, *being legitimate and serving a public purpose, should give rise to a compensation claim*."[emphasis added][166] The Tribunal ruled that Argentina violated Azurix's right to "fair and equitable treatment," among other breaches, and ordered the government to pay the Enron subsidiary $165 million plus interest, in addition to covering almost all of the tribunal's costs.[167]

RDC v. Guatemala (transportation), ***investor win (awarded $18.6 million)***

U.S.-based Railroad Development Corporation (RDC) launched an investor-state claim in 2007 under the U.S.-Central America Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA) after the government of Guatemala initiated a legal process to consider revoking a disputed railroad contract with the firm.[168] RDC was engaged in the domestic legal process but still alleged that it had been denied fair and equitable treatment.

Guatemala privatized its railroad system in 1997. RDC's contract in that privatization provided for rehabilitation of the entire railway network in five phases and significant investment in rolling stock and rail lines. After its first eight years of operation, RDC had only completed the first phase.[169] The Guatemalan government initiated a review of an RDC contract in a process that could result in its termination, after multiple assessments concluded that it did not comply with Guatemalan law.[170] This process, called *lesivo*, provided RDC the opportunity to present its case before an administrative court, and then appeal the resulting decision to the country's Supreme Court.[171] Most *lesivo* actions taken by the Guatemalan government pertained to domestic firms.

While taking advantage of this domestic due process and continuing to earn money from its investment, RDC launched its CAFTA claim. It alleged that the *lesivo* itself was an indirect expropriation and a violation of CAFTA's national treatment and "minimum standard of treatment" rules.[172] The tribunal not only allowed the ISDS claim to move forward despite the unresolved domestic process, but opined that in such instances of parallel ISDS claims, investors should be allowed to access extrajudicial investor-state proceedings *before* the conclusion of domestic legal processes.[173]

In 2012 the tribunal ruled in favor of RDC, ordering the government to pay the firm $18.6 million. The tribunal upheld the allegation that Guatemala's initiation of the *lesivo* process had failed to afford RDC a "minimum standard of treatment."[174] In doing so, the tribunal ignored the definition of that standard found in a CAFTA Annex that was ostensibly designed to limit tribunalist discretion. CAFTA governments had inserted the annex after a series of investor-state had interpreted the "minimum standard of treatment" obligation to mean that investors must be guaranteed a stable regulatory framework *that does not frustrate the expectations* they held at the time they established their investment.[175] In defending itself against an investor-state challenge that tried to invoke this sweeping interpretation, the U.S. government stated, "if States were prohibited from regulating in any manner that frustrated expectations – or had to compensate for any diminution in profit – they would lose the power to regulate."[176] By defining "minimum standard of treatment" in the CAFTA Annex as derived from customary international law that "results from a general and consistent practice of States that they follow from a sense of legal obligation," the U.S. and other CAFTA governments attempted to constrain "minimum standard of treatment" to an obligation to afford such basic rights as due process and police protection.[177] But the *RDC* tribunal ignored the annex and rejected the official submissions of four CAFTA governments, including the U.S. government, arguing that the foreign investor right was limited.[178] Instead, the tribunal borrowed a broad interpretation of "minimum standard of treatment," one that included protection of investors' expectations, from another investor-state tribunal and used it to rule against Guatemala.[179]

TCW v. Dominican Republic (electricity), *settled (investor paid $26.5 million)*

In 2007 TCW Group, a U.S. investment management corporation that jointly owned with the government one of the Dominican Republic's three electricity distribution firms, claimed that the government violated CAFTA by failing to raise electricity rates and failing to prevent electricity theft by poor residents.[180] The French multinational Société Générale (SG), which owned the TCW Group, filed a parallel claim under the France-Dominican Republic BIT.[181]

TCW launched its claim two weeks after CAFTA's enactment, arguing that decisions taken before the treaty's implementation violated the treaty.[182] TCW took issue with the government's unwillingness to raise electricity rates, a decision undertaken in response to a nationwide energy crisis. TCW also protested that the government did not subsidize electricity rates, which would have diminished electricity theft by poor residents. The *New York Times* noted that such subsidization was not feasible for the government after having just spent large sums to rectify a banking crisis.[183] TCW alleged expropriation and violation of CAFTA's guarantee of fair and equitable treatment.

TCW demanded $606 million from the government for the alleged CAFTA violations, despite having spent just $2 to purchase the business from another U.S. investor.[184] The company also admitted to having "not independently committed additional capital" to the electricity distribution firm after its $2 purchase in 2004.[185] After a tribunal constituted under the France-Dominican Republic BIT issued a jurisdictional ruling in favor of SG, allowing the case to move forward, the government decided to settle with SG and TCW. The government paid the foreign firms $26.5 million to drop the cases, reasoning that it was cheaper than continuing to pay legal fees.[186]

Labor Rights

Veolia v. Egypt (minimum wage), *pending*

Veolia Propreté, a French multinational corporation, launched an investor-state claim against Egypt in 2012, demanding at least $110 million under the France-Egypt BIT over disputes relating to a 15-year contract for waste management in the city of Alexandria.[187] The corporation claims that having to comply with changes to Egyptian laws of general application violated the government's contractual commitments to keep payments to Veolia aligned with cost increases.[188]

Among its claims, Veolia argues that changes to Egypt's labor laws – including increases to minimum wages – have negatively affected the company's investment, and that Egypt has violated its contract and the BIT's investor protections by not helping the corporation offset such costs.[189] An investor-state tribunal was established in 2013 and the case is pending.[190]

Development and Industrial Policy

ExxonMobil and Murphy Oil v. Canada (research and development), *investor win*

In 2007 Mobil Investments Canada, owned by U.S. oil giant ExxonMobil, and U.S.-based Murphy Oil Corporation used NAFTA to challenge the Canada-Newfoundland Offshore Petroleum Board's Guidelines for Research and Development Expenditures.[191] The guidelines require oil extraction firms to pay fees to support research and development in one of Canada's poorest provinces, Newfoundland and Labrador. It applies to domestic and foreign concession holders alike.[192] Offshore oil fields in the region, developed after significant infusions of public and private funds, were discovered to be far larger than anticipated, prompting a variety of new government measures that applied to all concession holders.[193]

In their NAFTA claim, the oil corporations argued that the new guidelines violated NAFTA's prohibition on performance requirements. In 2012 a tribunal majority ruled in favor of Mobil and Murphy Oil, deeming the requirement to use larger-than-expected oil revenue to fund research and development as a NAFTA-barred performance requirement. While the amount of the payment ordered by the tribunal has not been made public, it is expected to include the tribunal's estimation of the corporations' expected future profits.[194]

ENDNOTES

[1] For more information, *see* Lori Wallach, "Fair and Equitable Treatment" and Investors' Reasonable Expectations: Rulings in U.S. FTAs & BITs Demonstrate FET Definition Must be Narrowed," Public Citizen memo, Sept. 5, 2012. Available at: http://www.citizen.org/documents/MST-Memo.pdfhttp://www.citizen.org/documents/MST-Memo.pdf.

[2] *See* Andrew Newcombe and Lluís Paradell, *Law and Practice of Investment Treaties: Standards of Treatment*, (The Netherlands: Kluwer Law International, 2009).

[3] UNCTAD, "Recent Trends in IIAs and ISDS," February 2015, at 5. Available at: http://unctad.org/en/PublicationsLibrary/webdiaepcb2015d1_en.pdf.

[4] Pia Eberhardt and Cecilia Olivet, "Profiting from Injustice," Transnational Institute and Corporate Europe Observatory report, November 2012, at 7. Available at: http://www.tni.org/sites/www.tni.org/files/download/profitingfrominjustice.pdf.

[5] For more information on the cases brought under U.S. FTAs, *see* Public Citizen, "Table of Foreign Investor-State Cases and Claims under NAFTA and Other U.S. 'Trade' Deals," PC chart, June 2015. Available at: http://www.citizen.org/documents/investor-state-chart.pdf.

[6] "Fortune 500: Pharmaceuticals," *CNN Money*, May 21, 2012. Available at: http://money.cnn.com/magazines/fortune/fortune500/2012/industries/21/.

[7] *Eli Lilly and Company v. The Government of Canada*, Notice of Arbitration, Ad hoc – UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2013). Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw1582.pdf.

[8] *Eli Lilly and Company v. The Government of Canada*, Notice of Arbitration, Ad hoc – UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2013), at paras. 48-65. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw1582.pdf.

[9] *Eli Lilly and Company v. The Government of Canada*, Notice of Arbitration, Ad hoc – UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2013), at para. 81. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw1582.pdf.

[10] *Eli Lilly and Company v. The Government of Canada*, Notice of Arbitration, Ad hoc – UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2013), at paras. 74-84. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw1582.pdf.

[11] *Eli Lilly and Company v. The Government of Canada*, Procedural Order No. 1, Ad hoc – UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2014). Available at: http://www.italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw3212.pdf.

[12] *Philip Morris Asia Limited v. The Commonwealth of Australia*, Notice of Arbitration, Ad hoc—UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2011).

[13] Luke Eric Peterson, "Analysis: Australian Defense Strategy Puts Spotlight on Timing of Philip Morris's Corporate Structuring Moves, Claims Abuse of Investment Treaty," *Investment Arbitration Reporter*, December 31, 2011. Available at: http://www.iareporter.com/articles/20111231_8?.

[14] *Philip Morris Asia Limited v. The Commonwealth of Australia*, Notice of Arbitration, Ad hoc—UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2011), at para. 48.

[15] *Philip Morris Asia Limited v. The Commonwealth of Australia*, Notice of Arbitration, Ad hoc—UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2011), at paras. 1.5-1.6.

[16] *Philip Morris Asia Limited v. The Commonwealth of Australia*, Australia's Response to the Notice of Arbitration, Ad hoc—UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2011), at paras. 29-31.

[17] *JT International SA v Commonwealth of Australia* [2012] High Court of Australia 43 (5 October 2012). Available at: http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/cases/cth/HCA/2012/43.html.

[18] Luke Eric Peterson, "Analysis: Australian Defense Strategy Puts Spotlight on Timing of Philip Morris's Corporate Structuring Moves, Claims Abuse of Investment Treaty," *Investment Arbitration Reporter*, December 31, 2011. Available at: http://www.iareporter.com/articles/20111231_8?.

[19] Dr. Margaret Chan, "WHO Welcomes Landmark Decision from Australia's High Court on Tobacco Plain Packaging Act," World Health Organization, August 15, 2012. Available at: http://www.who.int/mediacentre/news/statements/2012/tobacco_packaging/en/.

[20] McCabe Centre for Law & Cancer, "Confidentiality of the Proceedings." Available at: http://www.mccabecentre.org/focus-areas/tobacco/philip-morris-asia-challenge/confidentiality-of-the-proceedings.html.

[21] Matthew C. Porterfield and Christopher R. Byrnes, Philip Morris v. Uruguay: Will Investor-State Arbitration Send Restriction on Tobacco Marketing up in Smoke?, *Investor Treaty News*, July 12, 2011. Available at: http://www.iisd.org/itn/2011/07/12/philip-morris-v-uruguay-will-investor-state-arbitration-send-restrictions-on-tobacco-marketing-up-in-smoke/.

[22] Tariana Turia, "Government moves forward with plain packaging of tobacco products," New Zealand government press release, February 19, 2013. Available at: http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/government-moves-forward-plain-packaging-tobacco-products.

[23] R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company, Submission to House of Commons Standing Committee on Health Re: Plain Packaging of Tobacco Products 2, 18 (1994), *available at* http://www.smoke-free.ca/plain-packaging/documents/1994/industryresponse-1994-canada/Smrm97c00-HIlls.pdf.

[24] *Ethyl Corporation v. Government of Canada*, Award on Jurisdiction, Ad hoc – UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (1998). Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0300_0.pdf.

[25] Philip J. Landrigan, "MMT, Déjà Vu and National Security," *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, Vol. 39, Issue 4, Mar. 2001, at 434-5.

[26] The transportation ban was necessary because the fuel standards established in the Canadian Environmental Protection Act are not sufficiently broad to cover a ban on substances that may damage pollution control systems in cars, even if such damage leads to increased emissions. Manganese-based Fuel Additives Act 1997, c. 11.

[27] Manganese-based Fuel Additives Act 1997, c. 11.

[28] 42 U.S. Code § 7545 (k)(2)(C)/

[29] *Ethyl Corporation v. Government of Canada*, Notice of Intent to Submit a Claim to Arbitration Under Section B of Chapter 11 of the North American Free Trade Agreement, Ad hoc – UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (1996), at 2,3.

[30] *Ethyl Corporation v. Government of Canada*, Award on Jurisdiction in the NAFTA/UNCITRAL Case between Ethyl Corporation and the Government of Canada, Ad hoc – UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (1998), at 36. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0300_0.pdf.

[31] For information on the settlement, *see*, Appleton & Associates, "Ethyl Corporation v. Canada." Available at: http://www.appletonlaw.com/files/cases_ethyl.pdf. For more information on the case, *see* Public Citizen, "Table of Foreign Investor-State Cases and Claims under NAFTA and Other U.S. 'Trade' Deals," PC chart, February 2014, at 11. Available at: http://www.citizen.org/documents/investor-state-chart.pdf.

[32] Ray Minjares, "Update: MMT," The International Council on Clean Transportation, February 16, 2012. Available at: http://www.theicct.org/blogs/staff/update-mmt.

[33] *Vattenfall AB, Vattenfall Europe AG, Vattenfall Europe Generation AG v. Federal Republic of Germany*, ICSID Case No. ARB/09/6, Request for Arbitration, March 30, 2009. Available at: http://italaw.com/documents/VattenfallRequestforArbitration.pdf.

[34] *Vattenfall AB, Vattenfall Europe AG, Vattenfall Europe Generation AG v. Federal Republic of Germany*, ICSID Case No. ARB/09/6, Request for Arbitration, March 30, 2009, at para. 16. Available at: http://italaw.com/documents/VattenfallRequestforArbitration.pdf.

[35] *Vattenfall AB, Vattenfall Europe AG, Vattenfall Europe Generation AG v. Federal Republic of Germany*, ICSID Case No. ARB/09/6, Request for Arbitration, March 30, 2009, at paras. 27-40. Available at: http://italaw.com/documents/VattenfallRequestforArbitration.pdf.

[36] *Vattenfall AB, Vattenfall Europe AG, Vattenfall Europe Generation AG v. Federal Republic of Germany*, ICSID Case No. ARB/09/6, Request for Arbitration, March 30, 2009, at paras. 52-54. Available at: http://italaw.com/documents/VattenfallRequestforArbitration.pdf.

[37] Sebastian Knauer, "Vattenfall vs. Germany: Power Plant Battle Goes to International Arbitration," *Spiegel Online International*, July 15, 2009. Available at: http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/vattenfall-vs-germany-power-plant-battle-goes-to-international-arbitration-a-636334.html.

[38] *Vattenfall AB, Vattenfall Europe AG, Vattenfall Europe Generation AG v. Federal Republic of Germany*, ICSID Case No. ARB/09/6, Award, March 11, 2011, at 17. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0890.pdf.

[39] Vattenfall, "Moorburg Power Plant Starts Generating Electricity," February 28, 2014. Available at: http://corporate.vattenfall.com/news-and-media/news/2014/moorburg/.

[40] "Germany Is Sued at ICSID by Swedish Energy Compnay in Bid for Compensation for Losses Arising out of Nuclear Phase-outs," *Investment Arbitration Reporter*, June 1, 2012. Available at: http://www.iareporter.com/articles/20120601_1.

[41] Nathalie Bernasconi-Osterwalder and Rhea Tamara Hoffman, "The German Nuclear Phase-Out Put to the Test in International Investment Arbitration? Background to the new dispute Vattenfall v. Germany (II)," International Institute for Sustainable Development, June 2012, at 2-3. Available at: http://www.iisd.org/sites/default/files/pdf/2012/german_nuclear_phase_out.pdf.

[42] See, for example, this German government response to a parliamentary inquiry that states the amount of Vattenfall's claim as 4.675 billion euros: German Bundestag, "Reply from the Federal Government: Vattenfall versus the Federal Government of Germany," 18/3721, January 13, 2015. Available at: http://dip21.bundestag.de/dip21/btd/18/037/1803721.pdf.

[43] Luke Eric Peterson, "Arbitrators Issue Decision on Germany's Preliminary Objections in Nuclear Phase-Out Case; Vattenfall's Energy Charter Treaty Claims to Proceed," *Investment Arbitration Reporter*, July 4, 3013. Available at: http://www.iareporter.com/articles/20130704_2.

[44] *Lone Pine Resources Inc. v. The Government of Canada*, Notice of Arbitration, Ad hoc – UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2013). Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw1596.pdf.

[45] Pierre Bertrand, "Quebec Installs Outright Moratorium On Hydraulic Fracturing," *International Business Times*, April 4, 2012. Available at: http://www.ibtimes.com/quebec-installs-outright-moratorium-hydraulic-fracturing-433930.

[46] *Lone Pine Resources Inc. v. The Government of Canada*, Notice of Arbitration, Ad hoc – UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2013), at para. 25. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw1596.pdf.

[47] *Lone Pine Resources Inc. v. The Government of Canada*, Notice of Arbitration, Ad hoc – UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2013), at paras. 48-56. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw1596.pdf.

[48] *Occidental Petroleum Corporation and Occidental Exploration and Production Company v. The Republic of Ecuador*, ICSID Case No. ARB/06/11, Award (Oct. 5, 2012). Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw1094.pdf.

[49] *Occidental Petroleum Corporation and Occidental Exploration and Production Company v. The Republic of Ecuador*, ICSID Case No. ARB/06/11, Award (Oct. 5, 2012), at para. 120. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw1094.pdf.

[50] *Occidental Petroleum Corporation and Occidental Exploration and Production Company v. The Republic of Ecuador*, ICSID Case No. ARB/06/11, Award (Oct. 5, 2012), at para. 121. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw1094.pdf.

[51] *Occidental Petroleum Corporation and Occidental Exploration and Production Company v. The Republic of Ecuador,* ICSID Case No. ARB/06/11, Award (Oct. 5, 2012), at para. 388. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw1094.pdf.

[52] *Occidental Petroleum Corporation and Occidental Exploration and Production Company v. The Republic of Ecuador,* ICSID Case No. ARB/06/11, Award (Oct. 5, 2012), at para. 381. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw1094.pdf.

[53] *Occidental Petroleum Corporation and Occidental Exploration and Production Company v. The Republic of Ecuador,* ICSID Case No. ARB/06/11, Award (Oct. 5, 2012), at para. 383. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw1094.pdf.

[54] *Occidental Petroleum Corporation and Occidental Exploration and Production Company v. The Republic of Ecuador,* ICSID Case No. ARB/06/11, Award (Oct. 5, 2012), at para. 416. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw1094.pdf.

[55] Luke Eric Peterson, "Ecuador Must Pay $1.76 Billion US to Occidental for Expropriation of Oil Investment; Largest Award Ever in Bilateral Investment Treaty Case at ICSID," *Investment Arbitration Reporter*, Oct. 5, 2012. Available at: http://www.iareporter.com/articles/20121005.

[56] *Occidental Petroleum Corporation and Occidental Exploration and Production Company v. The Republic of Ecuador*, ICSID Case No. ARB/06/11, Award (Oct. 5, 2012), at para. 748. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw1094.pdf.

[57] *Occidental Petroleum Corporation and Occidental Exploration and Production Company v. The Republic of Ecuador*, ICSID Case No. ARB/06/11, Award (Oct. 5, 2012), at paras. 649-651. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw1094.pdf.

[58] *Occidental Petroleum Corporation and Occidental Exploration and Production Company v. The Republic of Ecuador*, ICSID Case No. ARB/06/11, Award (Oct. 5, 2012), at para. 687. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw1094.pdf.

[59] Tai-Heng Cheng and Lucas Bento, "ICSID's Largest Award in History: An Overview of Occidental Petroleum Corporation v the Republic of Ecuador," *Kluwer Arbitration Blog*, December 19, 2012. Available at: http://kluwerarbitrationblog.com/blog/2012/12/19/icsids-largest-award-in-history-an-overview-of-occidental-petroleum-corporation-v-the-republic-of-ecuador/.

[60] *Chevron Corporation and Texaco Petroleum Corporation v. The Republic of Ecuador*, Claimants' Notice of Arbitration, Ad hoc – UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2009). Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0155_0.pdf.

[61] *Aguinda v. ChevronTexaco*, No. 2003-0002 (Ecuadorian Superior Court of Nueva Loja, 2011), at 173. Available at: http://chevrontoxico.com/assets/docs/2011-02-14-Aguinda-v-ChevronTexaco-judgement-English.pdf.

[62] *Aguinda v. ChevronTexaco*, No. 2003-0002 (Ecuadorian Superior Court of Nueva Loja, 2011), at 33. Available at: http://chevrontoxico.com/assets/docs/2011-02-14-Aguinda-v-ChevronTexaco-judgement-English.pdf.

[63] Alexandra Valencia, "Ecuador High Court Upholds Chevron Verdict, Halves Fine," *Reuters*, Nov. 13, 2013. Available at: http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/11/13/us-chevron-ecuador-idUSBRE9AC0YY20131113.

[64] *Chevron Corporation and Texaco Petroleum Corporation v. The Republic of Ecuador*, First Partial Award on Track I, Ad hoc – UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2013), at 48. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw1585.pdf.

[65] *Chevron Corporation and Texaco Petroleum Corporation v. The Republic of Ecuador*, Claimants' Notice of Arbitration, Ad hoc – UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2009), at para 69. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0155_0.pdf.

[66] *Chevron Corporation and Texaco Petroleum Corporation v. The Republic of Ecuador*, First Partial Award on Track I, Ad hoc – UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2013), at 52. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw1585.pdf.

[67] ICSID, ICSID Database of Bilateral Investment Treaties: Treaties of Ecuador, accessed Nov. 21, 2013. Available at: https://icsid.worldbank.org/ICSID/FrontServlet?requestType=ICSIDPublicationsRH&actionVal=ParticularCountry&country=ST42.

[68] Hernán Pérez Loose, "Tribunal Rules in Favour of State of Ecuador in Arbitral Dispute," International Law Office, Nov. 22, 2007. Available at: http://www.internationallawoffice.com/Newsletters/Detail.aspx?g=d638d98c-3964-42f0-8ddf-f91a0a3dcd0a&utm_source=ILO+Newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=Arbitration+Newsletter&utm_content=Newsletter+2007-12-13&l=7GZPNCR.

[69] *Chevron Corporation and Texaco Petroleum Corporation v. The Republic of Ecuador*, Second Interim Award on Interim Measures, Ad hoc – UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2012), at para. 3. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0174_0.pdf.

[70] *Chevron Corporation and Texaco Petroleum Corporation v. The Republic of Ecuador*, First Partial Award on Track I, Ad hoc – UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2013), at 107. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw1585.pdf.

[71] "Forbes 400 Richest Americans: Ira Rennert," *Forbes*, published Sept. 2012, accessed Nov. 20, 2012. Available at: http://www.forbes.com/profile/ira-rennert/.

[72] *The Renco Group, Inc. v. The Republic of Peru*, ICSID Case No. UNCT/13/1, Claimant's Notice of Intent to Commence Arbitration (December 29, 2010). Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0713.pdf.

[73] Blacksmith Institute, "The Top Ten of The Dirty Thirty", Project of The Blacksmith Institute, September 2007, at 6. Available at: http://www.worstpolluted.org/reports/file/2007%20Report%20updated%202009.pdf . Blacksmith Institute, "The Worlds Worst Polluters: The Top Ten" Project of the Blacksmith Institute, October 2006. http://www.worstpolluted.org/reports/file/10worst2.pdf

[74] "Doe Run Peru has committed under its PAMA to implement the following projects over the next nine years, estimated in the PAMA to cost approximately $107.5 million: (i) new sulfuric acid plants; (ii) elimination of fugitive gases from the coke plant; (iii) use of oxygenated gases in the anodic residue plant; (iv) water treatment plant for the copper refinery; (v) a recirculation system for cooling waters at the smelter; (vi) management and disposal of acidic solutions at the silver refinery; (vii) industrial waste water treatment plant for the smelter and refinery; (viii) containment dam for the lead muds near the zileret plant; (ix) granulation process water at the lead smelter; (x) anode washing system at the zinc refinery; (xi) management and disposal of lead and copper slag wastes; and (xii) domestic waste water treatment and domestic waste disposal. The actual current estimate for the environmental projects and related process changes for Doe Run Peru is $195.0 million." The Doe Run Resources Corporation Form S-4, Registration Statement Under The Securities Act Of 1933, 1998, at 91. Available at: http://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1061112/0001047469-98-018990.txt.

[75] For an overview of the company's contractual breaches and the government's extensions, *see* Public Citizen, "Renco Group Uses Trade Pact Foreign Investor Provisions to Chill Peru's Environment and Health Policy, Undermine Justice," PC memo, March 2012. Available at: http://www.citizen.org/documents/renco-memo-03-12.pdf.

[76] *A.O.A. v. Doe Run Resources Corp*., 2011 WL 2553259 (E.D.Mo. June 22, 2011) (denial of plaintiffs' motion to remand to state courts), at 3-4.

[77] *The Renco Group, Inc. v. The Republic of Peru*, ICSID Case No. UNCT/13/1, Claimant's Notice of Intent to Commence Arbitration (December 29, 2010). Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0713.pdf. For a summary of these allegations, *see* Public Citizen, "Renco Group Uses Trade Pact Foreign Investor Provisions to Chill Peru's Environment and Health Policy, Undermine Justice," PC memo, March 2012, at 14-22. Available at: http://www.citizen.org/documents/renco-memo-03-12.pdf.

[78] International Institute for Sustainable Development, "News in Brief," August 13, 2014. Available at: http://www.iisd.org/itn/2014/08/13/news-in-brief-16/.

[79] "Peru's La Oroya smelter sale attracting international bidders," BN Americas, August 22, 2014. Available at: http://www.bnamericas.com/news/metals/perus-la-oroya-smelter-sale-process-attracting-international-bidders1.

[80] *See*, for example, *The Renco Group, Inc. v. The Republic of Peru*, ICSID Case No. UNCT/13/1, Claimant's Reply on Scope of Respondent's Article 10.20(4) Objections (May 7, 2014). Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw3271.pdf.

[81] *See AAZA v. Doe Run Resources Corp*., No. 4:07CV1874 CDP, 2008 WL 748328 (E.D.Mo. Mar. 18, 2008) (order granting plaintiff's motion to remand to state courts). And *see A.O.A. v. Doe Run Resources Corp*., 2011 WL 2553259 (E.D.Mo. June 22, 2011) (denial of plaintiffs' motion to remand to state courts).

[82] *See* Environmental Protection Agency, "North America's Largest Lead Producer to Spend $65 Million for Environmental Violations at Missouri Facilities," EPA press release, Oct. 8, 2010. Available at: http://www.epa.gov/region07/cleanup/doe_run/pdf/hq_news_release_R336-100810.pdf.

[83] *A.O.A. v. Doe Run Resources Corp*., 2011 WL 2553259 (E.D.Mo. June 22, 2011) (denial of plaintiffs' motion to remand to state courts), at 4. ("…[U.S. law] allows removal of any action in state court in which 'the subject matter ... relates to an arbitration agreement or award falling under the Convention [Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards]… Accordingly, because the [FTA] arbitration panel's decision on the claims raised by Renco … could conceivably affect the issues in this case, these actions are removable…")

[84] *Metalclad Corporation v. The United Mexican States*, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/97/1, Award (August 30, 2000). Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0510.pdf.

[85] For examples of these concerns, see Greenpeace Mexico, "Las Lecciones de Guadalcázar: Impunidad y Política Ambiental," *La Jornada*, Aug. 28, 1996.

[86] Andrew Wheat, "Toxic Shock in a Mexican Village," *Multinational Monitor*, Vol. 16 No. 10, Oct. 1995.

[87] Petitioner's Outline of Argument, In the Matter of Arbitration Pursuant to Chapter 11 of NAFTA between Metalclad Corporation and the United Mexican States, ICSID Additional Facility, Case Number ARB(AF)/97/1, Supreme Court of British Columbia, Jan. 22, 2001, at 3

[88] *Metalclad Corporation v. The United Mexican States*, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/97/1, Award (August 30, 2000). Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0510.pdf.
[89] *Metalclad Corporation v. The United Mexican States*, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/97/1, Award (August 30, 2000), at para. 131. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0510.pdf.
[90] *Metalclad Corporation v. The United Mexican States*, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/97/1, Award (August 30, 2000), at paras. 106-107. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0510.pdf.
[91] *Metalclad Corporation v. The United Mexican States*, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/97/1, Award (August 30, 2000), at paras. 74-112. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0510.pdf.
[92] *Metalclad Corporation v. The United Mexican States*, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/97/1, Award (August 30, 2000), at para. 99. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0510.pdf.
[93] *See*, Stephen L. Kass and Jean M. McCarroll, "The 'Metalclad' Decision Under NAFTA's Chapter 11," *New York Law Journal*, Oct. 27, 2000.
[94] Reasons for Judgment of the Honourable Mr. Justice Tysoe, *the United Mexican States v. Metalclad Corporation*, Supreme Court of British Columbia, May 2, 2001, at 47-48.
[95] *S.D. Myers, Inc. v. Government of Canada*, Partial Award, Ad hoc—UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2000). Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0747.pdf.
[96] Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal Adopted by the Conference of the Plenipotentiaries on Mar. 22, 1989
[97] 15 U.S.C. § 2601.
[98] 59 FR 62785, 62877 (Dec. 6, 1994).
[99] *S.D. Myers, Inc. v. Government of Canada*, Statement of Defense, Ad hoc—UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (1999), at 4.
[100] *S.D. Myers, Inc. v. Government of Canada*, Statement of Defense, Ad hoc—UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (1999), 5-7.
[101] *S.D. Myers, Inc. v. Government of Canada*, Partial Award, Ad hoc—UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2000), at paras. 237-288. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0747.pdf.
[102] *S.D. Myers, Inc. v. Government of Canada*, Partial Award, Ad hoc—UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2000), at paras. 238-269. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0747.pdf.
[103] *S.D. Myers, Inc. v. Government of Canada*, Partial Award, Ad hoc—UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2000), at paras. 238-232. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0747.pdf.
[104] *Abengoa S.A. y COFIDES S.A. v. United Mexican States*, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/09/2, Award (April 18, 2013). Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw3187.pdf.
[105] Katia Fach Gomez, "ICSID Claim by Spanish Companies Against Mexico over the Center for the Integral Management of Industrial Resources," *Spain Arbitration Review*, August 2010, at 7. Available at: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1631835&download=yes.
[106] Katia Fach Gomez, "ICSID Claim by Spanish Companies Against Mexico over the Center for the Integral Management of Industrial Resources," *Spain Arbitration Review*, August 2010, at 9-10. Available at: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1631835&download=yes.
[107] Network for Justice in Global Investment, "Criticism of the Million-Dollar Compensation by the Mexican Government to Multinational Company, Abengoa," June 21, 2013. Available at: http://justinvestment.org/2013/07/criticism-of-the-million-dollar-compensation-by-the-mexican-government-to-multinational-company-abengoa/.
[108] Filip Balcerzak and Luke Eric Peterson, Mexico Held Liable for Expropriation of Waste Facility, and for Additional Mistreatment Prior to the Taking in the Abengoa Case, *Investment Arbitration Reporter*, May 21, 2014. Available at: http://www.iareporter.com/articles/20140516_1.
[109] Filip Balcerzak and Luke Eric Peterson, "DCF Method Used to Value Waste Plant that Operated for mere Months; Arbitrators Ask if Investor Added to Harm Due to Poor Consultation with Locals," *Investment Arbitration Reporter*, May 21, 2014. Available at: http://www.iareporter.com/articles/20140516.
[110] *William Ralph Clayton, William Richard Clayton, Douglas Clayton, Daniel Clayton and Bilcon of Delaware, Inc. v. Canada*, Award on Jurisdiction and Liability, Ad hoc—UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2015). Available at: http://www.italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw4212.pdf.
[111] *William Ralph Clayton, William Richard Clayton, Douglas Clayton, Daniel Clayton and Bilcon of Delaware, Inc. v. Canada*, Award on Jurisdiction and Liability, Ad hoc—UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2015), at para. 153. Available at: http://www.italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw4212.pdf.
[112] Joint Review Panel, "Environmental Assessment of the White Point Quarry and Marine Terminal Project," October 2007 at 57, 102-103. Available at: http://www.novascotia.ca/nse/ea/whitespointquarry/WhitesPointQuarryFinalReport.pdf.
[113] *William Ralph Clayton, William Richard Clayton, Douglas Clayton, Daniel Clayton and Bilcon of Delaware, Inc. v. Canada*, Award on Jurisdiction and Liability, Ad hoc—UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2015), at paras. 162-163. Available at: http://www.italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw4212.pdf.

[114] Fisheries and Oceans Canada, "The Government of Canada's Response to the Environmental Assessment Report of th e Joint Review Panel on the Whites Point Quarry and Marine Terminal Project (the Project)," Government of Can ada, 2007. Available at: http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/reports-rapports/quarry/gr-quarry-eng.htm.
[115] Fisheries and Oceans Canada, "The Government of Canada's Response to the Environmental Assessment Report of the Joint Review Panel on the Whites Point Quarry and Marine Terminal Project (the Project)," Government of Canada, 2007. Available at: http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/reports-rapports/quarry/gr-quarry-eng.htm.
[116] *William Ralph Clayton, William Richard Clayton, Douglas Clayton, Daniel Clayton and Bilcon of Delaware, Inc. v. Canada*, Notice of Arbitration, Ad hoc—UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2008), at paras. 33-37. Available at: http://www.italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw1143.pdf.
[117] *William Ralph Clayton, William Richard Clayton, Douglas Clayton, Daniel Clayton and Bilcon of Delaware, Inc. v. Canada*, Award on Jurisdiction and Liability, Ad hoc—UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2015), at 124-179. Available at: http://www.italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw4212.pdf.
[118] *William Ralph Clayton, William Richard Clayton, Douglas Clayton, Daniel Clayton and Bilcon of Delaware, Inc. v. Canada*, Award on Jurisdiction and Liability, Ad hoc—UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2015), at 742. Available at: http://www.italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw4212.pdf.
[119] Paul Withers, "Nova Scotia Taxpayers May Be on Hook for NAFTA," *CBC News*, March 24, 2015. Available at: http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/nova-scotia/nova-scotia-taxpayers-may-be-on-hook-for-nafta-defeat-1.3006319.
[120] *William Ralph Clayton, William Richard Clayton, Douglas Clayton, Daniel Clayton and Bilcon of Delaware, Inc. v. Canada*, Dissenting Opinion of Professor Donald McRae, Ad hoc—UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2015), at 19. Available at: http://www.italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw4213.pdf.
[121] *Infinito Gold Ltd. v. Costa Rica*, ICSID Case No. ARB/14/5, Request for Arbitration (February 6, 2014). Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw3118.pdf.
[122] Zack Dyer & Tania Lara, 3 years after Costa Rica kicked out gold-mining company, legal battle continues, *Tico Times*, November 21, 2013. Available at http://www.ticotimes.net/2013/11/22/3-years-after-costa-rica-kicked-out-gold-mining-company-legal-battle-continues
[123] Zach Dyer, "Infinito Gold to sue Costa Rica in World Bank court for $1 billion," *Tico Times*, October 3, 2013. Available at: http://www.ticotimes.net/2013/10/04/infinito-gold-to-sue-costa-rica-in-world-bank-court-for-1-billion.
[124] Costa Rica Court Annuls Infinito Gold Concession, Reuters, Nov. 24, 2010. Available at http://www.reuters.com/article/2010/11/25/costarica-gold-idUSN2425147520101125
[125] Carlos Salazar F., "En Canadá celebran fracaso judicial de Infinito Gold en Costa Rica," *El País*, July 4, 2013. Available at: http://elpais.cr/frontend/noticia_detalle/1/83170.
[126] Mike McDonald, Costa Rica Bans Open Pit Mining for Metals, *Tico Times*, Nov. 9, 2010 Available at http://www.ticotimes.net/2010/11/10/costa-rica-bans-open-pit-mining-for-metals
[127] Zach Dyer, "Infinto Gold Files Lawsuit Against Costa Rican Government Over Canceled Gold Mining Contract," *Tico Times*, February 10, 2014. Available at: http://www.ticotimes.net/2014/02/10/infinito-gold-files-lawsuit-against-costa-rica-over-canceled-gold-mining-contract.
[128] *Infinito Gold Ltd. v. Costa Rica*, ICSID Case No. ARB/14/5, Request for Arbitration (February 6, 2014), at paras. 97-99. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw3118.pdf.
[129] *Saluka Investments B.V. v. The Czech Republic*, Partial Award, Ad hoc—UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2006), at paras. 75-83. Available at: http://www.italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0740.pdf.
[130] *Saluka Investments B.V. v. The Czech Republic*, Partial Award, Ad hoc—UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2006), at paras. 36-41. Available at: http://www.italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0740.pdf.
[131] *Saluka Investments B.V. v. The Czech Republic*, Partial Award, Ad hoc—UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2006), at para. 66. Available at: http://www.italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0740.pdf.
[132] *Saluka Investments B.V. v. The Czech Republic*, Partial Award, Ad hoc—UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2006), at para. 83. Available at: http://www.italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0740.pdf.
[133] Watson, Farley & Williams, "Investment Treaty Update," Spring 2006. Available at: http://www.wfw.com/Publications/Publication254/$FILE/WFW%20Investment%20Treaty%20Update%20Spring%202006.pdf.
[134] *Saluka Investments B.V. v. The Czech Republic*, Partial Award, Ad hoc—UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2006), at paras. 65, 71. Available at: http://www.italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0740.pdf.
[135] *Saluka Investments B.V. v. The Czech Republic*, Partial Award, Ad hoc—UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2006), at para. 165. Available at: http://www.italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0740.pdf.
[136] *Saluka Investments B.V. v. The Czech Republic*, Partial Award, Ad hoc—UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2006), at para. 83. Available at: http://www.italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0740.pdf.
[137] *Saluka Investments B.V. v. The Czech Republic*, Partial Award, Ad hoc—UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2006), at para. 497. Available at: http://www.italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0740.pdf.

[138] Luke Eric Peterson, "Czech Republic to Pay Dutch Firm Slauka $188 Million (US), Plus 55 Million Interest; Contractual Counter-Claim Withdrawn," *Investment Arbitration Reporter*, July 1, 2008. Available at: http://www.iareporter.com/articles/20091001_72.

[139] *CMS Gas Transmission Company v. The Republic of Argentina*, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/8, Award (May 12, 2005). Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0184.pdf.

[140] Sarah Anderson and Sara Grusky, "How the World Bank's Investment Court, Free Trade Agreements, and Bilateral Investment Treaties have Unleashed a New Era of Corporate Power and What to Do About It," Food and Water Watch, April 2007. Available at: https://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/images/water/world-water/bank-policy/ICSID_print.pdf.

[141] *CMS Gas Transmission Company v. The Republic of Argentina*, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/8, Award (May 12, 2005), at paras. 68-73, 88. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0184.pdf.

[142] Sarah Anderson and Sara Grusky, "How the World Bank's Investment Court, Free Trade Agreements, and Bilateral Investment Treaties have Unleashed a New Era of Corporate Power and What to Do About It," Food and Water Watch, April 2007. Available at: https://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/images/water/world-water/bank-policy/ICSID_print.pdf.

[143] *CMS Gas Transmission Company v. The Republic of Argentina*, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/8, Award (May 12, 2005), at para. 99.

[144] U.S.-Argentina Bilateral Investment Treaty, Article XI. Available at: http://2001-2009.state.gov/documents/organization/43475.pdf.

[145] *CMS Gas Transmission Company v. The Republic of Argentina*, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/8, Award (May 12, 2005), at 139.

[146] Sarah Anderson and Sara Grusky, "How the World Bank's Investment Court, Free Trade Agreements, and Bilateral Investment Treaties have Unleashed a New Era of Corporate Power and What to Do About It," Food and Water Watch, April 2007. Available at: https://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/images/water/world-water/bank-policy/ICSID_print.pdf.

[147] *LG&E Energy Corp., LG&E Capital Corp., and LG&E International, Inc .v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/02/1, Award (October 3, 2006), at para. 257.

[148] Sarah Anderson and Sara Grusky, "How the World Bank's Investment Court, Free Trade Agreements, and Bilateral Investment Treaties have Unleashed a New Era of Corporate Power and What to Do About It," Food and Water Watch, April 2007. Available at: https://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/images/water/world-water/bank-policy/ICSID_print.pdf.

[149] "Come and get me: Argentina is putting international arbitration to the test," *The Economist*, February 18, 2012. Available at: http://www.economist.com/node/21547836.

[150] *See*, for example, *Blue Ridge Investments, LLC v. The Republic of Argentina*, 10 Civ. 153 Southern District of New York, Memorandum Opinion and Order (September 30, 2012). Available at: http://www.italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw1102.pdf.

[151] *Eureko B.V. v. Republic of Poland*, Partial Award, August 19, 2005. Available at: http://www.italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0308_0.pdf.

[152] Luke Eric Peterson, "Backgrounder: Eurkeo v. Poland Reaches Anti-Climax after Notable Liability Award and Battle over Arbitrator Challenge," *Investment Arbitration Reporter*, October 14, 2009. Available at: http://www.iareporter.com/articles/20091021_1.

[153] *Eureko B.V. v. Republic of Poland*, Partial Award, August 19, 2005, at paras. 231-243. Available at: http://www.italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0308_0.pdf.

[154] *Eureko B.V. v. Republic of Poland*, Partial Award, August 19, 2005, at paras. 244-260. Available at: http://www.italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0308_0.pdf.

[155] *Eureko B.V. v. Republic of Poland*, Dissenting Opinion, August 19, 2005, at para. 11. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0307_0.pdf.

[156] Luke Eric Peterson, "Backgrounder: Eurkeo v. Poland Reaches Anti-Climax after Notable Liability Award and Battle over Arbitrator Challenge," *Investment Arbitration Reporter*, October 14, 2009. Available at: http://www.iareporter.com/articles/20091021_1. .

[157] Luke Eric Peterson, "Eureko Settles One Claim with Poland, But Quietly Pursues a Separate Health Insurance Suit against the Slovak Republic," *Investment Arbitration Reporter*, October 14, 2009. Available at: http://www.iareporter.com/articles/20091021.

[158] *Azurix Corp. v. The Argentine Republic, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/12*, Award (July 14, 2006). Available at: http://www.italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0061.pdf.

[159] "Argentina: Azurix may be sanctioned," *South American Business Information*, 27 May 2000.

[160] "Argentine city warns its dwellers of toxic water." *Orlando Sentinel*, 26 April 2000. "Argentine city says tap water is toxic," *U.S. Water News Online*, May 2000. Perin, Monica, "Azurix water bugs Argentina," *Houston Business Journal*, 5 May 2000.

[161] Azurix 10-K filings for 2000, p. 38, Securities and Exchange Commission, 2001.

[162] *Azurix Corp. v. The Argentine Republic, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/12*, Award (July 14, 2006), at para. 129. Available at: http://www.italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0061.pdf.

[163] For a list of such complaints, *see* Public Citizen, "Liquid Assets: Enron's Dip into Water Business Highlights Pitfalls of Privatization," PC report, March 2002, at 13-14. Available at: http://www.citizen.org/documents/LiquidAssets.pdf.
[164] Azurix third quarter 10-Q filings for 2001, p. 9. Securities and Exchange Commission, 2001.
[165] *Azurix Corp. v. The Argentine Republic, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/12*, Award (July 14, 2006), at para. 43. Available at: http://www.italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0061.pdf.
[166] *Azurix Corp. v. The Argentine Republic, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/12*, Award (July 14, 2006), at para. 310. Available at: http://www.italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0061.pdf.
[167] *Azurix Corp. v. The Argentine Republic, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/12*, Award (July 14, 2006), at para. 441, 442. Available at: http://www.italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0061.pdf.
[168] *Railroad Development Corporation v. Republic of Guatemala*, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/23, Notice of Intent (March 13, 2007). Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw1457.pdf.
[169] *Railroad Development Corporation v. Republic of Guatemala*, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/23, Third Statement of Henry Posner III (October 5, 2010), at paras. 3-9.
[170] *Railroad Development Corporation v. Republic of Guatemala*, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/23, Respondent's Counter-Memorial on Merits (October 5, 2010), at para. 102. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0705.pdf.
[171] *Railroad Development Corporation v. Republic of Guatemala*, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/23, Award (June 29, 2012), at para. 91. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita1051.pdf.
[172] *Railroad Development Corporation v. The Republic of Guatemala*, Claimant's Memorial on the Merits, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/23, June 26, 2009.
[173] *Railroad Development Corporation v. Republic of Guatemala*, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/23, Award (June 29, 2012), at para. 221. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita1051.pdf.
[174] *Railroad Development Corporation v. Republic of Guatemala*, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/23, Award (June 29, 2012), at para. 283. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita1051.pdf.
[175] *See* Lori Wallach, "'Fair and Equitable Treatment' and Investors' Reasonable Expectations: Rulings in U.S. FTAs & BITs Demonstrate FET Definition Must be Narrowed," PC memo, September 5, 2012. http://www.citizen.org/documents/MST-Memo.pdf.
[176] *Glamis Gold, Ltd. v. United States of America*, Award, Ad hoc—UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2009), at 576.
[177] Dominican Republic – Central America – United States Free Trade Agreement, ch. 10 (Appendix 10-B), Aug. 5, 2004, Pub. L. No. 109-53, 119 Stat. 462 (2005), at 10-27.
[178] *See* Lori Wallach and Ben Beachy, "CAFTA Investor-State Ruling: Annex on Minimum Standard of Treatment, Proposed for TPP, Proves Insufficient as Tribunal Ignores Customary International Law Standard, Applies MST Definition from Past NAFTA Award to Rule against Guatemala," PC memo, July 19, 2012. Available at: http://www.citizen.org/documents/RDC-vs-Guatemala-Memo.pdf. And *see* Lori Wallach and Ben Beachy, "Rebutting Misleading Claims Made by Industry with Respect to RDC v. Guatemala Award: CAFTA Tribunal Rejected CAFTA Parties' and CAFTA Annex 10-B's Definition of CIL Based on State Practice, Imported Past Tribunal's MST Standard," PC memo, November 17, 2012. Available at: http://www.citizen.org/documents/rdc-v-guatemala-rebuttal.pdf.
[179] *Railroad Development Corporation (RDC) v. Republic of Guatemala*, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/23, Award (June 29, 2012), at para. 219. Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita1051.pdf.
[180] *TCW Group, Inc., et. al v. the Dominican Republic*, Notice of Violations of Chapter 10 of the Central America-Dominican Republic-United States Free Trade Agreement, Ad hoc—UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2007).
[181] Luke Eric Peterson, "UNCITRAL Tribunal Rules that Electricity Claim Can Proceed against Dominican Republic; Parallel CAFTA Claim Also Afoot," *Investment Arbitration Reporter*, Oct. 9, 2008.
[182] Letter from Paul Hastings Attorneys to the Dominican Republic Direccion de Comercio Exterior, "Notice of Violations of Chapter 10 of the Central America - Dominican Republic – United States Free Trade Agreement," March 15, 2007.
[183] Luke Eric Peterson, "UNCITRAL Tribunal Rules that Electricity Claim Can Proceed against Dominican Republic; Parallel CAFTA Claim Also Afoot," *Investment Arbitration Reporter*, Oct. 9, 2008. Available at: http://www.iareporter.com/articles/20091001_8.
[184] Luke Eric Peterson, "Dominican Republic Settles Trio of Electricity Arbitrations," *Investment Arbitration Reporter*, Sept. 19, 2009. Available at: http://www.iareporter.com/articles/20091008_12.
[185] *TCW Group, Inc., et. al v. the Dominican Republic*, Claimants' Counter-Memorial on Jurisdiction, Ad hoc—UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2009), at footnote 62.
[186] Luke Eric Peterson, "Dominican Republic Settles Trio of Electricity Arbitrations," *Investment Arbitration Reporter*, Sept. 19, 2009. Available at: http://www.iareporter.com/articles/20091008_12.
[187] Luke Eric Peterson, "French Company, Veolia, Launches Claim against Egypt Over Terminated Waste Contract and Labor Wage Stabilization Promises," *Investment Arbitration Reporter*, June 27, 2012. Available at: http://www.iareporter.com/articles/20120627_1.

[188] Luke Eric Peterson, "French Company, Veolia, Launches Claim against Egypt Over Terminated Waste Contract and Labor Wage Stabilization Promises," *Investment Arbitration Reporter*, June 27, 2012. Available at: http://www.iareporter.com/articles/20120627_1.
[189] Luke Eric Peterson, "French Company, Veolia, Launches Claim against Egypt Over Terminated Waste Contract and Labor Wage Stabilization Promises," *Investment Arbitration Reporter*, June 27, 2012. Available at: http://www.iareporter.com/articles/20120627_1.
[190] International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes, "*Veolia Propreté v. Arab Republic of Egypt* (ICSID Case No. ARB/12/15)," 2014, accessed July 28, 2014. Available at: https://icsid.worldbank.org/ICSID/FrontServlet.
[191] *Mobil Investments Canada Inc. and Murphy Oil Corporation v. Canada*, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/07/4, Notice of Arbitration (November 1, 2007). Available at: http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/italaw3080_0.pdf.
[192] Canada-Newfoundland and Labrador Offshore Petroleum Board, "Appendix II: Guidelines for Research and Development Expenditures," October 2004. Available at: http://www.cnlopb.nl.ca/pdfs/ibguide/guidelines_for_research_and_development_expenditures.pdf.
[193] For a review of this history, *see* Leah Fusco, "Offshore Oil: An Overview of Development in Newfoundland and Labrador," Sociology Department, Memorial University, 2007. Available at: http://www.ucs.mun.ca/~oilpower/documents/NL%20oil%207-25-1.pdf.
[194] Jarrod Hepburn, "Canada loses NAFTA claim; provincial R&D obligations imposed on US oil companies held to constitute prohibited performance requirements," *Investment Arbitration Reporter,* June 1, 2012. Available at: http://www.iareporter.com/articles/20120601.