



ICSID

INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR
SETTLEMENT OF INVESTMENT DISPUTES

**Updated Background Paper on Annulment
for the Administrative Council of ICSID***

May 5, 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Purpose of Background Paper.....	1
II.	Introduction to the Annulment Mechanism in the ICSID Convention	1
III.	The Drafting History of the Annulment Provisions in the ICSID Convention.....	2
	A. The Origin of the Annulment Provision	2
	B. Preliminary Draft ICSID Convention – 1963	4
	C. Regional Consultative Meetings – 1964.....	5
	D. First Draft Convention – September 1964.....	6
	E. Legal Committee Meetings – 1964.....	7
	F. Revised Draft Convention – December 1964	8
IV.	The Conduct of an Annulment Proceeding.....	9
	A. Filing an Application for Annulment.....	9
	B. Constitution of an ad hoc Committee	12
	C. The Proceeding	15
	(i) Applicable Provisions	16
	(ii) The First Session	17
	(iii) Advances to ICSID.....	17
	(iv) Stay of Enforcement.....	18
	(v) Hearing and Post-Hearing Phase.....	22
	D. The Decision on Annulment	23
	E. Resubmission Proceedings.....	31
V.	Interpretation of the Annulment Mechanism, the Role of the <i>ad hoc</i> Committee, and the Individual Grounds for Annulment	31
	A. The General Standards Identified in the Drafting History and ICSID Cases	31
	B. The Interpretation of Specific Grounds	53
	(i) Improper Constitution of the Tribunal	53
	(ii) Manifest Excess of Powers	54
	(a) Manifest Excess of Powers Relating to Jurisdiction	56
	(b) Manifest Excess of Powers Relating to the Applicable Law.....	57
	(iii) Corruption on the Part of a Tribunal Member.....	58
	(iv) Serious Departure from a Fundamental Rule of Procedure	59
	(v) Failure to State the Reasons on which the Award is Based	60
VI.	Conclusion	62

ANNEXES

Annex 1: Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Annex 2: Annulment Grounds in Concluded Proceedings

Annex 3: Bibliography on ICSID Annulment

I. Purpose of Background Paper

1. This paper is an updated version of the [Background Paper on Annulment for the Administrative Council of ICSID dated August 2, 2012](#).¹ It provides new data and updated charts and tables concerning developments in case law on annulment from August 2, 2012 through April 15, 2016.² In particular, it considers 37 new annulment proceedings, 22 new annulment decisions and 19 new decisions on the stay of enforcement of an award issued since the original Background Paper was published.

II. Introduction to the Annulment Mechanism in the ICSID Convention

2. One of the unique features of the ICSID system is its autonomous nature. ICSID arbitration is known as self-contained, or de-localized, arbitration because local courts in any particular State have no role in the ICSID proceeding. Instead, the ICSID Convention and rules contain all provisions necessary for the arbitration of disputes, including provisions addressing the institution of proceedings, jurisdiction, procedure, the award to be rendered by the Tribunal, post-award remedies, and recognition and enforcement of the award.³
3. An important aspect of the self-contained nature of the system is the remedies available to the parties after an award has been rendered. ICSID awards are binding on the disputing parties, may not be appealed and are not subject to any remedies except those provided for in the Convention.⁴ As a result, unlike other international arbitral awards, ICSID awards cannot be challenged before national courts. Challenges to ICSID awards must be brought within the framework of the Convention and pursuant to its provisions.
4. The choice of remedies offered by the ICSID Convention reflects a deliberate election by the drafters of the Convention to ensure finality of awards. The only way to review an award is pursuant to the five specific remedies provided by the Convention. These remedies are:
 - rectification (Article 49) – the Tribunal can rectify any clerical, arithmetical or similar error in its award;

¹ The original background paper was prepared to assist Contracting States at the 45th Annual Meeting of the ICSID Administrative Council on September 23, 2011.

² The ICSID Secretariat takes no position in this paper as to whether a specific decision of an ICSID *ad hoc* Committee is correct or is within the proper scope of review allowed by Article 52 of the ICSID Convention. Annex 1, which is attached to this paper, lists all annulment cases, including the full and short form citations, members of the Tribunals and *ad hoc* Committees, and the outcome in each case.

³ In accordance with Article 54 of the ICSID Convention, an award must be recognized by all ICSID Contracting States and pecuniary obligations imposed by an award are enforceable as a final judgment of the courts of a Contracting State.

⁴ ICSID Convention Article 53.

- supplementary decision (Article 49) – the Tribunal may decide any question it omitted to decide in its award;
 - interpretation (Article 50) – the Tribunal may interpret its award where there is a dispute between the parties as to the meaning or scope of the award rendered;
 - revision (Article 51) – the Tribunal may revise its award on the basis of a newly discovered fact of such a nature as to decisively affect the award; and
 - annulment (Article 52) – an *ad hoc* Committee may fully or partially annul an award on the basis of one or more of the following grounds: (a) the Tribunal was not properly constituted; (b) the Tribunal manifestly exceeded its powers; (c) there was corruption on the part of a Tribunal member; (d) there was a serious departure from a fundamental rule of procedure; or (e) the award failed to state the reasons on which it is based.
5. The following sections focus on the annulment remedy. Section III describes the drafting history of the annulment provisions in the Convention, Section IV outlines the conduct of an annulment proceeding before ICSID and Section V describes the general standards and the grounds for annulment invoked in ICSID case law.

III. The Drafting History of the Annulment Provisions in the ICSID Convention

6. The approval of the ICSID Convention by the Executive Directors of the World Bank in 1965 was preceded by five years of negotiation and consultation among government officials and international legal experts. It involved preparatory work by World Bank staff and Executive Directors in 1961 and 1962, a series of Regional Consultative Meetings of Experts convened by the World Bank in 1963 and 1964, and meetings of a Legal Committee consisting of representatives of all interested States held at the end of 1964. The final text was approved by the Executive Directors on March 18, 1965 and came into force on October 14, 1966.⁵ As of April 15, 2016, there were 152 Contracting States to ICSID.

A. The Origin of the Annulment Provision

7. The grounds for annulment in the ICSID Convention derive from the 1953 United Nations International Law Commission Draft Convention on Arbitral Procedure (“ILC Draft”), which was an effort to codify existing international law on arbitral procedure in State-to-State arbitration.⁶ The ILC recognized that the finality of an award is an essential feature

⁵ For a summary of steps in drafting the Convention, see ICSID, *History of the ICSID Convention: Documents Concerning the Origin and the Formulation of the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States* Vol. I-IV (1970) (“History”), Vol. I, 2-10.

⁶ See Documents of the Fifth Session Including the Report of the Commission to the General Assembly, [1953] 2 *Yearbook of the International Law Commission* 211, U.N. Doc. A/CN.4/SER.A/1953/Add.1 (“1953 ILC Yearbook II”) (Article 30 of the Draft Convention on Arbitral Procedure); Aron Broches, “Observations on the

of arbitral practice, but also recognized that there was a need for “exceptional remedies calculated to uphold the judicial character of the award as well as the will of the parties as a source of the jurisdiction of the tribunal.”⁷ It thus “sought to reconcile finality of the award with the need to prevent flagrant cases of excess of jurisdiction and injustice.”⁸ During its deliberations, the ILC decided that no appeal against an arbitral award should be allowed, but that the validity of an award might be challenged “within rigidly fixed limits.”⁹ An independent body, the International Court of Justice, would rule on whether a challenge should lead to the annulment of the award.¹⁰

8. The provision in the ILC Draft read as follows:

(1) The validity of an award may be challenged by either party on one or more of the following grounds:

(a) That the tribunal has exceeded its powers;

(b) That there was corruption on the part of a member of the tribunal;

(c) That there has been a serious departure from a fundamental rule of procedure, including failure to state the reasons for the award.¹¹

9. During its deliberations, the ILC debated the scope of specific grounds, including whether an excess of jurisdiction might warrant annulment, while misapplication of the law would not.¹² Ultimately, the ILC Draft made no attempt to define what conduct each ground would cover, with the exception of the express reference to the “failure to state the reasons for the award” as an example of a serious departure from a fundamental rule of procedure.¹³ The accompanying Report to the General Assembly stated that “[a]fter considerable

Finality of ICSID Awards” in *Selected Essays: World Bank, ICSID, and Other Subjects of Public and Private International Law* 299 (1995).

⁷ 1953 ILC Yearbook II, *supra* note 6, at 202.

⁸ Broches, *supra* note 6, at 298; *see also* comments by the ILC’s special rapporteur, Mr. Georges Scelles, Summary Records of the Fifth Session, [1953] 1 *Yearbook of the International Law Commission* 46, U.N. Doc. A/CN.4/SER.A/1953 (“1953 ILC Yearbook I”).

⁹ 1953 ILC Yearbook II, *supra* note 6, at 205.

¹⁰ *Id.* at 211 (Article 31 of the Draft Convention on Arbitral Procedure).

¹¹ The ILC adopted the Model Rules on Arbitral Procedure in 1958. The provision on annulment, Article 35, remained the same as to grounds (a) and (b), but ground (c) was phrased “failure to state the reasons for the award or a serious departure from a fundamental rule of procedure” and an additional ground was added: “(d) that the undertaking to arbitrate or the *compromis* is a nullity.” Documents of the Tenth Session Including the Report of the Commission to the General Assembly, [1958] 2 *Yearbook of the International Law Commission* 86, U.N. Doc. A/CN.4/SER.A/1958/Add.1. Interestingly, the drafters of the ICSID Convention chose to model the ICSID annulment provision on the 1953 ILC Draft and not on the final provision adopted by the ILC in 1958.

¹² Summary Records of the Fourth Session, [1952] 1 *Yearbook of the International Law Commission* 84, U.N. Doc. A/CN.4/SER.A/1952; 1953 ILC Yearbook I, *supra* note 8, at 44.

¹³ Documents of the Fourth Session Including the Report of the Commission to the General Assembly, [1952] 2 *Yearbook of the International Law Commission* 66, U.N. Doc. A/CN.4/SER.A/1952/Add.1; 1953 ILC Yearbook II, *supra* note 6, at 205.

discussion [the ILC] decided, having regard to the paramount requirement of finality, not to amplify - - subject to one apparent exception [the failure to state the reasons for the award] - - the grounds on which the annulment of the award may be sought.”¹⁴

B. *Preliminary Draft ICSID Convention – 1963*

10. The ICSID Convention’s earliest draft, an internal World Bank document entitled “Working Paper in the Form of a Draft Convention” of June 5, 1962, made no provision for annulment.¹⁵ However, a text on annulment identical to the 1953 ILC Draft was included in the Preliminary Draft of a Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of other States (“Preliminary Draft”) in 1963.¹⁶ The Preliminary Draft was a second working paper prepared by World Bank staff for consideration at the regional consultative meetings of experts. Section 13(1) read as follows:

- (1) The validity of an award may be challenged by either party on one or more of the following grounds:
 - (a) that the Tribunal has exceeded its powers;
 - (b) that there was corruption on the part of a member of the Tribunal; or
 - (c) that there has been a serious departure from a fundamental rule of procedure, including failure to state the reasons for the award.¹⁷

11. The comment accompanying Section 13 explained the purpose of the provision:

[...] As a general rule the award of the Tribunal is final, and there is no provision for appeal. Sections 11 and 12, however, provide for interpretation and revision of the award, respectively. In addition, where there has been some violation of the fundamental principles of law governing the Tribunal’s proceedings such as are listed in Section 13, the aggrieved party may apply to the Chairman [of the Administrative Council of ICSID] for a declaration that the award is invalid. Under that section the Chairman is required to refer the matter to a Committee of three persons which shall be competent to declare the nullity of the award. It may be noted that this is not a procedure by way of appeal requiring consideration of the merits of the case, but one that merely calls for an affirmative or negative ruling based upon one or other of the three grounds listed in Section 13(1).¹⁸

¹⁴ 1953 ILC Yearbook II, *supra* note 6, at 205.

¹⁵ History, *supra* note 5, at Vol. II, 19.

¹⁶ *Id.* at 184 (October 15, 1963).

¹⁷ *Id.* at 217 (Article IV, Section 13 of Preliminary Draft of a Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States).

¹⁸ *Id.* at 218 & 219.

C. *Regional Consultative Meetings – 1964*

12. The inclusion of a provision on annulment in the ICSID Convention does not appear to have been questioned or debated, nor is there any account of discussion concerning the general purpose and scope of annulment in the drafting history of the Convention. Indeed, a summary report of the meetings by the General Counsel of the World Bank concluded that no controversial issues of policy were raised by the draft annulment provision, but that a considerable number of detailed suggestions of a technical character had been raised.¹⁹ The specific grounds for annulment were discussed at a series of Regional Consultative Meetings.
13. During the first set of Regional Consultative Meetings, legal experts from various countries made suggestions for changes to the Preliminary Draft.²⁰ Among other things, a proposal was made that the grounds for annulment be set out in greater detail and modeled on commercial arbitration laws.²¹ However, Aron Broches, then General Counsel of the World Bank and Chair of the Regional Consultative Meetings and the subsequent meetings of the Legal Committee, discouraged the comparison with commercial arbitration.²² He recalled that “it had been fully recognized that only limited recourse had been provided and that acceptance of the binding character of the award went beyond what was normally expected in respect of an arbitral tribunal.”²³
14. A concern was raised by a legal expert from Germany that annulment posed a risk of frustrating awards and therefore the annulment provision should be made more restrictive. To that effect, this expert proposed a requirement that an excess of powers be “manifest” to warrant annulment.²⁴ In the context of the discussions on the meaning of “excess of powers,” Chairman Broches confirmed that the intention was to cover the situation where a decision of the Tribunal went beyond the terms of the parties’ arbitration agreement.²⁵
15. Other suggestions were to add the words “a serious misapplication of the law” or “including the failure to apply the proper law” to the ground concerning excess of powers.²⁶ In this connection, Chairman Broches remarked that “a mistake in the application of the law would not be a valid ground for annulment of the award,” stating that “[a] mistake of law as well as a mistake of fact constituted an inherent risk in judicial or arbitral decision for which appeal was not provided.”²⁷ However, the legal expert from Lebanon observed

¹⁹ *Id.* at 573 & 574.

²⁰ These meetings were held in the period December 1963 through May 1964 in Addis Ababa, Santiago, Geneva and Bangkok. *Id.* at 236-584.

²¹ *Id.* at 423.

²² *Id.*

²³ *Id.*

²⁴ *Id.*; Broches, *supra* note 6, at 303.

²⁵ History, *supra* note 5, at Vol. II, 517.

²⁶ *Id.* at 423 & 517.

²⁷ *Id.* at 518.

that if the parties had agreed to apply a particular law and the Tribunal in fact applied a different law, the award would violate the parties' arbitration agreement and could be annulled.²⁸

16. A further suggestion sought to clarify that "departure from a fundamental rule of procedure" excluded challenges on the basis of inobservance of ordinary arbitration rules, as opposed to "breaches of procedural rules which would constitute a violation of the rules of natural justice."²⁹ One proposal was to add the phrase "a serious departure from the principles of natural justice."³⁰ Another proposal was to replace the term by "fundamental principles of justice."³¹ Chairman Broches subsequently explained that "fundamental rule of procedure" was to be understood to have a wider connotation, and to include under its ambit the so-called principles of natural justice. As an example, he mentioned the parties' right to be heard.³²

D. *First Draft Convention – September 1964*

17. In light of the discussions at the Regional Consultative Meetings, World Bank staff prepared a further Draft of a Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of other States (the "First Draft"),³³ for consideration by the Legal Committee. This Committee was composed of experts representing member governments of the World Bank. The annulment provision in the First Draft read as follows:

- (1) Either party may request annulment of the award by an application in writing addressed to the Secretary-General on one or more of the following grounds:
- (a) that the Tribunal was not properly constituted;
 - (b) that the Tribunal has manifestly exceeded its powers;
 - (c) that there was corruption on the part of a member of the Tribunal;
 - (d) that there has been a serious departure from a fundamental rule of procedure; or
 - (e) failure to state the reasons for the award, unless the parties have agreed that reasons need not be stated.³⁴

²⁸ *Id.*

²⁹ *Id.* at 517.

³⁰ *Id.* at 271 & 423.

³¹ *Id.* at 480.

³² *Id.*

³³ *Id.* at 610 (September 11, 1964).

³⁴ *Id.* at 635 (Article 55(1)).

E. *Legal Committee Meetings – 1964*

18. The Legal Committee held a series of meetings in November and December 1964, chaired by Broches. At the meetings, clarification was sought by an Ethiopian Committee member regarding the meaning of the additional ground of improper constitution of the Tribunal.³⁵ It was explained that this expression was “intended to cover a variety of situations such as, for instance, absence of agreement or invalid agreement between the parties, the fact that the investor was not a national of a Contracting State, that a member of the Tribunal was not entitled to be an arbitrator, etc.”³⁶ Two experts were in favor of deleting the ground of improper constitution but the majority of the Legal Committee decided to retain this ground.³⁷
19. The Ethiopian Committee member also asked whether there was a contradiction in providing that a Tribunal is the sole judge of its competence and at the same time providing for excess of power as a ground of annulment.³⁸ Chairman Broches replied that:
- ...the expression ‘manifestly exceeded its powers’ concerned the cases [...] where the Tribunal would have gone beyond the scope of agreement of the parties or would have thus decided points which had not been submitted to it or had been improperly submitted to it. [...] the *ad hoc* Committee would limit itself to cases of manifest excess of those powers.³⁹
20. Suggestions that the word “manifestly” be omitted were defeated by a majority of 23 to 11 votes.⁴⁰ A proposal to include as a ground of annulment that the Tribunal had made a decision beyond the scope of the submissions was also defeated on a vote.⁴¹
21. Chairman Broches confirmed during the meetings that failure to apply the proper law could amount to an excess of power if the parties had agreed on an applicable law.⁴² One proposal suggested adding the “manifestly incorrect application of the law” by the Tribunal as a ground of annulment, but it was defeated by a vote of 17 to 8.⁴³
22. In regard to the ground concerning corruption on the part of a member of the Tribunal, there were suggestions by various legal experts to replace “corruption” with

³⁵ *Id.* at 850.

³⁶ *Id.*

³⁷ *Id.* at 852 & 853.

³⁸ *Id.* at 850.

³⁹ *Id.*

⁴⁰ *Id.* at 851 & 852.

⁴¹ *Id.* at 853.

⁴² *Id.* at 851.

⁴³ *Id.* at 851, 853 & 854.

“misconduct,”⁴⁴ “lack of integrity”⁴⁵ or “a defect in moral character.”⁴⁶ There were further suggestions that the ground be limited to cases where the corruption was evidenced by a judgment of a court, or in instances where there was “reasonable proof that corruption might exist.”⁴⁷ These proposals were put to a vote and defeated by a large majority.⁴⁸

23. The ground for annulment relating to a serious departure from a fundamental rule of procedure had become a stand-alone ground under the First Draft. A discussion was held about whether to add the words “or substance” after the words “rule of procedure,” but the proposal was seen as confusing.⁴⁹ A further suggestion to replace the word “rule” by “principle” was also rejected because the reference to “fundamental” rules of procedure was considered to be a clear reference to principles.⁵⁰ Likewise, a specific reference noting that both parties must have a fair hearing was defeated.⁵¹

24. The last ground, failure to state reasons, also became a stand-alone ground in the First Draft. The possibility of raising this ground of annulment was subject to the parties’ agreement on whether reasons for the award would have to be stated. The rationale for this discretion was to reconcile it with another provision which allowed the parties to agree that the award need not state the reasons.⁵² However, during one of the Legal Committee’s meetings, it was decided to remove the parties’ discretion in this regard and, as a consequence, the discretion was also removed from the ground for annulment.⁵³

F. *Revised Draft Convention – December 1964*

25. Following the Legal Committee’s meetings, a Revised Draft Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes (“Revised Draft”) was prepared.⁵⁴ Article 52 of the Revised Draft read as follows:

- (1) Either party may request annulment of the award by an application in writing addressed to the Secretary-General on one or more of the following grounds:

⁴⁴ *Id.* at 851.

⁴⁵ *Id.* at 852.

⁴⁶ *Id.*

⁴⁷ *Id.* at 851.

⁴⁸ *Id.* at 852.

⁴⁹ *Id.* at 853 & 854.

⁵⁰ *Id.* at 854.

⁵¹ *Id.* at 853.

⁵² *Id.* at 633. Article 51(3) of the First Draft provided: “Except as the parties otherwise agree: (a) the award shall state the reasons upon which it is based.”

⁵³ *Id.* at 816.

⁵⁴ *Id.* at 911 (December 11, 1964).

- (a) that the Tribunal was not properly constituted;
- (b) that the Tribunal has manifestly exceeded its powers;
- (c) that there was corruption on the part of a member of the Tribunal;
- (d) that there has been a serious departure from a fundamental rule of procedure; or
- (e) that the award has failed to state the reasons on which it is based.⁵⁵

26. Since the First Draft, the only modification made to the provision was to subsection (1)(e).⁵⁶ As explained above, the ground was no longer subject to the parties' agreement that reasons need not be stated and, therefore, the words "unless the parties have agreed that reasons need not be stated" were deleted.

27. The Revised Draft was submitted for consideration by the Executive Directors of the World Bank. While further changes were subsequently made to other provisions of the Revised Draft, Article 52 remained the same and thus became the text of the ICSID Convention.

IV. The Conduct of an Annulment Proceeding

28. In addition to stipulating the grounds for annulment, Article 52 of the ICSID Convention sets out the general procedural framework for an annulment proceeding. It is implemented by the ICSID Arbitration Rules, which apply to all ICSID Convention arbitration proceedings and govern ICSID post-award remedy proceedings. ICSID Arbitration Rules 50 and 52 through 55 implement the annulment remedy in the Convention, including the institution of annulment proceedings, the appointment of an *ad hoc* Committee to decide the application, and stays of enforcement of the award while the annulment application is pending. The various steps in an annulment proceeding are described below.

A. Filing an Application for Annulment

29. Either disputing party may initiate an annulment proceeding by filing an application for annulment with the ICSID Secretary-General. The application must: (i) identify the award to which it relates; (ii) indicate the date of the application; (iii) state in detail the grounds on which it is based pursuant to Article 52(1) of the ICSID Convention; and (iv) be accompanied by the payment of a fee for lodging the application.⁵⁷ It must be filed within 120 days after the date on which the award (or any subsequent decision or correction) was rendered, except that, in the case of corruption on the part of a Tribunal member, the


⁵⁵ *Id.* at 926 & 927.

⁵⁶ As to ground (d), in the French version of the Revised Draft, the word "*dérogation*" was replaced by "*inobservation*" and in the Spanish version the words "*grave apartamiento*" were replaced by "*quebrantamiento*."

⁵⁷ See Rules of Procedure for Arbitration Proceedings ("Arbitration Rules"), Arbitration Rule 50(1). The fee for lodging an application for annulment is currently US\$25,000.

application may be filed within 120 days after discovery of the corruption, and in any event within three years after the date on which the award was rendered.⁵⁸ The Secretary-General must refuse registration of an application for annulment that is not filed within the prescribed time limits.⁵⁹

30. The application for annulment must concern an ICSID award, which is the final decision concluding a case. Since there can be only one award in the ICSID system, the parties must wait until that award is rendered before initiating any post-award remedies.⁶⁰ An application for annulment concerning a decision issued prior to the award (*e.g.* a decision on a challenge, a provisional measure, or a decision upholding jurisdiction) cannot be challenged before it becomes part of the eventual award, even if it raises issues that may constitute the basis for an annulment application.⁶¹
31. Since the entry into force of the ICSID Convention in 1966, annulment proceedings have been instituted in 87 cases.⁶² In 3 of those cases, annulment proceedings were instituted a second time after a resubmission proceeding, meaning 90 annulment proceedings have been instituted in total.



32. A greater number of annulment applications have been registered since 2001 than in prior years. This reflects the increased number of awards issued, and not an increased rate of

⁵⁸ Arbitration Rule 50(3)(b); ICSID Convention Article 52(2).

⁵⁹ *Id.*


⁶⁰ See in particular ICSID Convention Articles 48-49 (addressing “the award”). Under the same principle, only the award is capable of enforcement under ICSID Convention Article 54. For enforcement purposes, ICSID Convention Article 53(2) provides that an “award” includes any decision interpreting, revising or annulling such award.

⁶¹ Annulment applications in respect of decisions on jurisdiction in pending cases have consistently been refused registration. See Broches, *supra* note 6, at 302.

⁶² See “Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings,” Annex 1.


annulment.⁶³ The rate of annulment for 2011– present is 3 percent, while the rate of annulment for 1971 – 2000 was 13 percent and for 2001 – 2010 was 8 percent.⁶⁴

Annulment Proceedings under the ICSID Convention - Outcomes 1971 - Present



33. Fifty-two percent of all annulment applications have been registered since January 2011, at about an even level per year.

Annulment Applications Registered by ICSID Fiscal Year 2011 - Present




⁶³ See *infra* para. 68.

⁶⁴ The rate is based on the number of awards rendered and the number of partial and full annulments of awards.

34. The annulment remedy has been pursued by both claimants and respondents to ICSID proceedings. Approximately 54 percent of annulment proceedings were initiated by respondents (in all instances States or State entities) while 40 percent of the proceedings were initiated by claimants. In 5 cases (approximately 6 percent of all annulment proceedings), both parties filed an application for annulment.⁶⁵

Annulment Proceeding by Instituting Party



- Annulment Application filed by State Party
- Annulment Application filed by National of Another State
- Annulment Application filed by both Parties

B. *Constitution of an ad hoc Committee*

35. Once an application for annulment is registered, the Chairman of the Administrative Council must appoint an *ad hoc* Committee of three persons to decide the application.⁶⁶ The function of an *ad hoc* Committee is either to reject the application for annulment or to annul the award or a part thereof on the basis of the grounds enumerated in Article 52.⁶⁷ Its function is not to rule on the merits of the parties’ dispute if it decides to annul, which would be the task of a new Tribunal should either party resubmit the dispute following annulment of the award.⁶⁸

36. *Ad hoc* Committee members are appointed from the ICSID Panel of Arbitrators, which consists of persons designated by ICSID Contracting States and ten designees named by the Chairman of the Administrative Council.⁶⁹ The ICSID Convention requires that Panel designees be “persons of high moral character and recognized competence in the fields of

⁶⁵ Fifteen applications sought partial annulment of the award. As noted in para. 67, applicant-Nationals of Another State and applicant-States have had a similar rate of success in annulment applications.

⁶⁶ Arbitration Rule 52(1); ICSID Convention Article 52(3).

⁶⁷ ICSID Convention Article 52(3).

⁶⁸ *Id.* at Article 52(6).


⁶⁹ *See id.* at Articles 12-16. Each Contracting State may designate up to four persons of any nationality to the Panel of Arbitrators, for renewable periods of six years.

law, commerce, industry or finance, who may be relied upon to exercise independent judgment.”⁷⁰ Both arbitrators and *ad hoc* Committee members are expected to be independent and impartial, and to decide the case solely on the basis of the facts before them and the applicable law.

37. Unlike the Centre’s appointment of Tribunal members, which may in certain circumstances be made outside of the Panel of Arbitrators with the parties’ consent,⁷¹ the Chairman of the Administrative Council is restricted to appointing *ad hoc* Committee members from persons on the Panel of Arbitrators.⁷² Many persons on the Panel of Arbitrators have served as members of both Tribunals and Committees.

38. The Panel of Arbitrators currently consists of 424 persons designated by 117 of the 152 Member States and the Chairman of the Administrative Council of ICSID.⁷³ As of April 15, 2016, ICSID appointed 271 *ad hoc* Committee members from the Panel, 141 of whom were appointed since 2011.

Appointments to ICSID *ad hoc* Committees by Decade



39. In addition to the general qualifications required for designation to the Panel of Arbitrators (see above, paragraph 36), a member of an *ad hoc* Committee must meet specific requirements prescribed by the ICSID Convention. First, the member of the *ad hoc* Committee cannot have been a member of the Tribunal which rendered the award or be of the same nationality as any of that Tribunal’s members.⁷⁴ Second, the member cannot have the same nationality as the disputing parties (State and National of Another State) and cannot have been designated to the Panel of Arbitrators either by the State party to the

⁷⁰ *Id.* at Article 14(1).

⁷¹ ICSID appoints Tribunal members either by agreement of the parties or under the default rule in ICSID Convention Article 38, which can be invoked by either party if the Tribunal has not been constituted within 90 days from registration of the case. *Id.* at Article 38; *see also* Arbitration Rule 4.

⁷² ICSID Convention Article 52(3); Arbitration Rule 52(1).

⁷³ Members of the Panels of Conciliators and Arbitrators, April 2016, Doc. ICSID/10, *available at* <http://icsid.worldbank.org>.

⁷⁴ ICSID Convention Article 52(3).

dispute or the State whose national is a party to the dispute.⁷⁵ Third, the member cannot have acted as a conciliator in the same dispute.⁷⁶ As a result, in each annulment proceeding there are usually 5 or more excluded nationalities.⁷⁷

40. A number of case-specific factors are considered, in addition to the formal requirements for appointment to an *ad hoc* Committee established by the ICSID Convention. For example, the languages used in the Tribunal proceeding and likely to be used before the *ad hoc* Committee are relevant, as is the experience of each candidate, including their past and current appointments. The internal process usually involves consultations among counsel, case management Team Leaders and the Secretary-General. Before the name of the candidate is proposed to the parties, the Centre researches whether there are any conflicts of interest and, if none are found, the candidate is asked to confirm that he/she is free of any conflicts, has time to dedicate to the proceeding, and is willing to act as a member of the *ad hoc* Committee.
41. Unlike the process for appointment of Tribunal members,⁷⁸ the ICSID Convention imposes no obligation on the Chairman to consult the parties about *ad hoc* Committee appointments. Nonetheless, before *ad hoc* Committee members are appointed, ICSID informs the parties of the proposed appointees and circulates their *curricula vitae*. This gives the parties an opportunity to submit comments indicating that there might be a manifest lack of the qualities required for serving as a Committee member;⁷⁹ for example, that there is a conflict of interest which the Centre or the candidate was unaware of. In exceptional circumstances, a proposed candidate is withdrawn and replaced by another person.
42. The Centre makes its best effort to complete the appointment process as soon as possible after registration of the annulment application. In recent years, the average time to complete the process has been reduced to 8 weeks, and efforts are being made to further reduce that average. This includes the time spent corresponding with the parties.
43. Approximately 41 percent of all Committee member appointments have been nationals of States which are classified by the World Bank Group as developing countries.⁸⁰ This corresponds to slightly more than one developing country national per case.⁸¹ The number of women appointed to *ad hoc* Committees has historically been low (only 15 *ad hoc*

⁷⁵ *Id.*

⁷⁶ *Id.*

⁷⁷ These requirements cannot be modified by agreement of the parties in annulment proceedings. This contrasts with Tribunal proceedings, where an arbitrator of an excluded nationality may be appointed in accordance with Arbitration Rule 1(3).

⁷⁸ ICSID Convention Articles 37-40.

⁷⁹ *Id.* at Articles 14(1) & 57.


⁸⁰ See Economic Country Classification available at <http://data.worldbank.org/about/country-classifications/country-and-lending-groups>. Low- and middle-income economies are referred to as developing economies. The classifications are set each year on July 1.

⁸¹ For the nationality of the members of *ad hoc* Committees and its classification at the time of appointment, see Annex 1.

Committee appointments involved women to date). This reflects the few women designated to the Panel of Arbitrators (approximately 13 percent of the members on the Panel of Arbitrators are women).⁸²

44. Parties sometimes request that *ad hoc* Committee members meet specific criteria; for example that they have investment arbitration experience, they do not sit on any pending case with any of the members of the original Tribunal or that they have not decided any legal issue similar to that considered in the annulment proceeding. At the same time, there is a call for greater diversity in ICSID arbitration and for the expansion of the pool of arbitrators and *ad hoc* Committee members. ICSID endeavors to take all of these considerations into account as far as possible when considering candidates from the Panel of Arbitrators, with due regard to the nationality restrictions.

Appointment to ICSID *ad hoc* Committees - Origin of Appointees



C. *The Proceeding*

45. Once the *ad hoc* Committee members have accepted their appointments,⁸³ the Secretary-General of ICSID notifies the parties of the constitution of the Committee. The party requesting annulment of the award is usually referred to as the “Applicant,” and the other party is usually the “Respondent” or “Respondent on Annulment.” A claimant in the Tribunal proceeding may thus become the respondent in the annulment proceeding.
46. A Secretary to the *ad hoc* Committee is appointed from among ICSID staff to assist the Committee and the parties. Where possible, the Secretary of the Committee is the same person as the Secretary of the Tribunal. This ensures the best possible assistance in view of the Secretary’s knowledge of the procedural history and submissions in the original proceeding. However, parties sometimes ask the Secretariat to appoint a different person, which the Secretariat is willing to do.

⁸² In September 2011 the Chairman of the Administrative Council designated 3 women and 6 developing country nationals out of 10 designees to the Chairman’s list for the ICSID Panel of Arbitrators.

⁸³ The members of the *ad hoc* Committee must sign a declaration in a form analogous to that specified in Arbitration Rule 6(2) for Tribunal members.

(i) Applicable Provisions

47. The Arbitration Rules apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to the proceeding before the *ad hoc* Committee.⁸⁴ This means that the Rules will apply with the changes necessary to take into account the fact that the proceeding is an annulment proceeding.
48. In addition, Article 52(4) of the ICSID Convention provides that Articles 41-45, 48, 49, 53 and 54 apply *mutatis mutandis* before the *ad hoc* Committee. By citing specific articles of the Convention, Article 52(4) implies that other provisions of the Convention do not apply to annulment. As a result, for example, it has been disputed whether Article 47 of the ICSID Convention concerning a Tribunal's power to recommend provisional measures applies to annulment proceedings.⁸⁵ Similarly, it has been argued that Article 52(4) does not allow a member of an *ad hoc* Committee to be challenged for a manifest lack of the qualities required by Article 14(1) of the Convention, suggesting that an *ad hoc* Committee member could not be disqualified.⁸⁶ However, this interpretation has been rejected in two annulment proceedings in which the *ad hoc* Committees found that they had the power to rule on disqualification but dismissed the requests.⁸⁷
49. With regard to the expedited procedure to dispose of unmeritorious claims at the preliminary stage of a proceeding introduced with the 2006 Arbitration Rules (Arbitration Rule 41(5)), *ad hoc* Committees have confirmed that this procedure also applies in annulment proceedings, but that the standard to accept an objection made under this provision is higher in the context of an annulment.⁸⁸ With regard to non-disputing party submissions under Arbitration Rule 37(2), one *ad hoc* Committee rejected such an

⁸⁴ Arbitration Rule 53.

⁸⁵ See *Libananco Holdings Co. Limited v. Republic of Turkey*, ICSID Case No. ARB/06/8, Decision on Applicant's Request for Provisional Measures (May 7, 2012), available at <http://icsid.worldbank.org>. The *ad hoc* Committee expressed doubts about its power to recommend provisional measures but rejected the request on other grounds. See also *Micula*, paras. 47-48, quoting from the *ad hoc* Committee's Decision on the Claimants' Request for Provisional Measures of August 18, 2014, para. 37: "Taking into consideration the limited scope of the annulment proceeding, at this stage of the annulment proceeding, as distinguished from the proceedings before the Tribunal, the rights of the Respondents on annulment relate mainly to the enforcement of the Award."

⁸⁶ See ICSID Convention Articles 57 & 58.

⁸⁷ *Compañía de Aguas del Aconquija S.A. and Vivendi Universal S.A. v. Argentine Republic (Vivendi I)*, ICSID Case No. ARB/97/3, Decision on the Challenge to the President of the Committee (October 3, 2001), available at <http://icsid.worldbank.org>; *Nations Energy, Inc. and others v. Republic of Panama*, ICSID Case No. ARB/06/19, Decisión sobre la Propuesta de Recusación del Dr. Stanimir A. Alexandrov (September 7, 2011), available at <http://italaw.com/sites/default/files/case-documents/ita0561.pdf>. In *Nations*, the parties did not dispute the power of the *ad hoc* Committee to rule on the request for disqualification.

⁸⁸ See *Elsamex, S.A. v. Republic of Honduras*, ICSID Case No. ARB/09/4, Decision on Elsamex S.A.'s Preliminary Objections (January 7, 2014), paras. 124-125, available at <http://icsid.worldbank.org>; and *Venoklim Holding B.V. v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela*, ICSID Case No. ARB/12/22, Decision on Respondent's Preliminary Objections pursuant to ICSID Arbitration Rule 41(5) (March 8, 2016), paras. 80-81, available at <http://icsid.worldbank.org>. In *Micula*, the *ad hoc* Committee dismissed the application because it found that the 2006 Arbitration Rules did not apply to that case. See *Micula*, paras. 14-20.

application,⁸⁹ while another Committee allowed a non-disputing party to file a written submission.⁹⁰

(ii) The First Session

50. The procedure before an *ad hoc* Committee normally corresponds to the procedure before a Tribunal. *Ad hoc* Committees must afford both parties the right to be heard and must respect the equality of the parties. There is an assumption that the parties' procedural agreements in the original proceeding will remain the same in the annulment proceeding, for example with respect to the choice of procedural language, the number and sequence of written pleadings and the parties' representatives.⁹¹ Nonetheless, the *ad hoc* Committee usually convenes a first session with the parties to discuss procedural matters, and it is not uncommon to vary certain arrangements, for example concerning the applicable rules, procedural language and place of proceedings. In most cases, the parties agree on a timetable involving two rounds of pleadings on the application for annulment (Memorial, Counter-Memorial, Reply and Rejoinder) and an oral hearing. In recent years, the time allowed for written pleadings rarely exceeded 3 months per party for the first round and 2 months per party for the second round.

51. The parties typically file with their written pleadings the factual and legal evidence from the original proceeding that they wish to rely on in the annulment proceeding. The record before the *ad hoc* Committee is usually limited to the factual evidence before the original Tribunal. However, new factual evidence could potentially be admitted.⁹²

(iii) Advances to ICSID

52. Unlike the Tribunal proceedings, the Applicant is solely responsible for making all advance payments requested by ICSID in an annulment proceeding, unless the parties agree otherwise. These advances cover the hearing expenses such as transcription, translation and interpretation, the administrative fee of ICSID as well as fees and expenses of the *ad hoc* Committee ("Costs of Proceeding"). The payments are made without prejudice to the right of the *ad hoc* Committee to decide how and by whom the costs ultimately should be

⁸⁹ *Iberdrola Energía, S.A. v. Republic of Guatemala*, ICSID Case No. ARB/09/5, Decision on the Non-Disputing Party's Application to File a Written Submission (February 12, 2014), mentioned in *Iberdrola*, paras. 17 and 18.

⁹⁰ *Ioan Micula, Viorel Micula and others v. Romania*, ICSID Case No. ARB/05/20, Decision on the EC's Application to file a Written Submission (December 3, 2014), mentioned in *Micula*, paras. 61-64. The *ad hoc* Committee indicated that a request by a non-disputing party in annulment proceedings "must be dealt with in a more restrictive and circumscribed manner." *Id.*, para. 63. This proceeding was governed by the 2003 Arbitration Rules.

⁹¹ See Note B to Arbitration Rule 53 of the annotated notes to the ICSID Regulations and Rules, 1968, Doc. ICSID/4/Rev. 1.

⁹² See e.g., *Sempra*, para. 74; see also Pierre Mayer, "To What Extent Can an *Ad Hoc* Committee Review the Factual Findings of an Arbitral Tribunal," in *Annulment of ICSID Awards* 243 (Emmanuel Gaillard & Yas Banifatemi eds., 2004); Peter D. Trooboff, "To What Extent May an *Ad Hoc* Committee Review the Factual Findings of an Arbitral Tribunal Based on a Procedural Error," in *Annulment of ICSID Awards* 251 (Emmanuel Gaillard & Yas Banifatemi eds., 2004).

paid.⁹³ Consequently, an Applicant must be prepared to fund the entire proceeding subject to the Committee's ultimate decision on costs.

53. The Costs of Proceeding for annulments concluded since July 2010 have averaged US\$388,000.⁹⁴ The fees and expenses of *ad hoc* Committee members represented 74 percent of these costs, while the hearing costs and ICSID administrative fee accounted for the other 26 percent of these costs.

(iv) Stay of Enforcement

54. An Applicant may in its application for annulment, or either party may at any time during the proceeding, request a stay of enforcement of all or part of the Tribunal award.⁹⁵ The stay of enforcement could concern an award of damages, award of costs or some other form of relief ordered by the original Tribunal. The stay of enforcement may be either partial or full.⁹⁶ If the request for stay is made in the application for annulment, the Secretary-General of ICSID must inform the parties of the provisional stay of enforcement when the application is registered.⁹⁷

55. The provisional stay remains in place until the *ad hoc* Committee, on a priority basis, rules on the request after having given each party an opportunity to present its observations.⁹⁸

56. *Ad hoc* Committees take into account the specific circumstances of each case when considering requests for a continued stay of enforcement of the award.⁹⁹ Some have held that there is no presumption in favor of a stay of enforcement.¹⁰⁰ Circumstances considered have included the risk of non-recovery of sums due under the award if the award is annulled, non-compliance with the award if the award is not annulled, any history of non-

⁹³ Administrative and Financial Regulation 14(3)(e); ICSID Convention Article 52(4). *See infra* para. 65.

⁹⁴ This includes one case in which such cost nearly exceeded US\$1 million. Excluding this case, the average cost of an annulment proceeding amounts to approximately US\$370,000.

⁹⁵ ICSID Convention Article 52(5); Arbitration Rule 54(1).

⁹⁶ For an example of a partial stay of enforcement of an award, *see Tidewater Investment SRL and Tidewater Caribe, C.A. v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela*, ICSID Case No. ARB/10/5, Decision on the Applicant's Request for a Continued Stay of Enforcement of the Award (February 29, 2016), available at <http://icsid.worldbank.org>.

⁹⁷ ICSID Convention Article 52(5); Arbitration Rule 54(2).

⁹⁸ Arbitration Rule 54(1) & (4). An expedited ruling may be requested, requiring the *ad hoc* Committee to decide within 30 days whether to continue the stay. The stay is automatically terminated if either party has requested an expedited ruling and the Committee does not continue the stay within 30 days of the request. *See* Arbitration Rule 54(2) and its explanatory note in ICSID Regulations and Rules, 1968, Doc. ICSID/4/Rev. 1.

⁹⁹ Arbitration Rule 54(4).

¹⁰⁰ *See e.g., Micula*, para. 33; *Occidental Petroleum Corporation and Occidental Exploration and Production Company v. Republic of Ecuador*, ICSID Case No. ARB/06/11, Decision on the Stay of Enforcement of the Award (September 30, 2013), para. 47, available at <http://icsid.worldbank.org>; *Víctor Pey Casado and Fundación Presidente Allende v. Republic of Chile*, ICSID Case No. ARB/98/2, Decision on the Republic of Chile's Request for a Stay of Enforcement of the Unannulled Portion of the Award (May 16, 2013), para. 37, available at <http://www.italaw.com/cases/829>.

compliance with other awards or failure to pay advances to cover the costs of arbitration proceedings, adverse economic consequences on either party and the balance of both parties' interests.¹⁰¹

57. If a stay is granted, the *ad hoc* Committee may modify or terminate the stay at the request of either party.¹⁰² A Committee may terminate a stay if the party requesting the stay of enforcement has failed to fulfill a condition for the stay ordered by the Committee (e.g., the provision of adequate financial security in respect of the amount due under the award). If a stay is not terminated during the proceeding, it terminates automatically upon the issuance of the *ad hoc* Committee's final decision on annulment.¹⁰³

58. There have been a total of 43 requests for the stay of enforcement in the 90 registered annulments, 41 of which have led to Committee decisions.¹⁰⁴ Thirty-six decisions granted the stay of enforcement. In 22 of those instances where a stay was granted, it was conditioned upon the issuance of some type of security or written undertaking. In 11 of those 22 cases, the stay was terminated because the condition had not been satisfied.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰¹ See e.g., *Sempra Energy International v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/02/16, Decision on the Argentine Republic's Request for a Continued Stay of Enforcement of the Award (Rule 54 of the ICSID Arbitration Rules) (March 5, 2009), para. 24, available at <http://icsid.worldbank.org>; *Tidewater Investment SRL and Tidewater Caribe, C.A. v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela*, ICSID Case No. ARB/10/5, Decision on the Applicant's Request for a Continued Stay of Enforcement of the Award (February 29, 2016), para. 35, available at <http://icsid.worldbank.org>; *Enron Creditors Recovery Corporation (formerly Enron Corporation) and Ponderosa Assets, L.P. v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/3, Decision on the Argentine Republic's Request for a Continued Stay of Enforcement of the Award (Rule 54 of the ICSID Arbitration Rules) (October 7, 2008), paras. 46-53, available at <http://icsid.worldbank.org>.


¹⁰² Arbitration Rule 54(3).

¹⁰³ *Id.* If an *ad hoc* Committee annuls part of an award, it may at its discretion "order the temporary stay" of the unannulled part. This enables the Committee to consider any advantage that the partial annulment may confer given that the annulled portion might be reconsidered by a new tribunal under ICSID Convention Article 52(6). If a Tribunal is reconstituted following a partial annulment, a party may request the stay of enforcement of the unannulled portion of the award until the date of the new tribunal's award. See Arbitration Rule 55(3). Although there have been several partial annulments with resubmissions, this situation has not yet occurred.

¹⁰⁴ The Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee on the Stay of Enforcement of the Award in *Ioannis Kardassopoulos v. Georgia*, ICSID Case No. ARB/05/18 and *Ron Fuchs v. Georgia*, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/15 (November 12, 2012) has been counted as one decision for these purposes.

¹⁰⁵ *Repsol*, para. 12; *Vivendi II*, para. 11; *CDC*, para. 16; *Sempra*, para. 29; *EDF*, para. 9; *Micula*, para. 37; *Kılıç*, para. 16; *Lahoud*, para. 17; *Lemire*, paras. 57 and 67 (stay terminated on April 2, 2012 and subsequently reinstated on December 21, 2012); *Ioannis Kardassopoulos and Ron Fuchs v. Georgia*, ICSID Case Nos. ARB/05/18 and ARB/07/15, Decision of the *Ad hoc* Committee to Terminate the Stay of Enforcement of the Award (January 19, 2011), para. 8, available at <http://icsid.worldbank.org>; *Elsamex, S.A. v. Republic of Honduras*, ICSID Case No. ARB/09/4, Decision of the *Ad hoc* Committee on the Termination of the Stay of Enforcement of the Award (March 11, 2014), para. 35, available at <http://icsid.worldbank.org>.

Decisions on Stay of Enforcement



Decisions on the Stay of Enforcement of an Award in all ICSID Annulment Cases*

Case	Applicant	Stay of Enforcement	Condition for Stay	Decision on Stay and Source of Publication
1. <i>Amco v. Indonesia I</i> ARB/81/1	Indonesia	Granted	Security	May 17, 1985; Noted in 1 ICSID Rep. 509 (2003)
2. <i>Amco v. Indonesia II</i> ARB/81/1- Resubmission	Indonesia	Granted	Security	March 2, 1991; Available at 9 ICSID Rep. 59 (2006)
3. <i>SPP v. Egypt</i> ARB/84/3	Egypt	Stay agreed by the Parties	Security agreed by the Parties	September 29, 1992; Noted in 8 ICSID REV. – FILJ 264 (1993)
4. <i>MINE v. Guinea</i> ARB/84/4	Guinea	Granted	No condition	August 12, 1988; Available at 4 ICSID Rep. 111 (1997)
5. <i>Vivendi v. Argentina II</i> ARB/97/3 – Resubmission	Argentina	Granted	Written Undertaking	November 4, 2008; Noted in Decision on Annulment English
6. <i>Pey Casado v. Chile</i> ARB/98/2	Chile	Granted	No Condition	August 5, 2008; French Spanish May 5, 2010; English
7. <i>Wena Hotels v. Egypt</i> ARB/98/4	Egypt	Granted	Security	April 5, 2001; Available at 18 (10) MEALEY'S INT'L ARB. REP. 33 (2003)
8. <i>Mitchell v. DRC</i> ARB/99/7	Democratic Republic of Congo	Granted	No condition	November 30, 2004; English French
9. <i>Enron v. Argentina</i> ARB/01/3	Argentina	Granted	No condition	October 7, 2008; English Spanish
10. <i>MTD Equity v. Chile</i> ARB/01/7	Chile	Granted	No condition	June 1, 2005; English

* Excludes provisional stays by the Secretary-General

Case	Applicant	Stay of Enforcement	Condition for Stay	Decision on Stay and Source of Publication
11. <i>CMS Gas v. Argentina</i> ARB/01/8	Argentina	Granted	Written Undertaking	September 1, 2006; Noted in Decision on Annulment English Spanish
12. <i>Repsol v. Petroecuador</i> ARB/01/10	Petroecuador	Granted	Security	December 22, 2005; Spanish
13. <i>Azurix v. Argentina</i> ARB/01/12	Argentina	Granted	No condition	December 28, 2007; English Spanish
14. <i>CDC Group v. Seychelles</i> ARB/02/14	Seychelles	Granted	Security	July 14, 2004; Available at 11 ICSID Rep. 225 (2007)
15. <i>Sempra v. Argentina</i> ARB/02/16	Argentina	Granted	Security	March 5, 2009; English Spanish
16. <i>Continental Casualty v. Argentina</i> ARB/03/9	Argentina	Granted	No condition	October 23, 2009; Noted in Decision on Annulment English Spanish
17. <i>El Paso v. Argentina</i> ARB/03/15	Argentina	Granted	No Condition	November 14, 2012; Noted in Decision on Annulment English Spanish
18. <i>EDF v. Argentina</i> ARB/03/23	Argentina	Granted	Written Undertaking	July 18, 2013; Noted in Decision on Annulment English Spanish
19. <i>Duke Energy v. Peru</i> ARB/03/28	Peru	Granted	Written Undertaking	June 23, 2009; Noted in Decision on Annulment English
20. <i>Total v. Argentina</i> ARB/04/1	Argentina	Rejected	N/A	December 4, 2014; Noted in Decision on Annulment English Spanish
21. <i>SAUR v. Argentina</i> ARB/04/4	Argentina	Information not publicly available	Information not publicly available	March 1, 2016
22. <i>Transgabonais v. Gabon</i> ARB/04/5	Gabon	Granted	Written Undertaking	March 13, 2009; Noted in Decision on Annulment 26 ICSID Rev.— FILJ 214 (2011) (French; excerpts)
23. <i>Rumeli v. Kazakhstan</i> ARB/05/16	Kazakhstan	Granted	Written Undertaking	March 19, 2009; Noted in Decision on Annulment English
24. <i>Kardassopoulos / Fuchs v. Georgia</i> ARB/05/18; ARB/07/15	Georgia	Granted	Security	November 12, 2010; English
25. <i>Micula v. Romania</i> ARB/05/20	Romania	Granted	Written undertaking	August 7, 2014; Noted in Decision on Annulment English
26. <i>Togo Electricité v. Togo</i> ARB/06/7	Togo	Granted	No Condition	January 31, 2011; Noted in Decision on Annulment French
27. <i>Libananco v. Turkey</i> ARB/06/8	Libananco	Granted	No Condition	May 7, 2012; English
28. <i>Occidental v. Ecuador</i> ARB/06/11	Ecuador	Granted	No Condition	September 30, 2013; English September 23, 2014; English
29. <i>Lemire v. Ukraine</i> ARB/06/18	Ukraine	Granted	Security	February 14, 2012; Noted in Decision on Annulment English (excerpts)
30. <i>RSM v. Central African Republic</i> ARB/07/2	RSM	Rejected	N/A	March 29, 2012; Noted in Decision on Annulment French (excerpts)
31. <i>Venezuela Holdings v. Venezuela</i> ARB/07/27	Venezuela	Granted	Written undertaking	September 17, 2015; English

Case	Applicant	Stay of Enforcement	Condition for Stay	Decision on Stay and Source of Publication
32. <i>SGS v. Paraguay</i> ARB/07/29	Paraguay	Rejected	N/A	March 22, 2013; English
33. <i>Caratube v. Kazakhstan</i> ARB/08/12	Caratube	Granted	No Condition	March 14, 2013; Noted in Decision on Annulment English
34. <i>Elsamex v. Honduras</i> ARB/09/4	Honduras	Granted	Written Undertaking	January 7, 2014; Spanish
35. <i>Iberdrola v. Guatemala</i> ARB/09/5	Iberdrola	Stay agreed by the Parties	Security	October 28, 2013; Noted in Decision on Annulment Spanish
36. <i>Dogan v. Turkmenistan</i> ARB/09/9	Turkmenistan	Granted	Security	November 24, 2014; Noted in Decision on Annulment English
37. <i>Kılıç v. Turkmenistan</i> ARB/10/1	Kılıç	Granted	Security	June 5, 2014; Noted in Decision on Annulment English
38. <i>Lahoud v. DRC</i> ARB/10/4	Democratic Republic of Congo	Granted	Security	September 30, 2014 French
39. <i>Tidewater v. Venezuela</i> ARB/10/5	Venezuela	Partially granted	No Condition	February 29, 2016; English Spanish
40. <i>Flughafen v. Venezuela</i> ARB/10/19	Venezuela	Granted	Security	March 11, 2016; Spanish
41. <i>Teco v. Guatemala</i> ARB/10/23	Guatemala	Granted	No Condition	February 10, 2015; Noted in Decision on Annulment English
42. <i>Rizvi v. Indonesia</i> ARB/11/13	Rizvi	Information not publicly available	Information not publicly available	February 5, 2015
43. <i>OI European Group v. Venezuela</i> ARB/11/25	Venezuela	Rejected	N/A	April 4, 2016; English

(v) Hearing and Post-Hearing Phase

59. The filing of written pleadings is followed by an oral hearing which most often lasts one to two days. The hearing is usually limited to the parties' oral arguments and, in some cases, to examination of legal experts whose opinions were submitted by the parties in the annulment proceeding. Because an *ad hoc* Committee does not reexamine the facts of the dispute, factual witnesses do not usually have any role in the process.¹⁰⁶

60. At the hearing or shortly thereafter, the *ad hoc* Committee invites the parties to file submissions on costs and sometimes also to file post-hearing briefs. The *ad hoc* Committee closes the proceeding once the presentation of the annulment case is concluded and the Committee has made progress in the deliberations. It must issue the decision on annulment within 120 days from the date of closure.¹⁰⁷


61. Of the 25 decisions on annulment issued since January 2011, 22 have been issued within one year of the hearing. The average time from the hearing to issuance of these 22 decisions

¹⁰⁶ *But see supra*, para. 51 & note 92.

¹⁰⁷ *See* Arbitration Rules 38(1) & 46.

was 7 months. Over the same period, the average time for an annulment proceeding from the registration of the application for annulment until the issuance of the decision was 24 months.¹⁰⁸ The overall average duration of all concluded annulment proceedings during the past 5 years is 22 months from the date of registration (20 months from the date of constitution of the *ad hoc* Committee).

**Average Duration of Annulment Proceedings
(Fiscal Years 2010 – Present)**



* This average excludes one case in which the constitution of the *ad hoc* Committee was suspended for over 6 years pursuant to an agreement by the parties.

D. *The Decision on Annulment*

62. The proceeding ends with the *ad hoc* Committee’s decision on annulment. The Committee may (i) reject all grounds for annulment, meaning that the award remains intact; (ii) uphold one or more grounds for annulment in respect of a part of the award, leading to a partial annulment; (iii) uphold one or more grounds for annulment in respect of the entire award, meaning that the whole of the award is annulled; or (iv) exercise its discretion not to annul notwithstanding that an error has been identified.¹⁰⁹ The proceeding may also be discontinued before the Committee issues a final decision because the parties agree on a settlement, a party does not object to the other party’s request for discontinuance, due to nonpayment of the advances requested by ICSID to cover the Costs of Proceeding or because the parties fail to take any steps in the proceeding during six consecutive months.¹¹⁰ Several annulment proceedings have been discontinued due to an Applicant’s


¹⁰⁸ This average excludes discontinued proceedings.

¹⁰⁹ ICSID Convention Article 52(3), *see infra*, para. 74(4).

¹¹⁰ Arbitration Rules 43-45; Administrative and Financial Regulation 14(3)(d) & (e).

failure to pay the advances and the other party's unwillingness to make the outstanding payment.¹¹¹

Annulment Proceedings - Outcomes



63. The *ad hoc* Committee's decision on annulment is not an award and is not subject to any further annulment proceeding, although it is equated to an award for purposes of its binding force, recognition and enforcement.¹¹² Likewise, the decision must contain the elements required in an award.¹¹³ Notably, the decision must include the reasons upon which it is based.¹¹⁴ As to the requirement to deal with every question, one *ad hoc* Committee has opined that once an award is annulled in full on any ground, it is unnecessary to examine whether other grounds may also lead to annulment.¹¹⁵ Similarly, some *ad hoc* Committees which partially annulled an award based on one ground did not see the need to examine alternative grounds for annulment of the same portion of the award that had been annulled.¹¹⁶ Other *ad hoc* Committees examined all grounds raised, even where one of these grounds warranted full annulment.¹¹⁷

¹¹¹ See Annex 1. As noted in para. 52, the Applicant is solely responsible for the advance payments to ICSID in annulment proceedings. Under Administrative and Financial Regulation 14(3)(d) and (e), if an Applicant fails to make an advance, the Secretary-General informs both parties of the default and gives an opportunity to either of them to make the outstanding payment within 15 days. If neither party makes the payment, the proceeding may, after consultation with the Committee, be suspended and eventually discontinued after six months.

¹¹² ICSID Convention Article 53(2).

¹¹³ *Id.* at Articles 48 & 52(4); Arbitration Rules 47 & 53.

¹¹⁴ ICSID Convention Articles 48(3) & 52(4); Arbitration Rules 47(1)(i) & 53.


¹¹⁵ See e.g., *Sempra*, para 78.

¹¹⁶ See e.g., *MINE*, para. 6.109; *Vivendi I*, paras. 115 & 116; *Occidental*, para. 302; *TECO*, paras. 150, 159 & 167.

¹¹⁷ See e.g., *Amco I*, para. 16; *Klöckner I*, para. 82.

64. Nothing in the ICSID Convention or rules expressly prohibits an *ad hoc* Committee from stating its opinion on any issue addressed by the Tribunal award. However, some decisions have stated that an *ad hoc* Committee should not pronounce upon aspects of the Tribunal award that are not essential to its decision.¹¹⁸
65. The decision on annulment must also contain the *ad hoc* Committee's determination on the allocation of costs incurred by the parties in connection with the proceeding.¹¹⁹ The Committee has discretion to decide how and by whom these costs should be paid, including each party's legal fees and expenses.¹²⁰ While *ad hoc* Committees in the past usually divided the Costs of Proceeding¹²¹ equally between the parties and ruled that each party bear its own legal fees and expenses, in recent years, a majority of Committees have decided that the Applicant should bear all or a majority of the Costs of Proceeding when the application for annulment was unsuccessful. Some *ad hoc* Committees have also ruled that the losing party should bear the legal fees and expenses of the successful party, in most instances the defending party.¹²²

Allocation of Costs of Proceeding/ Legal Fees and Expenses



*Including 7 Orders of Discontinuance which contained orders on costs and counting as two the separate decisions on cross-applications made in one decision on annulment.

¹¹⁸ See, e.g., *Enron*, para. 340; *Azurix*, para. 362; *CDC*, para. 70; *Lucchetti*, para. 112; *AES*, para. 15; *Tza Yap Shum*, para. 81; *Duke Energy*, para. 99; *Dogan*, paras. 261-263.

¹¹⁹ ICSID Convention Articles 52(4) & 61(2); Arbitration Rules 47(1)(j) & 53; Administrative and Financial Regulation 14(3)(e).

¹²⁰ *Id.*

¹²¹ See *supra*, para. 52.

¹²² As noted in para. 63, a decision on the allocation of costs in a decision on annulment is enforceable in the same manner as an ICSID award. ICSID Convention Article 53(2).

Decisions on Allocation of Costs

Case	Applicant	Outcome	Who bears the Costs of Proceeding	Who bears the Legal Fees and Expenses
1. <i>Amco v. Indonesia I</i> ARB/81/1	Indonesia	Annulled in part	Divided equally	Each Party bears its own costs
2. <i>Amco v. Indonesia II</i> ARB/81/1- Resubmission	Both Parties	Annulment rejected	Divided equally	Each Party bears its own costs
3. <i>Klöckner v. Cameroon I</i> ARB/81/2	Klöckner	Annulled in full English	Divided equally	Each Party bears its own costs
4. <i>Klöckner v. Cameroon II</i> ARB/81/2 – Resubmission	Both Parties	Annulment rejected	Divided equally	Each Party bears its own costs
5. <i>SPP v. Egypt</i> ARB/84/3	Egypt	Discontinued	Settlement – No order on costs	Settlement – No order on costs
6. <i>MINE v. Guinea</i> ARB/84/4	Guinea	Annulled in part English	Divided equally	Each Party bears its own costs
7. <i>Vivendi v. Argentina I</i> ARB/97/3	Vivendi	Annulled in part English Spanish	Divided equally	Each Party bears its own costs
8. <i>Vivendi v. Argentina II</i> ARB/97/3 – Resubmission	Argentina	Annulment rejected English Spanish	Divided equally	Each Party bears its own costs
9. <i>Pey Casado v. Chile</i> ARB/98/2	Chile	Annulled in part English French	Divided equally	Each Party bears its own costs
10. <i>Wena Hotels v. Egypt</i> ARB/98/4	Egypt	Annulment rejected English	Divided equally	Each Party bears its own costs
11. <i>Gruslin v. Malaysia</i> ARB/99/3	Both Parties	Discontinued (Lack of Payment)	No order on costs	No order on costs
12. <i>Mitchell v. DRC</i> ARB/99/7	DRC	Annulled in full English	Divided equally	Each Party bears its own costs
13. <i>RFCC v. Morocco</i> ARB/00/6	RFCC	Annulment rejected	Applicant	Each Party bears its own costs
14. <i>Enron v. Argentina</i> ARB/01/3	Argentina	Annulled in part English	Divided equally	Each Party bears its own costs
15. <i>MTD Equity v. Chile</i> ARB/01/7	Chile	Annulment rejected English	Divided equally	Each Party bears its own costs
16. <i>CMS Gas v. Argentina</i> ARB/01/8	Argentina	Annulled in part English Spanish	Divided equally	Each Party bears its own costs
17. <i>Repsol v. Petroecuador</i> ARB/01/10	Petroecuador	Annulment rejected English Spanish	Applicant	Applicant
18. <i>Azurix v. Argentina</i> ARB/01/12	Argentina	Annulment rejected English Spanish	Applicant	Each Party bears its own costs
19. <i>LG&E v. Argentina</i> ARB/02/1	Both Parties	Discontinued English Spanish	No order on costs	No order on costs
20. <i>Soufraki v. UAE</i> ARB/02/7	Soufraki	Annulment rejected English	Divided equally	Each Party bears its own costs

Case	Applicant	Outcome	Who bears the Costs of Proceeding	Who bears the Legal Fees and Expenses
21. <i>Siemens v. Argentina</i> ARB/02/8	Argentina	Discontinued	Settlement – Divided equally	Settlement – Each Party bears its own costs
22. <i>CDC Group v. Seychelles</i> ARB/02/14	Seychelles	Annulment rejected English	Applicant	Applicant
23. <i>Ahmonseto v. Egypt</i> ARB/02/15	Ahmonseto	Discontinued (Lack of Payment)	Applicant	Each Party bears its own costs
24. <i>Sempra v. Argentina</i> ARB/02/16	Argentina	Annulled in full English Spanish	Respondent on Annulment	Each Party bears its own costs
25. <i>Lucchetti v. Peru</i> ARB/03/4	Lucchetti	Annulment rejected English Spanish	Divided equally	Each Party bears its own costs
26. <i>MCI v. Ecuador</i> ARB/03/6	MCI	Annulment rejected English Spanish	Divided equally	Each Party bears its own costs
27. <i>Continental Casualty v. Argentina</i> ARB/03/9	Both Parties	Annulment rejected English Spanish	Divided equally	Each Party bears its own costs
28. <i>Joy Mining v. Egypt</i> ARB/03/11	Joy Mining	Discontinued English	Settlement – no order on costs	Settlement – no order on costs
29. <i>El Paso v. Argentina</i> ARB/03/15	Argentina	Annulment rejected English Spanish	Applicant	Each Party bears its own costs
30. <i>EDF v. Argentina</i> ARB/03/23	Argentina	Annulment rejected English Spanish	Applicant	Each Party bears its own costs
31. <i>Fraport v. Philippines</i> ARB/03/25	Fraport	Annulled in full English	Divided equally	Each Party bears its own costs
32. <i>Duke Energy v. Peru</i> ARB/03/28	Peru	Annulment rejected English	Applicant	Each Party bears its own costs
33. <i>Total v. Argentina</i> ARB/04/1	Argentina	Annulment rejected English Spanish	Applicant	Each Party bears its own costs
34. <i>Transgabonais v. Gabon</i> ARB/04/5	Gabon	Annulment rejected	Applicant	Applicant
35. <i>Vieira v. Chile</i> ARB/04/7	Vieira	Annulment rejected Spanish	Applicant	Applicant
36. <i>Daimler v. Argentina</i> ARB/05/1	Daimler	Annulment rejected English Spanish	Applicant	Each Party bears its own costs
37. <i>MHS v. Malaysia</i> ARB/05/10	MHS	Annulled in full English	Respondent on Annulment	Each Party bears its own costs
38. <i>RSM v. Grenada</i> ARB/05/14	RSM	Discontinued (Lack of Payment)	Applicant	Applicant
39. <i>Siag v. Egypt</i> ARB/05/15	Egypt	Discontinued	Applicant	Each Party bears its own costs
40. <i>Rumeli v. Kazakhstan</i> ARB/05/16	Kazakhstan	Annulment rejected English	Divided equally	Each Party bears its own costs

Case	Applicant	Outcome	Who bears the Costs of Proceeding	Who bears the Legal Fees and Expenses
41. <i>Kardassopoulos / Fuchs v. Georgia</i> ARB/05/18; ARB/07/15	Georgia	Discontinued	Settlement – no order on costs	Settlement – no order on costs
42. <i>Helnan v. Egypt</i> ARB/05/19	Helnan	Annulled in part English	Divided equally	Each Party bears its own costs
43. <i>Micula v. Romania</i> ARB/05/20	Romania	Annulment rejected English	Applicant	Each Party bears its own costs
44. <i>Togo Electricité v. Togo</i> ARB/06/7	Togo	Annulment rejected French	Applicant	Applicant
45. <i>Libananco v. Turkey</i> ARB/06/8	Libananco	Annulment rejected English (excerpts)	Applicant	Each Party bears its own costs
46. <i>Occidental v. Ecuador</i> ARB/06/11	Ecuador	Annulled in part English Spanish	Divided equally	Each Party bears its own costs
47. <i>Lemire v. Ukraine</i> ARB/06/18	Ukraine	Annulment rejected English (excerpts)	Applicant	Each party bears its own costs
48. <i>Nations v. Panama</i> ARB/06/19	Nations	Discontinued (Lack of Payment)	Information not publicly available	Information not publicly available
49. <i>RSM v. Central African Republic</i> ARB/07/2	RSM	Annulment rejected French (excerpts)	Applicant	Each Party bears its own costs
50. <i>Shum v. Peru</i> ARB/07/6	Peru	Annulment rejected Spanish	Divided with Applicant to bear 80% of the costs of the proceedings and Respondent 20%.	Each Party bears its own costs
51. <i>Toto v. Lebanon</i> ARB/07/12	Toto	Discontinued	Information not publicly available	Information not publicly available
52. <i>Impregilo v. Argentina</i> ARB/07/17	Argentina	Annulment rejected English Spanish	Applicant	Each Party bears its own costs
53. <i>AES Summit v. Hungary</i> ARB/07/22	AES Summit	Annulment rejected English	Applicant	Applicant
54. <i>SGS v. Paraguay</i> ARB/07/29	Paraguay	Annulment rejected English	Applicant	Each Party bears its own costs
55. <i>Astaldi v. Honduras</i> ARB/07/32	Honduras	Discontinued Spanish	Settlement - no order on costs	Settlement - no order on costs
56. <i>ATA v. Jordan</i> ARB/08/2	Jordan	Discontinued English	Respondent on Annulment	Respondent on Annulment
57. <i>Caratube v. Kazakhstan</i> ARB/08/12	Caratube	Annulment rejected English	Applicant	Each Party bears its own costs
58. <i>Alapli v. Turkey</i> ARB/08/13	Alapli	Annulment rejected English	Applicant	Applicant
59. <i>Malicorp v. Egypt</i> ARB/08/18	Malicorp	Annulment rejected English French	Applicant	Each Party bears its own costs

Case	Applicant	Outcome	Who bears the Costs of Proceeding	Who bears the Legal Fees and Expenses
60. <i>Karmer v. Georgia</i> ARB/08/19	Georgia	Discontinued	Information not publicly available	Information not publicly available
61. <i>Elsamex v. Honduras</i> ARB/09/4	Honduras	Discontinued Spanish	Settlement – no order on costs	Settlement – no order on costs
62. <i>Iberdrola v. Guatemala</i> ARB/09/5	Iberdrola	Annulment rejected Spanish	Divided equally	Each Party bears its own costs
63. <i>KT Asia v. Kazakhstan</i> ARB/09/8	KT Asia	Discontinued (Lack of payment)	Information not publicly available	Information not publicly available
64. <i>Dogan v. Turkmenistan</i> ARB/09/9	Turkmenistan	Annulment rejected English	Applicant	Applicant
65. <i>Commerce Group v. El Salvador</i> ARB/09/17	Commerce Group	Discontinued (Lack of payment) English	Applicant	Each Party bears its own costs
66. <i>Kılıç v. Turkmenistan</i> ARB/10/1	Kılıç	Annulment Rejected English	Applicant	Each Party bears its own costs
67. <i>Lahoud v. DRC</i> ARB/10/4	DRC	Annulment rejected French	Applicant	Applicant bears its own costs and half the costs incurred by Respondent on Annulment
68. <i>Levy de Levi v. Peru</i> ARB/10/17	Levy de Levi	Discontinued	Information not publicly available	Information not publicly available
69. <i>TECO v. Guatemala</i> ARB/10/23	Both Parties	Annulled in part English	Divided equally (TECO's application); Applicant (Guatemala's application)	Each Party bears its own costs (TECO's application); Applicant bears 60% of legal fees and expenses (Guatemala's application)
70. <i>Rizvi v. Indonesia</i> ARB/11/13	Rizvi	Discontinued	Information not publicly available	Information not publicly available
71. <i>Tulip v. Turkey</i> ARB/11/28	Tulip	Annulment rejected English	Applicant	Each Party bears its own costs


66. Similar to a Tribunal award, the *ad hoc* Committee's decision on annulment may be accompanied by the individual opinion of a member of the Committee.¹²³ In practice, only 5 Committee members have partially or fully dissented from the majority's decision.¹²⁴

67. Where an award has been partially or wholly annulled, the prevailing Applicant on annulment was roughly evenly divided as between claimants (40%) and respondents (60%) in the Tribunal proceeding.

¹²³ ICSID Convention Articles 48(4) & 52(4); Arbitration Rules 47(3) & 53.

¹²⁴ See *Vivendi II*; *Soufraki*; *Lucchetti*; *MHS*; *Iberdrola*.


Full and Partial Annulment - By Party



■ Annulment in Favor of Applicant-National of Another State
 ■ Annulment in Favor of Applicant-State

68. The rate of annulment is low, with 2.8 percent of registered cases (6.6 percent of all awards) ending in full or partial annulment.¹²⁵ The ratio of annulments to awards fluctuates historically and has shown a downward trend over the decades. In the early years, during the period 1971 – 2000, the rate of annulment was 13 percent. During the period 2001–2010, this ratio decreased to 8 percent. Since January 2011, the ratio has further decreased to 3 percent.

Annulment Proceedings under the ICSID Convention - Outcomes 1971 - Present



¹²⁵ *Amco I* (partial); *Amco II* (partial); *Klöckner I* (full); *MINE* (partial); *Vivendi I* (partial); *Victor Pey Casado* (partial); *Mitchell* (full); *Enron* (partial); *CMS* (partial); *Sempra* (full); *Fraport* (full); *MHS* (full); *Helnan* (partial); *Occidental* (partial); *TECO* (partial).

E. *Resubmission Proceedings*

69. The effect of annulment is that the award or a part thereof becomes a nullity, meaning that the binding force of the annulled portion of the award is terminated. However, the decision on annulment does not replace the award or substitute any of the reasoning in the award. A party is entitled to request resubmission of the dispute to a newly constituted Tribunal to obtain a new award concerning the same dispute following annulment of the original award.¹²⁶ Either party may start this process by filing a request for resubmission of the dispute, identifying the original award and explaining in detail which aspects of the dispute are to be submitted to the new Tribunal.¹²⁷ The new Tribunal is constituted by the same method as the original Tribunal¹²⁸ and is not bound by the reasoning of the *ad hoc* Committee. It is, however, bound by the unannulled portions of the original award in cases of partial annulment.¹²⁹
70. There have been 7 resubmission proceedings registered to date,¹³⁰ 3 of which led to awards that were subject to a second annulment proceeding.¹³¹ The applications for annulment in those second annulment proceedings were rejected by the *ad hoc* Committees with the exception of the *Amco II* case, where the *ad hoc* Committee annulled the Tribunal's Decision on Supplemental Decisions and Rectification.¹³²

V. **Interpretation of the Annulment Mechanism, the Role of the *ad hoc* Committee, and the Individual Grounds for Annulment**

A. *The General Standards Identified in the Drafting History and ICSID Cases*

71. As illustrated by Section III, the drafting history of the ICSID Convention demonstrates that assuring the finality of ICSID arbitration awards was a fundamental goal for the ICSID system. As a result, annulment was designed purposefully to confer a limited scope of review which would safeguard against “violation of the fundamental principles of law governing the Tribunal’s proceedings.”¹³³ The remedy has thus been characterized as one

¹²⁶ ICSID Convention Article 52(6); Arbitration Rule 55(1). The new Tribunal could reach the same conclusion as the original Tribunal whose award was annulled.

¹²⁷ Arbitration Rule 55(1). The Secretary-General has no authority to refuse registration of a resubmitted dispute. Arbitration Rule 55(2).

¹²⁸ Arbitration Rule 55(2)(d).

¹²⁹ Arbitration Rule 55(3). A partial annulment means that only those portions of the award that have been annulled may be resubmitted, whereas the remainder will be *res judicata*.

¹³⁰ *Amco II*; *Klöckner II*; *MINE*; *Vivendi II*; *Enron* (pending); *Sempra*; *Victor Pey Casado* (pending).

¹³¹ *See Amco II*; *Klöckner II*; *Vivendi II*.

¹³² *Amco II*. The annulment is regarded as a partial annulment of an award for purposes of the tables contained in this paper.

¹³³ *See* comment to Section 13 of the Preliminary Draft, History, *supra* note 5, at Vol. II, 218 & 219.

concerning “procedural errors in the decisional process” rather than an inquiry into the substance of the award.¹³⁴

72. The drafting history of the ICSID Convention also demonstrates that annulment “is not a procedure by way of appeal requiring consideration of the merits of the case, but one that merely calls for an affirmative or negative ruling based upon one [of the grounds for annulment].”¹³⁵ It does not provide a mechanism to appeal alleged misapplication of law or mistake in fact. The Legal Committee confirmed by a vote that even a “manifestly incorrect application of the law” is not a ground for annulment.¹³⁶
73. The limited and exceptional nature of the annulment remedy expressed in the drafting history of the Convention has been repeatedly confirmed by ICSID Secretary-Generals in Reports to the Administrative Council of ICSID, papers and lectures.¹³⁷
74. ICSID *ad hoc* Committees have also affirmed these principles in their decisions.¹³⁸ These decisions have clearly established that: (1) the grounds listed in Article 52(1) are the only grounds on which an award may be annulled; (2) annulment is an exceptional and narrowly circumscribed remedy and the role of an *ad hoc* Committee is limited; (3) *ad hoc* Committees are not courts of appeal, annulment is not a remedy against an incorrect decision, and an *ad hoc* Committee cannot substitute the Tribunal’s determination on the merits for its own; (4) *ad hoc* Committees should exercise their discretion not to defeat the object and purpose of the remedy or erode the binding force and finality of awards; (5) Article 52 should be interpreted in accordance with its object and purpose, neither narrowly nor broadly; and (6) an *ad hoc* Committee’s authority to annul is circumscribed by the Article 52 grounds specified in the application for annulment, but an *ad hoc* Committee has discretion with respect to the extent of an annulment, *i.e.*, either partial or full. The following section enumerates each of these commonly cited principles related to ICSID annulment, accompanied by excerpts of annulment decisions confirming the relevant principle.

¹³⁴ Broches, *supra* note 6, at 298.

¹³⁵ See comment to Section 13 of the Preliminary Draft, History, *supra* note 5, at Vol. II, 218 & 219.

¹³⁶ See *supra* para. 21.

¹³⁷ See *e.g.*, Report of Secretary-General Ibrahim F.I. Shihata to the Administrative Council at its Twentieth Annual Meeting 3 (October 2, 1986): “The history of the Convention makes it clear that the draftsmen intended to: (i) assure the finality of ICSID awards; (ii) distinguish carefully an annulment proceeding from an appeal; and (iii) construe narrowly the ground for annulment, so that this procedure remained exceptional;” Report of Secretary-General Ibrahim F.I. Shihata to the Administrative Council at its Twenty-Second Annual Meeting (September 27-29, 1988): “It may be expected that use of the annulment procedure would be a rare event because of the seriousness of the shortcomings against which it is meant to be a safeguard. It is also wrong to confuse the annulment proceeding with an appeals process which is not possible in respect of awards issued by ICSID’s tribunals;” Broches, *supra* note 6, at 354 & 355.

¹³⁸ All decisions on annulment have been published, either by ICSID with the consent of the parties, by the parties themselves, or in summaries of the legal reasoning of the *ad hoc* Committee excerpted by ICSID. See Annex 1, which includes references to each decision on annulment and its publication source. Pursuant to ICSID Arbitration Rule 48(4), the Centre has published the legal reasoning of the decisions on annulment in *RFCC*, *Repsol*, *Transgabonais*, *Lemire*, and *RSM*.

(1) The grounds listed in Article 52(1) are the only grounds on which an award may be annulled

- “The remedy of annulment requested by either or by both Parties under Article 52 of the CONVENTION is essentially limited by the grounds expressly enumerated in paragraph 1, on which an application for annulment may be made. This limitation is further confirmed by Article 53 (1) by the exclusion of review of the merits of the Awards.” *Amco Asia Corporation and others v. Republic of Indonesia*, ICSID Case No. ARB/81/1, Decision on the Applications by Indonesia and Amco Respectively for Annulment and Partial Annulment, para. 1.17 (December 17, 1992).
- “It seems quite clear that, in accordance with Article 52(1), the grounds on which an application is founded can only be the five grounds provided for in the Convention.” *Klöckner Industrie-Anlagen GmbH and others v. United Republic of Cameroon and Société Camerounaise des Engrais*, ICSID Case No. ARB/81/2, Decision on Annulment, para. 4.24 (May 17, 1990) [unofficial translation from French].
- “Claimants and Respondent agree that an *ad hoc* Committee is not a court of appeal and that its competence extends only to annulment based on one or other of the grounds expressly set out in Article 52 of the ICSID Convention.” *Compañía de Aguas del Aconquija S.A. and Vivendi Universal S.A. v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/97/3, Decision on Annulment, para. 62 (July 3, 2002).
- “The power for review is limited to the grounds of annulment as defined in [Article 52 of the ICSID Convention].” *Wena Hotels Limited v. Arab Republic of Egypt*, ICSID Case No. ARB/98/4, Decision on the Application by the Arab Republic of Egypt for Annulment of the Arbitral Award dated December 8, 2000, para. 18 (February 5, 2002).
- “Annulment may be based only on a very limited number of fundamental grounds exhaustively listed in Article 52(1).” *Consortium R.F.C.C. v. Kingdom of Morocco*, ICSID Case No. ARB/00/6, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee on the Application for Annulment of Consortium R.F.C.C., para. 222 (January 18, 2006) [unofficial translation from French].
- “Both parties recognize that an *ad hoc* committee is not a court of appeal and that its competence extends only to annulment based on one or other of the grounds expressly set out in Article 52 of the ICSID Convention.” *CMS Gas Transmission Company v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/8, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee on the Application for Annulment of the Argentine Republic, para. 43 (September 25, 2007).
- “The limitation of recourse to the annulment mechanism to the few grounds listed in Article 52(1) serves to reinforce the finality and stability of ICSID awards...” *Hussein Nuaman Soufraki v. United Arab Emirates*, ICSID Case No. ARB/02/7, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee on the Application for Annulment of Mr. Soufraki, para. 127 (June 5, 2007).
- “Annulment review is limited to a specific set of carefully defined grounds (listed exhaustively in Article 52(1) of the ICSID Convention).” *Sempra Energy International v. Argentine*

Republic, ICSID Case No. ARB/02/16, Decision on the Argentine Republic's Request for Annulment of the Award, para. 74 (June 29, 2010) (footnote omitted).

- “The role of the Committee is confined to the grounds of annulment in Article 52 of the ICSID Convention, and as noted above, even if the Tribunal erred in law, this would not be a ground for annulment.” *Enron Creditors Recovery Corporation (formerly Enron Corporation) and Ponderosa Assets, L.P. v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/3, Decision on the Application for Annulment of the Argentine Republic, para. 237 (July 30, 2010).
- “The review conducted by an *ad hoc* Committee is limited to the grounds that were carefully contemplated and are exhaustively listed in Article 52(1) of the Convention.” *Sociedad Anónima Eduardo Vieira v. Republic of Chile*, ICSID Case No. ARB/04/7, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee on the Application for Annulment of Sociedad Anónima Eduardo Vieira, para. 236 (December 10, 2010) (footnote omitted) [unofficial translation from Spanish].
- “The grounds for annulment are exhaustively listed in Article 52(1). Neither the ordinary meaning of the terms used by such article nor its context allows any possibility for additional grounds.” *Togo Electricité and GDF-Suez Energie Services v. Republic of Togo*, ICSID Case No. ARB/06/7, Decision on Annulment, para. 51 (September 6, 2011) (footnote omitted) [unofficial translation from French].
- “Indeed, Article 52(1) of the ICSID Convention limits annulment to five grounds, all of which concern the very integrity of the arbitral process.” *Alapli Elektrik B.V. v. Republic of Turkey*, ICSID Case No. ARB/08/13, Decision on Annulment, para. 32 (July 10, 2014).
- “Article 52(1) of the ICSID Convention sets out the five grounds on the basis of which a party may request annulment of an award. This is an exhaustive list.” *Víctor Pey Casado and Foundation “Presidente Allende” v. Republic of Chile*, ICSID Case No. ARB/98/2, Decision on the Application for Annulment of the Republic of Chile, para. 89 (December 18, 2012).
- “[T]he Committee will review the allegations raised by Argentina corresponding to those which are exhaustively listed in Article 52 of the ICSID Convention; the remaining allegations, which do not refer to the grounds for annulment, will be rejected without any analysis.” *El Paso Energy International Company v. The Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/15, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee on the Application for Annulment of the Argentine Republic, para. 137 (September 22, 2014) (emphasis omitted).
- “The only recourse against the award available to the parties is limited to what is set out in Article 52 of the ICSID Convention... Thus the grounds for annulment should be interpreted as being exhaustive and restrictive.” *Impregilo S.p.A. v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/17, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee on the Application for Annulment, para. 118 (January 24, 2014).
- “As regards the general approach of Article 52, the annulment grounds referred therein are clearly exhaustive.” *RSM Production Corporation v. Central African Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/2, Decision on Annulment of RSM Production Corporation, para. 76 (February 20, 2013) [unofficial translation from French].

- “The award may only be subject to annulment if an *ad hoc* committee finds that one or more of the five grounds for annulment established in Article 52(1) apply.” *Occidental Petroleum Corporation and Occidental Exploration and Production Company v. Republic of Ecuador*, ICSID Case No. ARB/06/11, Decision on Annulment of the Award, para. 47 (November 2, 2015).
- “Under the ICSID Convention, annulment provides relief for egregious violations of certain basic principles. Article 52(1) of the Convention circumscribes the reasons for annulment.” *Tulip Real Estate and Development Netherlands B.V. v. Republic of Turkey*, ICSID Case No. ARB/11/28, Decision on Annulment, para. 39 (December 30, 2015).
- “[I]t is clear from the text of Article 52 that an award may be annulled only on one or more of the five grounds set out in Article 52. An *ad hoc* committee is not entitled to range beyond those five grounds. Its function is not to consider whether or not it agrees with the reasoning or the conclusions of the tribunal but only to determine whether or not one or more of the five grounds has been made out.” *EDF International S.A., SAUR International S.A. and León Participaciones Argentinas S.A. v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/23, Decision, para. 67 (February 5, 2016).
- “It is not disputed that the grounds for annulment provided by Article 52(1) of the ICSID Convention are exhaustive and are the only grounds under which an award may be annulled.” *Total S.A. v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/04/1, Decision on Annulment, para. 163 (February 1, 2016).
- “Annulment is a remedy of limited scope. Article 53 provides for the finality of awards by stating that they shall not be subject to ‘any appeal or any other remedy except those provided for in this Convention’. Article 52 sets out the limits of that exception by listing the grounds on which a party may seek annulment. The list is exhaustive. The decision to annul cannot be based on a ground other than the five listed in Article 52(1). It is now well settled that this exhaustive list of grounds safeguards the integrity and not the outcome of the arbitration proceedings.” *Adem Dogan v. Turkmenistan*, ICSID Case No. ARB/09/9, Decision on Annulment, para. 28 (January 15, 2016).
- “An annulment committee’s mandate is strictly circumscribed by the five grounds for annulment listed under the ICSID Convention and it may not, under the guise of applying them, reverse an award on the merits.” *TECO Guatemala Holdings, LLC v. Republic of Guatemala*, ICSID Case No. ARB/10/23, Decision on Annulment, para. 73 (April 5, 2016).

(2) Annulment is an exceptional and narrowly circumscribed remedy and the role of an *ad hoc* Committee is limited

- “Article 52(1) makes it clear that annulment is a limited remedy.” *Maritime International Nominees Establishment v. Republic of Guinea*, ICSID Case No. ARB/84/4, Decision on the Application by Guinea for Partial Annulment of the Arbitral Award dated January 6, 1988, para. 4.04 (December 22, 1989).

- “Because of its focus on procedural legitimacy, annulment is ‘an extraordinary remedy for unusual and important cases.’” *CDC Group plc v. Republic of the Seychelles*, ICSID Case No. ARB/02/14, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee on the Application for Annulment of the Republic of Seychelles, para. 34 (June 29, 2005) (footnote omitted).
- “The sole purpose of Article 52 is to provide for an exceptional remedy in cases where there has been a manifest and substantial breach of a number of essential principles set out in this Article.” *Consortium R.F.C.C. v. Kingdom of Morocco*, ICSID Case No. ARB/00/6, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee on the Application for Annulment of Consortium R.F.C.C., para. 223 (January 18, 2006) [unofficial translation from French].
- “The purpose of the grounds for annulment under Article 52 of the Convention is to allow a limited exception to the finality of ICSID awards, which is highlighted by Article 53.” *Repsol YPF Ecuador S.A. v. Empresa Estatal Petróleos del Ecuador (Petroecuador)*, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/10, Decision on the Application for Annulment, para. 81 (January 8, 2007) (footnote omitted) [unofficial translation from Spanish].
- “[T]he role of an *ad hoc* committee in the ICSID system is a limited one.” *MTD Equity Sdn. Bhd. and MTD Chile S.A. v. Republic of Chile*, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/7, Decision on Annulment, para. 54 (March 21, 2007) (footnote omitted).
- “At the outset, the Committee must recall that, in the ICSID system, annulment has a limited function.” *CMS Gas Transmission Company v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/8, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee on the Application for Annulment of the Argentine Republic, para. 44 (September 25, 2007).
- “It is not contested by the parties that the annulment review, although obviously important, is a limited exercise, and does not provide for an appeal of the initial award.” *Hussein Nuaman Soufraki v. United Arab Emirates*, ICSID Case No. ARB/02/7, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee on the Application for Annulment of Mr. Soufraki, para. 20 (June 5, 2007).
- “[T]he Committee is conscious that it exercises its jurisdiction under a narrow and limited mandate conferred by Article 52 of the ICSID Convention. The scope of this mandate allows annulment as an option only when certain specific conditions exist.” *CMS Gas Transmission Company v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/8, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee on the Application for Annulment of the Argentine Republic, para. 158 (September 25, 2007).
- “One general purpose of Article 52, including its sub-paragraph (1)(b), must be that an annulment should not occur easily.” *Industria Nacional de Alimentos, S.A. and Indalsa Perú, S.A. (formerly Empresas Lucchetti, S.A. and Lucchetti Perú, S.A.) v. Republic of Peru*, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/4, Decision on Annulment, para. 101 (September 5, 2007).
- “[T]he role of an *ad hoc* committee is a limited one, restricted to assessing the legitimacy of the award and not its correctness.” *M.C.I. Power Group, L.C. and New Turbine, Inc. v. Republic of Ecuador*, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/6, Decision on Annulment, para. 24 (October 19, 2009).

- “It is true that the annulment procedure is exceptional in its nature...the grounds for the annulment remedy and the mandate of the *ad hoc* committee are limited.” *Compagnie d’Exploitation du Chemin de Fer Transgabonais v. Gabonese Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/04/5, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee on the Application for Annulment of the Gabonese Republic, para. 228 (May 11, 2010) [unofficial translation from French].
- “[T]he Committee considers that annulment proceedings are confined to determining whether the integrity of the arbitration proceedings has been respected.” *Sociedad Anónima Eduardo Vieira v. Republic of Chile*, ICSID Case No. ARB/04/7, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee on the Application for Annulment of Sociedad Anónima Eduardo Vieira, para. 236 (December 10, 2010)[unofficial translation from Spanish].
- “It is not contested by the parties that the annulment review, although obviously important, is a limited exercise, and does not provide for an appeal of the initial award. In other words, it is not contested that ‘ . . . an *ad hoc* committee does not have the jurisdiction to review the merits of the original award in any way. The annulment system is designed to safeguard the integrity, not the outcome, of ICSID arbitration proceedings.’” *Hussein Nuaman Soufraki v. United Arab Emirates*, ICSID Case No. ARB/02/7, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee on the Application for Annulment of Mr. Soufraki, para. 20 (June 5, 2007) (footnote omitted).
- “In the Committee’s view, and in light of the text of the Convention, annulment is a limited remedy with a strictly circumscribed role: to safeguard the fundamental fairness and integrity of the underlying proceeding.” *Alapli Elektrik B.V. v. Republic of Turkey*, ICSID Case No. ARB/08/13, Decision on Annulment, para. 32 (July 10, 2014).
- “The annulment procedure is not a mechanism to correct alleged errors of fact or law that a tribunal may have committed, but a limited remedy meant to ensure the fundamental fairness of the arbitration proceeding.” *Alapli Elektrik B.V. v. Republic of Turkey*, ICSID Case No. ARB/08/13, Decision on Annulment, para. 232 (July 10, 2014).
- “[I]t follows from the very nature of annulment as an exceptional measure that it should not be resorted to unless the tribunal’s act or its failure to act has had, or at least may have had, serious consequences for a party.” *Libananco Holdings Co. Ltd. v. Republic of Turkey*, ICSID Case No. ARB/06/8, Decision on Annulment, para. 102 (May 22, 2013).
- “Therefore, when an allegation is made that there was a manifest excess of powers for failure to apply the applicable law, it is not the role of an *ad hoc* committee to verify whether the interpretation of the law by the tribunal was correct, or whether it correctly ascertained the facts or whether it correctly appreciated the evidence. These are issues relevant to an appeal, but not for annulment proceedings in view of the limited grounds provided for under the ICSID Convention.” *Daimler Financial Services A.G. v. Republic of Argentina*, ICSID Case No. ARB/05/1, Decision on Annulment, para. 189 (January 7, 2015).
- “[T]he object and purpose of the ICSID annulment procedure is to control the integrity of the arbitral proceeding in all its aspects... [L]imiting the number of grounds for annulment also aims to reinforce the finality and the ‘stability’ of ICSID awards.” *RSM Production Corporation v. Central African Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/2, Decision on Annulment

of RSM Production Corporation, paras. 73, 75 (February 20, 2013) (footnote omitted) [unofficial translation from French].

- “In the context of the ICSID Convention, the object of the review is, however, restricted by Article 52(1)(e) which provides only a limited scope for review, as confirmed by a series of *ad hoc* committees’ decisions.” *Mr. Tza Yap Shum v. Republic of Peru*, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/6, Decision on Annulment, para. 112 (February 12, 2015) [unofficial translation from Spanish].
- “Article 52 of the ICSID Convention follows the model of a limited review. It represents a control mechanism that ensures that a decision has remained within the framework of the parties’ agreement to arbitrate and is the result of a process that was in accord with basic requirements of fair procedure. The main function of annulment is to provide a limited form of review of awards in order to safeguard the integrity of ICSID proceedings.” *Tulip Real Estate and Development Netherlands B.V. v. Republic of Turkey*, ICSID Case No. ARB/11/28, Decision on Annulment, para. 41 (December 30, 2015).
- “Annulment is possible on a very limited number of grounds. In the case of the ICSID Convention, these are listed exhaustively in Article 52(1).” *Tulip Real Estate and Development Netherlands B.V. v. Republic of Turkey*, ICSID Case No. ARB/11/28, Decision on Annulment, para. 43 (December 30, 2015).
- “As indicated before, the annulment proceeding is not an appeal and therefore is not a mechanism to correct alleged errors of fact or law that the tribunal may have committed. Annulment under the ICSID Convention is a limited remedy.” *Total S.A. v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/04/1, Decision on Annulment, para. 179 (February 1, 2016) (footnotes omitted).
- “[A]nnulment is an exceptional, narrowly circumscribed remedy, and the role of an *ad hoc* committee is limited.” *Antoine Abou Lahoud and Leila Bounafeh-Abou Lahoud v. Democratic Republic of the Congo*, ICSID Case No. ARB/10/4, Decision on the Application for Annulment of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, para. 108 (March 29, 2016) [unofficial translation from French].

(3) *Ad hoc* Committees are not courts of appeal, annulment is not a remedy against an incorrect decision, and an *ad hoc* Committee cannot substitute the Tribunal’s determination on the merits for its own

- “The law applied by the Tribunal will be examined by the *ad hoc* Committee, not for the purpose of scrutinizing whether the Tribunal committed errors in the interpretation of the requirements of applicable law or in the ascertainment or evaluation of the relevant facts to which such law has been applied. Such scrutiny is properly the task of a court of appeals, which the *ad hoc* Committee is not.” *Amco Asia Corporation and others v. Republic of Indonesia (Amco I)*, ICSID Case No. ARB/81/1, Decision on Annulment, para. 23 (May 16, 1986).
- “Annulment is not a remedy against an incorrect decision. An *ad hoc* Committee may not in fact review or reverse an ICSID award on the merits under the guise of annulment under Article

52.” *Amco Asia Corporation and others v. Republic of Indonesia (Amco II)*, ICSID Case No. ARB/81/1, Decision on the Applications by Indonesia and Amco Respectively for Annulment and Partial Annulment, para. 1.17 (December 17, 1992).

- “It is incumbent upon Ad Hoc Committees to resist the temptation to rectify incorrect decisions or to annul unjust awards.” *Amco Asia Corporation and others v. Republic of Indonesia (Amco II)*, ICSID Case No. ARB/81/1, Decision on the Applications by Indonesia and Amco Respectively for Annulment and Partial Annulment, para. 1.18 (December 17, 1992).
- “[I]t should be recalled that as a rule an application for annulment cannot serve as a substitute for an appeal against an award and permit criticism of the merits of the judgments rightly or wrongly formulated by the award. Nor can it be used by one party to complete or develop an argument which it could and should have made during the arbitral proceeding or help that party retrospectively to fill gaps in its arguments.” *Klöckner Industrie-Anlagen GmbH and others v. United Republic of Cameroon and Société Camerounaise des Engrais (Klöckner I)*, ICSID Case No. ARB/81/2, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee, para. 83 (May 3, 1985) [unofficial translation from French].
- “Another basic consideration which must be mentioned concerns the limited scope of the annulment procedure, which cannot in any way serve as an appellate procedure.” *Klöckner Industrie-Anlagen GmbH and others v. United Republic of Cameroon and Société Camerounaise des Engrais (Klöckner II)*, ICSID Case No. ARB/81/2, Decision on Annulment, para. 5.07 (May 17, 1990) [unofficial translation from French].
- “Annulment is not a remedy against an incorrect decision. Accordingly, an *ad hoc* Committee may not in fact reverse an award on the merits under the guise of applying Article 52.” *Maritime International Nominees Establishment v. Republic of Guinea*, ICSID Case No. ARB/84/4, Decision on the Application by Guinea for Partial Annulment of the Arbitral Award dated January 6, 1988, para. 4.04 (December 22, 1989).
- “It is agreed by all that Article 52 does not introduce an appeal facility but only a facility meant to uphold and strengthen the integrity of the ICSID process. In the Treaty, the possibility of annulment is in this connection based on specific and limited grounds.” *Compañía de Aguas del Aconquija S.A. and Vivendi Universal S.A. v. Argentine Republic (Vivendi II)*, ICSID Case No. ARB/97/3, Decision on the Argentine Republic’s Request for Annulment of the Award Rendered on 20 August 2007, para. 247(i) (August 10, 2010).
- “As has been stated in earlier published decisions made on requests for annulment of ICSID awards, the remedy of Article 52 is in no sense an appeal.” *Wena Hotels Limited v. Arab Republic of Egypt*, ICSID Case No. ARB/98/4, Decision on the Application by the Arab Republic of Egypt for Annulment of the Arbitral Award dated December 8, 2000, para. 18 (February 5, 2002) (footnote omitted).
- “No one has the slightest doubt – all the *ad hoc* Committees have so stated, and all authors specializing in the ICSID arbitration system agree – that an annulment proceeding is different from an appeal procedure and that it does not entail the carrying out of a substantive review of

an award.” *Patrick Mitchell v. Democratic Republic of the Congo*, ICSID Case No. ARB/99/7, Decision on the Application for Annulment of the Award, para. 19 (November 1, 2006).

- “Even the most evident error of fact in an award is not in itself a ground for annulment.” *Consortium R.F.C.C. v. Kingdom of Morocco*, ICSID Case No. ARB/00/6, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee on the Application for Annulment of Consortium R.F.C.C., para. 222 (January 18, 2006) [unofficial translation from French].
- “In annulment proceedings under Article 52 of the ICSID Convention, an *ad hoc* Committee is thus not a court of appeal, and cannot consider the substance of the dispute, but can only determine whether the award should be annulled on one of the grounds in Article 52(1).” *Enron Creditors Recovery Corporation (formerly Enron Corporation) and Ponderosa Assets, L.P. v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/3, Decision on the Application for Annulment of the Argentine Republic, para. 63 (July 30, 2010).
- “Under Article 52 of the ICSID Convention, an annulment proceeding is not an appeal, still less a retrial; it is a form of review on specified and limited grounds which take as their premise the record before the Tribunal.” *MTD Equity Sdn. Bhd. and MTD Chile S.A. v. Republic of Chile*, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/7, Decision on Annulment, para. 31 (March 21, 2007).
- “[T]he role of an *ad hoc* committee in the ICSID system is a limited one. It cannot substitute its determination on the merits for that of the tribunal. Nor can it direct a tribunal on a resubmission how it should resolve substantive issues in dispute. All it can do is annul the decision of the tribunal: it can extinguish a *res judicata* but on a question of merits it cannot create a new one.” *MTD Equity Sdn. Bhd. and MTD Chile S.A. v. Republic of Chile*, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/7, Decision on Annulment, para. 54 (March 21, 2007) (footnote omitted).
- “The Committee recalls, once more, that it has only a limited jurisdiction under Article 52 of the ICSID Convention. In the circumstances, the Committee cannot simply substitute its own view of the law and its own appreciation of the facts for those of the Tribunal.” *CMS Gas Transmission Company v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/8, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee on the Application for Annulment of the Argentine Republic, para. 136 (September 25, 2007).
- “The Parties are aware that the annulment proceedings are designed to grant reparation for damages only in cases of serious violations of certain fundamental principles. Such procedures should not be confused with the proceedings of an Appeals Tribunal and, therefore, should be adopted only in special situations.” *Repsol YPF Ecuador S.A. v. Empresa Estatal Petróleos del Ecuador (Petroecuador)*, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/10, Decision on the Application for Annulment, para. 86 (January 8, 2007) (footnote omitted) [unofficial translation from Spanish].
- “In annulment proceedings under Article 52 of the ICSID Convention, an *ad hoc* committee is thus not a court of appeal, and cannot consider the substance of the dispute, but can only determine whether the award should be annulled on one of the grounds in Article 52(1).” *Azurix Corp. v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/12, Decision on the Application for Annulment of the Argentine Republic, para. 41 (September 1, 2009) (footnotes omitted).

- “An *ad hoc* committee is responsible for controlling the overall integrity of the arbitral process and may not, therefore, simply determine which party has the better argument. This means that an annulment, as already stated, is to be distinguished from an ordinary appeal, and that, even when a ground for annulment is justifiably found, an annulment need not be the necessary outcome in all circumstances.” *Hussein Nuaman Soufraki v. United Arab Emirates*, ICSID Case No. ARB/02/7, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee on the Application for Annulment of Mr. Soufraki, para. 24 (June 5, 2007).
- “Article 52(1) looks not to the merits of the underlying dispute as such, but rather is concerned with the fundamental integrity of the tribunal, whether basic procedural guarantees were largely observed, whether the Tribunal exceeded the bounds of the parties’ consent, and whether the Tribunal’s reasoning is both coherent and displayed. To borrow Caron’s terminology, annulment is concerned with the ‘legitimacy’ of the process of decision” rather than with the ‘substantive correctness of decision.’ Because of its focus on procedural legitimacy, annulment is ‘an extraordinary remedy for unusual and important cases.’ That annulment is not the same thing as appeal is a principle acknowledged, although applied unevenly, in the various decisions of *ad hoc* Committees.” *CDC Group plc v. Republic of the Seychelles*, ICSID Case No. ARB/02/14, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee on the Application for Annulment of the Republic of Seychelles, para. 34 (June 29, 2005) (footnotes omitted).
- “Annulment is distinct from an appeal. An *ad hoc* committee cannot substitute its own judgment on the merits for the decision of the Tribunal.” *Sempra Energy International v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/02/16, Decision on the Argentine Republic’s Request for Annulment of the Award, para. 73 (June 29, 2010).
- “[A] request for annulment is not an appeal, which means that there should not be a full review of the tribunal’s award.” *Industria Nacional de Alimentos, S.A. and Indalsa Perú, S.A. (formerly Empresas Lucchetti, S.A. and Lucchetti Perú, S.A.) v. Republic of Peru*, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/4, Decision on Annulment, para. 101 (September 5, 2007).
- “[I]t is no part of the Committee’s functions to review the decision itself which the Tribunal arrived at, still less to substitute its own views for those of the Tribunal, but merely to pass judgment on whether the manner in which the Tribunal carried out its functions met the requirements of the ICSID Convention.” *Industria Nacional de Alimentos, S.A. and Indalsa Perú, S.A. (formerly Empresas Lucchetti, S.A. and Lucchetti Perú, S.A.) v. Republic of Peru*, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/4, Decision on Annulment, para. 97 (September 5, 2007).
- “It is an overarching principle that *ad hoc* committees are not entitled to examine the substance of the award but are only allowed to look at the award insofar as the list of grounds contained in Article 52 of the Washington Convention requires... Consequently, the role of an *ad hoc* committee is a limited one, restricted to assessing the legitimacy of the award and not its correctness. The committee cannot for example substitute its determination on the merits for that of the tribunal...” *M.C.I. Power Group, L.C. and New Turbine, Inc. v. Republic of Ecuador*, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/6, Decision on Annulment, para. 24 (October 19, 2009) (footnote omitted).

- “Although this Committee expressed earlier some reservations about the way the Tribunal proceeded in its interpretation exercise, it is not itself empowered to act as an appeal body and substitute its own interpretation of the BIT for the one adopted by the Arbitral Tribunal.” *Fraport AG Frankfurt Airport Services Worldwide v. Republic of the Philippines*, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/25, Decision on the Application for Annulment of Fraport AG Frankfurt Airport Services Worldwide, para. 112 (December 23, 2010).
- “An *ad hoc* committee, which is not an appellate body, is not called upon to substitute its own analysis of law and fact to that of the arbitral tribunal.” *Duke Energy International Peru Investments No. 1 Ltd. v. Republic of Peru*, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/28, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee, para. 144 (March 1, 2011).
- “It is very common for an *ad hoc* Committee considering an application for annulment to deem it necessary to delineate between appeal (which relates to the merits of the arbitral award) and annulment (a form of specific control over the arbitral process subject to the requirements of Article 52 of the ICSID Convention)... The Committee insists, however, on strongly emphasizing that annulment is certainly not a means by which a party to an arbitral proceeding may seek to invalidate the merits of the arbitral award that it does not like.” *Compagnie d’Exploitation du Chemin de Fer Transgabonais v. Gabonese Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/04/5, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee on the Application for Annulment of the Gabonese Republic, para. 19 (May 11, 2010) [unofficial translation from French].
- “An *ad hoc* committee may not replace the Tribunal’s decision on the merits of the dispute by its own decision.” *Sociedad Anónima Eduardo Vieira v. Republic of Chile*, ICSID Case No. ARB/04/7, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee on the Application for Annulment of Sociedad Anónima Eduardo Vieira, para. 235 (December 10, 2010) [unofficial translation from Spanish].
- “An *ad hoc* committee is not a court of appeal and cannot therefore enter, within the bounds of its limited mission, into an analysis of the probative value of the evidence produced by the parties.” *Rumeli Telekom A.S. and Telsim Mobil Telekomunikasyon Hizmetleri A.S. v. Republic of Kazakhstan*, ICSID Case No. ARB/05/16, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee, para. 96 (March 25, 2010).
- “In respect to the legal framework of the ICSID annulment proceedings, both Parties agree that an annulment proceeding is not an appeal process and that Article 52 of the ICSID Convention should be construed in accordance with the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.” *Rumeli Telekom A.S. and Telsim Mobil Telekomunikasyon Hizmetleri A.S. v. Republic of Kazakhstan*, ICSID Case No. ARB/05/16, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee, para. 70 (March 25, 2010).
- “It is no part of the function of an annulment committee to reconsider findings of fact made by an ICSID arbitral tribunal. Rather the issues for this Committee are circumscribed by the terms of Article 52(1) of the ICSID Convention and relate to the Tribunal itself: its powers; its process; and the reasoning of its Award.” *Helnan International Hotels A/S v. Arab Republic of Egypt*, ICSID Case No. ARB/05/19, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee, para. 20 (June 14, 2010).

- “Article 52 excludes a review of the Award on the merits to the extent that article 53(1) excludes any appeal. As a result, an *ad hoc* Committee cannot consider new matters regarding the merits of a case in an annulment proceeding.” *Togo Electricité and GDF-Suez Energie Services v. Republic of Togo*, ICSID Case No. ARB/06/7, Decision on Annulment, para. 50 (September 6, 2011) (footnote omitted) [unofficial translation from French].
- “An ICSID award is not subject to any appeal or to any other remedy except those provided for in the ICSID Convention. In annulment proceedings under Article 52 of the ICSID Convention, an *ad hoc* committee is thus not a court of appeal, and cannot consider the substance of the dispute, but can only determine whether the award should be annulled on one of the grounds in Article 52(1).” *Continental Casualty Company v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/9, Decision on the Application for Partial Annulment of Continental Casualty Company and the Application for Partial Annulment of the Argentine Republic, para. 81 (September 16, 2011) (footnotes omitted).
- “As unambiguously expressed in Article 53 of the Convention, an award is not subject to an appeal. Annulment must therefore be different from appeal. It is well settled in international investment arbitration that an *ad hoc* committee may not substitute its own judgment on the merits for that of a tribunal.” *AES Summit Generation Limited and AES-Tisza Erömü Kft. v. Hungary*, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/22, Decision of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Application for Annulment, para. 15 (June 29, 2012).
- “Article 52(1)(e) does not empower an *ad hoc* Committee to review the merits of a case. Indeed, such a review would amount to an appeal, which is an impermissible remedy pursuant to Article 53 of the ICSID Convention.” *Alapli Elektrik B.V. v. Republic of Turkey*, ICSID Case No. ARB/08/13, Decision on Annulment, para. 197 (July 10, 2014).
- “If this Committee were to undertake a careful and detailed analysis of the respective submissions of the parties before the Tribunal... and annul the Award on the ground that its understanding of facts or interpretation of law or appreciation of evidence is different from that of the Tribunal, it will cross the line that separates annulment from appeal.” *Daimler Financial Services A.G. v. Republic of Argentina* ICSID Case No. ARB/05/1, Decision on Annulment, para. 186 (January 7, 2015).
- “The annulment proceeding is not an appeal and therefore, is not a mechanism to correct alleged errors of fact or law that a tribunal may have committed.” *Daimler Financial Services A.G. v. Republic of Argentina* ICSID Case No. ARB/05/1, Decision on Annulment, para. 188 (January 7, 2015) (footnote omitted).
- “It is clear that Chile is here seeking in effect to appeal the Tribunal’s decision and is asking the Committee to substitute its decision for that of the Tribunal. As is well established, this is not the remit of an Annulment Committee. An *ad hoc* committee is not an appeal body.” *Víctor Pey Casado and Foundation “Presidente Allende” v. Republic of Chile*, ICSID Case No. ARB/98/2, Decision on the Application for Annulment of the Republic of Chile, para. 129 (December 18, 2012).

- “If the tribunal’s legal interpretation is reasonable or tenable, even if the committee might have taken a different view on a debatable point of law, the award must stand – otherwise the annulment procedure would expand into an appeal mechanism, in contravention of the clear wording of the Convention.” *Caratube International Oil Company LLP v. Republic of Kazakhstan*, ICSID Case No. ARB/08/12, Decision on the Annulment Application of Caratube International Oil Company LLP, para. 144 (February 21, 2014) (footnote omitted).
- “Article 52.1.e of the Convention is not a means by which a Committee may decide or influence the substance of the dispute. Indeed, this provision is no means of appeal, which is not disputed by the parties for that matter.” *RSM Production Corporation v. Central African Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/2, Decision on Annulment of RSM Production Corporation, para. 92 (February 20, 2013) [unofficial translation from French].
- “Most committees have understood that this recourse of annulment must be clearly distinguished from an appeal. The difference between appeal and annulment is relevant in two ways. First, as to the result of the review procedure: an appeal can modify the award under review, whereas annulment can only invalidate it (fully or partially) or assert its validity, without being able to modify its content. Second, as has been recognized (among others) by the Committees in *Soufraki* and *Pey Casado* in the annulment decision it is not pertinent to rule on the substantive correctness of the award, because the annulment regime was designed to protect the integrity and not the result of ICSID arbitration proceedings; therefore, annulment refers only to the legitimacy of the decision process and not to its merit.” *Iberdrola Energía, S.A. v. Republic of Guatemala*, ICSID Case No. ARB/09/5, Decision on the Request for Annulment of the Award Submitted by Iberdrola Energía, S.A., para. 74 (January 13, 2015) (footnotes omitted) [unofficial translation from Spanish].
- “It is the Arbitral Tribunal which must interpret the law. The Committee reiterates that it is not its function to act as an appeals tribunal.” *Mr. Tza Yap Shum v. Republic of Peru*, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/6, Decision on Annulment, para. 156 (February 12, 2015) [unofficial translation from Spanish].
- “In essence, there is a unanimous agreement that annulment is distinct from appeal. The *ad hoc* committees are not courts of appeal and their task is not to harmonize ICSID’s jurisprudence[.]” *SGS Société Générale de Surveillance S.A. v. Republic of Paraguay*, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/29, Decision on Annulment, para. 105 (May 19, 2014) (footnote omitted).
- “Allowing annulment committees to overturn incorrect applications of the law was specifically rejected by the drafters of the ICSID Convention because some delegates feared that this would call into question the finality of awards. Incorrect application of the law is thus not a basis for annulment except in the most egregious cases[.]” *Libananco Holdings Co. Ltd. v. Republic of Turkey*, ICSID Case No. ARB/06/8, Decision on Annulment, para. 97 (May 22, 2013) (footnote omitted).
- “[A]n examination of the reasons presented by a tribunal cannot be transformed into a re-examination of the correctness of the factual and legal premises on which the award is based. Committees do not have the power to review the adequacy of the reasons set forth by the tribunal in its award. Rather, the role of the committee is limited to analyzing whether a reader

can understand how the tribunal arrived at its conclusion. Broadening the scope of Article 52(1)(e) to comprise decisions with inadequate reasons would transform the annulment proceeding into an appeal.” *Occidental Petroleum Corporation and Occidental Exploration and Production Company v. Republic of Ecuador*, ICSID Case No. ARB/06/11, Decision on Annulment of the Award, para. 66 (November 2, 2015).

- “Annulment is fundamentally different from appeal. The result of a successful application for annulment is the invalidation of the original decision. The result of a successful appeal is its modification. A decision-maker exercising the power to annul only has the choice between leaving the original decision intact or annulling it in whole or in part. An appeals body may substitute its own decision for the decision that it has found to be deficient. Under the ICSID Convention, an ad hoc committee only has the power to annul the award. The ad hoc committee may not amend or replace the award by its own decision on the merits. Article 53(1) of the Convention explicitly rules out any appeal.” *Tulip Real Estate and Development Netherlands B.V. v. Republic of Turkey*, ICSID Case No. ARB/11/28, Decision on Annulment, para. 42 (December 30, 2015).
- “ICSID *ad hoc* committees have adamantly stressed the distinction between annulment and appeal. They have stated consistently that their functions are limited and that they do not have the powers of a court of appeal. A decision to annul has to be based on one of the five reasons listed in Article 52(1). *Ad hoc* committees cannot review an award’s findings for errors of fact or law.” *Tulip Real Estate and Development Netherlands B.V. v. Republic of Turkey*, ICSID Case No. ARB/11/28, Decision on Annulment, para. 44 (December 30, 2015) (footnotes omitted).
- “[I]t is a well established principle that, as the *ad hoc* committee in *MTD Equity and MTD Chile v. Republic of Chile* put it – Under Article 52 of the ICSID Convention, an annulment proceeding is not an appeal, still less a retrial; it is a form of review on specified and limited grounds which take as their premise the record before the Tribunal.” *EDF International S.A., SAUR International S.A. and León Participaciones Argentinas S.A. v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/23, Decision, para. 64 (February 5, 2016) (footnote omitted).
- “Article 53 of the ICSID Convention provides for the fundamental features of an arbitration award and confirms the well-established doctrine of finality in arbitration and the binding effect of the awards on the parties. The said article confirms also that the only recourse against the award available to the parties is limited to what is set out in Article 52 of the ICSID Convention and that no appeal is allowed.” *Total S.A. v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/04/1, Decision on Annulment, para. 164 (February 1, 2016) (footnote omitted).
- “As indicated before, the annulment proceeding is not an appeal and therefore is not a mechanism to correct alleged errors of fact or law that the tribunal may have committed. Annulment under the ICSID Convention is a limited remedy.” *Total S.A. v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/04/1, Decision on Annulment, para. 179 (February 1, 2016) (footnotes omitted).
- “[I]t is not within the Committee’s remit to review the substantive correctness of the Award, either in fact or in law. However, the Committee must examine the legitimacy of the arbitration

proceedings resulting in the Award. This means that it is not the Committee's function to sit in appeal on the Award of the Tribunal. It must not substitute its views for those of the Tribunal." *Adem Dogan v. Turkmenistan*, ICSID Case No. ARB/09/9, Decision on Annulment, para. 29 (January 15, 2016).

- "It is not within an *ad hoc* committee's remit to re-examine the facts of the case to determine whether a tribunal erred in appreciating or evaluating the available evidence. A tribunal's discretion in such matters of appreciation and evaluation of evidence is recognized by the ICSID system. An *ad hoc* committee cannot sit in appeal on a tribunal's assessment of the evidence. If the Committee were to proceed to a re-examination of the facts of the present case and an assessment of how the Tribunal evaluated the evidence before it, it would act as an appellate body. That is not a function envisaged for it by the ICSID Convention." *Adem Dogan v. Turkmenistan*, ICSID Case No. ARB/09/9, Decision on Annulment, para. 129 (January 15, 2016) (footnotes omitted).
- "The Committee notes that ICSID *ad hoc* committees have repeatedly held that the annulment mechanism is an exceptional and narrowly circumscribed remedy, and that it is not a remedy against an incorrect decision. As a result, committees have stressed the distinction between annulment and appeal, and stated that they cannot review the correctness of an award's findings on facts or law. The Committee agrees with *CMS v. Argentina* that a committee 'has only limited jurisdiction under Article 52 of the Convention' and 'cannot simply substitute its own view of the law and its own appreciation of the facts for those of the Tribunal.' The Committee will apply these general standards when considering each of the grounds for annulment pleaded in this case." *Ioan Micula, Viorel Micula and others v. Romania*, ICSID Case No. ARB/05/20, Decision on Annulment, para. 122 (February 26, 2016) (footnotes omitted).
- "Unreasoned awards can be annulled, because parties should be able to ascertain to what extent a tribunal's findings are based on a correct interpretation of the law and on a proper evaluation of the facts. However, as long as reasons have been stated, even if incorrect, unconvincing or non-exhaustive, the award cannot be annulled on this ground. Article 52(1)(e) does not permit any enquiry into the quality or persuasiveness of reasons." *Ioan Micula, Viorel Micula and others v. Romania*, ICSID Case No. ARB/05/20, Decision on Annulment, para. 135 (February 26, 2016) (footnotes omitted).
- "[A]*d hoc* committees are not courts of appeal, and annulment is not a remedy against a decision deemed as incorrect. This principle has been repeatedly stated by *ad hoc* committees." *Antoine Abou Lahoud and Leila Bounafteh-Abou Lahoud v. Democratic Republic of the Congo*, ICSID Case No. ARB/10/4, Decision on the Application for Annulment of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, para. 111 (March 29, 2016) (footnote omitted) [unofficial translation from French].
- "It is nevertheless necessary to distinguish between the non-application by the arbitral Tribunal of the normally applicable law that constitutes a ground for annulment, and the misapplication of the applicable law, which does not constitute an excess of power and is therefore not a ground for annulment." *Antoine Abou Lahoud and Leila Bounafteh-Abou Lahoud v. Democratic Republic of the Congo*, ICSID Case No. ARB/10/4, Decision on the Application

for Annulment of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, para. 119 (March 29, 2016) (footnotes omitted) [unofficial translation from French].

- “Within the carefully balanced system of remedies established by the ICSID Convention and the Arbitration Rules, annulment is concerned with ensuring the fundamental fairness and integrity of the underlying proceeding. As it has often been repeated, annulment is not an appeal and an annulment committee is not empowered to review the substantive correctness of the Award, either in fact or in law. An annulment committee may not, within the confines of an annulment proceeding, review the assessment of the factual record by a tribunal.” *TECO Guatemala Holdings, LLC v. Republic of Guatemala*, ICSID Case No. ARB/10/23, Decision on Annulment, para. 73 (April 5, 2016) (footnote omitted).

(4) *Ad hoc* Committees should exercise their discretion not to defeat the object and purpose of the remedy or erode the binding force and finality of awards

- “An *ad hoc* Committee retains a measure of discretion in ruling on applications for annulment. To be sure, its discretion is not unlimited and should not be exercised to the point of defeating the object and purpose of the remedy of annulment. It may, however, refuse to exercise its authority to annul an award where annulment is clearly not required to remedy procedural injustice and annulment would unjustifiably erode the binding force and finality of ICSID awards.” *Maritime International Nominees Establishment v. Republic of Guinea*, ICSID Case No. ARB/84/4, Decision on the Application by Guinea for Partial Annulment of the Arbitral Award dated January 6, 1988, para. 4.10 (December 22, 1989).
- “The *ad hoc* Committee may refuse to exercise its authority to annul an Award if and when annulment is clearly not needed to remedy procedural injustice and annulment would unwarrantably erode the binding force and finality of ICSID Awards.” *Amco Asia Corporation and others v. Republic of Indonesia (Amco II)*, ICSID Case No. ARB/81/1, Decision on the Applications by Indonesia and Amco Respectively for Annulment and Partial Annulment, para. 1.20 (December 17, 1992).
- “[It] appears to be established that an *ad hoc* committee has a certain measure of discretion as to whether to annul an award, even if an annulable error is found... Among other things, it is necessary for an *ad hoc* committee to consider the significance of the error relative to the legal rights of the parties.” *Compañía de Aguas del Aconquija S.A. and Vivendi Universal S.A. v. Argentine Republic (Vivendi I)*, ICSID Case No. ARB/97/3, Decision on Annulment, para. 66 (July 3, 2002).
- “Keeping the object and purpose of the Convention as well as these underlying policy considerations in mind, we note that the *ad hoc* Committees operating during the last two decades have considered that a Committee has discretion to determine not to annul an Award even where a ground for annulment under Article 52(1) is found to exist... We thus should consider the significance of the [alleged annulable] error relative to the legal rights of the parties.” *CDC Group plc v. Republic of the Seychelles*, ICSID Case No. ARB/02/14, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee on the Application for Annulment of the Republic of Seychelles, para. 37 (June 29, 2005) (footnotes omitted).

- “[The Committee] should therefore refrain from making an annulment decision too hastily. It must do so only in case of manifest error, substantial breach or, more specifically, whenever the breach is such that, if it had not been committed, the Tribunal would have reached a different outcome than the one reached. To this extent, the *ad hoc* Committee retains a measure of discretion.” *Consortium R.F.C.C. v. Kingdom of Morocco*, ICSID Case No. ARB/00/6, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee on the Application for Annulment of Consortium R.F.C.C., para. 226 (January 18, 2006) (citations omitted) [unofficial translation from French].
- “An *ad hoc* Committee should not decide to annul an award unless it is convinced that there has been a substantial violation of a rule protected by Article 52.” *Patrick Mitchell v. Democratic Republic of the Congo*, ICSID Case No. ARB/99/7, Decision on the Application for Annulment of the Award, para. 19 (November 1, 2006).
- “[E]ven in the case of annulable error, the *ad hoc* Committee still has a measure of discretion under Article 52(3) in ordering annulment or in refusing to do so.” *Compañía de Aguas del Aconquija S.A. and Vivendi Universal S.A. v. Argentine Republic (Vivendi II)*, ICSID Case No. ARB/97/3, Decision on the Argentine Republic’s Request for Annulment of the Award Rendered on 20 August 2007, para. 252 (August 10, 2010).
- “An *ad hoc* committee will not annul an award if the Tribunal’s disposition is tenable, even if the committee considers that it is incorrect as a matter of law.” *Helnan International Hotels A/S v. Arab Republic of Egypt*, ICSID Case No. ARB/05/19, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee, para. 55 (June 14, 2010) (footnote omitted).
- “The fundamental goal of the ICSID system is to assure the finality of the ICSID arbitration award. In this respect, the Committee agrees with Claimant that the annulment proceeding concerns serious procedural irregularities in the decisional process rather than an appeal on the merits. The limited and exceptional nature of the annulment remedy provided by Article 52 of the ICSID Convention forbids an inquiry on the substance of the case, on the misapplication of the law or on mistakes in analyzing the facts.” *Joseph C. Lemire v. Ukraine*, ICSID Case No. ARB/06/18, Decision on Ukraine’s Application for Annulment of the Award, para. 233 (July 8, 2013) (footnotes omitted).
- “Article 53 sets out the fundamental features of an arbitration award, reiterating the well-established doctrine of finality in arbitration and the binding effect of the awards on the parties... Given this framework this Committee concludes that in balancing these principles and interests, annulment is an exceptional recourse that should respect the finality of the award.” *Impregilo S.p.A. v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/17, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee on the Application for Annulment, para. 118 (January 24, 2014).
- “Article 52(3) of the ICSID Convention provides in part that ‘[t]he Committee shall have the authority to annul the award [...]’. Under the ordinary meaning of this provision, an *ad hoc* committee has some discretion and is not under an obligation to annul even if it finds that there is a ground for annulment listed in Article 52(1). Decisions on applications for annulment confirm that, even if a ground listed in Article 52(1) exists, annulment will ensue only if the flaw has had a serious adverse impact on one of the parties.” *Tulip Real Estate and*

Development Netherlands B.V. v. Republic of Turkey, ICSID Case No. ARB/11/28, Decision on Annulment, para. 45 (December 30, 2015) (footnote omitted).

- “The Committee considers that the [final sentence of Article 52(3) of the ICSID Convention] clearly indicate[s] that committees were intended to have a degree of discretion. To say that a committee ‘shall have the authority to annul the award’ is very different from saying that a committee ‘shall annul the award’. Moreover, the Committee notes that other *ad hoc* committees have proceeded on the basis that annulment was not mandatory and that they enjoyed a discretion whether or not to annul the award under consideration. The Committee concludes that, even if an Article 52(1) ground is made out, it nevertheless retains a discretion as to whether or not to annul the award. That discretion is by no means unlimited and must take account of all relevant circumstances, including the gravity of the circumstances which constitute the ground for annulment and whether or not they had – or could have had – a material effect upon the outcome of the case, as well as the importance of the finality of the award and the overall question of fairness to both Parties.” *EDF International S.A., SAUR International S.A. and León Participaciones Argentinas S.A. v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/23, Decision, para. 73 (February 5, 2016) (footnote omitted).
- “[I]t is also undisputed that an annulment committee should not review the merits. It is not the duty of an *ad hoc* committee under the ICSID Convention to revisit the merits of the case, or to comment on what it would have decided on the merits had it acted as an arbitral tribunal. Annulment is an exceptional recourse that should consider the finality of the award.” *Total S.A. v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/04/1, Decision on Annulment, para. 165 (February 1, 2016).
- “Thus, the grounds for annulment should be interpreted as being exhaustive, considering their object and purpose, as an exceptional remedy, against an award that is otherwise considered final and binding.” *Total S.A. v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/04/1, Decision on Annulment, para. 166 (February 1, 2016).

(5) Article 52 should be interpreted in accordance with its object and purpose, neither narrowly nor broadly

- “[A]pplication of the paragraph demands neither a narrow interpretation, nor a broad interpretation, but an appropriate interpretation, taking into account the legitimate concern to surround the exercise of the remedy to the maximum extent possible with guarantees in order to achieve a harmonious balance between the various objectives of the Convention.” *Klöckner Industrie-Anlagen GmbH and others v. United Republic of Cameroon and Société Camerounaise des Engrais (Klöckner I)*, ICSID Case No. ARB/81/2, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee, para. 3 (May 3, 1985) [unofficial translation from French].
- “The fact that annulment is a limited, and in that sense extraordinary, remedy might suggest either that the terms of Article 52(1), i.e., the grounds for annulment, should be strictly construed or, on the contrary, that they should be given a liberal interpretation since they represent the only remedy against unjust awards. The Committee has no difficulty in rejecting either suggestion. In its view, Article 52(1) should be interpreted in accordance with its object and purpose, which excludes on the one hand, as already stated, extending its application to

the review of an award on the merits and, on the other, an unwarranted refusal to give full effect to it within the limited but important area for which it was intended.” *Maritime International Nominees Establishment v. Republic of Guinea*, ICSID Case No. ARB/84/4, Decision on the Application by Guinea for Partial Annulment of the Arbitral Award dated January 6, 1988, para. 4.05 (December 22, 1989).

- “Article 52(1) should be interpreted in accordance with its object and purpose: this precludes its application to the review of an Award on the merits and in a converse case excludes an unwarranted refusal to give full effect to it within the limited but significant area for which it was intended.” *Amco Asia Corporation and others v. Republic of Indonesia (Amco II)*, ICSID Case No. ARB/81/1, Decision on the Applications by Indonesia and Amco Respectively for Annulment and Partial Annulment, para. 1.17 (December 17, 1992).
- “It also appears to be established that there is no presumption either in favour of or against annulment, a point acknowledged by Claimants as well as Respondent.” *Compañía de Aguas del Aconquija S.A. and Vivendi Universal S.A. v. Argentine Republic (Vivendi I)*, ICSID Case No. ARB/97/3, Decision on Annulment, para. 62 (July 3, 2002) (footnote omitted).
- “As has been stated in earlier published decisions made on requests for annulment of ICSID awards, the remedy of Article 52 is in no sense an appeal. The power for review is limited to the grounds of annulment as defined in this provision. These grounds are to be interpreted neither narrowly nor extensively.” *Wena Hotels Limited v. Arab Republic of Egypt*, ICSID Case No. ARB/98/4, Decision on the Application by the Arab Republic of Egypt for Annulment of the Arbitral Award dated December 8, 2000, para. 18 (February 5, 2002) (footnotes omitted).
- “As for the interpretation of grounds for annulment there is compelling support for the view that neither a narrow nor a broad approach is to be applied [footnote omitted].” *Sempra Energy International v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/02/16, Decision on the Argentine Republic’s Request for Annulment of the Award, para. 75 (June 29, 2010).
- “[T]he grounds for annulment set out in Article 52 must be examined in a neutral and reasonable manner, that is, neither narrowly nor extensively.” *Patrick Mitchell v. Democratic Republic of the Congo*, ICSID Case No. ARB/99/7, Decision on the Application for Annulment of the Award, para. 19 (November 1, 2006) (footnote omitted).
- “Furthermore, there is no presumption either in favor of or against annulment.” *Consortium R.F.C.C. v. Kingdom of Morocco*, ICSID Case No. ARB/00/6, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee on the Application for Annulment of Consortium R.F.C.C., para. 220 (January 18, 2006) (citation omitted) [unofficial translation from French].
- “Article 52 of the ICSID Convention must be read in accordance with the principles of treaty interpretation forming part of general international law, which principles insist on neither restrictive nor extensive interpretation, but rather on interpretation in accordance with the object and purpose of the treaty. Some commentators have suggested that in case of doubt, an annulment committee should decide in favor of the validity of the award. Such presumption, however, finds no basis in the text of Article 52 and has not been used by annulment

committees.” *Hussein Nuaman Soufraki v. United Arab Emirates*, ICSID Case No. ARB/02/7, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee on the Application for Annulment of Mr. Soufraki, paras. 21-22 (June 5, 2007) (footnote omitted).

- “As for the interpretation of grounds for annulment there is compelling support for the view that neither a narrow nor a broad approach is to be applied. Nor is there any preponderant inclination ‘*in favorem validitatis*’, i.e. a presumption in favour of the Award’s validity.” *Sempra Energy International v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/02/16, Decision on the Argentine Republic’s Application for Annulment of the Award, paras. 75-76 (June 29, 2010) (footnotes omitted).
- “[T]he Award shall be reviewed in light of the annulment grounds invoked by Iberdrola according to their genuine meaning, i.e. pursuant to an interpretation that is neither restrictive nor extensive, but limited to the scope and object of annulment.” *Iberdrola Energía, S.A. v. Republic of Guatemala*, ICSID Case No. ARB/09/5, Decision on the Request for Annulment of the Award Submitted by Iberdrola Energía, S.A., para. 77 (January 13, 2015) (footnote omitted) [unofficial translation from Spanish].
- “ICSID *ad hoc* committees have affirmed in their decisions, and this Committee agrees, that (a) the grounds listed in Article 52(1) are the only grounds on which an award may be annulled; (b) annulment is an exceptional and narrowly circumscribed remedy and the role of an *ad hoc* committee is limited; (c) *ad hoc* committees are not courts of appeal, annulment is not a remedy against an incorrect decision, and an *ad hoc* Committee cannot substitute the tribunal’s determination on the merits for its own; (d) *ad hoc* committees should exercise their discretion not to defeat the object and purpose of the remedy or erode the binding force and finality of awards; (e) Article 52 should be interpreted in accordance with its object and purpose, neither narrowly nor broadly; and (f) an *ad hoc* committee’s authority to annul is circumscribed by the Article 52 grounds specified in the application for annulment, but an *ad hoc* committee has discretion with respect to the extent of an annulment, i.e., either partial or full.” *Total S.A. v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/04/1, Decision on Annulment, para. 167 (February 1, 2016) (footnotes omitted).

(6) An *ad hoc* Committee’s authority to annul an award is circumscribed by the Article 52 grounds specified in the application for annulment, but an *ad hoc* Committee has discretion with respect to the extent of an annulment, i.e., either full or partial

- “[M]erely because the Parties agree on the total or partial annulment of the Award on the same ground does not mean that the Committee must follow their requests in whole or in part. The annulment procedure is above all a procedure for the protection of the law. It is not instituted merely in the interest of the Parties.” *Klöckner Industrie-Anlagen GmbH and others v. United Republic of Cameroon and Société Camerounaise des Engrais (Klöckner II)*, ICSID Case No. ARB/81/2, Decision on Annulment, para. 9.15 (May 17, 1990) [unofficial translation from French].
- “The Committee notes that an *ad hoc* Committee may annul an award (or any part thereof) only pursuant to a request by a party and only within the scope of that request, unless by necessary implication annulment entails the annulment of other portions.” *Maritime*


International Nominees Establishment v. Republic of Guinea, ICSID Case No. ARB/84/4, Decision on the Application by Guinea for Partial Annulment of the Arbitral Award dated January 6, 1988, para. 4.08 (December 22, 1989).

- “[W]here a ground for annulment is established, it is for the *ad hoc* committee, and not the requesting party, to determine the extent of the annulment. In making this determination, the committee is not bound by the applicant’s characterisation of its request, whether in the original application or otherwise, as requiring either complete or partial annulment of the award.” *Compañía de Aguas del Aconquija S.A. and Vivendi Universal S.A. v. Argentine Republic (Vivendi I)*, ICSID Case No. ARB/97/3, Decision on Annulment, para. 69 (July 3, 2002).
- “The *ad hoc* Committee derives its authority from the same source, the parties’ will, as the Arbitral Tribunal itself. Its authority is no more legitimate than that of the Arbitral Tribunal. It should therefore refrain from deciding to annul too hastily.” *Consortium R.F.C.C. v. Kingdom of Morocco*, ICSID Case No. ARB/00/6, Decision of the *ad hoc* Committee on the Application for Annulment of Consortium R.F.C.C., para. 226 (January 18, 2006) [unofficial translation from French].
- “Once an *ad hoc* committee has concluded that there is one instance of manifest excess of powers (or any other ground for annulment), which warrants annulment of the Award in its entirety, this will be the end of the *ad hoc* committee’s examination. Since annulment of an award in its entirety necessarily leads to the loss of the *res judicata* effect of all matters adjudicated by the Tribunal, it is unnecessary to consider whether there are other grounds - whether in respect of the same matter or other matters - that may also lead to annulment. On the other hand, an *ad hoc* committee will need to proceed differently where it decides not to annul the Award or decides to annul the Award only in part. In those instances it will be necessary for the *ad hoc* committee to examine all of the grounds invoked by the applicant in support of its application.” *Sempra Energy International v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/02/16, Decision on the Argentine Republic’s Application for Annulment of the Award, paras. 78-79 (June 29, 2010).
- “Awards can be annulled in their entirety ‘or any part thereof’ [Article 52 (3)]. Committees, however, are not empowered to amend or replace such awards, nor to review the merits of the dispute. Factual findings and weighing of evidence made by tribunals are, as a general rule, outside the remit of *ad hoc* committees.” *Occidental Petroleum Corporation and Occidental Exploration and Production Company v. Republic of Ecuador*, ICSID Case No. ARB/06/11, Decision on Annulment of the Award, para. 47 (November 2, 2015) (footnote omitted).
- “ICSID *ad hoc* committees have affirmed in their decisions, and this Committee agrees, that... an *ad hoc* committee’s authority to annul is circumscribed by the Article 52 grounds specified in the application for annulment, but an *ad hoc* committee has discretion with respect to the extent of an annulment, *i.e.*, either partial or full.” *Total S.A. v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/04/1, Decision on Annulment, para. 167 (February 1, 2016) (footnotes omitted).

B. *The Interpretation of Specific Grounds*

75. The grounds for annulment in Article 52(1) of the ICSID Convention are: (a) the improper constitution of the Tribunal; (b) manifest excess of powers by the Tribunal; (c) corruption on the part of a Tribunal member; (d) a serious departure from a fundamental rule of procedure; and (e) failure to state reasons. Grounds (b), (d) and (e) are the most frequently relied upon grounds for annulment and they are usually invoked cumulatively in support of the application to annul an award.¹³⁹

Grounds Invoked in Annulment Proceedings



76. The specific grounds for annulment were discussed in the drafting history of the ICSID Convention and have been extensively analyzed and interpreted in ICSID cases, in particular grounds (b), (d) and (e). The following is a brief summary of the meaning of these grounds as indicated in the drafting history and as interpreted by *ad hoc* Committees. The table at Annex 2 details the grounds invoked in annulment decisions, showing which were upheld and rejected.¹⁴⁰

(i) *Improper Constitution of the Tribunal*

77. The drafting history of the ICSID Convention indicates that the ground of improper constitution of the Tribunal was intended to cover situations such as a departure from the

¹³⁹ ICSID Convention Article 52(1) provides that a party may request annulment “on one or more” grounds.

¹⁴⁰ See “Annulment Grounds in Concluded Proceedings,” Annex 2.

parties' agreement on the method of constituting the Tribunal or an arbitrator's failure to meet the nationality or other requirements for becoming a member of the Tribunal.¹⁴¹

78. No provision of the ICSID Convention or rules explicitly addresses when a Tribunal might be considered to be improperly constituted. However, Chapter I of the ICSID Arbitration Rules, entitled "Establishment of the Tribunal," provides detailed rules concerning constitution of a Tribunal, including nationality and other requirements for Tribunal members, the appointment process, and the arbitrator's declaration of impartiality and independence.¹⁴² The parties may raise an objection concerning compliance with any of these provisions, which should be addressed by the Tribunal as soon as it has been constituted. In practice, Tribunals consistently ask the parties whether they have any objection to the constitution of the Tribunal or to any individual member during the Tribunal's first session dealing with procedural matters.¹⁴³ If a Tribunal decides that it has been properly constituted following an objection by a party, that party must await the Tribunal's award before filing an application for annulment on this ground.¹⁴⁴

79. Improper constitution of a Tribunal has been raised in only 5 annulment cases leading to decisions. Four rejected the allegation based on this ground.¹⁴⁵ In a fifth case, the *ad hoc* Committee did not address the ground, as it had already decided to annul the award in full based on another ground.¹⁴⁶

80. The 5 decisions indicate that annulment applications based on this ground are likely to succeed only in rare circumstances. One annulment decision held that the *ad hoc* Committee's role is limited to considering whether the provisions concerning constitution of the Tribunal were respected in the original proceeding, and does not extend to matters such as review of the Tribunal's decision on a request for disqualification of a Tribunal member under Article 58 of the Convention.¹⁴⁷ *Ad hoc* Committees have also indicated that a party with knowledge of an alleged improper constitution of the Tribunal in the original proceeding who fails to raise such issue may be taken to have waived its right to raise this as a ground for annulment.¹⁴⁸

(ii) Manifest Excess of Powers

81. The drafters of the ICSID Convention anticipated an excess of powers when a Tribunal went beyond the scope of the parties' arbitration agreement, decided points which had not

¹⁴¹ See *supra* para. 18.

¹⁴² See Arbitration Rules 1-12 (which implement the provisions of ICSID Convention Articles 14(1), 37-40 & 56-58).

¹⁴³ See Arbitration Rule 13(1). The first session is to be held within 60 days after the Tribunal's constitution or such other period as the parties may agree.

¹⁴⁴ History, *supra* note 5, at Vol. II, 851 & 852.

¹⁴⁵ See Annex 2; *Vivendi II*; *Azurix*; *Transgabonais*; *EDF*.

¹⁴⁶ *Sempra*.

¹⁴⁷ *Azurix*, paras. 272-284.

¹⁴⁸ *Azurix*, para. 291; *Transgabonais*, paras. 129 & 130.

been submitted to it, or failed to apply the law agreed to by the parties.¹⁴⁹ The main powers of the Tribunal that appear to have been contemplated by this provision thus relate to the Tribunal's jurisdiction and to the applicable law. These two categories will be described separately below.

82. Article 52(1)(b) of the ICSID Convention provides that only instances of “manifest” excess of the Tribunal's powers may lead to an annulment, indicating a dual requirement of an “excess” that is “manifest.”¹⁵⁰ As a result, *ad hoc* Committees have identified two methodological approaches to determine whether there is an annulable error on this ground. The first is a two-step analysis determining whether there was an excess of powers and, if so, whether the excess was “manifest.”¹⁵¹ The second is a *prima facie* test, consisting of a summary examination to determine whether any of the alleged excesses of power could be viewed as “manifest.”¹⁵²

83. The “manifest” nature of the excess of powers has been interpreted by most *ad hoc* Committees to mean an excess that is obvious, clear or self-evident,¹⁵³ and which is discernable without the need for an elaborate analysis of the award.¹⁵⁴ However, some *ad hoc* Committees have interpreted the meaning of “manifest” to require that the excess be serious or material to the outcome of the case.¹⁵⁵

¹⁴⁹ See *supra* paras. 14, 19-20.

¹⁵⁰ See *supra* paras. 14, 19-21.

¹⁵¹ *Sempra*, para. 212; *Fraport*, para. 40; *AES*, para. 32; *Lemire* para. 240; *Occidental*, para. 57; *EDF*, para. 191; *Total*, para. 171; *Micula*, para. 123; *TECO*, para. 76.

¹⁵² *Id.* One *ad hoc* Committee has stated that “‘manifest’ does not prevent that in some cases an extensive argumentation and analysis may be required to prove that the misuse of power has in fact occurred.” *Occidental*, para. 267.

¹⁵³ *Vivendi II*, para. 245 (“must be ‘evident’”); *Repsol*, para. 36 (“obvious by itself”); *Azurix*, para. 68 (“obvious”); *Soufraki*, para. 39 (“obviousness”) (citing *Webster’s Revised Unabridged Dictionary* (1913) (“‘clear,’ ‘plain,’ ‘obvious,’ ‘evident’...”)); *CDC*, para. 41 (citing *Wena*, para. 25 (“clear or ‘self-evident’”)); *MCI*, para. 49 (citing *Wena*, para. 25) (“self-evident”); *Rumeli*, para. 96 (“evident on the face of the Award”); *Helnan*, para. 55 (“obvious or clear”); *Malicorp*, para. 56 (“both obvious and serious”); *Tza Yap Shum*, para. 82 (“must be evident”); *SGS*, para. 122 (“textually obvious and substantively serious”); *Libananco*, para. 82 (“‘self-evident,’ ‘clear,’ ‘plain on its face’ or ‘certain’”); *Occidental*, para. 57 (“perceived without difficulty”); *Tulip*, para. 56 (“obvious, clear or easily recognizable”); *Micula*, para. 123 (“evident, obvious, clear or easily recognizable”); *Total*, para. 173; *Dogan*, para. 103; *Lahoud*, para. 128; *TECO*, paras. 77, 181.

¹⁵⁴ See *Wena*, para. 25 (“The excess of power must be self-evident rather than the product of elaborate interpretations one way or the other.”); *Mitchell*, para. 20 (manifest if found “with certainty and immediacy, without it being necessary to engage in elaborate analyses of the award”); *Enron*, para. 69 (quoting *MTD*, para. 47 (“not arguable”)); *Repsol*, para. 36 (quoting Christoph H. Schreuer, *The ICSID Convention: A Commentary* 933 (Cambridge University Press 2001) (“discerned with little effort and without deeper analysis”)); *Azurix*, paras. 48 & 68; *CDC*, para. 41 (“Any excess apparent in a Tribunal's conduct, if susceptible ‘one way or the other’, is not manifest”); *Sempra*, para. 213 (“quite evident without the need to engage in an elaborate analysis”); *MCI*, para. 49 (“the manifest excess requirement in Article 52(1)(b) suggests a somewhat higher degree of proof than a searching analysis of the findings of the Tribunal”); *El Paso*, para. 142 (“obvious, evident, clear, self-evident and extremely serious”).

¹⁵⁵ *Klöckner I*, para. 52(e) (“the [Tribunal's] answers seem tenable and not arbitrary”); *Vivendi I*, para. 86 (“clearly capable of making a difference to the result”); *Soufraki*, para. 40 (“at once be textually obvious and substantially serious”); *Fraport*, para. 44 (“demonstrable and substantial and not doubtful”); *MHS*, para. 80; *AES*, para. 31;

84. Manifest excess of powers has been invoked in every case but one leading to a decision on annulment.¹⁵⁶ There have been 9 instances of partial or full annulment on this basis.¹⁵⁷

(a) Manifest Excess of Powers Relating to Jurisdiction

85. A Tribunal is expected to observe the parties' arbitration agreement. If a Tribunal goes beyond the scope of the parties' arbitration agreement, it in effect surpasses the mandate granted to it by the parties. In addition, the ICSID Convention prescribes certain mandatory requirements that must be fulfilled for a Tribunal to have jurisdiction.¹⁵⁸ These jurisdictional requirements require: (i) 'a legal dispute;' (ii) 'arising directly out of an investment;' (iii) 'between a Contracting State (or any constituent subdivision or agency of a Contracting State designated to the Centre by that State);' (iv) 'and a national of another Contracting State;' (v) 'which the parties to the dispute consent in writing to submit to the Centre.'¹⁵⁹ The parties cannot agree to derogate from these criteria. In fact, the Tribunal must decline jurisdiction where a mandatory requirement is not met, even if neither party has raised any objection to jurisdiction.¹⁶⁰

86. Objections to jurisdiction are often raised in international investment cases and the jurisdictional requirements have been extensively discussed and analyzed in such cases.

87. *Ad hoc* Committees have held that there may be an excess of powers if a Tribunal incorrectly concludes that it has jurisdiction when in fact jurisdiction is lacking,¹⁶¹ or when the Tribunal exceeds the scope of its jurisdiction.¹⁶² It has been recognized, in the inverse case, that a Tribunal's rejection of jurisdiction when jurisdiction exists also amounts to an excess of powers.¹⁶³

Impregilo, para. 128 ("obvious, self-evident, clear, flagrant and substantially serious"); *Libananco*, para. 102; *Total*, para. 308.

¹⁵⁶ The exception is *RSM v. Central African Republic*.

¹⁵⁷ *Amco I* (partial); *Klöckner I* (full); *Vivendi I* (partial); *Mitchell* (full); *Enron* (partial); *Sempra* (full); *MHS* (full); *Helnan* (partial); and *Occidental* (partial).

¹⁵⁸ ICSID Convention Article 25(1).

¹⁵⁹ *Id.*

¹⁶⁰ ICSID Convention Article 41(1).

¹⁶¹ *Vivendi I*, para. 86; *Mitchell*, paras. 47, 48 & 67; *CMS*, para. 47 (quoting *Klöckner I*, para. 4); *Azurix*, para. 45 (quoting *Klöckner I*, para. 4); *Lucchetti*, para. 99; *MCI*, para. 56 (quoting *Lucchetti*, para. 99); *Occidental*, paras. 49-51; *Tulip*, para. 55; *EDF*, para. 191; *Total*, para. 242; *Dogan*, para. 105; *Micula*, para. 125; *Lahoud*, para. 118; *TECO*, para. 77.

¹⁶² *Klöckner I*, para. 4; *Soufraki*, para. 42; *Occidental*, paras. 49-51; *Tulip*, para. 55; *Total*, para. 242; *Dogan*, para. 105; *Micula*, para. 125; *Lahoud*, para. 118; *TECO*, para. 77.

¹⁶³ *Vivendi I*, para. 86; *Soufraki*, para. 43 (quoting *Vivendi I*, para. 86); *Lucchetti*, para. 99; *Fraport*, para. 36 (citing *Vivendi I*, para. 86); *MHS*, para. 80; *Helnan*, para. 41 (citing *Soufraki*, para. 44; *Vivendi I*, para. 86); *Caratube*, para. 75 (quoting *Vivendi I*, para. 115; *MHS*, para. 80); *Tulip*, para. 55; *Dogan*, para. 105; *Micula*, para. 126.

88. At the same time, *ad hoc* Committees have acknowledged the principle specifically provided by the Convention that the Tribunal is the judge of its own competence.¹⁶⁴ This means that the Tribunal has the power to decide whether it has jurisdiction to hear the parties' dispute based on the parties' arbitration agreement and the jurisdictional requirements in the ICSID Convention. In light of this principle, the drafting history suggests—and most *ad hoc* Committees have reasoned—that in order to annul an award based on a Tribunal's determination of the scope of its own jurisdiction, the excess of powers must be “manifest.”¹⁶⁵ However, one *ad hoc* Committee found that an excess of jurisdiction or failure to exercise jurisdiction is a manifest excess of powers when it is capable of affecting the outcome of the case.¹⁶⁶

89. The issue of lack or excess of jurisdiction has been ruled on in 30 annulment decisions and has led to one full and one partial annulment.¹⁶⁷ In addition, the non-exercise of an existing jurisdiction has been decided in 13 decisions and has resulted in one full and 2 partial annulments.¹⁶⁸

(b) Manifest Excess of Powers Relating to the Applicable Law

90. The drafting history of the ICSID Convention shows that a Tribunal's failure to apply the proper law could constitute a manifest excess of powers, but that erroneous application of the law could not amount to an annulable error, even if it is manifest.¹⁶⁹ As stated above, there is no basis for an annulment due to an incorrect decision by a Tribunal, a principle that has been expressly recognized by many *ad hoc* Committees.¹⁷⁰

91. The ICSID Convention provides as follows concerning the law to be applied by a Tribunal:

The Tribunal shall decide a dispute in accordance with such rules of law as may be agreed by the parties. In the absence of such agreement, the Tribunal shall apply the law of the Contracting State party to the dispute (including

¹⁶⁴ *Enron*, para. 69 (citing *Azurix*, para. 67); *Azurix*, para. 67; *Soufraki*, para. 50; *SGS v. Paraguay*, para. 114; see also History, *supra* note 5, at Vol. I, 186-190, Vol. II, 206, 291-92, 406 & 511; International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, *Report of the Executive Directors on the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States*, para. 38 (March 18, 1965).

¹⁶⁵ See *supra* para. 19; *MTD*, para. 54; *Azurix*, paras. 64-66 (quoting *Lucchetti*, paras. 101 & 102); *Soufraki*, paras. 118 & 119 (“the requirement that an excess of power must be ‘manifest’ applies equally if the question is one of jurisdiction”); *Lucchetti*, para. 101; *Rumeli*, para. 96; *SGS v. Paraguay*, para. 114; *Kılıç*, para. 56; *Total*, para. 176; *TECO*, para. 219.

¹⁶⁶ *Vivendi I*, paras. 72 & 86.

¹⁶⁷ See *Mitchell*, para. 67. The award in *Mitchell* was annulled in full on 2 grounds: manifest excess of powers and failure to state the reasons. See *Occidental*, para. 590. The award in *Occidental* was partially annulled on this ground.

¹⁶⁸ *Vivendi I* (partial); *Helnan* (partial); *MHS* (full).

¹⁶⁹ See *supra* paras. 15 & 21.

¹⁷⁰ See *supra* para. 74.

its rules on the conflict of laws) and such rules of international law as may be applicable.¹⁷¹

92. Where the parties' agree on applicable law, a disregard of this law would likely be equivalent to a derogation from the mandate conferred on the Tribunal by the parties.

93. *Ad hoc* Committees agree that a Tribunal's complete failure to apply the proper law or acting *ex aequo et bono* without agreement of the parties to do so as required by the ICSID Convention could constitute a manifest excess of powers.¹⁷² However, *ad hoc* Committees have taken different approaches to whether an error in the application of the proper law may effectively amount to non-application of the proper law. Some *ad hoc* Committees have concluded that gross or egregious misapplication or misinterpretation of the law may lead to annulment,¹⁷³ while others have found that such an approach comes too close to an appeal.¹⁷⁴ Similarly, *ad hoc* Committees have discussed whether application of a law different from that purportedly applied by the Tribunal could be considered a manifest excess of powers.¹⁷⁵ These discussions have led *ad hoc* Committees to observe that there is sometimes a fine line between failure to apply the proper law and erroneous application of the law.¹⁷⁶ In this connection, one issue discussed by some *ad hoc* Committees concerns which rules of law apply when consent to arbitration is based on an arbitration clause in a bilateral investment treaty.¹⁷⁷

94. The failure to apply the proper law has been invoked in 44 out of 52 annulment decisions. It has led to two partial and two full annulments.¹⁷⁸

(iii) Corruption on the Part of a Tribunal Member

95. The drafters of the ICSID Convention decided not to replace the word "corruption" with "misconduct," "lack of integrity" or "a defect in moral character."¹⁷⁹ They also decided not

¹⁷¹ ICSID Convention Article 42(1).

¹⁷² *Amco I*, paras. 23 & 28; *Amco II*, para. 7.28; *Klöckner I*, para. 79; *MINE*, para. 5.03; *Enron*, para. 218 (quoting *Azurix*, para. 136 (footnotes omitted)); *MTD*, para. 44; *CMS*, para. 49; *Soufraki*, para. 85 (quoting *Amco I*, para. 23); *Daimler*, para. 153; *Tulip*, para. 58; *EDF*, para. 191; *Total*, para. 195; *Dogan*, para. 98; *Micula*, para. 127; *Lahoud*, para. 118; *TECO*, paras. 283, 311.

¹⁷³ *Soufraki*, para. 86; *Sempra*, para. 164; *MCI*, paras. 43 & 51 (quoting *Soufraki*, para. 86); *MHS*, para. 74; *AES*, paras. 33 & 34 (quoting *Soufraki*, para. 86); *Caratube*, para. 81 (quoting *Soufraki*, para. 86); *Dogan*, para. 105; *Micula*, para. 130; *Lahoud*, para. 121.

¹⁷⁴ *MINE*, paras. 5.03 & 5.04; *MTD*, para. 47; *CMS*, paras. 50-51 (quoting *MINE*, paras. 5.03 & 5.04; *MTD*, para. 47); *Sempra*, para. 206; *Impregilo*, para. 131; *El Paso*, para. 144; *Occidental*, para. 56.

¹⁷⁵ *MTD*, para. 47; *CMS*, para. 51 (quoting *MTD*, para. 47); *Azurix*, para. 136, fn 118 (citing *MTD*, para. 47); *Sempra*, para. 163, fn 44 (citing *MTD*, para. 47); *Occidental*, para. 55.

¹⁷⁶ *Klöckner I*, para. 60; *Enron*, paras. 68 & 220; *Azurix*, para. 47; *Iberdrola*, para. 98; *Dogan*, paras. 106-108.

¹⁷⁷ *Enron*; *CMS*; *Sempra*.

¹⁷⁸ *Amco I* (partial); *Klöckner I* (full); *Enron* (partial); *Sempra* (full).

¹⁷⁹ See *supra* para. 22.

to limit this ground to cases of corruption evidenced by a court judgment or a showing of “reasonable proof that corruption might exist.”¹⁸⁰

96. When an arbitrator agrees to serve as a member of a Tribunal, the arbitrator is required to sign a declaration that he or she “shall not accept any instruction or compensation with regard to the proceeding from any source except as provided in the ICSID Convention.”¹⁸¹ An arbitrator’s conduct in breach of that declaration can thus lead to annulment of an award. If a party has knowledge of such conduct during the proceeding before the Tribunal, it should file a request for disqualification based on Article 57 of the ICSID Convention.

97. This ground has not been dealt with in any decision on annulment to date.

(iv) Serious Departure from a Fundamental Rule of Procedure

98. It appears from the drafting history of the ICSID Convention that the ground of a “serious departure from a fundamental rule of procedure” has a wide connotation including principles of natural justice, but that it excludes the Tribunal’s failure to observe ordinary arbitration rules. The phrase “fundamental rules of procedure” was explained by the drafters as a reference to principles.¹⁸² One such fundamental principle mentioned during the negotiations was the parties’ right to be heard.¹⁸³ The drafting history thus indicates that this ground is concerned with the integrity and fairness of the arbitral process.

99. Based on the words “serious” and “fundamental” in this ground, *ad hoc* Committees have adopted a dual analysis: the departure from a rule of procedure must be serious and the rule must be fundamental.¹⁸⁴ *Ad hoc* Committees have thus consistently held that not every departure from a rule of procedure justifies annulment.¹⁸⁵ Examples of fundamental rules of procedure identified by *ad hoc* Committees concern: (i) the equal treatment of the parties;¹⁸⁶ (ii) the right to be heard;¹⁸⁷ (iii) an independent and impartial Tribunal;¹⁸⁸ (iv)

¹⁸⁰ *Id.*

¹⁸¹ *See* Arbitration Rule 6(2), which provides the standard form of the declaration.

¹⁸² *See supra* para. 23.

¹⁸³ *See supra* para. 16.

¹⁸⁴ *Amco II*, para. 9.07; *MINE*, para. 4.06; *Wena*, para. 56; *CDC*, para. 48; *Fraport*, para. 180; *Malicorp*, para. 28; *Libananco*, para. 84. *See also Iberdrola*, para. 103 (recognizing these two cumulative requirements and noting that “although the qualifier of fundamental is not found in the Spanish version [of the ICSID Convention], it should equally be understood as incorporated”) [unofficial translation from Spanish]; *Occidental*, para. 62; *Tulip*, para. 70; *EDF*, paras. 199-200; *Micula*, paras. 131-134, 283; *TECO*, para. 81.

¹⁸⁵ *MINE*, para. 4.06; *CDC*, para. 48; *Fraport*, para. 186; *Tulip*, para. 71; *Total*, para. 312.

¹⁸⁶ *Amco I*, paras. 87 & 88; *Malicorp* para. 36; *Iberdrola*, para. 105; *Tulip*, paras. 72, 84, 145; *Total*, paras. 309, 314.

¹⁸⁷ *Amco II*, paras. 9.05-9.10; *Klöckner I*, paras. 89-92; *Wena*, para. 57; *CDC*, para. 49; *Lucchetti*, para. 71; *Fraport*, para. 197; *Víctor Pey Casado*, paras. 261-71; *Malicorp*, paras. 29, 36; *Iberdrola*, para. 105; *Occidental*, para. 60; *Tulip*, paras. 80, 145; *Total*, paras. 309, 314; *TECO*, para. 184.

¹⁸⁸ *Klöckner I*, para. 95; *Wena*, para. 57; *CDC*, paras. 51-55; *EDF*, paras. 123-125; *Total*, paras. 309, 314.

the treatment of evidence and burden of proof;¹⁸⁹ and (v) deliberations among members of the Tribunal.¹⁹⁰

100. The task of determining whether an alleged fundamental rule of procedure has been seriously breached is usually very fact specific, involving an examination of the conduct of the proceeding before the Tribunal. Some *ad hoc* Committees have required that the departure have a material impact on the outcome of the award for the annulment to succeed.¹⁹¹

101. The ground of serious departure from a fundamental rule of procedure has been pursued in 41 proceedings which led to annulment decisions. It resulted in the annulment in full of one award, the annulment in part of two further awards, and in the annulment of one decision on supplemental decisions and rectification.¹⁹²

(v) Failure to State the Reasons on which the Award is Based

102. During the drafting of the ICSID Convention, the ground of “failure to state the reasons on which the award is based” was originally included in the ground of a “serious departure from a fundamental rule of procedure.”¹⁹³ It subsequently became a stand-alone ground. In addition, a proposed qualifier enabling parties to waive the requirement that reasons be stated was eliminated during the negotiation of the Convention.¹⁹⁴ This elimination of the proposed waiver related to the removal of the same discretion in another provision in the Convention, which now reads: “[t]he award shall deal with every question submitted to the Tribunal, and shall state the reasons upon which it is based.”¹⁹⁵ There is thus a clear link between the provision in the Convention requiring the Tribunal to state the reasons for the award, and the ground providing for annulment when there has been a failure to provide the reasons on which the award is based. The drafting history of the Convention concerning annulment based on a failure to state reasons does not provide further guidance as to when such a failure has occurred, nor does the Convention specify the manner in which a Tribunal’s reasons should be stated.

103. While a Tribunal must deal with every question submitted to it, the drafting history indicates that a failure to do so should not result in annulment.¹⁹⁶ Instead, the ICSID Convention provides another remedy where a Tribunal fails to address a question: the

¹⁸⁹ *Amco I*, paras. 90 & 91; *Klöckner II*, para. 6.80; *Wena*, paras. 59-61; *Iberdrola*, para. 105; *Total*, paras. 309, 314.

¹⁹⁰ *Klöckner I*, para. 84; *CDC*, para. 58; *Daimler*, paras. 297-303; *Iberdrola*, para. 105; *Total*, paras. 309, 314.

¹⁹¹ *Wena*, para. 58; *Repsol*, para. 81; *CDC*, para. 49; *Fraport*, para. 246; *Impregilo*, para. 164; *El Paso*, para. 269; *Iberdrola*, para. 104; *Dogan*, para. 208; *Micula*, para. 134; *TECO*, paras. 82-85. See also the analysis of the Annulment Committee in *Kılıç*.

¹⁹² *Fraport* (partial); *Victor Pey Casado* (full); *Amco II* (supplemental decision and rectification); *TECO* (partial).

¹⁹³ See *supra* para. 8.

¹⁹⁴ See *supra* para. 24.

¹⁹⁵ *Id.*; ICSID Convention Article 48(3).

¹⁹⁶ History, *supra* note 5, at Vol. II, 849.

dissatisfied party may request that the same Tribunal issue a supplementary decision concerning the question not addressed.¹⁹⁷ In addition, if there is a dispute between the parties as to the meaning or scope of the award, either party may request interpretation of the award by the original Tribunal.¹⁹⁸ Therefore, certain issues relating to the reasoning or lack of reasoning in an award can be heard by the Tribunal that rendered the award.¹⁹⁹

104. At the same time, if a Tribunal's failure to address a particular question submitted to it might have affected the Tribunal's ultimate decision, this could, in the view of some *ad hoc* Committees, amount to a failure to state reasons and could warrant annulment.²⁰⁰ *Ad hoc* Committees have also noted that such failure could amount to a serious departure from a fundamental rule of procedure.²⁰¹ A recent Decision on Annulment found that the failure to address certain evidence relevant to the determination of damages amounted to a failure to state the reasons.²⁰²

105. *Ad hoc* Committees have explained that the requirement to state reasons is intended to ensure that parties can understand the reasoning of the Tribunal, meaning the reader can understand the facts and law applied by the Tribunal in coming to its conclusion.²⁰³ The correctness of the reasoning or whether it is convincing is not relevant.²⁰⁴

¹⁹⁷ ICSID Convention Article 49(2). The request must be made within 45 days of the dispatch of the award. The supplementary decision becomes part of the award and is thus subject to the remedy of annulment.

¹⁹⁸ *Id.* at Article 50(1). There is no time bar for a request to interpret an award under the ICSID Convention.

¹⁹⁹ *Wena*, para. 100; *Tulip*, para. 113.

²⁰⁰ *Amco I*, para. 32; *Klöckner I*, para. 115; *MINE*, para. 5.13; *Soufraki*, para. 126; *Duke Energy*, para. 228; *Lemire*, para. 279; *EDF*, paras. 197-198. In *Alapli*, the Committee held that "it is for the Tribunal to determine the questions which are material to resolve the dispute between the parties and put these to vote." *Alapli*, para. 129.

²⁰¹ *Amco I*, para. 32; *Klöckner I*, para. 115.

²⁰² *TECO*, paras. 123-139. The *ad hoc* Committee stated: "While the Committee accepts that a tribunal cannot be required to address within its award each and every piece of evidence in the record, that cannot be construed to mean that a tribunal can simply gloss over evidence upon which the Parties have placed significant emphasis, without any analysis and without explaining why it found that evidence insufficient, unpersuasive or otherwise unsatisfactory." *Id.*, para. 131. In view of the partial annulment on this ground, the *ad hoc* Committee did not deal with a similar argument under Article 52(1)(d) of the ICSID Convention.

²⁰³ *MINE*, para. 5.09 ("the requirement to state reasons is satisfied as long as the award enables one to follow how the tribunal proceeded from Point A. to Point B. and eventually to its conclusion, even if it made an error of fact or of law"); *Vivendi I*, para. 64; *Wena*, para. 81; *Transgabonais*, para. 88; *El Paso*, para. 220; *Kılıç*, para. 64; *Iberdrola*, para. 124; *Lemire*, para. 277; *Libananco*, para. 192; *Occidental*, para. 66; *Tulip*, paras. 98, 104; *Total*, para. 267; *Dogan*, paras. 261-263; *Micula*, paras. 136, 198; *Lahoud*, para. 131; *TECO*, paras. 87, 124.

²⁰⁴ *Klöckner I*, para. 129; *MINE*, paras. 5.08 & 5.09; *Vivendi I*, para. 64; *Wena*, para. 79; *CDC*, paras. 70 & 75; *MCI*, para. 82; *Fraport*, para. 277; *Vieira*, para. 355; *Caratube*, para. 185; *Impregilo*, para. 180; *SGS*, para. 121; *Iberdrola*, paras. 76-77; *Lemire*, para. 278; *Occidental*, para. 66; *Tulip*, paras. 99, 104; *EDF*, para. 328; *Total*, para. 271; *Micula*, para. 135; *TECO*, para. 124.

106. Some *ad hoc* Committees have suggested that “insufficient” and “inadequate” reasons could result in annulment.²⁰⁵ However, the extent of insufficiency and inadequacy required to justify annulment on this basis has been debated.²⁰⁶ Other *ad hoc* Committees have suggested that they have discretion to further explain, clarify, or infer the reasoning of the Tribunal rather than annul the award.²⁰⁷

107. Finally, a majority of *ad hoc* Committees have concluded that “frivolous” and “contradictory” reasons are equivalent to no reasons and could justify an annulment.²⁰⁸

108. The ground of failure to state the reasons on which the award is based has been invoked by parties in 50 proceedings leading to decisions. The ground was upheld in 8 cases which resulted in 2 full and 6 partial annulments.²⁰⁹

VI. Conclusion

109. It is clear that annulment is a limited and exceptional recourse, available only on the basis of the grounds enumerated in Article 52 of the ICSID Convention. It safeguards against “violation of the fundamental principles of law governing the Tribunal’s proceedings.”²¹⁰

110. While there is agreement on the general standards for annulment, commentators sometimes disagree on whether a specific case has been decided correctly or incorrectly.²¹¹ The complexity of the task assigned to *ad hoc* Committees was summarized by Broches as follows:

²⁰⁵ *Mitchell*, para. 21 (“a failure to state reasons exists whenever reasons are... so inadequate that the coherence of the reasoning is seriously affected”); *Soufraki*, paras. 122-26 (“insufficient or inadequate reasons, which are insufficient to bring about the solution or inadequate to explain the result arrived at by the Tribunal”); *TECO*, paras. 248-250.

²⁰⁶ *Compare Amco I*, para. 43 (“sufficiently pertinent reasons”), and *Klöckner I*, para. 120 (“sufficiently relevant”), with *Amco II*, para. 7.55 (“no justification for adding a further requirement that the reasons stated be ‘sufficiently pertinent’”), and *MINE*, para. 5.08 (“[t]he adequacy of the reasoning is not an appropriate standard of review”); *Iberdrola*, para. 94 (“this Committee considers that the annulment mechanism does not allow it to review the adequacy of the reasoning of the Award”) [unofficial translation from Spanish]; *Occidental*, para. 64; *TECO*, paras. 249-250.

²⁰⁷ *Vivendi II*, para. 248; *Wena*, para. 83; *Soufraki*, para. 24; *CMS*, para. 127; *Rumeli*, para. 83 (with the caveat that if non-stated reasons “do not necessarily follow or flow from the award’s reasoning, an *ad hoc* committee should not construct reasons in order to justify the decision of the tribunal”).

²⁰⁸ *Amco I*, para. 97; *Klöckner I*, para. 116; *MINE*, paras. 5.09 & 6.107; *CDC*, para. 70; *MCI*, para. 84; *Vieira*, para. 357; *Caratube*, paras. 185-86 & 245; *Tza Yap Shum*, para. 101; *El Paso*, para. 221 (“contradictory to a point to neutralize each other”); *Malicorp*, para. 45 (“an award must be upheld unless the logic is so contradictory as to be ‘as useful as no reasons at all’”); *RSM*, para. 86 (noting that the contradiction must be substantial); *Occidental*, para. 65; *Tulip*, paras. 109-112; *Total*, para. 268; *Lahoud*, paras. 133-135; *TECO*, paras. 90, 275, 278.

²⁰⁹ *Amco I* (partial), *Klöckner I* (full), *MINE* (partial), *Mitchell* (full); *CMS* (partial), *Enron* (partial), *Victor Pey Casado* (partial); *TECO* (partial).

²¹⁰ *See supra* para. 71.

²¹¹ A number of authors have analyzed and commented on annulment decisions and the annulment mechanism generally. Such discussions are included in the bibliography at Annex 3 of this paper.

Annulment is an essential but exceptional remedy. It is well understood that the grounds listed in Article 52(1) are the only grounds on which an award may be annulled. [footnote omitted] However, the application of that paragraph places a heavy responsibility on the *ad hoc* committees which must rule on requests for annulment. For example, in relation to a Tribunal's alleged "excess of powers" they may have to make fine distinctions between failure to apply the applicable law, which is a ground for annulment, and incorrect interpretation of that law, which is not. With respect to allegations that a tribunal's failure to deal with questions submitted to it constitutes a serious departure from a fundamental rule of procedure, or failure to state the reasons on which the award is based, they will have to assess the relevance of those questions, that is to say, their nature and potential effect, had they been dealt with, on the tribunal's award. They are also likely to be called on to give specific meaning to such terms as "manifest," "serious departure" and "fundamental rule of procedure" in judging the admissibility of claims for annulment.

After these determinations have been made on the basis of objective legal analysis, the *ad hoc* committees may be faced with the delicate final task of weighing the conflicting claims of finality of the award, on the one hand and, on the other, of protection of parties against procedural injustice, as defined in the five sub-paragraphs of Article 52(1). This requires that an *ad hoc* committee be able to exercise a measure of discretion in ruling on applications for annulment.²¹²

111. The task of an *ad hoc* Committee should also be assessed in the overall context of the ICSID case load. In its 50 year history, ICSID has registered 505 Convention arbitration cases and rendered 228 awards. Of these, 5 awards have been annulled in full and another 10 awards have been partially annulled. In other words, only 2 percent of all ICSID awards have led to full annulment and 4 percent have led to partial annulment.

²¹² Broches, *supra* note 6, at 354 & 355.


Annulment Proceedings under the ICSID Convention – Overview




112. While the number of applications for annulment registered annually fluctuates, the increase in annulment applications in the last 5 years reflects the vastly increased number of cases registered and awards rendered at ICSID in this same period. Since January 2011, 101 Convention awards were rendered, 49 annulment proceedings were instituted and 3 awards were partially annulled.²¹³ At the same time, the number of discontinued applications for annulment has increased substantially, with 14 discontinuances since 2011. By comparison, in the period 2001 – 2010, 96 Convention awards were rendered, 33 annulments instituted, 8 awards were annulled in full or in part and 5 annulment applications were discontinued. Between 1971 – 2000, 31 awards were rendered, 6 annulment proceedings were instituted, 4 awards were annulled in full or in part (13 percent of awards were annulled in part or in full) and one was discontinued. As a result, the rate of annulment for the period since January 2011 is 3 percent, while the annulment rate for the years 1971 – 2000 is 13 percent, and the rate for the decade 2001 – 2010 is 8 percent.

²¹³ See *supra* paras. 31 & 32.

Rate of Annulment 1971 - Present



Annulment Proceedings under the ICSID Convention - Outcomes 1971 - Present



113. Finally, it is vital that ICSID Contracting States continue to supply the ICSID Panel of Arbitrators with capable, experienced and impartial individuals who may be called upon to apply the standards of Article 52 of the ICSID Convention.

* * *

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
1. <i>Amco Asia Corporation and others v. Republic of Indonesia</i> ARB/81/1 (<i>Amco I</i>)	Award of November 21, 1984 1 ICSID Rep. 413 (1993) (English); Unofficial French translation in 114 J. Droit Int'l 145 (1987) (excerpts)	Berthold Goldman (French) Isi Foighel (Danish) Edward W. Rubin (Canadian)	Ignaz Seidl-Hohenveldern (Austrian) Florentino P. Feliciano (Philippine)* Andrea Giardina (Italian)	Annulled in part Decision of May 16, 1986 1 ICSID Rep. 509 (1993) (English); Unofficial French translation in 114 J. Droit Int'l 175 (1987) (excerpts)
2. <i>Amco Asia Corporation and others v. Republic of Indonesia</i> ARB/81/1- Resubmission (<i>Amco II</i>)	Award of June 5, 1990 1 ICSID Rep. 569 (1993) (English); Unofficial French translation in 118 J. Droit Int'l 172 (1991) (excerpts)	Rosalyn Higgins (British) Marc Lalonde (Canadian) Per Magid (Danish)	Sompong Sucharitkul (Thai)* Arghyrios A. Fatouros (Greek) Dietrich Schindler (Swiss)	Annulled in part (Supplemental Decision and Rectification annulled) Decision of December 17, 1992 9 ICSID Rep. 9 (2006) (English)
3. <i>Klöckner Industrie-Anlagen GmbH and others v. United Republic of Cameroon and Société Camerounaise des Engrais</i> ARB/81/2 (<i>Klöckner I</i>)	Award of October 21, 1983 111 J. Droit Int'l 409 (1984) (French; excerpts); Unofficial English translation in 2 ICSID Rep. 9 (1994)	Eduardo Jimenez de Arechaga (Uruguayan)* William D. Rogers (U.S.) Dominique Schmidt (French)	Pierre Lalive (Swiss) Ahmed Sadek El-Kosheri (Egyptian)* Ignaz Seidl-Hohenveldern (Austrian)	Annulled in full Decision of May 3, 1985 114 J. Droit Int'l 163 (1987) (French; excerpts); Unofficial English translation

* Developing country nationality at the time of the appointment.

** Current as of April 15, 2016. Excludes members who resigned during the proceedings.

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
4. <i>Klöckner Industrie-Anlagen GmbH and others v. United Republic of Cameroon and Société Camerounaise des Engrais</i> ARB/81/2 – Resubmission (<i>Klöckner II</i>)	Award of January 26, 1988 14 ICSID Rep. 8 (2009) (English); French version unpublished	Carl F. Salans (U.S.) Jorge Castaneda (Mexican)* Juán Antonio Cremades Sanz-Pastor (Spanish)	Sompong Sucharitkul (Thai)* Andrea Giardina (Italian) Kebá Mbayé (Senegalese)*	Annulment rejected Decision of May 17, 1990 14 ICSID Rep. 101 (2009) (Unofficial English translation); French original unpublished
5. <i>Southern Pacific Properties (Middle East) Limited v. Arab Republic of Egypt</i> ARB/84/3 (<i>SPP</i>)	Award of May 20, 1992 English ; Official French translation in 121 J. Droit Int'l 229 (1994) (excerpts)	Eduardo Jimenez de Arechaga (Uruguayan)* Mohamed Amin Elabassy El Mahdi (Egyptian)* Robert F. Pietrowski, Jr. (U.S.)	Claude Reymond (Swiss) Arghyrios A. Fatouros (Greek) Kéba Mbaye (Senegalese)*	Discontinued (Rule 43(1))
6. <i>Maritime International Nominees Establishment v. Republic of Guinea</i> ARB/84/4 (<i>MINE</i>)	Award of January 6, 1988 4 ICSID Rep. 61 (1997) (English)	Donald E. Zubrod (U.S.) Jack Berg (U.S.) David K. Sharpe (U.S.)	Sompong Sucharitkul (Thai)* Aron Broches (Dutch) Kéba Mbaye (Senegalese)*	Annulled in part Decision of December 22, 1989 English ; Unofficial French translation in 1 La Juris. du CIRDI 291(2004) (excerpts)

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
7. <i>Compañía de Aguas del Aconquija S.A. and Vivendi Universal S.A. v. Argentine Republic</i> ARB/97/3 (<i>Vivendi I</i>)	Award of November 21, 2000 English ; Spanish	Francisco Rezek (Brazilian)* Thomas Buergenthal (U.S.) Peter D. Trooboff (U.S.)	L. Yves Fortier (Canadian) James R. Crawford (Australian) José Carlos Fernández Rozas (Spanish)	Annulled in part Decision of July 3, 2002 English ; Spanish ; Unofficial French translation in 130 J. Droit Int'l 195 (2003)
8. <i>Compañía de Aguas del Aconquija S.A. and Vivendi Universal S.A. v. Argentine Republic</i> ARB/97/3 – Resubmission (<i>Vivendi II</i>)	Award of August 20, 2007 English ; Spanish	J. William Rowley (Canadian) Gabrielle Kaufmann-Kohler (Swiss) Carlos Bernal Verea (Mexican)*	Ahmed Sadek El-Kosheri (Egyptian)* Andreas J. Jacovides (Cypriot) Jan Hendrik Dalhuisen (Dutch)	Annulment rejected Decision of August 10, 2010 (including Separate Opinion by Jan Hendrik Dalhuisen) English ; Spanish
9. <i>Víctor Pey Casado and President Allende Foundation v. Republic of Chile</i> ARB/98/2 (<i>Pey Casado</i>)	Award of May 8, 2008 French ; Spanish	Pierre Lalive (Swiss) Mohammed Chemloul (Algerian)* Emmanuel Gaillard (French)	L. Yves Fortier (Canadian) Piero Bernardini (Italian) Ahmed Sadek El-Kosheri (Egyptian)*	Annulled in part Decision of December 18, 2012 English ; French

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
10. <i>Wena Hotels Limited v. Arab Republic of Egypt</i> ARB/98/4 (<i>Wena</i>)	Award of December 8, 2000 English	Monroe Leigh (U.S.) Ibrahim Fadlallah (Lebanese*/French) Don Wallace, Jr. (U.S.)	Konstantinos D. Kerameus (Greek) Andreas Bucher (Swiss) Francisco Orrego Vicuña (Chilean)*	Annulment rejected Decision of February 5, 2002 English ; Unofficial French translation in 130 J. Droit Int'l 167 (2003)
11. <i>Philippe Gruslin v. Malaysia</i> ARB/99/3 (<i>Gruslin</i>)	Award of November 28, 2000 English	Gavan Griffith (Australian)	Thomas Buergenthal (U.S.) Kamal Hossain (Bangladeshi)* Gabrielle Kaufmann-Kohler (Swiss)	Discontinued (Administrative and Financial Regulation 14(3)(d))
12. <i>Patrick Mitchell v. Democratic Republic of the Congo</i> ARB/99/7 (<i>Mitchell</i>)	Award of February 9, 2004 English (excerpts); French (excerpts) Dissenting Opinion of Arbitrator Yawovi Agboyibo	Andreas Bucher (Swiss) Yawovi Agboyibo (Togolese)* Marc Lalonde (Canadian)	Antonias C. Dimolitsa (Greek) Robert S.M. Dossou (Beninese)* Andrea Giardina (Italian)	Annulled in full Decision of November 1, 2006 English ; French version in 2 La Jurisprudence du CIRDI 333 (2010)

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
13. <i>Consortium R.F.C.C. v. Kingdom of Morocco</i> ARB/00/6 (RFCC)	Award of December 22, 2003 French	Robert Briner (Swiss) Bernardo M. Cremades (Spanish) Ibrahim Fadlallah (Lebanese*/French)	Bernard Hanotiau (Belgian) Arghyrios A. Fatouros (Greek) Franklin Berman (British)	Annulment rejected Decision of January 18, 2006 26 ICSID Rev.— FILJ 196 (2011) (French; excerpts)
14. <i>Enron Creditors Recovery Corporation (formerly Enron Corporation) and Ponderosa Assets, L.P. v. Argentine Republic</i> ARB/01/3 (Enron)	Award of May 22, 2007 English ; Spanish version unpublished	Francisco Orrego Vicuña (Chilean)* Albert Jan Van den Berg (Dutch) Pierre-Yves Tschanz (Swiss/Irish)	Gavan Griffith (Australian) Patrick L. Robinson (Jamaican)* Per Tresselt (Norwegian)	Annulled in part Decision of July 30, 2010 English ; Spanish version unpublished
15. <i>MTD Equity Sdn. Bhd. and MTD Chile S.A. v. Republic of Chile</i> ARB/01/7 (MTD)	Award of May 25, 2004 English ; Spanish version unpublished	Andrés Rigo Sureda (Spanish) Marc Lalonde (Canadian) Rodrigo Oreamuno (Costa Rican)*	Gilbert Guillaume (French) James R. Crawford (Australian) Sara Ordoñez Noriega (Colombian)*	Annulment rejected Decision of March 21, 2007 English ; Unofficial French translation in 2 La Juris. CIRDI 385 (2010) (excerpts)

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
16. <i>CMS Gas Transmission Company v. Argentine Republic</i> ARB/01/8 (CMS)	Award of May 12, 2005 English ; Spanish ; Unofficial French translation in 2 La Jurisprudence du CIRDI 177 (2010) (excerpts)	Francisco Orrego Vicuña (Chilean)* Marc Lalonde (Canadian) Francisco Rezek (Brazilian)*	Gilbert Guillaume (French) Nabil Elaraby (Egyptian)* James R. Crawford (Australian)	Annulled in part Decision of September 25, 2007 English ; Spanish Unofficial French translation in 2 La Juris. du CIRDI 413 (2010) (excerpts)
17. <i>Repsol YPF Ecuador S.A. v. Empresa Estatal Petróleos del Ecuador (Petroecuador)</i> ARB/01/10 (Repsol)	Award of February 20, 2004 26 ICSID Rev.— FILJ 231 (2011) (Spanish; excerpts)	Rodrigo Oreamuno (Costa Rican)* Eduardo Carmigniani Valencia (Ecuadorian)* Alberto Wray Espinosa (Ecuadorian)*	Judd L. Kessler (U.S.) Piero Bernardini (Italian) Gonzalo Biggs (Chilean)*	Annulment rejected Decision of January 8, 2007 Spanish ; English Unofficial French translation in 2 La Juris. du CIRDI 375 (2010) (excerpts)
18. <i>Azurix Corp. v. Argentine Republic</i> ARB/01/12 (Azurix)	Award of July 14, 2006 English ; Spanish	Andrés Rigo Sureda (Spanish) Marc Lalonde (Canadian) Daniel H. Martins (Uruguayan)*	Gavan Griffith (Australian) Bola Ajibola (Nigerian)* Michael Hwang (Singaporean)	Annulment rejected Decision of September 1, 2009 English ; Spanish

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
19. <i>LG&E Energy Corp., LG&E Capital Corp. and LG&E International Inc. v. Argentine Republic</i> ARB/02/1 (<i>LG& E</i>)	Award of July 25, 2007 English ; Spanish	Tatiana Bogdanowsky de Maekelt (Venezuelan)* Francisco Rezek (Brazilian)* Albert Jan van den Berg (Dutch)	No Committee appointed	Discontinued (Rule 44)
20. <i>Hussein Nuaman Soufraki v. United Arab Emirates</i> ARB/02/7 (<i>Soufraki</i>)	Award of July 7, 2004 English	L. Yves Fortier (Canadian) Aktham El Kholy (Egyptian)* Stephen M. Schwebel (U.S.)	Florentino P. Feliciano (Philippine)* Omar Nabulsi (Jordanian)* Brigitte Stern (French)	Annulment rejected Decision of June 5, 2007 English ; Unofficial French translation in 2 La Juris. du CIRDI 395 (2010) (excerpts) Dissenting Opinion by Omar Nabulsi English
21. <i>Siemens A.G. v. Argentine Republic</i> ARB/02/8 (<i>Siemens</i>)	Award of February 6, 2007 English ; Spanish version unpublished	Andrés Rigo Sureda (Spanish) Charles N. Brower (U.S.) Domingo Bello Janeiro (Spanish)	Gilbert Guillaume (French) Florentino P. Feliciano (Philippine)* Mohamed Shahabuddeen (Guyanese)*	Discontinued (Rule 43(1))

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
22. <i>CDC Group plc v. Republic of Seychelles</i> ARB/02/14 (CDC)	Award of December 17, 2003 English	Anthony Mason (Australian)	Charles N. Brower (U.S.) Michael Hwang (Singaporean) David A. R. Williams (New Zealand)	Annulment rejected Decision of June 29, 2005 English
23. <i>Ahmonseto, Inc. and others v. Arab Republic of Egypt</i> ARB/02/15 (Ahmonseto)	Award of June 18, 2007 23 ICSID Rev.— FILJ 356 (2008) (English; excerpts)	Pierre Tercier (Swiss) Ibrahim Fadlallah (Lebanese*/French) Alain Viandier (French)	Piero Bernardini (Italian) Azzedine Kettani (Moroccan)* Peter Tomka (Slovak)*	Discontinued (Administrative and Financial Regulation 14(3)(d) and (e))
24. <i>Sempra Energy International v. Argentine Republic</i> ARB/02/16 (Sempra)	Award of September 28, 2007 English ; Spanish	Francisco Orrego Vicuña (Chilean)* Marc Lalonde (Canadian) Sandra Morelli Rico (Colombian)*	Christer Söderlund (Swedish) David A.O. Edward (British) Andreas J. Jacovides (Cypriot)	Annulled in full Decision of June 29, 2010 English ; Spanish

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
<p>25. <i>Industria Nacional de Alimentos, S.A. and Indalsa Perú, S.A. (formerly Empresas Lucchetti, S.A. and Lucchetti Perú, S.A.) v. Republic of Peru</i></p> <p>ARB/03/4</p> <p>(<i>Lucchetti</i>)</p>	<p>Award of February 7, 2005</p> <p>English; Spanish</p>	<p>Thomas Buergenthal (U.S.)</p> <p>Jan Paulsson (French)</p> <p>Bernardo M. Cremades (Spanish)</p>	<p>Hans Danelius (Swedish)</p> <p>Andrea Giardina (Italian)</p> <p>Franklin Berman (British)</p>	<p>Annulment rejected</p> <p>Decision of September 5, 2007</p> <p>English; Spanish</p> <p>Unofficial French translation in 2 La Juris. du CIRDI 407 (2010) (excerpts)</p> <p>Dissenting Opinion by Franklin Berman</p> <p>English; Spanish</p>
<p>26. <i>M.C.I. Power Group, L.C. and New Turbine, Inc. v. Republic of Ecuador</i></p> <p>ARB/03/6</p> <p>(<i>MCI</i>)</p>	<p>Award of July 31, 2007</p> <p>English; Spanish</p>	<p>Raúl E. Vinuesa (Argentine)*</p> <p>Benjamin J. Greenberg (Canadian)</p> <p>Jaime C. Irrarrazabal (Chilean)*</p>	<p>Dominique Hascher (French)</p> <p>Hans Danelius (Swedish)</p> <p>Peter Tomka (Slovak)*</p>	<p>Annulment rejected</p> <p>Decision of October 19, 2009</p> <p>English; Spanish</p>

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
27. <i>Continental Casualty Company v. Argentine Republic</i> ARB/03/9 (<i>Continental Casualty</i>)	Award of September 5, 2008 English	Giorgio Sacerdoti (Italian) V.V. Veeder (British) Michell Nader (Mexican)*	Gavan Griffith (Australian) Bola Ajibola (Nigerian)* Christer Söderlund (Swedish)	Annulment rejected Decision of September 16, 2011 English ; Spanish
28. <i>Joy Mining Machinery Limited v. Arab Republic of Egypt</i> ARB/03/11 (<i>Joy Mining</i>)	Award of August 6, 2004 English ; Unofficial French translation in 132 J. Droit Int'l 163 (2005) (excerpts)	Francisco Orrego Vicuña (Chilean)* C.G. Weeramantry (Sri Lankan)* William Laurence Craig (U.S.)	Antonias C. Dimolitsa (Greek) Michael Hwang (Singaporean) José Luis Shaw (Uruguayan)*	Discontinued (Rule 43(1))
29. <i>El Paso Energy International Company v. Argentine Republic</i> ARB/03/15 (<i>El Paso</i>)	Award of October 31, 2011 English ; Spanish	Lucius Cafilisch (Swiss) Piero Bernardini (Italian) Brigitte Stern (French)	Rodrigo Oreamuno (Costa Rican)* Teresa Cheng (Chinese)* Rolf Knieper (German)	Annulment rejected Decision of September 22, 2014 English ; Spanish

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
30. <i>Suez, Sociedad General de Aguas de Barcelona S.A. and Vivendi Universal S.A v. Argentine Republic</i> ARB/03/19 (Suez)	Award of April 9, 2015 English	Jeswald W. Salacuse (U.S.) Gabrielle Kaufmann-Kohler (Swiss) Pedro Nikken (Venezuelan)	Klaus Sachs (German) Trevor A. Carmichael (Barbadian) Rodrigo Oreamuno (Costa Rican)	Pending
31. <i>EDF International S.A., SAUR International S.A. and León Participaciones Argentinas S.A. v. Argentine Republic</i> ARB/03/23 (EDF)	Award of June 11, 2012 English	William W. Park (U.S.) Gabrielle Kaufmann-Kohler (Swiss) Jesús Remón (Spanish)	Christopher J. Greenwood (British) Teresa Cheng (Chinese)* Yasuhei Taniguchi (Japanese)	Annulment rejected Decision of February 5, 2016 English Spanish
32. <i>Fraport AG Frankfurt Airport Services Worldwide v. Republic of the Philippines</i> ARB/03/25 (Fraport)	Award of August 16, 2007 English	L. Yves Fortier (Canadian) Bernardo M. Cremades (Spanish) W. Michael Reisman (U.S.)	Peter Tomka (Slovak)* Dominique Hascher (French) Campbell McLachlan (New Zealand)	Annulled in full Decision of December 23, 2010 English

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
33. <i>Duke Energy International Peru Investments No. 1 Ltd. v. Republic of Peru</i> ARB/03/28 (<i>Duke Energy</i>)	Award of August 18, 2008 English	L. Yves Fortier (Canadian) Guido Santiago Tawil (Argentine)* Pedro Nikken (Venezuelan)*	Campbell McLachlan (New Zealand) Dominique Hascher (French) Peter Tomka (Slovak)*	Annulment rejected Decision of March 1, 2011 English
34. <i>Total S.A. v. Argentine Republic</i> ARB/04/1 (<i>Total</i>)	Award of November 27, 2013 English ; Spanish	Giorgio Sacerdoti (Italian) Henri Alvarez (Canadian) Luis Herrera Marcano (Venezuelan)*	Eduardo Zuleta (Colombian) * Alvaro Rodrigo Castellanos Howell (Guatemalan)* Teresa Cheng (Chinese)*	Annulment rejected Decision of February 1, 2016 English ; Spanish
35. <i>SAUR International v. Argentine Republic</i> ARB/04/4 (<i>SAUR</i>)	Award of May 22, 2014 French ; Spanish	Juan Fernández-Armesto (Spanish) Bernard Hanotiau (Belgian) Christian Tomuschat (German)	Eduardo Zuleta (Colombian)* Alvaro Rodrigo Castellanos Howell (Guatemalan)* Abdulgawi Ahmed Yusuf (Somali)*	Pending

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
36. <i>Compagnie d'Exploitation du Chemin de Fer Transgabonais v. Gabonese Republic</i> ARB/04/5 (<i>Transgabonais</i>)	Award of March 7, 2008 26 ICSID Rev.— FILJ 181 (2011) (French; excerpts)	Ibrahim Fadlallah (Lebanese*/French) Charles Jarrosson (French) Michel Gentot (French)	Franklin Berman (British) Ahmed Sadek El-Kosheri (Egyptian)* Rolf Knieper (German)	Annulment rejected Decision of May 11, 2010 26 ICSID Rev.— FILJ 214 (2011) (French; excerpts)
37. <i>Sociedad Anónima Eduardo Vieira v. Republic of Chile</i> ARB/04/7 (<i>Vieira</i>)	Award of August 21, 2007 Spanish Dissenting Opinion of Arbitrator Susana B. Czar de Zalduendo Spanish	Claus von Wobeser (Mexican)* Susana B. Czar de Zalduendo (Argentine)* W. Michael Reisman (U.S.)	Christer Söderlund (Swedish) Piero Bernardini (Italian) Eduardo Silva Romero (Colombian*/French)	Annulment rejected Decision of December 10, 2010 Spanish
38. <i>Daimler Financial Services AG v. Argentine Republic</i> ARB/05/1 (<i>Daimler</i>)	Award of August 22, 2012 English Dissenting Opinion of Arbitrator Charles N. Brower English	Pierre-Marie Dupuy (French) Charles N. Brower (U.S.) Domingo Bello Janeiro (Spanish)	Eduardo Zuleta (Colombian)* Florentino P. Feliciano (Philippine)* Makhdoom Ali Khan (Pakistani)*	Annulment rejected Decision of January 7, 2015 English ; Spanish

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
39. <i>Malaysian Historical Salvors, SDN, BHD v. Malaysia</i> ARB/05/10 (MHS)	Award of May 17, 2007 English	Michael Hwang (Singaporean)	Stephen M. Schwebel (U.S.) Mohamed Shahabuddeen (Guyanese)* Peter Tomka (Slovak)*	Annulled in full Decision of April 16, 2009 English Dissenting Opinion of Mohamed Shahabuddeen* English Unofficial French translation in 2 La Jurisprudence du CIRDI 559 (2010) (excerpts)
40. <i>RSM Production Corporation v. Grenada</i> ARB/05/14 (RSM)	Award of March 13, 2009 English	V.V. Veeder (British) Bernard Audit (French) David Berry (Canadian)	Gavan Griffith (Australian) Cecil W.M. Abraham (Malaysian)* Campbell McLachlan (New Zealand)	Discontinued (Administrative and Financial Regulation 14(3)(d) and (e))

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
41. <i>Waguih Elie George Siag and Clorinda Vecchi v. Arab Republic of Egypt</i> ARB/05/15 (<i>Siag</i>)	Award of June 1, 2009 English Dissenting Opinion of Arbitrator Francisco Orrego Vicuña English	David A.R. Williams (New Zealand) Francisco Orrego Vicuña (Chilean)* Michael C. Pryles (Australian)	Stephen M. Schwebel (U.S.) Azzedine Kettani (Moroccan)* Peter Tomka (Slovak)*	Discontinued (Rule 45)
42. <i>Rumeli Telekom A.S. and Telsim Mobil Telekomunikasyon Hizmetleri A.S. v. Republic of Kazakhstan</i> ARB/05/16 (<i>Rumeli</i>)	Award of July 29, 2008 English	Bernard Hanotiau (Belgian) Stewart Boyd (British) Marc Lalonde (Canadian)	Stephen M. Schwebel (U.S.) Campbell McLachlan (New Zealand) Eduardo Silva Romero (Colombian*/French)	Annulment rejected Decision of March 25, 2010 English
43. <i>Ioannis Kardassopoulos v. Georgia</i> ARB/05/18 (<i>Kardassopoulos</i>)	Award of March 3, 2010 English	L. Yves Fortier (Canadian) Francisco Orrego Vicuña (Chilean)* Vaughan Lowe (British)	Dominique Hascher (French) Cecil W.M. Abraham (Malaysian)* Karl-Heinz Böckstiegel (German)	Discontinued (Rule 43(1))

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
44. <i>Helnan International Hotels A/S v. Arab Republic of Egypt</i> ARB/05/19 (<i>Helnan</i>)	Award of July 3, 2008 English	Yves Derains (French) Michael J.A. Lee (British) Rudolf Dolzer (German)	Stephen M. Schwebel (U.S.) Bola Ajibola (Nigerian)* Campbell McLachlan (New Zealand)	Annulled in part Decision of June 14, 2010 English
45. <i>Ioan Micula, Viorel Micula and others v. Romania</i> ARB/05/20 (<i>Micula</i>)	Award of December 11, 2013 English Separate Opinion of Arbitrator Georges Abi-Saab	Laurent Lévy (Swiss/Brazilian*) Stanimir A. Alexandrov (Bulgarian)* Georges Abi-Saab (Egyptian)*	Claus von Wobeser (Mexican)* Bernardo M. Cremades (Spanish) Abdulgawi Ahmed Yusuf (Somali)*	Annulment rejected Decision of February 26, 2016 English
46. <i>Quiborax S.A. and Non-Metallic Minerals S.A. v. Plurinational State of Bolivia</i> ARB/06/2 (<i>Quiborax</i>)	Award of September 16, 2015 English Partial Dissenting Opinion of Arbitrator Brigitte Stern English	Gabrielle Kaufmann-Kohler (Swiss) Marc Lalonde (Canadian) Brigitte Stern (French)	Andrés Rigo Sureda (Spanish) Milton Estuardo Argueta Pinto (Guatemalan) Christer Söderlund (Swedish)	Pending

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
47. <i>Togo Electricité and GDF-Suez Energie Services v. Republic of Togo</i> ARB/06/7 (<i>Togo Electricité</i>)	Award of August 10, 2010 French	Ahmed Sadek El-Kosheri (Egyptian)* Marc Gruninger (Swiss) Marc Lalonde (Canadian)	Albert Jan van den Berg (Dutch) Franklin Berman (British) Rolf Knieper (German)	Annulment rejected Decision of September 6, 2011 French
48. <i>Libananco Holdings Co. Limited v. Republic of Turkey</i> ARB/06/8 (<i>Libananco</i>)	Award of September 2, 2011 English	Michael Hwang (Singaporean) Henri C. Álvarez (Canadian) Franklin Berman (British)	Andrés Rigo Sureda (Spanish) Hans Danelius (Swedish) Eduardo Silva Romero (Colombian*/French)	Annulment rejected Decision of May 22, 2013 English (excerpts)
49. <i>Occidental Petroleum Corp. and Occidental Exploracion and Production Co. v. Republic of Ecuador</i> ARB/06/11 (<i>Occidental</i>)	Award of October 5, 2012 English ; Spanish Dissenting Opinion of Arbitrator Brigitte Stern English ; Spanish	L. Yves Fortier (Canadian) Brigitte Stern (French) David A.R. Williams (New Zealand)	Juan Fernández-Armesto (Spanish) Florentino P. Feliciano (Philippine)* Rodrigo Oreamuno (Costa Rican)*	Annulled in part Decision of November 2, 2015 English ; Spanish

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
50. <i>Joseph C. Lemire v. Ukraine</i> ARB/06/18 (<i>Lemire</i>)	Award of March 28, 2011 English	Juan Fernández-Armesto (Spanish) Jan Paulsson (French) Jurgen Voss (German)	Claus von Wobeser (Mexican)* Azzedine Kettani (Moroccan)* Eduardo Zuleta (Colombian)*	Annulment rejected Decision of July 8, 2013 English (excerpts)
51. <i>Nations Energy, Inc. and others v. Republic of Panama</i> ARB/06/19 (<i>Nations</i>)	Award of November 24, 2010 Spanish	Alexis Mourre (French) José María Chillón Medina (Spanish) Claus von Wobeser (Mexican)*	Stanimir A. Alexandrov (Bulgarian)* Jaime C. Irarrázabal (Chilean)* Enrique Gómez-Pinzón (Colombian)*	Discontinued (Administrative and Financial Regulation 14(3)(d) and (e))
52. <i>RSM Production Corporation v. Central African Republic</i> ARB/07/2 (<i>RSM</i>)	Award of July 11, 2011 French (excerpts)	Azzedine Kettani (Moroccan)* Philippe Merle (French) Brigitte Stern (French)	Bernardo M. Cremades (Spanish) Abdulgawi Ahmed Yusuf (Somali)* Fernando Mantilla-Serrano (Colombian)*	Annulment rejected Decision of February 20, 2013 French (excerpts)

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
53. <i>Tza Yap Shum v. Republic of Peru</i> ARB/07/6 (<i>Shum</i>)	Award of July 7, 2011 Spanish	Judd L. Kessler (U.S.) Hernando Otero (Colombian)* Juan Fernández-Armesto (Spanish)	Dominique Hascher (French) Donald M. McRae (Canadian) Kaj Hobér (Swedish)	Annulment rejected Decision of February 12, 2015 Spanish
54. <i>Toto Costruzioni Generali S.p.A. v. Republic of Lebanon</i> ARB/07/12 (<i>Toto</i>)	Award of June 7, 2012 English	Hans van Houtte (Belgian) Stephen M. Schwebel (U.S.) Fadi Moghaizel (Lebanese)*	Emmanuel Gaillard (French) Michael C. Pryles (Australian) Andrés Rigo Sureda (Spanish)	Discontinued (Rules 53 and 44)
55. <i>Ron Fuchs v. Georgia</i> ARB/07/15 (<i>Fuchs</i>)	Award of March 3, 2010 English	L. Yves Fortier (Canadian) Francisco Orrego Vicuña (Chilean)* Vaughan Lowe (British)	Dominique Hascher (French) Cecil W. M. Abraham (Malaysian)* Karl-Heinz Böckstiegel (German)	Discontinued (Rule 43(1))

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
56. <i>Impregilo S.p.A. v. Argentine Republic</i> ARB/07/17 (<i>Impregilo</i>)	Award of June 21, 2011 English ; Spanish	Hans Danelius (Swedish) Charles N. Brower (U.S.) Brigitte Stern (French)	Rodrigo Oreamuno (Costa Rican)* Eduardo Zuleta (Colombian)* Teresa Cheng (Chinese)*	Annulment rejected Decision of January 24, 2014 English ; Spanish
57. <i>AES Summit Generation Limited and AES-Tisza Erömu Kft. v. Republic of Hungary</i> ARB/07/22 (<i>AES</i>)	Award of September 23, 2010 English	Claus von Wobeser (Mexican)* J. William Rowley (Canadian) Brigitte Stern (French)	Bernard Hanotiau (Belgian) Rolf Knieper (German) Abdulqawi Ahmed Yusuf (Somali)*	Annulment rejected Decision of June 29, 2012 English
58. <i>Venezuela Holdings B.V. and others v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela</i> ARB/07/27 (<i>Venezuela Holdings</i>)	Award of October 9, 2014 English ; Spanish	Gilbert Guillaume (French) Ahmed Sadek El-Kosheri (Egyptian)* Gabrielle Kaufmann-Kohler (Swiss)	Franklin Berman (British) Cecil W.M. Abraham (Malaysian)* Rolf Knieper (German)	Pending

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
59. <i>SGS Société Générale de Surveillance S.A. v. Republic of Paraguay</i> ARB/07/29 (<i>SGS v. Paraguay</i>)	Award of February 10, 2012 English ; Spanish	Stanimir A. Alexandrov (Bulgarian)* Donald Donovan (U.S.) Pablo García Mexía (Spanish)	Rodrigo Oreamuno (Costa Rican)* Abdulqawi Ahmed Yusuf (Somali)* Eduardo Zuleta (Colombian)*	Annulment rejected Decision of May 19, 2014 English
60. <i>Astaldi S.p.A. v. Republic of Honduras</i> ARB/07/32 (<i>Astaldi</i>)	Award of September 17, 2010 Spanish	Eduardo Sancho González (Costa Rican)*	Juan Fernández-Armesto (Spanish) Jaime C. Irarrázabal (Chilean)* Eduardo Silva Romero (Colombian*/French)	Discontinued (Rule 43(1))
61. <i>ATA Construction, Industrial and Trading Company v. Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan</i> ARB/08/2 (<i>ATA</i>)	Award of May 18, 2010 English	L. Yves Fortier (Canadian) Ahmed Sadek El-Kosheri (Egyptian)* W. Michael Reisman (U.S.)	Gilbert Guillaume (French) Juan Fernández-Armesto (Spanish) Bernard Hanotiau (Belgian)	Discontinued (Rule 44)

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
62. <i>Caratube International Oil Company LLP v. Republic of Kazakhstan</i> ARB/08/12 (<i>Caratube</i>)	Award of June 5, 2012 English	Karl-Heinz Böckstiegel (German) Gavan Griffith (Australian) Kamal Hossain (Bangladeshi)*	Juan Fernández-Armesto (Spanish) Cecil W.M. Abraham (Malaysian)* Hans Danelius (Swedish)	Annulment rejected Decision of July 10, 2014 English
63. <i>Alapli Elektrik B.V. v. Republic of Turkey</i> ARB/08/13 (<i>Alapli</i>)	Award of July 16, 2012 English (excerpts)	William W. Park (U.S.) Marc Lalonde (Canadian) Brigitte Stern (French)	Bernard Hanotiau (Belgian) Karl-Heinz Böckstiegel (German) Makhdoom Ali Khan (Pakistani)*	Annulment rejected Decision of July 10, 2014 English
64. <i>Malicorp Limited v. Arab Republic of Egypt</i> ARB/08/18 (<i>Malicorp</i>)	Award of February 7, 2011 English ; French	Pierre Tercier (Swiss) Luiz Olavo Baptista (Brazilian)* Pierre-Yves Tschanz (Swiss/Irish)	Andrés Rigo Sureda (Spanish) Stanimir A. Alexandrov (Bulgarian)* Eduardo Silva Romero (Colombian*/French)	Annulment rejected Decision of July 3, 2013 English ; French

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
65. <i>Karmer Marble Tourism Construction Industry and Commerce Limited Liability Company v. Georgia</i> ARB/08/19 (<i>Karmer</i>)	Award of August 9, 2012 Unpublished	Marc Lalonde (Canadian) Francisco Orrego Vicuña (Chilean)* Eric Schwartz (U.S./French)	No Committee appointed	Discontinued (Rule 44)
66. <i>Deutsche Bank AG v. Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka</i> ARB/09/2 (<i>Deutsche Bank</i>)	Award of October 31, 2012 English Dissenting Opinion of Arbitrator Makhdoom Ali Khan English	Bernard Hanotiau (Belgian) Makhdoom Ali Khan (Pakistani)* David A.R. Williams (New Zealand)	Andrés Rigo Sureda (Spanish) Hans Danelius (Swedish) Azzedine Kettani (Moroccan)*	Pending
67. <i>Elsamex, S.A. v. Republic of Honduras</i> ARB/09/4 (<i>Elsamex</i>)	Award of November 16, 2012 Spanish	Enrique Gómez-Pinzón (Colombian)*	Andrés Jana (Chilean)* Jan Paulsson (Swedish/French/Bahraini) Álvaro Castellanos (Guatemalan)*	Discontinued (Rule 43(1))

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
68. <i>Iberdrola Energía, S.A. v. Republic of Guatemala</i> ARB/09/5 (<i>Iberdrola</i>)	Award of August 17, 2012 Spanish	Eduardo Zuleta (Colombian)* Yves Derains (French) Rodrigo Oreamuno (Costa Rican)*	Enrique Barros Bourie (Chilean)* Piero Bernardini (Italian) José Luis Shaw (Uruguayan)*	Annulment rejected Decision of January 13, 2015 Spanish Dissenting Opinion of José Luis Shaw: Spanish
69. <i>KT Asia Investment Group B.V. v. Republic of Kazakhstan</i> ARB/09/8 (<i>KT Asia</i>)	Award of October 17, 2013 English	Gabrielle Kaufmann-Kohler (Swiss) Ian Glick (British) J.Christopher Thomas (Canadian)	Rodrigo Oreamuno (Costa Rican)* Lawrence Boo (Singaporean) Michael C. Pryles (Australian)	Discontinued (Administrative and Financial Regulation 14(3)(d) and (e))
70. <i>Adem Dogan v. Turkmenistan</i> ARB/09/9 (<i>Dogan</i>)	Award of August 12, 2014 Unpublished	Jan Paulsson (Swedish/ French/Bahraini) Phillippe Sands (British/ French) Markus Wirth (Swiss)	Piero Bernardini (Italian) Makhdoom Ali Khan (Pakistani)* Jacomijn J. Van Haersolte-Van Hof (Dutch)	Annulment rejected Decision of January 15, 2016 English

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
71. <i>H&H Enterprises Investments, Inc. v. Arab Republic of Egypt</i> ARB/09/15 (H & H)	Award of May 6, 2014 Unpublished	Bernardo M. Cremades (Spanish) Hamid G. Gharavi (Iranian*/French) Veijo Heiskanen (Finnish)	Stanimir A. Alexandrov (Bulgarian)* Cecil. W.M. Abraham (Malaysian)* Teresa Cheng (Chinese)*	Pending
72. <i>Commerce Group Corp. and San Sebastian Gold Mines, Inc. v. Republic of El Salvador</i> ARB/09/17 (Commerce Group)	Award of March 14, 2011 English ; Spanish	Albert Jan van den Berg (Dutch) Horacio A. Grigera Naón (Argentine)* J. Christopher Thomas (Canadian)	Emmanuel Gaillard (French) Michael C. Pryles (Australian) Christoph H. Schreuer (Austrian)	Discontinued (Administrative and Financial Regulation 14(3)(d)) English
73. <i>Carnegie Minerals (Gambia) Limited v. Republic of The Gambia</i> ARB/09/19 (Carnegie Minerals)	Award of July 14, 2015 Unpublished	Donald Donovan (U.S.) Jean Engelmayer Kalicki (U.S.) Philippe Pinsolle (Swiss, French)	Donald M. McRae (Canadian, New Zealand) Zhidong Chen (Chinese) Bernardo M. Cremades (Spanish)	Pending

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
74. <i>Kılıç İnşaat İthalat İhracat Sanayi ve Ticaret Anonim Şirketi v. Turkmenistan</i> ARB/10/1 (<i>Kılıç</i>)	Award of July 2, 2014 English	J. William Rowley (British, Canadian) William W. Park (Swiss/ U.S.) Phillippe Sands (British/ French)	Andrés Rigo Sureda (Spanish) Karl-Heinz Böckstiegel (German) Hi-Taek Shin (Korean)	Annulment rejected Decision of July 14, 2015 English
75. <i>Antoine Abou Lahoud and Leila Bounafeh- Abou Lahoud v. Democratic Republic of the Congo</i> ARB/10/4 (<i>Lahoud</i>)	Award of February 7, 2014 English	William W. Park (Swiss, U.S.) Karim Hafez (Egyptian)* Marie Andrée Ngwee (French)	Azzedine Kettani (Morrocan)* Kaj Hobér (Swedish) Rolf Knieper (German)	Annulment rejected Decision of March 29, 2016 French
76. <i>Tidewater Investment SRL and Tidewater Caribe, C.A. v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela</i> ARB/10/5 (<i>Tidewater</i>)	Award of March 13, 2015 English ; Spanish	Campbell McLachlan (New Zealand) Andrés Rigo Sureda (Spanish) Brigitte Stern (French)	Abdulqawi Ahmed Yusuf (Somali) Cecil W.M. Abraham (Malaysian) Rolf Knieper (German)	Pending

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
77. <i>Standard Chartered Bank v. United Republic of Tanzania</i> ARB/10/12 (SCB)	Award of November 2, 2012 English	William W. Park (Swiss/ U.S.) Barton Legum (U.S.) Michael C. Pryles (Australian)	No Committee appointed	Pending
78. <i>Bernhard von Pezold and others v. Republic of Zimbabwe</i> ARB/10/15 (von Pezold)	Award of July 28, 2015 English	L. Yves Fortier (Canadian) Michael Hwang (Singaporean) David A.R. Williams (New Zealand)	Veijo Heiskanen (Finnish) Jean Engelmayr Kalicki (U.S.) Azzedine Kettani (Moroccan)	Pending
79. <i>Renée Rose Levy de Levi v. Republic of Peru</i> ARB/10/17 (Levy de Levi)	Award of February 26, 2014 English ; Spanish Dissenting Opinion of Arbitrator Joaquin Morales Godoy English ; Spanish	Rodrigo Oreamuno (Costa Rican)* Bernard Hanotiau (Belgian) Joaquin Morales Goody (Chilean)*	John Townsend (U.S.) Andreas Bucher (Swiss) Hi-Taek Shin (Korean)	Discontinued (Rule 44)

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
80. <i>Flughafen Zürich A.G. and Gestión e Ingeniería IDC S.A. v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela</i> ARB/10/19 (<i>Flughafen</i>)	Award of November 18, 2014 Spanish	Juan-Fernández Armesto (Spanish) Henri C. Alvarez (Canadian) Raúl E. Vinuesa (Spanish/ Argentine*)	Álvaro Rodrigo Castellanos Howell (Guatemalan) Shoschana Zusman Tinman (Peruvian) Carlos Urrutia Valenzuela (Colombian)	Pending
81. <i>TECO Guatemala Holdings, LLC v. Republic of Guatemala</i> ARB/10/23 (<i>TECO</i>)	Award of December 19, 2013 English ; Spanish	Alexis Mourre (French) William W. Park (Swiss/U.S.) Claus von Wobeser (Mexican)*	Bernard Hanotiau (Belgian) Tinuade Oyekunle (Nigerian)* Klaus Sachs (German)	Annulled in part Decision of April 5, 2016 English
82. <i>Border Timbers Limited, Timber Products International (Private) Limited, and Hangani Development Co. (Private) Limited v. Republic of Zimbabwe</i> ARB/10/25 (<i>Border Timbers</i>)	Award of July 28, 2015 Unpublished	L. Yves Fortier (Canadian) Michael Hwang (Singaporean) David A. R. Williams (New Zealand)	Veijo Heiskanen (Finnish) Jean Engelmayer Kalicki (U.S.) Azzedine Kettani (Moroccan)	Pending

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
83. <i>Highbury International AVV and Ramstein Trading Inc. v Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela</i> ARB/11/1 (<i>Highbury</i>)	Award of September 26, 2013 Spanish	Enrique Barros Bourie (Chilean)* Guido Santiago Tawil (Argentine)* Claus von Wobeser (Mexican)*	José Carlos Fernández Rozas (Spanish) Paolo Michele Patocchi (Swiss) Alvaro Rodrigo Castellanos Howell (Guatemalan)*	Pending
84. <i>Rafat Ali Rizvi v. Republic of Indonesia</i> ARB/11/13 (<i>Rizvi</i>)	Award of July 16, 2013 English Separate Concurring Opinion of Arbitrator Muthucumaraswamy Sornarajah English	Gavan Griffith (Australian) Joan. E. Donoghue (U.S.) Muthucumaraswamy Sornarajah (Australian)	Andrés Rigo Sureda (Spanish) Teresa Cheng (Chinese)* Rolf Knieper (German)	Discontinued (Rule 44)
85. <i>Mamidoil Jetoil Greek Petroleum Products Societe Anonyme S.A. v. Republic of Albania</i> ARB/11/24 (<i>Mamidoil</i>)	Award of March 30, 2015 English Dissenting Opinion of arbitrator Steven A. Hammond English	Rolf Knieper (German) Steven A. Hammond (U.S.) Yas Banifatemi (Iranian, French)	Ronald M. McRae (Canadian, New Zealand) Doug Jones (Australian, Irish) August Reinisch (Austrian)	Pending

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
86. <i>OI European Group B.V. v Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela</i> ARB/11/25 (<i>OI European</i>)	Award of March 10, 2015 Spanish	Juan Fernández-Armesto (Spanish) Francisco Orrego Vicuña (Chilean)* Alexis Mourre (French)	Álvaro Rodrigo Castellanos Howell (Guatemalan) Piero Bernardini (Italian) David A. Pawlak (U.S., Irish)	Pending
87. <i>Tulip Real Estate and Development Netherlands B.V. v. Republic of Turkey</i> ARB/11/28 (<i>Tulip</i>)	Award of March 10, 2014 English Separate Opinion of Michael Evan Jaffe English	Gavan Griffith (Australian) Michael Evan Jaffe (U.S.) Rolf Knieper (German)	Peter Tomka (Slovak) Cherie Booth (British) Christoph H. Schreuer (Austrian)	Annulment rejected Decision of December 30, 2015 English
88. <i>Gambrinus, Corp. v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela</i> ARB/11/31 (<i>Gambrinus</i>)	Award of June 15, 2015 Unpublished	Piero Bernardini (Italian) Marc Lalonde (Canadian) Pierre-Marie Dupuy (French)	Cecil W.M. Abraham (Malaysian) Hussein A. Hassouna (Egyptian) Michael C. Pryles (Australian)	Pending

Pending and Concluded Annulment Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Award	Tribunal** (President in Bold)	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee** (President in Bold)	Outcome
89. <i>Venoklim Holding B.V. v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela</i> ARB/12/22 (<i>Venoklim</i>)	Award of April 3, 2015 Spanish Concurring and dissenting opinion of Enrique Gómez Pinzón Spanish	Yves Derains (French) Enrique Gómez Pinzón (Colombian) Rodrigo Oreamuno Blanco (Costa Rican)	Álvaro Rodrigo Castellanos Howell (Guatemalan) Piero Bernardini (Italian) José Antonio Moreno Rodríguez (Paraguayan)	Pending
90. <i>Poštová banka, a.s. and ISTROKAPITAL SE v. Hellenic Republic</i> ARB/13/8 (<i>Poštová banka</i>)	Award of April 9, 2015 English	Eduardo Zuleta (Colombian) John M. Townsend (U.S.) Brigitte Stern (French)	Azzedine Kettani (Moroccan) David A. O. Edward (British) Hi-Taek Shin (Korean)	Pending

Annulment Grounds in Concluded Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Applicant	Request for Full or Partial Annulment	Ground Invoked: Article 52(1) (a)-(e)*	Ground Invoked: Description	Upheld	Outcome
1. <i>Amco Asia Corporation and others v. Republic of Indonesia</i> ARB/81/1 (<i>Amco I</i>)	Respondent	Full	(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	N	Annulled in part Decision of May, 16, 1986 1 ICSID Rep. 509 (1993) (English); Unofficial French translation in 114 J.Droit Int'l 175 (1987) (excerpts)
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	Y	
			(d)	Lack of impartiality	N	
			(d)	Treatment of evidence	N	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	
			(e)	Insufficient and/or inadequate reasons	Not addressed	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	Y	
2. <i>Amco Asia Corporation and others v. Republic of Indonesia</i> ARB/81/1-Resubmission (<i>Amco II</i>)	Respondent	Full	(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	N	Annulled in part Decision of December 17, 1992 9 ICSID Rep. 9 (2006) (English)
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	
			(d)	Lack of impartiality	N	
			(d)	Treatment of evidence	N	
			(d)	Inequality of treatment	Y	
			(e)	Insufficient and/or inadequate reasons	N	
	Claimants	Partial	(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	N	

*In a number of annulment proceedings, the Applicant characterized its arguments as falling within more than one of the grounds for annulment envisaged in Article 52 of the ICSID Convention.

Annulment Grounds in Concluded Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Applicant	Request for Full or Partial Annulment	Ground Invoked: Article 52(1) (a)-(e)*	Ground Invoked: Description	Upheld	Outcome
3. <i>Klöckner Industrie-Anlagen GmbH and others v. United Republic of Cameroon and Société Camerounaise des Engrais</i> ARB/81/2 (<i>Klöckner I</i>)	Claimants	Full	(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	N	Annulled in full English
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	Y	
			(d)	Lack of due process	N	
			(d)	Lack of impartiality	N	
			(d)	Right to be heard	N	
			(d)	Lack of deliberation	N	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	
			(e)	Insufficient and/or inadequate reasons	N	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
			(e)	Failure to deal with questions	Y	
4. <i>Klöckner Industrie-Anlagen GmbH and others v. United Republic of Cameroon and Société Camerounaise des Engrais</i> ARB/81/2 – Resubmission (<i>Klöckner II</i>)	Respondent	Not specified	(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	Annulment rejected
			(d)	Lack of impartiality	N	
			(d)	Right to be heard	N	
			(d)	Lack of deliberations	N	
			(d)	Treatment of evidence	N	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
	Claimants	Partial	(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	

Annulment Grounds in Concluded Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Applicant	Request for Full or Partial Annulment	Ground Invoked: Article 52(1) (a)-(e)*	Ground Invoked: Description	Upheld	Outcome
5. <i>Southern Pacific Properties (Middle East) Limited v. Arab Republic of Egypt</i> ARB/84/3 (SPP)	Respondent	Not specified				Discontinued
6. <i>Maritime International Nominees Establishment v. Republic of Guinea</i> ARB/84/4 (MINE)	Respondent	Partial	(b)	Failure to apply proper law	Not addressed	Annulled in part English
			(d)	Right to be heard	Not addressed	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	Y	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	Y	
			(e)	Failure to deal with questions	Y	
7. <i>Compañía de Aguas del Aconquija S.A. and Vivendi Universal S.A. v. Argentine Republic</i> ARB/97/3 (Vivendi I)	Claimants	Partial	(b)	Non-exercise of jurisdiction	Y	Annulled in part English Spanish
			(d)	Right to be heard	N	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	Not addressed	

Annulment Grounds in Concluded Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Applicant	Request for Full or Partial Annulment	Ground Invoked: Article 52(1) (a)-(e)*	Ground Invoked: Description	Upheld	Outcome
8. <i>Compañía de Aguas del Aconquija S.A. and Vivendi Universal S.A. v. Argentine Republic</i> ARB/97/3- Resubmission (<i>Vivendi II</i>)	Respondent	Full	(a)	Improper constitution of the tribunal	N	Annulment rejected English Spanish
			(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	N	
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	
			(d)	Lack of impartiality	N	
			(d)	Treatment of evidence	N	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	
			(e)	Failure to deal with questions	N	
9. <i>Víctor Pey Casado and President Allende Foundation v. Republic of Chile</i> ARB/98/2 (<i>Pey Casado</i>)	Respondent	Full	(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	N	Annulled in part English French
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	
			(d)	Lack of due process/inequality of treatment	N	
			(d)	Lack of impartiality	N	
			(d)	Right to be heard	Y	
			(d)	Burden of proof/treatment of evidence	N	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	Y	

Annulment Grounds in Concluded Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Applicant	Request for Full or Partial Annulment	Ground Invoked: Article 52(1) (a)-(e)*	Ground Invoked: Description	Upheld	Outcome
10. <i>Wena Hotels Limited v. Arab Republic of Egypt</i> ARB/98/4 (<i>Wena</i>)	Respondent	Full	(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	N	Annulment rejected English
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	
			(d)	Right to be heard	N	
			(d)	Treatment of evidence	N	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	
			(e)	Insufficient and/or inadequate reasons	N	
			(e)	Failure to deal with questions	N	
11. <i>Philippe Gruslin v. Malaysia</i> ARB/99/3 (<i>Gruslin</i>)	Claimant	Not Specified				Discontinued
12. <i>Patrick Mitchell v. Democratic Republic of the Congo</i> ARB/99/7 (<i>Mitchell</i>)	Respondent	Full	(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	Y	Annulled in full English
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	Y	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	

Annulment Grounds in Concluded Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Applicant	Request for Full or Partial Annulment	Ground Invoked: Article 52(1) (a)-(e)*	Ground Invoked: Description	Upheld	Outcome
13. <i>Consortium R.F.C.C. v. Kingdom of Morocco</i> ARB/00/6 (RFCC)	Claimant	Full	(b)	Non-exercise of jurisdiction	N	Annulment rejected
			(d)	Right to be heard	N	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
14. <i>Enron Creditors Recovery Corporation (formerly Enron Corporation) and Ponderosa Assets, L.P. v. Argentine Republic</i> ARB/01/3 (Enron)	Respondent	Full	(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	N	Annulled in part English
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	Y	
			(d)	Lack of impartiality	N	
			(d)	Right to be heard	N	
			(d)	Treatment of evidence	N	
			(d)	Breach of party autonomy	N	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	Y	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
			(e)	Failure to deal with questions	N	
15. <i>MTD Equity Sdn. Bhd. and MTD Chile S.A. v. Republic of Chile</i>	Respondent	Full	(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	Annulment rejected English
			(d)	Right to be heard	N	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	
			(e)	Insufficient and/or inadequate reasons	N	

Annulment Grounds in Concluded Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Applicant	Request for Full or Partial Annulment	Ground Invoked: Article 52(1) (a)-(e)*	Ground Invoked: Description	Upheld	Outcome
ARB/01/7 (MTD)			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
16. <i>CMS Gas Transmission Company v. Argentine Republic</i> ARB/01/8 (CMS)	Respondent	Full	(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	N	Annulled in part English Spanish
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	Y	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
17. <i>Repsol YPF Ecuador S.A. v. Empresa Estatal Petróleos del Ecuador (Petroecuador)</i> ARB/01/10 (Repsol)	Respondent	Full	(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	N	Annulment rejected Spanish English (unofficial translation)
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	
18. <i>Azurix Corp. v. Argentine Republic</i> ARB/01/12 (Azurix)	Respondent	Full	(a)	Improper constitution of the tribunal	N	Annulment rejected English Spanish
			(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	N	
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	
			(d)	Lack of impartiality	N	
			(d)	Treatment of evidence	N	

Annulment Grounds in Concluded Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Applicant	Request for Full or Partial Annulment	Ground Invoked: Article 52(1) (a)-(e)*	Ground Invoked: Description	Upheld	Outcome
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	
			(e)	Insufficient and/or inadequate reasons	N	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
			(e)	Failure to deal with questions	N	
19. <i>LG & E Energy Corp., LG & E Capital Corp. and LG & International Inc. v. Argentine Republic</i> ARB/02/1 (LG&E)	Both	Partial				Discontinued Order of Discontinuance English Spanish
20. <i>Hussein Nuaman Soufraki v. United Arab Emirates</i> ARB/02/7 (Soufraki)	Claimant	Full	(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	N	Annulment rejected English
			(b)	Non-exercise of jurisdiction	N	
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	
			(e)	Insufficient and/or inadequate reasons	N	

Annulment Grounds in Concluded Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Applicant	Request for Full or Partial Annulment	Ground Invoked: Article 52(1) (a)-(e)*	Ground Invoked: Description	Upheld	Outcome
21. <i>Siemens A.G. v. Argentine Republic</i> ARB/02/8 (Siemens)	Respondent	Full				Discontinued
22. <i>CDC Group plc v. Republic of Seychelles</i> ARB/02/14 (CDC)	Respondent	Full	(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	Annulment rejected English
			(d)	Lack of impartiality	N	
			(d)	Lack of deliberation	N	
			(d)	Treatment of evidence	N	
			(d)	Untimely issuance of award	N	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	
			(e)	Insufficient and/or inadequate reasons	N	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
			(e)	Failure to deal with questions	N	
23. <i>Ahmonseto, Inc. and others v. Arab Republic of Egypt</i> ARB/02/15 (Ahmonseto)	Claimant	Partial				Discontinued

Annulment Grounds in Concluded Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Applicant	Request for Full or Partial Annulment	Ground Invoked: Article 52(1) (a)-(e)*	Ground Invoked: Description	Upheld	Outcome
24. <i>Sempra Energy International v. Argentine Republic</i> ARB/02/16 (<i>Sempra</i>)	Respondent	Full	(a)	Improper constitution of the tribunal	Not addressed	Annulled in full English Spanish
			(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	N	
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	Y	
			(d)	Treatment of evidence	Not addressed	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	
25. <i>Industria Nacional de Alimentos, S.A. and Indalsa Perú, S.A. (formerly Empresas Lucchetti, S.A. and Lucchetti Perú, S.A.) v. Republic of Peru</i> ARB/03/4 (<i>Lucchetti</i>)	Claimants	Full	(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	N	Annulment rejected English Spanish
			(b)	Non-exercise of jurisdiction	N	
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	
			(d)	Lack of due process	N	
			(d)	Treatment of evidence	N	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
26. <i>M.C.I. Power Group, L.C. and New Turbine, Inc. v. Republic of Ecuador</i> ARB/03/6 (<i>MCI</i>)	Claimants	Partial	(b)	Non-exercise of jurisdiction	N	Annulment rejected English Spanish
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
			(e)	Failure to deal with questions	N	

Annulment Grounds in Concluded Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Applicant	Request for Full or Partial Annulment	Ground Invoked: Article 52(1) (a)-(e)*	Ground Invoked: Description	Upheld	Outcome
27. <i>Continental Casualty Company v. Argentine Republic</i> ARB/03/9 (Continental Casualty)	Respondent	Partial	(b)	Contradictory reasons	N	Annulment rejected English Spanish
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	
	Claimant	Partial	(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	
			(d)	Treatment of evidence	N	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
(e)	Failure to deal with questions	N				
28. <i>Joy Mining Machinery Limited v. Arab Republic of Egypt</i> ARB/03/11 (Joy Mining)	Claimant	Full				Discontinued English
29. <i>El Paso Energy International Company v. Argentine Republic</i> ARB/03/15 (El Paso)	Respondent	Full	(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	N	Annulment rejected English Spanish
			(b)	Contradictory conclusions/reasons	N	
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	
			(d)	Treatment of evidence	N	
			(d)	Lack of due process	N	
			(d)	Right to be heard	N	
			(e)	Insufficient and/or inadequate reasons	N	
(e)	Contradictory reasons	N				
30. <i>EDF International S.A., SAUR</i>	Respondent	Full	(a)	Improper constitution of the tribunal	N	Annulment rejected
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	

Annulment Grounds in Concluded Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Applicant	Request for Full or Partial Annulment	Ground Invoked: Article 52(1) (a)-(e)*	Ground Invoked: Description	Upheld	Outcome
<i>International S.A. and León Participaciones Argentinas S.A. v. Argentine Republic</i> ARB/03/23 <i>(EDFI v. Argentina)</i>			(b)	Treatment of evidence	N	English Spanish
			(d)	Lack of impartiality	N	
			(d)	Lack of due process	N	
			(d)	Treatment of evidence	N	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	
			(e)	Treatment of evidence	N	
31. <i>Fraport AG Frankfurt Airport Services Worldwide v. Republic of the Philippines</i> ARB/03/25 <i>(Fraport)</i>	Claimant	Full	(b)	Non-exercise of jurisdiction	N	Annulled in full English
			(d)	Lack of due process	N	
			(d)	Right to be heard	Y	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
32. <i>Duke Energy International Peru Investments No. 1 Ltd. v. Republic of Peru</i> ARB/03/28 <i>(Duke Energy)</i>	Respondent	Full	(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	N	Annulment rejected English
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
			(e)	Failure to deal with questions	N	

Annulment Grounds in Concluded Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Applicant	Request for Full or Partial Annulment	Ground Invoked: Article 52(1) (a)-(e)*	Ground Invoked: Description	Upheld	Outcome
33. <i>Total S.A. v. Argentine Republic</i> ARB/04/1 (Total)	Respondent	Full	(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	N	Annulment rejected English Spanish
			(d)	Right to be heard	N	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
34. <i>Compagnie d'Exploitation du Chemin de Fer Transgabonais v. Gabonese Republic</i> ARB/04/5 (Transgabonais)	Respondent	Full	(a)	Improper constitution of the tribunal	N	Annulment rejected 26(1) ICSID Rev.— FILJ 214 (2011) (French; excerpts)
			(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	N	
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	
			(d)	Treatment of evidence	N	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
35. <i>Sociedad Anónima Eduardo Vieira v. Republic of Chile</i> ARB/04/7 (Vieira)	Claimant	Full	(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	N	Annulment rejected Spanish
			(b)	Non-exercise of jurisdiction	N	
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	
			(d)	Right to be heard	N	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
36. <i>Daimler Financial Services</i>	Claimant	Partial	(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	Annulment rejected

Annulment Grounds in Concluded Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Applicant	Request for Full or Partial Annulment	Ground Invoked: Article 52(1) (a)-(e)*	Ground Invoked: Description	Upheld	Outcome
ARB/05/01 <i>(Daimler)</i>			(d)	Treatment of evidence/ burden of proof	N	English Spanish
			(d)	Right to be heard	N	
			(d)	Failure to decide by a majority	N	
			(d)	Unreasonable delay	N	
			(e)	Failure to deal with questions	N	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
37. <i>Malaysian Historical Salvors, SDN, BHD v. Malaysia</i> ARB/05/10 <i>(MHS)</i>	Claimant	Full	(b)	Non-exercise of jurisdiction	Y	Annulled in full English
38. <i>RSM Production Corporation v. Grenada</i> ARB/05/14 <i>(RSM v. Grenada)</i>	Claimant	Full				Discontinued

Annulment Grounds in Concluded Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Applicant	Request for Full or Partial Annulment	Ground Invoked: Article 52(1) (a)-(e)*	Ground Invoked: Description	Upheld	Outcome
39. <i>Waguïh Elie George Siag and Clorinda Vecchi v. Arab Republic of Egypt</i> ARB/05/15 (<i>Siag</i>)	Respondent	Full				Discontinued
40. <i>Rumeli Telekom A.S. and Telsim Mobil Telekomunikasyon Hizmetleri A.S. v. Republic of Kazakhstan</i> ARB/05/16 (<i>Rumeli</i>)	Respondent	Full	(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	N	Annulment rejected English
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	
			(d)	Treatment of evidence	N	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
			(e)	Failure to deal with questions	N	
41. <i>Ioannis Kardassopoulos v. Georgia</i> ARB/05/18 (<i>Kardassopoulos</i>)	Respondent	Partial				Discontinued

Annulment Grounds in Concluded Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Applicant	Request for Full or Partial Annulment	Ground Invoked: Article 52(1) (a)-(e)*	Ground Invoked: Description	Upheld	Outcome
42. <i>Helnan International Hotels A/S v. Arab Republic of Egypt</i> ARB/05/19 (<i>Helnan</i>)	Claimant	Full	(b)	Non-exercise of jurisdiction	Y	Annulled in part English
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	
			(d)	Right to be heard	N	
			(d)	Treatment of evidence	N	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
43. <i>Ioan Micula, Viorel Micula and others v. Romania</i> ARB/05/20 (<i>Micula</i>)	Respondent	Full	(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	Annulment rejected English
			(b)	Failure to deal with questions	N	
			(d)	Burden of proof	N	
			(e)	Failure to decide	N	
			(e)	Failure to deal with questions	N	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
44. <i>Togo Electricité and GDF-Suez Energie Services v. Republic of Togo</i> ARB/06/7 (<i>Togo Electricité</i>)	Respondent	Full	(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	Annulment rejected French
			(d)	Right to be heard	N	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	

Annulment Grounds in Concluded Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Applicant	Request for Full or Partial Annulment	Ground Invoked: Article 52(1) (a)-(e)*	Ground Invoked: Description	Upheld	Outcome
45. <i>Libananco Holdings Co. Limited v. Republic of Turkey</i> ARB/06/8 (<i>Libananco</i>)	Claimant	Full	(b)	Non-exercise of jurisdiction	N	Annulment rejected English (excerpts)
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	
			(d)	Lack of impartiality	N	
			(d)	Lack of due process/violation of equality of arms	N	
			(d)	Treatment of evidence	N	
			(d)	Untimely issuance of award	N	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	
46. <i>Occidental Petroleum Corp. and Occidental Exploration and Production Co. v. Republic of Ecuador</i> ARB/06/11 (<i>Occidental</i>)	Respondent	Full	(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	Y	Annulled in part English Spanish
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	
			(d)	Lack of reasoning	N	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	
			(e)	Insufficient and/or inadequate reasons	N	
			(e)	Failure to deal with questions	N	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
47. <i>Joseph C. Lemire v. Ukraine</i> ARB/06/18 (<i>Lemire</i>)	Respondent	Partial	(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	Annulment rejected English (excerpts)
			(d)	Right to be heard	N	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	

Annulment Grounds in Concluded Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Applicant	Request for Full or Partial Annulment	Ground Invoked: Article 52(1) (a)-(e)*	Ground Invoked: Description	Upheld	Outcome
48. <i>Nations Energy Inc. and others v. Republic of Panama</i> ARB/06/19 (Nations)	Claimant	Full				Discontinued
49. <i>RSM Production Corporation v. Central African Republic</i> ARB/07/02 (RSM v. Central African Republic)	Claimant	Full	(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	Annulment rejected French (excerpts)
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
50. <i>Tza Yap Shum v. Republic of Peru</i> ARB/07/6 (Shum)	Respondent	Full	(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	N	Annulment rejected Spanish
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	
			(d)	Right to be heard	N	
			(d)	Treatment of evidence	N	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
			(e)	Insufficient and/or inadequate reasons	N	

Annulment Grounds in Concluded Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Applicant	Request for Full or Partial Annulment	Ground Invoked: Article 52(1) (a)-(e)*	Ground Invoked: Description	Upheld	Outcome
51. <i>Toto Costruzioni Generali S.p.A. v. Republic of Lebanon</i> ARB/07/12 (Toto)	Claimant	Full				Discontinued
52. <i>Ron Fuchs v. Georgia</i> ARB/07/15 (Fuchs)	Respondent	Full				Discontinued
53. <i>Impregilo S.p.A v. Argentine Republic</i> ARB/07/17 (Impregilo)	Respondent	Full	(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	N	Annulment rejected English Spanish
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	
			(d)	Right to be heard	N	
			(d)	Treatment of evidence	N	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
54. <i>AES Summit Generation Limited and AES-Tisza Erömü Kft.</i>	Claimants	Full	(b)	Non-exercise of jurisdiction	N	Annulment rejected English
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	

Annulment Grounds in Concluded Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Applicant	Request for Full or Partial Annulment	Ground Invoked: Article 52(1) (a)-(e)*	Ground Invoked: Description	Upheld	Outcome
<i>v. Republic of Hungary</i> ARB/07/22 (AES Summit)			(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	
			(e)	Insufficient and/or inadequate reasons	N	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
			(e)	Failure to deal with questions	N	
55. <i>SGS Société Générale de Surveillance S.A. v. Republic of Paraguay</i> ARB/07/29 (<i>SGS v. Paraguay</i>)	Respondent	Full	(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	N	Annulment rejected English
			(e)	Insufficient and/or inadequate reasons	N	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
56. <i>Astaldi S.p.A. v. Republic of Honduras</i> ARB/07/32 (<i>Astaldi</i>)	Respondent	Not Specified				Discontinued Spanish

Annulment Grounds in Concluded Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Applicant	Request for Full or Partial Annulment	Ground Invoked: Article 52(1) (a)-(e)*	Ground Invoked: Description	Upheld	Outcome
57. <i>ATA Construction, Industrial and Trading Company v. Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan</i> ARB/08/2 (ATA)	Respondent	Partial				Discontinued English
58. <i>Caratube International Oil Company v. Republic of Kazakhstan</i> ARB/08/12 (Caratube)	Claimant	Full	(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	N	Annulment rejected English
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	
			(d)	Right to be heard	N	
			(d)	Treatment of evidence	N	
			(d)	Burden of proof	N	
			(e)	Insufficient and/or inadequate reasons	N	
59. <i>Alapli Elektrik B.V. v. Republic of Turkey</i> ARB/08/13 (Alapli)	Claimant	Full	(b)	Non-exercise of jurisdiction	N	Annulment rejected English
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	
			(d)	Failure to deal with questions	N	
			(d)	Failure to decide by a majority	N	
			(e)	Insufficient and/or inadequate reasons	N	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	

Annulment Grounds in Concluded Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Applicant	Request for Full or Partial Annulment	Ground Invoked: Article 52(1) (a)-(e)*	Ground Invoked: Description	Upheld	Outcome
60. <i>Malicorp Limited v. Arab Republic of Egypt</i> ARB/08/18 (<i>Malicorp</i>)	Claimant	Full	(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	Annulment rejected English French
			(d)	Right to be heard/Inequality of treatment	N	
			(d)	Treatment of evidence	N	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
61. <i>Karmer Marble Tourism Construction Industry and Commerce Limited Liability Company v. Georgia</i> ARB/08/19 (<i>Karmer</i>)	Respondent	Partial				Discontinued
62. <i>Elsamex, S.A. v. Republic of Honduras</i> ARB/09/04 (<i>Elsamex</i>)	Respondent	Full				Discontinued Spanish
63. <i>Iberdrola Energia S.A. v. Republic of Guatemala</i>	Claimant	Full	(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	N	Annulment rejected Spanish
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	

Annulment Grounds in Concluded Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Applicant	Request for Full or Partial Annulment	Ground Invoked: Article 52(1) (a)-(e)*	Ground Invoked: Description	Upheld	Outcome
ARB/09/5 <i>(Iberdrola)</i>			(d)	Failure to deal with questions	N	
			(d)	Right to be heard	N	
			(d)	Lack of due process	N	
			(e)	Failure to state reasons	N	
			(e)	Insufficient and/or inadequate reasons	N	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
64. <i>KT Asia Investment Group B.V. v. Republic of Kazakhstan</i> ARB/09/8 <i>(KT Asia)</i>	Claimant	Full				Discontinued
65. <i>Adem Dogan v. Turkmenistan</i> ARB/09/9 <i>(Dogan)</i>	Respondent	Full	(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	N	Annulment rejected English
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	
			(b)	Burden of proof / Treatment of evidence	N	
			(d)	Burden of proof	N	
			(d)	Right to be heard	N	
			(d)	Inequality of treatment	N	

Annulment Grounds in Concluded Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Applicant	Request for Full or Partial Annulment	Ground Invoked: Article 52(1) (a)-(e)*	Ground Invoked: Description	Upheld	Outcome
			(e)	Insufficient and/or inadequate reasons	N	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
66. <i>Commerce Group Corp. and San Sebastian Gold Mines v. Republic of El Salvador</i> ARB/09/17 (Commerce Group)	Claimants	Full				Discontinued Order of Discontinuance English
67. <i>Kilç İnşaat İthalat İhracat Sanayi ve Ticaret Anonim Şirketi v. Turkmenistan</i> ARB/10/1 (Kilç)	Claimant	Full	(b)	Non-exercise of jurisdiction	N	Annulment Rejected English
			(b)	Contradictory reasons	N	
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	
			(b)	Burden of Proof/ Treatment of evidence	N	
			(d)	Inequality of treatment	N	
			(d)	Burden of Proof/ Treatment of evidence	N	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
			(e)	Insufficient and/or inadequate reasons	N	

Annulment Grounds in Concluded Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Applicant	Request for Full or Partial Annulment	Ground Invoked: Article 52(1) (a)-(e)*	Ground Invoked: Description	Upheld	Outcome
			(e)	Burden of Proof/ Treatment of evidence	N	
68. <i>Antoine Abou Lahoud and Leila Bounafeh-Abou Lahoud v. Democratic Republic of the Congo</i> ARB/10/4 (Lahoud)	Respondent	Full	(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	N	Annulment Rejected French
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
			(e)	Insufficient and/or inadequate reasons	N	
69. <i>Renée Rose Levy de Levi v. Republic of Peru</i> ARB/10/17 (Levy de Levi)	Claimant	Partial				Discontinued
70. <i>TECO Guatemala Holdings LLC v. Republic of Guatemala</i> ARB/10/23 (TECO)	Respondent	Full	(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	N	Annulled in part English
			(b)	Failure to apply proper law	N	
			(d)	Treatment of evidence	N	
			(e)	Insufficient and/or inadequate reasons	N	

Annulment Grounds in Concluded Proceedings

Case (Short Title)	Applicant	Request for Full or Partial Annulment	Ground Invoked: Article 52(1) (a)-(e)*	Ground Invoked: Description	Upheld	Outcome
	Claimant	Partial	(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
			(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	Not addressed	
			(d)	Burden of proof/ Treatment of evidence	Not addressed	
			(d)	Right to be heard	Y	
			(d)	Inequality of treatment	Not addressed	
			(e)	Contradictory reasons	N	
			(e)	Failure to address evidence	Y	
71. <i>Rafat Ali Rizvi v. Republic of Indonesia</i> ARB/11/13 (Rizvi)	Claimant	Full				Discontinued
72. <i>Tulip Real Estate and Development Netherlands B.V. v. Republic of Turkey</i> ARB/11/28 (Tulip)	Claimants	Full	(b)	Lack or excess of jurisdiction	N	Annulment rejected English
(d)			Right to be heard	N		
(d)			Treatment of evidence	N		
(d)			Inequality of treatment	N		
(e)			Contradictory reasons	N		

Bibliography on ICSID Annulment

<i>Author(s)</i>	<i>Title of Book, Book Chapter, or Article</i>	<i>Periodical Title / URL</i>	<i>Volume / Page</i>	<i>Year</i>
Aggirezabalaga, Iñigo Iruretagoiena	<i>Límites de la función de los Comités ad hoc en el marco de los recursos de anulación del Convenio del CIADI (M.C.I. Power Group L.C. y New Turbine Inc. c. República de Ecuador, Caso CIADI No. ARB/03/6)</i>	Arbitraje: Revista de Arbitraje Comercial y de Inversiones	Vol. III, No. 2, p. 485	2010
Alexandrov, Stanimir A.	<i>The Vivendi Annulment Decision and the Lessons for Future ICSID Arbitrations – The Applicant’s Perspective</i> , in <i>Annulment of ICSID Awards</i> , IAI series on international arbitration n°1 (Emmanuel Gaillard and Yas Banifatemi eds., Juris and International Arbitration Institute)		p. 97	2004
Alvarez Avila, Gabriela	<i>ICSID Annulment Procedure: A Balancing Exercise Between Correctness and Finality</i> , in <i>Arbitration Advocacy in Changing Times</i> , ICCA Congress Series No. 15 (Albert Jan van den Berg ed., Kluwer Law International)		p. 289	2011
Alvarez, Henri C.	<i>Setting Aside Additional Facility Awards: the Metalclad Case</i> , in <i>Annulment of ICSID Awards</i> , IAI series on international arbitration n°1 (Emmanuel Gaillard and Yas Banifatemi eds., Juris and International Arbitration Institute)		p. 267	2004
Alvarez-Jiménez, Alberto	<i>The Interpretation of Necessity Clauses in Bilateral Investment Treaties After the Recent ICSID Annulment Decisions</i> , in <i>Yearbook on International Investment Law & Policy 2010–2011</i> (Karl P. Sauvant ed., Oxford University Press)		p. 419	2012
Aronson, Benjamin M.	<i>A New Framework for ICSID Annulment Jurisprudence: Rethinking the “Three Generations”</i>	Vienna Journal on International Constitutional Law	Vol. 6, No. 1, p. 3	2012
Balaš, Vladimir	<i>Review of Awards</i> , in <i>The Oxford Handbook of International Investment Law</i> (Peter Muchlinski et al. eds., Oxford University Press)		p. 1125	2008
Banifatemi, Yas	<i>Defending Investment Treaty Awards: Is There an ICSID Advantage?</i> , in <i>50 Years of the New York Convention: ICCA International Commercial Arbitration Conference</i> , ICCA Congress Series No. 14 (Albert Jan van den Berg ed., Kluwer Law International)		p. 318	2009
Ben Hamida, Walid	<i>Two Nebulous ICSID Features: The Notion of Investment and the Scope of Annulment Control – Ad Hoc Committee’s Decision in Patrick Mitchell v. Democratic Republic of Congo</i>	Journal of International Arbitration	Vol. 24, No. 3, p. 287	2007

Bibliography on ICSID Annulment

<i>Author(s)</i>	<i>Title of Book, Book Chapter, or Article</i>	<i>Periodical Title / URL</i>	<i>Volume / Page</i>	<i>Year</i>
Berman, Franklin	<i>Review of the Arbitral Tribunal's Jurisdiction in ICSID Arbitration</i> , in The Review of International Arbitral Awards, IAI series on international arbitration n° 6 (Emmanuel Gaillard ed., JurisNet)		p. 253	2010
Bernasconi-Osterwalder, Nathalie	<i>ICSID's Annulment Decision in Impregilo v. Argentina: Finality of Awards v. Legal Correctness</i>	IISD Investment Treaty News	Vol. 5, No. 1	2014
Bernardini, Piero	<i>ICSID Versus Non-ICSID Investment Treaty Arbitration</i> , in Liber Amicorum Bernardo Cremades (Miguel Ángel Fernández-Ballesteros and David Arias eds., La Ley)		p. 159	2010
Bishop, R. Doak, and Silvia M. Marchili	Annulment under the ICSID Convention (Oxford University Press)			2012
Bjorklund, Andrea K.	<i>The Continuing Appeal of Annulment? Lessons from Amco Asia and CME</i> , in International Investment Law and Arbitration: Leading Cases from the ICSID, NAFTA, Bilateral Treaties and Customary International Law (Todd Weiler ed., Cameron May Ltd.)		p. 471	2005
Blackaby, Nigel, et al.	<i>Challenge of Arbitral Awards</i> , in Redfern and Hunter on International Arbitration (Alan Redfern et al. eds., 6 th ed. Oxford University Press)		p. 569	2015
Blackaby, Nigel, et al.	<i>Challenge of Arbitral Awards</i> , in Redfern and Hunter on International Arbitration (Alan Redfern et al. eds., 5 th ed. Oxford University Press)		p. 585	2009
Blyschak, Paul Michael	<i>State Consent, Investor Interests and the Future of Investment Arbitration: Reanalyzing the Jurisdiction of Investor-State Tribunals in Hard Cases</i>	Asper Review of International Business and Trade Law	Vol. 9, No. 1, p. 99	2009
Blome, Matthew	<i>Contractual waiver of Article 52 ICSID: a solution to the concerns with annulment?</i>	Arbitration International		2016
Bohmer, Lisa M.	<i>Finality in ICSID Arbitration Revisited</i>	ICSID Review—Foreign Investment Law Journal	Vol. 31, No. 1	2016
Bondar, Kateryna	<i>Annulment of ICSID and Non-ICSID Investment Awards: Differences in the Extent of Review</i>	Journal of International Arbitration	Vol. 32, No. 6, p. 621	2015

Bibliography on ICSID Annulment

<i>Author(s)</i>	<i>Title of Book, Book Chapter, or Article</i>	<i>Periodical Title / URL</i>	<i>Volume / Page</i>	<i>Year</i>
Born, Gary B.	<i>Annulment and Revision of International Arbitral Awards</i> , in <i>International Arbitration: Cases and Materials</i> (Gary B. Born ed., Kluwer Law International)		p. 1047	2011
Born, Gary B.	<i>Annulment of International Arbitral Awards</i> , in <i>International Commercial Arbitration</i> (Gary B. Born, Kluwer Law International)		Vol. II, p. 2551	2009
Born, Gary B.	<i>Recognition and Enforcement of International Arbitral Awards – Suspension of Proceedings Pending Resolution of Application to Annul Award</i> , in <i>International Commercial Arbitration</i> (Gary B. Born, Kluwer Law International)		Vol. II, p. 2701	2009
Branson, David J.	<i>Annulments of “Final” ICSID Awards Raise Questions about the Process</i>	National Law Journal	p. 25	Aug. 4, 1986
Broches, Aron	<i>Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States of 1965</i> , in <i>Yearbook Commercial Arbitration</i> (Albert Jan van den Berg ed., Kluwer Law International)		Vol. XVIII, p. 627	1993
Broches, Aron	<i>On the Finality of Awards: A Reply to Michael Reisman</i>	ICSID Review—Foreign Investment Law Journal	Vol. 8, No. 1, p. 92	1993
Broches, Aron	<i>Observations on the Finality of ICSID Awards</i>	ICSID Review—Foreign Investment Law Journal	Vol. 6, No. 2, p. 321	1991
Broches, Aron	<i>Awards Rendered Pursuant to the ICSID Convention: Binding Force, Finality, Recognition, Enforcement, Execution</i>	ICSID Review—Foreign Investment Law Journal	Vol. 2, No. 2, p. 287	1987
Broches, Aron	<i>The Experience of the International Centre for the Settlement of Investment Disputes</i> , in <i>International Investment Disputes: Avoidance and Settlement</i> (Seymour J. Rubin and Richard W. Nelson eds., West Publishing)		p. 75	1985
Brower, Charles N., Michael Ottolenghi, and Peter Prows	<i>The Saga of CMS, Res Judicata, and the Legitimacy of ICSID Arbitration</i> , in <i>International Investment Law for the 21st Century: Essays in Honour of Christoph Schreuer</i> (Christina Binder et al. eds., Oxford University Press)		p. 843	2009

Bibliography on ICSID Annulment

<i>Author(s)</i>	<i>Title of Book, Book Chapter, or Article</i>	<i>Periodical Title / URL</i>	<i>Volume / Page</i>	<i>Year</i>
Brower, Charles N.	<i>Ibrahim Shihata and the Resolution of International Investment Disputes: The Masterful Missionary</i>	Studies in Transnational Legal Policy	Vol. 31, p. 79	1999
Buckley, Ross P	<i>Now We Have come to the ICSID Party: Are its Awards Final and Enforceable?</i>	Sydney Law Review	Vol. 14, No. 3, p. 359	1992
Burgstaller, Markus, and Charles B. Rosenberg	<i>Challenging International Arbitral Awards: To ICSID or not to ICSID?</i>	Arbitration International	Vol. 27, No. 1, p. 91	2011
Burke-White, William, et al.	<i>Private Litigation in a Public Law Sphere: The Standard of Review in Investor-State Arbitrations</i>	Yale Journal of International Law	Vol. 35, No. 2, p. 283	2010
Burke-White, William	<i>The Argentine Financial Crisis: State Liability under BITS and the Legitimacy of the ICSID System</i>	Asian World Trade Organization and International Health Law and Policy	Vol. 3, p. 199	2008
Caron, David D.	<i>Framing the Work of ICSID Annulment Committees</i>	World Arbitration and Mediation Review	Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 173-199	2012
Caron, David D.	<i>Reputation and Reality in the ICSID Annulment Process: Understanding the Distinction Between Annulment and Appeal</i>	ICSID Review—Foreign Investment Law Journal	Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 21	1992
Cheng, Tai-Heng	<i>The Role of Justice in Annulling Investor-State Arbitration Awards</i>	Berkeley Journal of International Law	Vol. 31, No. 1, p. 236	2013
Cheng, Tai-Heng and Lucas Bento	<i>Practical Measures to Control Annulments in Investor-State Arbitration Awards</i>	New York Law Journal	Vol. 248, p. S8	2012
Cheng, Tai-Heng, et al.	<i>Reasons and Reasoning in Investment Treaty Arbitration</i>	Suffolk Transnational Law Review	Vol. 32, No. 2, p. 409	2009

Bibliography on ICSID Annulment

<i>Author(s)</i>	<i>Title of Book, Book Chapter, or Article</i>	<i>Periodical Title / URL</i>	<i>Volume / Page</i>	<i>Year</i>
Clapham, Jason	<i>Finality of Investor-State Arbitral Awards: Has the Tide Turned and is there a Need for Reform?</i>	Journal of International Arbitration	Vol. 26, No. 3, p. 437	2009
Collins, David	<i>ICSID Annulment Committee Appointments: Too Much Discretion for the Chairman?</i>	Journal of International Arbitration	Vol. 30, No. 4, pp. 333-343	2013
Committee on International Commercial Disputes of the New York City Bar Association	<i>Report: Recommended Procedures for Recognition and Enforcement of International Arbitration Awards Rendered under the ICSID Convention</i>	ICSID Review—Foreign Investment Journal	Vol. 27, No. 1, p. 207	2012
Cordero Arce, Gonzalo	<i>Anulación de laudos arbitrales en el CIADI</i>	Revista Chilena de Derecho	Vol. 32, No. 2, p. 219	2005
Craig, William L.	<i>The Final Chapter in the Pyramids Case: Discounting an ICSID Award for Annulment Risk</i>	ICSID Review—Foreign Investment Journal	Vol. 8, No. 2, p. 264	1993
Craig, William L.	<i>Uses and Abuses of Appeal from Awards</i>	Arbitration International	Vol. 4. No. 3, p. 174	1988
Cremades, Bernardo M.	<i>Litigating Annulment Proceedings – The Vivendi Matter: Contract and Treaty Claims</i> , in <i>Annulment of ICSID Awards</i> , IAI series on international arbitration n°1 (Emmanuel Gaillard and Yas Banifatemi eds., Juris and International Arbitration Institute)		p. 87	2004
Cristani, Federica	<i>The “Sempra” Annulment Decision of 29 June 2010 and Subsequent Developments in Investment Arbitration Dealing with the Necessity Defence</i>	International Community Law Review	Vol. 15, No. 2, p. 237	2013
Crivellaro, Antonio	<i>The Failure to State Reasons in ICSID Awards</i>	Les Cahiers de l’Arbitrage	Vol. 4, p. 865	2012
Crivellaro, Antonio	<i>Annulment of ICSID Awards: Back to the “First Generation”?</i> , in <i>Liber Amicorum – Mélanges en l’Honneur de Serge Lazareff</i> (Laurent Lévy and Yves Derains eds., Pedone)		p. 145	2011
Crivellaro, Antonio	<i>Actualité du contrôle des sentences arbitrales CIRDI</i> , in <i>La procédure arbitrale relative aux investissements internationaux: Aspects récents</i> (Charles Leben ed., Anthemis)		p. 221	2010

Bibliography on ICSID Annulment

<i>Author(s)</i>	<i>Title of Book, Book Chapter, or Article</i>	<i>Periodical Title / URL</i>	<i>Volume / Page</i>	<i>Year</i>
Crivellaro, Antonio	<i>The Arbitrator's Failure to Disclose Conflicts of Interest: Is it a Per Se Ground for Annulling the Award?</i> , in Liber Amicorum Bernardo Cremades (Miguel Ángel Fernández-Ballesteros and David Arias eds., La Ley)		p. 309	2010
Crook, John R.	<i>Case Summary: CMS Gas Transmission Company v. Argentine Republic (ICSID Case No. ARB/01/08) (Annulment Decision, September 25, 2007)</i>	ICSID Review— Foreign Investment Law Journal	Vol. 22, No. 2, p. 455	2007
Curtis, Christopher T.	<i>International Investment Disputes – Res Judicata Effect of Partially Annulled ICSID Award</i>	American Journal of International Law	Vol. 83, No. 1, p. 106	1989
Daly, Brooks, and Fedelma Claire Smith	<i>Comment on the differing legal frameworks of investment treaty arbitration and commercial arbitration as seen through precedent, annulment, and procedural rules</i> , in 50 Years of the New York Convention (A.J. van den Berg ed., Kluwer Law International)		p. 151	2009
De Berranger, Thibaut	<i>L'article 52 de la Convention de Washington du 18 mars 1965 et les premiers enseignements de sa pratique</i>	Revue de l'Arbitrage	No. 1, p. 93	1988
Delaume, Georges R.	<i>Reflections on the Effectiveness of International Arbitral Awards</i>	Journal of International Arbitration	Vol. 12, No. 1, p. 5	1995
Delaume, Georges R.	<i>The Pyramids Stand – The Pharaohs Can Rest in Peace</i>	ICSID Review— Foreign Investment Law Journal	Vol. 8, No. 2, p. 231	1993
Delaume, Georges R.	<i>The Finality of Arbitration Involving States: Recent Developments</i>	Arbitration International	Vol. 5, No. 1, p. 21	1989
Demirkol, Berk	<i>Enforcement of International Commercial Arbitration Agreements and Awards in Investment Treaty Arbitration</i>	ICSID Review— Foreign Investment Law Journal	Vol. 30, No. 1, pp. 56-77	2015
Derains, Yves	<i>La tentación pedagógica de algunos Comités de anulación del CIADI</i> , in Sistema de Anulación de los Laudos CIADI, Anuario Latinoamericano de Arbitraje N°1 (Carlos A. Soto Coaguila ed., Instituto Peruano de Arbitraje)		p. 11	2011

Bibliography on ICSID Annulment

<i>Author(s)</i>	<i>Title of Book, Book Chapter, or Article</i>	<i>Periodical Title / URL</i>	<i>Volume / Page</i>	<i>Year</i>
Diel-Gligor, Katharina	<i>Systemic Deficiencies of ICSID Investment Arbitration? : an Inspection of the Annulment Mechanism: Paper</i> , in <i>International dispute settlement: room for innovations?</i> (Rüdiger Wolfrum and Ina Gätzschmann, eds.)		p. 359	2013
Di Rosa, Paolo	<i>Consideraciones sobre el predominio de la “extralimitación manifiesta de facultades” versus la “falta de motivación del laudo” como causal de anulación de laudos CIADI</i> , in <i>Sistema de Anulación de los Laudos CIADI</i> , Anuario Latinoamericano de Arbitraje N°1 (Carlos A. Soto Coaguila ed., Instituto Peruano de Arbitraje)		p. 19	2011
Dong, Wang	<i>Post-Award Remedies and Procedures</i> , in <i>Dispute Settlement: International Centre for the Settlement of Investment Disputes</i> (United Nations)	<i>Available at</i> http://unctad.org/en/docs/edmmisc232add7_en.pdf		2003
Dugan, Christopher F., et al.	<i>Annulment and Set Aside</i> , in <i>Investor-State Arbitration</i> (Christopher F. Dugan et al., Oxford University Press)		p. 627	2008
El-Kosheri, Ahmed S.	<i>Reflections on the ICSID Annulment Decision Rendered in the Fraport/Philippines Case</i> , in <i>Grenzen überwinden - Prinzipien bewahren</i> / Herbert Kronke and Karsten Thorn eds., Giesecking)		p. 996	2011
El-Kosheri, Ahmed S.	<i>Review of ICSID Awards Based on a Manifest Excess of Powers</i> , in <i>The Review of International Arbitral Awards</i> , IAI series on international arbitration n° 6 (Emmanuel Gaillard ed., JurisNet)		p. 265	2010
El-Kosheri, Ahmed S.	<i>The Klöckner Case and the Finality of ICSID Arbitral Awards</i> , in <i>Liber Amicorum Professor Ignaz Seidl-Hohenveldern in Honour of His 80th Birthday</i> (Gerhard Hafner et al. eds., Kluwer Law International)		p. 103	1998
Escobar, Alejandro A., and Ernesto J. Félix De Jesús	<i>La decisión de anulación en el caso Iberdrola Energía, SA c República de Guatemala: Alcance del estándar aplicable a causales de anulación bajo el Convenio del CIADI</i>	ICSID Review— Foreign Investment Law Journal	Vol. 31, No. 1, p. 104	2016
Escobar, Alejandro A.	<i>Introductory Note: International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID): Azurix Corp. v. The Argentine Republic Decision on the Argentine Republic’s Request for a Continued Stay of Enforcement of the Award</i>	International Legal Materials	Vol. 47, No. 3, p. 445	2008

Bibliography on ICSID Annulment

<i>Author(s)</i>	<i>Title of Book, Book Chapter, or Article</i>	<i>Periodical Title / URL</i>	<i>Volume / Page</i>	<i>Year</i>
Evseev, Dmitri	<i>Living with Indeterminacy: A Practical Approach to ICSID Annulment Reasoning</i> , in Investment Treaty Arbitration and International Law (Ian A. Laird and Todd J. Weiler eds., JurisNet)		Vol. 2, p. 177	2009
Feldman, Mark B.	<i>The Annulment Proceedings and the Finality of ICSID Arbitral Awards</i>	ICSID Review—Foreign Investment Law Journal	Vol. 2, No. 1, p. 85	1987
Fernández Rozas, José Carlos	<i>Dogmática del recurso de anulación ante el CIADI</i> , in Sistema de Anulación de los Laudos CIADI, Anuario Latinoamericano de Arbitraje N°1 (Carlos A. Soto Coaguila ed., Instituto Peruano de Arbitraje)		p. 31	2011
Fernández-Armesto, Juan	<i>Different Systems for the Annulment of Investment Awards</i>	ICSID Review—Foreign Investment Law Journal	Vol. 26, No. 1, p. 128	2011
Fernando, Anthony F.T.	<i>The Requirement to Provide a Bank Guarantee in Return for a Continuation of the Provisional Stay of Enforcement of the Award under Article 52(5) of the ICSID Convention – Can This Be Justified?</i>	Transnational Dispute Management:	No. 1	2005
Fouret, Julien (ed.)	Enforcement of Investment Treaty Arbitration Awards: A Global Guide (Globe Law and Business)			2015
Fouret, Julien	<i>Stay(ing) on Track or Falling off the Edge: The Absence of Legal Security in the Ad Hoc Committees' Decisions under Article 52(5) of the ICSID Convention</i>	ICSID Review—Foreign Investment Law Journal	Vol. 27, No. 2, pp. 303-334	2012
Fouret, Julien, and Dany Khayat	<i>International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID) Case Law Review</i>	The Law and Practice of International Courts and Tribunals	Vol. 11, No. 1, p. 137	2012
Fouret, Julien, and Dany Khayat	<i>Le Centre international pour le règlement des différends relatifs aux investissements</i>	Revue québécoise de droit international	Vols. 2–11	2002–2011
Fouret, Julien, and Dany Khayat	Recueil des commentaires des décisions du CIRDI : (2002–2007) (Bruylant)			2009

Bibliography on ICSID Annulment

<i>Author(s)</i>	<i>Title of Book, Book Chapter, or Article</i>	<i>Periodical Title / URL</i>	<i>Volume / Page</i>	<i>Year</i>
Franck, Susan D.	<i>The ICSID Effect? Considering Potential Variations in Arbitration Awards</i>	Virginia Journal of International Law	Vol. 51, No. 4, p. 825	2010–2011
Franck, Susan D.	<i>The Legitimacy Crisis in Investment Treaty Arbitration: Privatizing Public International Law Through Inconsistent Decisions</i>	Fordham Law Review	Vol. 73, No. 4, p. 1521	2005
Friedland, Paul D.	<i>Stay of Enforcement of the Arbitral Award Pending ICSID Annulment Proceedings</i> , in <i>Annulment of ICSID Awards</i> , IAI series on international arbitration n°1 (Emmanuel Gaillard and Yas Banifatemi eds., Juris and International Arbitration Institute)		p. 177	2004
Friedland, Paul D., and Paul Brumpton	<i>Rabid Redux: The Second Wave of Abusive ICSID Annulments</i>	American University International Law Review	Vol. 27, p. 727	2012
Frutos-Peterson, Claudia	<i>Case Summary: Azurix Corp. v. Argentine Republic (ICSID Case No. ARB/01/12), Annulment Proceeding – Decision on the Argentine Republic’s Request for a Continued Stay of Enforcement of the Award</i>	ICSID Review—Foreign Investment Law Journal	Vol. 23, No. 1, p. 155	2008
Frutos-Peterson, Claudia	<i>Case Summary: Enron Corporation and Ponderosa Assets, L.P. v. Argentine Republic (ICSID Case No. ARB/01/3), Annulment Proceeding – Decision on the Argentine Republic’s Request for a Continued Stay of Enforcement of the Award</i>	ICSID Review—Foreign Investment Law Journal	Vol. 23, No. 1, p. 164	2008
Fuentes, Ximena, and Johanna Klein Kranenberg	<i>Annulment proceedings in cases involving Latin American countries – Procesos de anulación en casos relacionados a países latinoamericanos</i> , in <i>International Investment Law in Latin America: Problems and Prospects / Derecho Internacional de las Inversiones en América Latina: Problemas y Perspectivas</i> (Attila Tanzi, Alessandra Asteriti, Rodrigo Polanco Lazo and Paolo Turrini eds., Brill Nijhoff)		p. 229	2016
Gaillard, Emmanuel	<i>Centre international pour le règlement des différends relatifs aux investissements (CIRDI) – Chronique des sentence arbitrales</i>	Journal du Droit International	p. 499	2010
Gaillard, Emmanuel	<i>Centre international pour le règlement des différends relatifs aux investissements (CIRDI) – Chronique des sentence arbitrales</i>	Journal du Droit International	p. 311	2008
Gaillard, Emmanuel	La Jurisprudence du CIRDI (2004-2008) (Pedone)		Vol. II	2008
Gaillard, Emmanuel	La Jurisprudence du CIRDI (Pedone)		Vol. I	2004

Bibliography on ICSID Annulment

<i>Author(s)</i>	<i>Title of Book, Book Chapter, or Article</i>	<i>Periodical Title / URL</i>	<i>Volume / Page</i>	<i>Year</i>
Gaillard, Emmanuel	<i>The Extent of Review of the Applicable Law in Investment Treaty Arbitration</i> , in Annulment of ICSID Awards, IAI series on international arbitration n°1 (Emmanuel Gaillard and Yas Banifatemi eds., Juris and International Arbitration Institute 2004)		p. 223	2004
Gaillard, Emmanuel	<i>L'arbitrage sur le fondement des traités de protection des investissements</i>	Revue de l'Arbitrage	No. 3, p. 853	2003
Gaillard, Emmanuel	<i>Landmark in ICSID Arbitration: Committee Decision in Wena Hotels</i>	New York Law Journal	Vol. 227, p. 3	Apr. 4, 2002
Gaillard, Emmanuel	<i>Centre international pour le règlement des différends relatifs aux investissements (CIRDI) – Chronique des sentences arbitrales</i>	Journal du Droit International	p. 135	1987
Gaillard, Emmanuel	<i>Introductory Note: International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes: Decision of Ad hoc Committee on Annulment of Arbitral Award in Amco Asia Corporation et al. v. Indonesia</i>	International Legal Materials	Vol. 25, p. 1439	1986
Garcia-Bolivar, Omar E.	<i>Protected Investments and Protected Investors: The Outer Limits of ICSID's Reach</i>	Trade, Law, and Development	Vol. 2, No. 1, p. 145	2010
Garibaldi, Oscar M., et al.	<i>La anulación de los laudos en los casos Sempra y Enron</i> , in Sistema de Anulación de los Laudos CIADI, Anuario Latinoamericano de Arbitraje N°1 (Carlos A. Soto Coaguila ed., Instituto Peruano de Arbitraje)		p. 62	2011
Gazzini, Tarciso	<i>Necessity in International Investment Law: Some Critical Remarks on CMS v. Argentina</i>	Journal of Energy and Natural Resources Law	Vol. 26, No. 3, p. 450	2008
Giannakopoulos, Charalampos	<i>Reconceptualizing "Failure to State Reasons" as a Ground for Annulment under Article 52(1)(e) of the ICSID Convention</i>	Journal of International Dispute Settlement		2015
Giardina, Andrea	<i>ICSID: A Self-Contained, Non-National Review System</i> , in International Arbitration in the 21 Century: Towards 'Judicialization' and Uniformity? (Richard B. Lillich and Charles N. Brower eds., Hotei)		p. 199	1994
Giardina, Andrea	<i>L'exécution des sentences du Centre international pour le règlement des différends relatifs aux investissements</i>	Revue critique de droit international privé	Vol. 71, No. 2, p. 273	1982

Bibliography on ICSID Annulment

<i>Author(s)</i>	<i>Title of Book, Book Chapter, or Article</i>	<i>Periodical Title / URL</i>	<i>Volume / Page</i>	<i>Year</i>
Godfrey, Jenna M.	<i>Introductory Note: Consortium R.F.C.C. v. Kingdom of Morocco (ICSID Case No. ARB/00/6) (Annulment Proceeding), Décision du Comité ad hoc sur la demande d'annulation du Consortium R.F.C.C. (18 janvier 2006)</i>	ICSID Review— Foreign Investment Law Journal	Vol. 26, No. 1, p. 184	2011
Gouiffes, Laurent	<i>Annulment of ICSID awards : adjustment variables and flexibility of ad hoc committees, in The future of ICSID and the place of investment treaties in international law (N. Jansen Calamita, David Earnest, and Markus Burgstaller, eds., British Institute of International and Comparative Law)</i>		p. 275	2013
Gouiffes, Laurent, and Melissa Ordoñez	<i>Anulación de los laudos CIADI. Variables de ajuste y margen de maniobra de los Comités ad hoc, in Sistema de Anulación de los Laudos CIADI, Anuario Latinoamericano de Arbitraje N°1 (Carlos A. Soto Coaguila ed., Instituto Peruano de Arbitraje)</i>		p. 47	2011
Guillaume, Gilbert	<i>Failure to State Reasons in ICSID Awards, in The Review of International Arbitral Awards, IAI series on international arbitration n° 6 (Emmanuel Gaillard ed., JurisNet)</i>		p. 271	2010
Hamamoto, Shotaro	<i>New Challenges for the ICSID Annulment System: another Private-public Problem in the International Investment Dispute Settlement: Paper, in International dispute settlement: room for innovations? (Rüdiger Wolfrum and Ina Gätschmann, eds.)</i>		p. 393	2013
Honlet, Jean-Christophe, Barton Legum, and Anna Crevon	<i>ICSID Annulment, in International Investment Law (Marc Bungenberg, Jörn Griebel, Stephan Hobe, August Reinisch, Yun-i Kim eds., International Investment Law Centre Cologne, Universität Wien)</i>		p. 1431	2015
Honlet, Jean-Christophe, and Guillaume Borg	<i>The Decision of the ICSID Ad Hoc Committee in CMS v. Argentina Regarding the Conditions of Application of an Umbrella Clause: SGS v. Philippines Revisited</i>	The Law and Practice of International Courts and Tribunals	Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 1	2008
ICSID	<i>Possible Improvements of the Framework for ICSID Arbitration</i>	ICSID Secretariat Discussion Paper, available at http://icsid.worldbank.org		Oct. 22, 2004
ICSID	History of the ICSID Convention: Documents Concerning the Origin and the Formulation of the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States (International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes)		Vols. I–IV	1970

Bibliography on ICSID Annulment

<i>Author(s)</i>	<i>Title of Book, Book Chapter, or Article</i>	<i>Periodical Title / URL</i>	<i>Volume / Page</i>	<i>Year</i>
Jagusch, Stephen, et al.	<i>A Comparison of ICSID and UNCITRAL Arbitration: Areas of Divergence and Concern</i> , in <i>The Backlash against Investment Arbitration</i> (Michael Waibel et al. eds., Kluwer Law International)		p. 79	2010
Jaime Ramírez, Margie-Lys	<i>Reflexiones en torno a la ley aplicable en el sistema de anulación del CIADI: Entre treaty claims y contract claims</i> , in <i>Sistema de Anulación de los Laudos CIADI, Anuario Latinoamericano de Arbitraje N°1</i> (Carlos A. Soto Coaguila ed., Instituto Peruano de Arbitraje)		p. 79	2011
Johnson, Lise	<i>Annulment of ICSID Awards: Recent Developments</i>	International Institute for Sustainable Development, available at http://www.iisd.org/pdf/2011/dci_2010_annulment_icsid_awards.pdf		2011
Johnson, Thomas	<i>Factual Review</i> , in <i>Investment Treaty Law: Current Issues Vol. 1</i> (Federico Ortino et al. eds., British Institute of International and Comparative Law)		p. 59	2006
Júdice, José Miguel, and Tiago Duarte	<i>La anulación de sentencias CIADI: ¿Corregir las sentencias o corregir las tendencias?</i> , in <i>Sistema de Anulación de los Laudos CIADI, Anuario Latinoamericano de Arbitraje N°1</i> (Carlos A. Soto Coaguila ed., Instituto Peruano de Arbitraje)		p. 99	2011
Kahn, Philippe	<i>Le contrôle des sentences arbitrales rendues par un Tribunal CIRDI</i> , in <i>La juridiction internationale permanente</i> (Société française pour le Droit International, Colloque de Lyon)		p. 363	1986
Kalnina, Ieva, and Domenico Di Pietro	<i>The Scope of ICSID Review: Remarks on Selected Problematic Issues of ICSID Decisions</i> , in <i>International Investment Law for the 21st Century: Essays in Honour of Christoph Schreuer</i> (Christina Binder et al. eds., Oxford University Press)		p. 223	2009
Karamanian, Susan L.	<i>Case Comment: Compañía de Aguas del Aconquija S.A. & Vivendi Universal S.A. v. Argentine Republic</i>	American Journal of International Law	Vol. 105, No. 3, p. 553	2011

Bibliography on ICSID Annulment

<i>Author(s)</i>	<i>Title of Book, Book Chapter, or Article</i>	<i>Periodical Title / URL</i>	<i>Volume / Page</i>	<i>Year</i>
Kaufmann-Kohler, Gabrielle	<i>La anulación de los laudos arbitrales del CIADI en arbitrajes de contratos y tratados: ¿Existen diferencias?</i> , in Sistema de Anulación de los Laudos CIADI, Anuario Latinoamericano de Arbitraje N°1 (Carlos A. Soto Coaguila ed., Instituto Peruano de Arbitraje)		p. 122	2011
Kaufmann-Kohler, Gabrielle	<i>Annulment of ICSID Awards in Contract and Treaty Arbitrations: Are there Differences?</i> , in Annulment of ICSID Awards, IAI series on international arbitration n°1 (Emmanuel Gaillard and Yas Banifatemi eds., Juris and International Arbitration Institute)		p. 189	2004
Khayat, Dany	<i>Case Summary: Industria Nacional de Alimentos, S.A. and Indalsa Perú, S.A. v. Republic of Peru (ICSID Case No. ARB/03/4) (Annulment Decision, September 5, 2007)</i>	ICSID Review— Foreign Investment Law Journal	Vol. 23, No. 2, p. 324	2008
Kim, Dohyun	<i>The Annulment Committee's Role in Multiplying Inconsistency in ICSID Arbitration: The Need to Move Away from an Annulment-Based System</i>	New York University Law Review	Vol. 86, No. 1, p. 242	2010
Knahr, Christina	<i>Annulment and its Role in the Context of Conflicting Awards</i> , in The Backlash against Investment Arbitration (Michael Waibel et al. eds., Kluwer Law International)		p. 151	2010
Knieper, Rolf	<i>Contradictions between the ICSID Convention and the ICSID Arbitration Rules with Respect to the Suspension of Enforcement in Annulment Proceedings</i> , in Europäische und internationale Dimension des Rechts – Festschrift für Daphne-Ariane Simotta (Reinhold Geimer et al. eds., LexisNexis)		p. 325	2012
Kurtz, Jürgen T.	<i>ICSID Annulment Committee Rules on the Relationship between Customary and Treaty Exceptions on Necessity in Situations of Financial Crisis</i>	ASIL Insights, International Economic and Law Edition, available at http://www.asil.org/insights071220.cfm	Vol. 11, No. 30	Dec. 20, 2007
Lalive, Pierre	<i>On the Reasoning of International Arbitral Awards</i>	Journal of International Dispute Settlement	Vol. 1, No. 1, p. 55	2010

Bibliography on ICSID Annulment

<i>Author(s)</i>	<i>Title of Book, Book Chapter, or Article</i>	<i>Periodical Title / URL</i>	<i>Volume / Page</i>	<i>Year</i>
Lalive, Pierre	<i>Concluding Remarks</i> , in Annulment of ICSID Awards, IAI series on international arbitration n°1 (Emmanuel Gaillard and Yas Banifatemi eds., Juris and International Arbitration Institute)		p. 297	2004
Lalonde, Marc	<i>The Post-arbitral Phase in North American and Western Europe</i> , in International Arbitration in a Changing World, ICCA Congress Series No. 6 (Albert Jan van den Berg ed., Kluwer Law International)		p. 127	1994
Lamm, Carolyn B., Eckhard R. Hellbeck, and David P. Riesenber	<i>The two annulment decisions in Amco Asia and 'non-application' of applicable law by ICSID tribunals</i> , in Practising virtue : inside international arbitration (David D. Caron, Stephan Schill, Abby Cohen Smutny, and Epaminontas E. Triantafilou eds., Oxford University Press)		p. 689	2015
Lamm, Carolyn B., Hellbeck, Eckhard R., and Giorgetti, Chiara	<i>The New Frontier of Investor-State Arbitration : Annulment of NAFTA Awards</i>	International Arbitration Law Review	Vol. 11, No. 1, p. 58	2008
Le Cannu, Paul-Jean	<i>Introductory Note : Compagnie D'Exploitation du Chemin de Fer Transgabonias v. Gabonese Republic, Décision du Comité ad hoc sur la demande d'annulation de la République Gabonaise (11 mai 2010)</i>	ICSID Review— Foreign Investment Law Journal	Vol. 26, No. 1, p. 153	2011
Leigh, Monroe	<i>Arbitration – Annulment of Arbitral Awards for Failure to Apply Law Applicable under ICSID Convention and Failure to State Sufficiently Pertinent Reasons</i>	American Journal of International Law	Vol. 81, No. 1, p. 222	1987
Lin, Tsai-Yu	<i>Systemic Reflections on Argentina's Non-Compliance with ICSID Arbitral Awards: A New Role of the Annulment Committee at Enforcement?</i>	Contemporary Asia Arbitration Journal	Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 1–22	2012
Magdaleno Carmona, Antonia	<i>Algunas cuestiones de interés respecto a la anulación de los laudos CIADI</i> , in Sistema de Anulación de los Laudos CIADI, Anuario Latinoamericano de Arbitraje N°1 (Carlos A. Soto Coaguila ed., Instituto Peruano de Arbitraje)		p. 163	2011
Manciaux, Sébastien	<i>Centre international pour le règlement des différends relatifs aux investissements (CIRDI) – Chronique des sentence arbitrales</i>	Journal du Droit International	p. 565	2011
Manciaux, Sébastien	<i>L'exécution provisoire des sentences arbitrales CIRDI pendant une procédure d'annulation</i>	La Gazette du Palais	p. 24	2005

Bibliography on ICSID Annulment

<i>Author(s)</i>	<i>Title of Book, Book Chapter, or Article</i>	<i>Periodical Title / URL</i>	<i>Volume / Page</i>	<i>Year</i>
Marboe, Irmgard	<i>Annulment of ICSID Awards</i> , in <i>Investment and Commercial Arbitration: Similarities and Divergences</i> (Christina Knahr et al. eds., Eleven International)		p. 97	2010
Marboe, Irmgard	<i>Introductory Note: Sempra Energy Int'l v. Argentina</i> (ICSID)	International Legal Materials	Vol. 49, No. 5, p. 1441	2010
Marboe, Irmgard	<i>ICSID Annulment Decisions: Three Generations Revisited</i> , in <i>International Investment Law for the 21st Century: Essays in Honour of Christoph Schreuer</i> (Christina Binder et al. eds., Oxford University Press)		p. 200	2009
Marchili, Silvia M.	<i>ICSID Annulment: A Saga of Virtue and Vice</i> , in <i>Investment Treaty Arbitration and International Law</i> (Ian A. Laird and Todd J. Weiler eds., JurisNet)		Vol. 5, p. 283	2012
Marzorati, Osvaldo J.	<i>El recurso de anulación en el CIADI y el estado de necesidad en los casos argentinos</i> , in <i>Sistema de Anulación de los Laudos CIADI, Anuario Latinoamericano de Arbitraje N°1</i> (Carlos A. Soto Coaguila ed., Instituto Peruano de Arbitraje)		p. 173	2011
Maupin, Julie A.	<i>The Awards in Wena Hotels Limited v. Arab Republic of Egypt</i> , in <i>The Reasons Requirement in International Investment Arbitration: Critical Case Studies</i> (W. Michael Reisman and Guillermo Aguilar-Alvarez eds., Martinus Nijhoff)		p. 231	2008
Mayer, Pierre	<i>To What Extent Can an Ad Hoc Committee Review the Factual Findings of an Arbitral Tribunal</i> , in <i>Annulment of ICSID Awards, IAI series on international arbitration n°1</i> (Emmanuel Gaillard and Yas Banifatemi eds., Juris and International Arbitration Institute 2004)		p. 243	2004
Mezgravis, Andrés A., and Carolina González	<i>La proliferación de la nulidad de los laudos: Una falla del CIADI que sí puede ser corregida</i> , in <i>Sistema de Anulación de los Laudos CIADI, Anuario Latinoamericano de Arbitraje N°1</i> (Carlos A. Soto Coaguila ed., Instituto Peruano de Arbitraje)		p. 141	2011
Mistelis, Loukas A.	<i>Washington/ICSID Convention, 1965 – Interpretation, Revision and Annulment of the Award: Article 52 [Annulment]</i> , in <i>Concise International Arbitration</i> (Loukas A. Mistelis ed., Kluwer Law International)		p. 131	2010
Mullen, Stephanie, and Elizabeth Whitsitt	<i>Quantum, annulment and the requirement to give reasons: analysis and reform</i>	Arbitration International	Vol. 32, No. 1, p. 59	2016
Nelson, Timothy G.	<i>Annulment of International Arbitration Awards, The Orinoco Steamship Case Sails On</i>	ASA Bulletin	Vol. 28, No. 2, p. 205	2010

Bibliography on ICSID Annulment

<i>Author(s)</i>	<i>Title of Book, Book Chapter, or Article</i>	<i>Periodical Title / URL</i>	<i>Volume / Page</i>	<i>Year</i>
Newcombe, Andrew	<i>Introductory Note: ICSID ad hoc Committee: Decision to Terminate Stay of Enforcement of Arbitral Award in Sempra Energy Int'l v. Argentine Republic</i>	International Legal Materials	Vol. 48, No. 6, p. 1448	2009
Padilla, Sabino B., IV	<i>Some Available Options to Save the Viability of ICSID Arbitration in the Light of the Annulment Awards in Klöckner v. Cameroon and Amco Asia v. Republic of Indonesia</i>	Philippine Law Journal	Vol. 63, No. 3, p. 321	1988
Parra, Antonio R., and Mark Baker	<i>The Merits, the Award and Annulment – The Award and its Aftermath – Act IV, Scene II</i>	Arbitration International	Vol. 24, No. 1, p. 97	2008
Paulsson, Jan	<i>Avoiding Unintended Consequences</i> , in Appeals Mechanism in International Investment Disputes (Karl P. Sauvant and Michael Chiswick-Patterson eds., Oxford University Press)		p. 241	2008
Paulsson, Jan	<i>ICSID's Achievements and Prospects</i>	ICSID Review—Foreign Investment Law Journal	Vol. 6, No. 2, p. 380	1991
Penusliski, Ilija Mitrev	<i>A Dispute Systems Design Diagnosis of ICSID</i> , in The Backlash against Investment Arbitration (Michael Waibel et al. eds., Kluwer Law International)		p. 507	2010
Pérez Pacheco, Yaritza, and Elizabeth Méndez Salom	<i>Recurso de anulación contra laudos CIADI: ¿Refuerza la autonomía del sistema o contraría la celeridad del arbitraje internacional?</i> , in Sistema de Anulación de los Laudos CIADI, Anuario Latinoamericano de Arbitraje N°1 (Carlos A. Soto Coaguila ed., Instituto Peruano de Arbitraje)		p. 201	2011
Perret, François	<i>Quelques considérations à propos de la motivation des sentences arbitrales en matière d'arbitrage international à la lumière d'une jurisprudence récente du Tribunal Fédéral</i>	ASA Bulletin	Vol. 29, No. 3., p. 666	2011
Pinsolle, Philippe	<i>“Manifest” Excess of Powers and Jurisdictional Review of ICSID Awards</i> , in Investment Treaty Law: Current Issues Vol. 1 (Federico Ortino et al. eds., British Institute of International and Comparative Law)		p. 51	2006
Pinsolle, Philippe	<i>Jurisdictional Review of ICSID Awards</i>	Journal of World Investment	Vol. 5, No. 4, p. 613	2004
Pinsolle, Philippe	<i>The Annulment of ICSID Arbitral Awards</i>	Journal of World Investment	Vol. 1, p. 243	2000
Pirrwitz, Björn	<i>Annulment of Arbitral Awards Under Article 52 of the Washington Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes Between States and Nationals of Other States</i>	Texas International Law Journal	Vol. 23, No. 1, p. 73	1988

Bibliography on ICSID Annulment

<i>Author(s)</i>	<i>Title of Book, Book Chapter, or Article</i>	<i>Periodical Title / URL</i>	<i>Volume / Page</i>	<i>Year</i>
Polasek, Martina	<i>Introductory Note to Three Decisions on the Stay of Enforcement of an ICSID Award</i>	ICSID Review— Foreign Investment Law Journal	Vol. 20, No. 2, p. 581	2005
Racine, Jean-Babstiste	<i>La sentence d'incompétence</i>	Revue de l'Arbitrage	No. 4, p. 729	2010
Rajput, Aniruddha	<i>AES Summit Generation Limited and AES-Tisza Erömü Kft v Hungary: The Scope of ad hoc Committee Review for Manifest Excess of Powers and Failure to State Reasons</i>	ICSID Review— Foreign Investment Law Journal	Vol. 28, No. 2, p. 273	2013
Rambaud, Patrick	<i>De la compétence du tribunal C.I.R.D.I. saisi après une décision d'annulation</i>	Annuaire français de droit international	Vol. 34, p. 209	1988
Rambaud, Patrick	<i>L'annulation des sentences Klöckner et Amco</i>	Annuaire français de droit international	Vol. 32, p. 259	1986
Redfern, Alan D.	<i>ICSID – Losing its Appeal?</i>	Arbitration International	Vol. 3, No. 2, p. 98	1987
Reed, Lucy, and Giorgio F. Mandelli	<i>Ad hoc or ad arbitrium? An audit of Recent Annulment Decisions</i> , in Contemporary Issues in International Arbitration and Mediation: The Fordham Papers 2011 (Arthur W. Rovine ed., Martinus Nijhoff Publishers)			2012
Reed, Lucy, et al.	<i>Recognition, Enforcement, and Execution of ICSID Awards</i> , in Guide to ICSID Arbitration (2d ed., Kluwer Law International)		p. 179	2010
Reed, Lucy, et al.	<i>The ICSID Review Regime</i> , in Guide to ICSID Arbitration (2d ed., Kluwer Law International)		p. 159	2010
Reinisch, August	<i>The Role of Precedent in ICSID Arbitration</i> , in Austrian Arbitration Yearbook 2008 (Christian Klausegger et al. eds., C.H. Beck, Stämpfli & Manz)		p. 495	2008
Reisman, W. Michael	<i>Reflections on the Control Mechanism of the ICSID System</i> , in The Review of International Arbitral Awards, IAI series on international arbitration n° 6 (Emmanuel Gaillard ed., JurisNet)		p. 197	2010

Bibliography on ICSID Annulment

<i>Author(s)</i>	<i>Title of Book, Book Chapter, or Article</i>	<i>Periodical Title / URL</i>	<i>Volume / Page</i>	<i>Year</i>
Reisman, W. Michael	<i>Repairing ICSID's Control System: Some Comments on Aron Broches' "Observations on the Finality of ICSID Awards"</i>	ICSID Review— Foreign Investment Law Journal	Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 196	1996
Reisman, W. Michael	Systems of Control in International Adjudication and Arbitration: Breakdown and Repair (Duke University Press)			1992
Reisman, W. Michael	<i>The Breakdown of the Control Mechanism in ICSID Arbitration</i>	Duke Law Journal	No. 4, p. 739	1989
Rodríguez-Sastre, Iñigo, and Elena Sevilla	<i>Puntos débiles del vigente sistema de anulación de laudos CIADI: Necesaria reforma del órgano decisor de la anulación y de los requisitos de suspensión de la ejecución de laudos</i> , in Sistema de Anulación de los Laudos CIADI, Anuario Latinoamericano de Arbitraje N°1 (Carlos A. Soto Coaguila ed., Instituto Peruano de Arbitraje)		p. 227	2011
Salvati, Pierluigi	<i>Con commento - International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes Washington, D.C. - Decision on the application for annulment - April 16, 2009 - ICSID Case No. ARB/05/10 - Malaysian Historical Salvors Sdn Bhd (Applicant) v. The Government of Malaysia (Respondent)</i>	Diritto comunitario e degli scambi internazionali	Vol. 49, No. 4, p. 721	2010
Salomon, Claudia, and Kate Knox	<i>Options for Change in the Annulment Process</i>	Global Arbitration Review	Vol. 2, No. 1	2007
Samra, Harout	<i>Five Years Later: The CMS Award Placed in the Context of the Argentine Financial Crisis and the ICSID Arbitration Boom</i>	University of Miami Inter-American Law Review	Vol. 38, No. 3, p. 667	2006– 2007
Santiago Tawil, Guido	<i>Binding Force and Enforcement of ICSID Awards: Untying Articles 53 and 54 of the ICSID Convention</i> , in 50 Years of the New York Convention: ICCA International Arbitration Conference, ICCA Congress Series No. 14 (Albert Jan van den Berg ed., Kluwer Law International)		p. 327	2009
Savarese, Eduardo	<i>The Arbitral Practice of the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID) in 2007</i>	Italian Yearbook of International Law	Vol. 17, p. 237	2007
Schatz, Sylvia	<i>The Effect of the Annulment Decisions in Amco v. Indonesia and Klöckner v. Cameroon on the Future of the International Centre for the Settlement of Investment Disputes</i>	American University Journal of International Law and Policy	Vol. 3, No. 2, p. 481	1988

Bibliography on ICSID Annulment

<i>Author(s)</i>	<i>Title of Book, Book Chapter, or Article</i>	<i>Periodical Title / URL</i>	<i>Volume / Page</i>	<i>Year</i>
Scherer, Matthias	<i>ICSID Annulment Proceedings Based on Serious Departure from a Fundamental Rule of Procedure</i> , in <i>The Relationship between Constitutional Values, Human Rights and Arbitration</i> , Czech (& Central European) Yearbook of Arbitration (Alexander J. Bělohlávek and Naděžda Rozehnalová eds., JurisNet)		Vol. I, p. 211	2011
Schreuer, Christoph H.	<i>Víctor Pey Casado and President Allende Foundation v Republic of Chile: Barely an Annulment</i>	ICSID Review— Foreign Investment Law Journal	Vol. 29, No. 2, pp. 321-327	2014
Schreuer, Christoph H.	<i>Why Still ICSID?</i>	Transnational Dispute Management	No. 3	2012
Schreuer, Christoph H.	<i>From ICSID Annulment to Appeal, Half Way Down the Slippery Slope</i>	The Law and Practice of International Courts and Tribunals	Vol. 10, No. 2, p. 211	2011
Schreuer, Christoph H.	<i>ICSID Annulment Awards: The Fourth Generation?</i>	Global Arbitration Review	Vol. 5, No. 5	2010
Schreuer, Christoph H., et al.	<i>Article 52 – Annulment</i> , in <i>The ICSID Convention: A Commentary</i> (2d ed., Cambridge University Press)		p. 890	2009
Schreuer, Christoph H.	<i>Preliminary Rulings in Investment Arbitration</i> , in <i>Appeals Mechanism in International Investment Disputes</i> (Karl P. Sauvant and Michael Chiswick-Patterson eds., Oxford University Press)		p. 207	2008
Schreuer, Christoph H.	<i>Three Generations of ICSID Annulment Proceedings</i> , in <i>Annulment of ICSID Awards</i> , IAI series on international arbitration n°1 (Emmanuel Gaillard and Yas Banifatemi eds., Juris and International Arbitration Institute)		p. 17	2004
Schreuer, Christoph H.	<i>ICSID Annulment Revisited</i>	Legal Issues of Economic Integration	Vol. 30, No. 2, p. 103	2003

Bibliography on ICSID Annulment

<i>Author(s)</i>	<i>Title of Book, Book Chapter, or Article</i>	<i>Periodical Title / URL</i>	<i>Volume / Page</i>	<i>Year</i>
Schreuer, Christoph H.	<i>Decisions Ex Aequo et Bono under the ICSID Convention</i>	ICSID Review— Foreign Investment Law Journal	Vol. 11, No. 1, p. 37	1996
Schuetz, Christina Cathey	<i>Legitimacy and Inconsistency: Is Investment Treaty Arbitration Broken and Can It Be “Fixed”? – Is the ICSID Annulment Mechanism Broken and Could It Be Improved?</i> , in <i>Investment Treaty Arbitration and International Law</i> (Ian A. Laird and Todd J. Weiler eds., JurisNet)		Vol. 2, p. 259	2009
Schwartz, Eric A.	<i>Finality at What Cost? The Decision of the Ad Hoc Committee in Wena Hotels v. Egypt</i> , in <i>Annulment of ICSID Awards</i> , IAI series on international arbitration n°1 (Emmanuel Gaillard and Yas Banifatemi eds., Juris and International Arbitration Institute)		p. 43	2004
Sedlak, David R.	<i>ICSID’s Resurgence in International Investment Arbitration: Can the Momentum Hold?</i>	Penn State International Law Review	Vol. 23, No. 1, p. 147	2004– 2005
Shihata, Ibrahim F.I., and Antonio R. Parra	<i>The Experience of the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes</i>	ICSID Review— Foreign Investment Law Journal	Vol. 14, No. 2, p. 299	1999
Shin, Hi-Taek	<i>Annulment</i> , in <i>Building International Investment Law: The First 50 Years of ICSID</i> (Meg Kinnear, Geraldine Fischer, Jara Minguez Almeida, Luisa Fernanda Torres, and Mairée Uran Bidegain eds.)	Kluwer Law International	p. 699	2015
Silberman, Mallory	<i>ICSID Annulment Reform: Are We Looking at the Right Problem?</i> , in <i>Reshaping the Investor-State Dispute Settlement System: Journeys for the 21st Century</i> (Jean E. Kalicki and Anna Joubin-Bret eds.)	Brill / Nijhoff	p. 853	2015
Sinclair, Anthony C.	<i>Award-Creditor Security and a Continuing Stay of Enforcement in CDC Group plc v. Republic of the Seychelles</i>	Mealey’s International Arbitration Report	Vol. 19, No. 9, p. 35	2004
Smutny, Abby Cohen	<i>Procedural Review</i> , in <i>Investment Treaty Law: Current Issues Vol. 1</i> (Federico Ortino et al. eds., British Institute of International and Comparative Law)		p. 65	2006

Bibliography on ICSID Annulment

<i>Author(s)</i>	<i>Title of Book, Book Chapter, or Article</i>	<i>Periodical Title / URL</i>	<i>Volume / Page</i>	<i>Year</i>
Solís, Tomás	<i>Decisiones recientes en casos de anulación en el CIADI. El caso de argentina y la consistencia en la jurisprudencia de anulación</i> , in Sistema de Anulación de los Laudos CIADI, Anuario Latinoamericano de Arbitraje N°1 (Carlos A. Soto Coaguila ed., Instituto Peruano de Arbitraje)		p. 239	2011
Steindl, Barbara Helene	<i>ICSID annulment vs. set aside by state courts: compared to ICSID “ad hoc” annulment Committees, is it the state courts that are now more hesitant to set aside awards?</i>	Yearbook on International Arbitration	Vol. 4, p. 150	2014
Stevens, Margrete	<i>The Power of ICSID Ad Hoc Committees to Order Security When Granting a Stay of Enforcement</i> , in Enforcement of Arbitral Awards Against Sovereigns (R. Doak Bishop ed., JurisNet)		p. 113	2009
Stockford, Claire	<i>Appeal versus Annulment: Is the ICSID Annulment Process Working or Is It Time for an Appellate Mechanism</i> , in Investment Treaty Arbitration and International Law (Ian A. Laird and Todd J. Weiler eds., JurisNet)		Vol. 5, p. 307	2012
Sturzenegger, Marc	<i>ICSID Arbitration and Annulment for Failure to State Reasons: The Decision of the Ad Hoc Committee in Maritime International Nominees Establishment v. The Republic of Guinea</i>	Journal of International Arbitration	Vol. 9, No. 4, p. 173	1992
Suarez Anzorena, Carlos Ignacio	<i>Vivendi v. Argentina: On the Admissibility of Requests for Partial Annulment and the Ground of a Manifest Excess of Powers</i> , in Annulment of ICSID Awards, IAI series on international arbitration n°1 (Emmanuel Gaillard and Yas Banifatemi eds., Juris and International Arbitration Institute)		p. 123	2004
Szewczyk, Bart M.	<i>Case Comment: Sempra Energy International v. Argentina</i>	American Journal of International Law	Vol. 105, No. 3, p. 547	2011
Thompson, Dennis	<i>The Klöckner v. Cameroon Appeal: A Note on Jurisdiction</i>	Journal of International Arbitration	Vol. 3, No. 2, p. 93	1986
Timmer, Laurens J.E.	<i>Manifest Excess of Powers as a Ground for the Annulment of ICSID Awards</i>	Journal of World Investment and Trade	Vol. 14, No. 5, p. 775	2013

Bibliography on ICSID Annulment

<i>Author(s)</i>	<i>Title of Book, Book Chapter, or Article</i>	<i>Periodical Title / URL</i>	<i>Volume / Page</i>	<i>Year</i>
Tortorola, Ignacio	<i>Notas sobre el requerimiento de garantías como condición para la suspensión de la ejecución de laudos arbitrales del CIADI</i> , in Sistema de Anulación de los Laudos CIADI, Anuario Latinoamericano de Arbitraje N°1 (Carlos A. Soto Coaguila ed., Instituto Peruano de Arbitraje)		p. 257	2011
Trooboff, Peter D.	<i>To What Extent May an Ad Hoc Committee Review the Factual Findings of an Arbitral Tribunal Based on Procedural Error?</i> , in Annulment of ICSID Awards, IAI series on international arbitration n°1 (Emmanuel Gaillard and Yas Banifatemi eds., Juris and International Arbitration Institute)		p. 251	2004
Trooboff, Peter D.	<i>International Investment Disputes - Res Judicata effect of Partially Annulled ICSID Awards</i>	American Journal of International Law	Vol. 83, No. 1, p. 111	1989
Tsolakidis, Nikolaos	<i>ICSID Annulment Standards: Who Has Finally Won the Reisman v. Broches Debate of Two Decades Ago?</i> , in Reshaping the Investor-State Dispute Settlement System: Journeys for the 21st Century (Jean E. Kalicki and Anna Joubin-Bret eds.)	Brill / Nijhoff	p. 828	2015
Tuck, Andrew P.	<i>Investor-State Arbitration Revised: A Critical Analysis of the Revisions and Proposed Reforms to the ICSID and UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules</i>	Law and Business Review of the Americas	Vol. 13, No. 4, p. 885	2007
Uchkunova, Inna	<i>Much Ado about Nothing – Conditional Stay of Enforcement in Annulment Proceedings under the ICSID Convention</i>	Arbitration International	Vol. 30, No. 2, p. 283	2014
Van Harten, Gus	<i>Perceived Bias in Investment Treaty Arbitration</i> , in The Backlash against Investment Arbitration (Michael Waibel et al. eds., Kluwer Law International)		p. 443	2010
Van Houtte, Hans	<i>Article 52 of the Washington Convention – A Brief Introduction</i> , in IAI International Arbitration Series No. 1, Annulment of ICSID Awards (Emmanuel Gaillard and Yas Banifatemi eds., Juris and International Arbitration Institute)		p. 11	2004
Verhoosel, Gaëtan	<i>Annulment and Enforcement Review of Treaty Awards: To ICSID or Not to ICSID?</i>	ICSID Review—Foreign Investment Journal	Vol. 23, No. 1, p. 119	2008
Volkmer, Sven-Michael	<i>Stay of Enforcement Proceedings in ICSID Annulment Proceedings: Taking Stock</i>	Journal of International Arbitration	Vol. 29, No. 6, pp. 691-714	2012

Bibliography on ICSID Annulment

<i>Author(s)</i>	<i>Title of Book, Book Chapter, or Article</i>	<i>Periodical Title / URL</i>	<i>Volume / Page</i>	<i>Year</i>
Von Staden, Andreas	<i>Towards Greater Doctrinal Clarity in Investor-State Arbitration: The CMS, Enron, and Sempra Annulment Decisions</i> , in Czech Yearbook of International Law (Alexander J. Bělohávek and Naděžda Rozehnalová eds., Juris)		Vol II, p. 207	2011
Von Wobeser, Claus	<i>Estándar de aplicación de la causal de anulación contenida en el artículo 52(1)(b) del convenio CIADI, tratándose de la extralimitación de facultades en la aplicación de la ley</i> , in Sistema de Anulación de los Laudos CIADI, Anuario Latinoamericano de Arbitraje N°1 (Carlos A. Soto Coaguila ed., Instituto Peruano de Arbitraje)		p. 265	2011
Waibel, Michael, et al.	<i>The Backlash against Investment Arbitration: Perceptions and Reality</i> , in The Backlash Against Investment Arbitration (Michael Waibel et al. eds., Kluwer Law International)		p. xxxvii	2010
Wald, Arnaldo	<i>Estado de necesidad en Enron, Sempra y CMS: Extralimitación manifiesta de las facultades como causal de anulación</i> , in Sistema de Anulación de los Laudos CIADI, Anuario Latinoamericano de Arbitraje N°1 (Carlos A. Soto Coaguila ed., Instituto Peruano de Arbitraje)		p. 283	2011
Wälde, Thomas W.	<i>ICSID 'Annulment Committee'</i>	Transnational Dispute Management	No. 1	2004
Walsh, Thomas W.	<i>Substantive Review of ICSID Awards: Is the Desire for Accuracy Sufficient to Compromise Finality?</i>	Berkeley Journal of International Law	Vol. 24, No. 2, p. 444	2006
Williams, David A.R.	<i>International Commercial Arbitration and Globalization – Review and Recourse against Awards Rendered under Investment Treaties</i>	Journal of World Investment	Vol. 4, p. 251	2003
Williams, David A.R.	<i>Challenging Investment Treaty Arbitration Awards – Issues Concerning the Forum Arising from the Metalclad Case</i>	Business Law International	Vol. 2003, No. 2, p. 156	2003
Wilson, Michael	<i>The Enron v. Argentina Annulment Decision: Moving a Bishop Vertically in the Precarious ICSID System</i>	University of Miami Inter-American Law Review	Vol. 43, No. 2, p. 347	2012
Yannaca-Small, Catherine	<i>Annulment of ICSID Awards: Limited Scope But Is there Potential?</i> , in Arbitration Under International Investment Agreements: A Guide to Key Issues (Catherine Yannaca-Small ed., Oxford University Press)		p. 635	2010

Bibliography on ICSID Annulment

<i>Author(s)</i>	<i>Title of Book, Book Chapter, or Article</i>	<i>Periodical Title / URL</i>	<i>Volume / Page</i>	<i>Year</i>
Yannaca-Small, Catherine	<i>Improving the System of Investor-State Dispute Settlement: An Overview</i>	OECD Working Paper on International Investment, , available at http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/3/59/36052284.pdf	No. 2006/1	Feb. 2006