

PARIS ARBITRATION WEEK

2023 PAW Recap – Day 5: The Power of “Proportionality” – A Sleeping Giant of a Concept in Investment Arbitration?

Natalia Rodriguez Alvarez, Sabina Nurbagandova, Antoine Cottin (Assistant Editor for Europe) (Laborde Law) and Mihaela Tarnovschi (ICC International Court of Arbitration) / April 4, 2023 / Leave a comment

Investor-state dispute settlement (ISDS) issues were again in the spotlight on the very last day of the Paris Arbitration Week (PAW). A panel discussion was organized by Fieldfisher on “The power of proportionality” – a sleeping giant of a concept in investment arbitration”, with Lucas Bastin KC (Essex Court Chambers), Jackie McArthur (Essex Court Chambers), Alexandra Underwood (Fieldfisher) as speakers, and Tracey Ann Wright (Fieldfisher) as moderator. The panel touched upon a range of issues relating to proportionality, including its emerging status in investment law, its influence as well as its origins and future, as summarized below.

General Definition of Proportionality

As explained by Jackie McArthur, broadly speaking, proportionality is a tool that is used to assess whether a state’s act is justified. It provides an analytical framework to assess the balance between, on the one hand, a public interest and, on the other hand, individual rights or interests that might have been harmed when the state pursued that public interest.

Proportionality works on two different levels. It provides a framework for (i) states to make sure that, when pursuing a public interest, they counterbalance the harm that might be caused to individuals and (ii) the reviewing court or tribunal to assess the state’s measure and to avoid giving one-sided consideration to either competing interest. The goal of proportionality is to give a framework for identifying all relevant considerations and placing them properly in relation to each other.

Proportionality is not widely used in ISDS, but is firmly applied in other areas of law, especially in human rights law. Its application varies amongst the systems, but the European Court of Human Rights’ (“ECTHR”) three-step analysis is commonly accepted. It requires:

- First, to identify a public interest that the state deems to have justified the measure. This step provides the ground for decision-making by requiring the state to clearly identify and justify the measure by a public interest. Depending on how deferential a reviewing tribunal/court is, it may either accept what the state identifies as a public interest or require further evidence.
- Second, to determine whether the measure truly corresponds to the public interest put forward. The theory is that proportionality works on two different levels. It provides a framework (i) for the actual decision makers to be sure that when pursuing a public interest, they counterbalances harms that might be caused to individuals and (ii) for the reviewing court or tribunal to assess the decision maker measure and to avoid giving one side consideration to either competing interests, by the state as a justification. If there is no genuine link between the two, the measure cannot be justified by the public interest. Difficult questions of proof can arise as to the analysis of the existence of such a connection.
- Third, to balance the public interest justification and the measure’s effects on an individual or a group of individuals who say that the measure in question has harmed them. This is the step which lies at the core of the notion of proportionality. Depending on the degree of deference given to the state by a reviewing court/tribunal, there can be different approaches to this step. If a high degree of deference is afforded, the court or tribunal may say that the decision would only be unfair and unlawful if it is manifestly without a reasonable foundation. A medium level of deference would involve balancing the importance of the public interest against the seriousness of harm caused. If there is a low degree of deference, the tribunal/court may also question if the state could have achieved the public interest goal in any other way.

Finally, Ms. McArthur noted that the degree of deference is crucial to determine how rigorous a proportionality analysis will be in a given case. The deference or margin of appreciation refers to the extent to which courts/tribunals reviewing a measure will “second-guess” the choices of the state. Deference to a state may be justified by (i) its legitimacy as a decision maker and (ii) its better institutional capacity to assess the public interest.

Proportionality in Investment Arbitration

In the context of ISDS, Lucas Bastin KC explained that there are four ways in which proportionality comes up.

First, proportionality can be used to determine whether a disproportionate measure taken by a state pursuing a public interest can by itself constitute a breach of the fair and equitable treatment (“FET”) and lead to an award on damages. Tribunals have answered this question disparately. Nonetheless, it has now become more accepted that proportionality is a standalone component of the FET standard. What is still difficult is defining what constitutes a breach of proportionality. In contrast to other systems, in investment arbitration tribunals have not articulated a consistent proportionality standard.

In Charanne v. Spain the tribunal attempted to define proportionality on the basis of other concepts including capriciousness, necessity and the degree to which a state measure changed the grounds on which an investor had operated. While subsequent tribunals “nodded” to the Charanne definition, it was not endorsed.

Mr. Bastin noted that the most recent case that started to elaborate on the notion of proportionality is RWE v. Spain, in which the test relied on (i) suitability (a measure will be proportionate if it is suitable, i.e., there is a connection between the goal pursued by the state and the implemented measure) and (ii) necessity, which is a more demanding element requiring an analysis of whether there was any less restrictive means to achieve the same outcome.

Second, as to the determination of whether an indirect taking of property has occurred in breach of an expropriation provision, the tribunal in Tecmed v. Mexico confirmed that when there is an indirect taking or there is a measure that substantially impairs the value of an asset, that measure needs to be proportionate to the public interest behind it. In turn – third –, preclusion of wrongfulness is determined on the basis of the concept of necessity, which has found its direct place within investment arbitration (see Argentina cases related to the 2000’s economic crisis).

Finally, proportionality in ISDS can be found in the assessment of countermeasures. In general international law, countermeasures are found in Article 51 of the draft articles on Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts. It provides for a number of criteria, including the notion of “commensurate”: “[c]ountermeasures must be commensurate with the injury suffered, taking into account the gravity of the internationally wrongful act and the rights in question.” Commensurateness often requires proportionality (see Corn Products v. Mexico).

Proportionality and FET Analysis

Against this background, Lucas Bastin KC explained that proportionality fills a gap in the FET standard. In the early days of investment arbitration, arbitrators tried to clarify FET using both diagnostic tools (analytical tools that enable the determination of a breach of primary norm) and proxy rules (primary rules surrogating the content of FET). The usage of proportionality has been able to grow because it is a diagnostic tool and a method of analysis suited to prove a breach. Therefore, diagnostic tools such as proportionality or legitimate expectations encourage a rigorous analysis of FET breaches.

Alexandra Underwood added that in the context of FET, proportionality provides a framework to distill cultural differences between arbitrators and agree how investor’s rights should be balanced against the state’s right to regulate. However, for the time being, tribunals have no uniformed practice to rely on in this regard.

Jackie McArthur illustrated how the typical steps of the proportionality analysis fit in the FET assessment. First, tribunals often identify the legitimate interests at stake. For instance, in EDF v. Romania, there was a public interest in harmonizing domestic laws with EU requirements. In this case, the tribunal assessed the extent to which the measure could truly be justified by examining contemporaneous legislative materials. Second, tribunals look for a connection between the measure and the public interest at stake. In Watkins Holdings v. Spain, the tribunal found that tariffs on wind energy played a marginal role in the public interest the state was said to be pursuing, and questioned the connection between the measure taken and the public interest pursued. Third and finally, tribunals attempt to balance the public interest and the harm caused.

Proportionality and Police Powers

Alexandra Underwood added that a key area in which proportionality can be used is the analysis of a state’s police powers defense in expropriation cases. The police powers exception is found in Article 10.5 of the Harvard Draft Convention on the International Responsibility of States for Injuries to Aliens, a provision on which tribunals rely. In Saluka v. Czech Republic, the tribunal held that an uncompensated taking of property shall not be considered wrongful provided (i) it is not a clear and discriminatory violation of a law of the state; (ii) it is not the result of a violation of articles 6 or 8 of the Harvard Convention (denial of access to a tribunal and denial of hearing); (iii) it is not an unreasonable departure from the principles of justice recognized in the principle legal systems in the world, and (iv) it is not an abuse of power depriving an alien of its property. Proportionality comes in the third step of the test. However, Philip Morris v. Uruguay set up an alternative test. To avail itself from a police powers defense, the state measure must be (i) taken bona fide for the purpose of protection of public welfare, (ii) non-discriminatory, and (iii) proportionate.

In most of the cases where a police powers defense is raised, tribunals have been able to dismiss it without assessing the proportionality element of the test. In Ms. Underwood’s experience, the reasons for this defense’s failure include, amongst others, mainly bona fide reasons, ex post facto justifications of the measure, and lack of contemporaneous evidence.

Will the Giant of Proportionality Wake Up?

Lucas Bastin KC observed that investment arbitration is suffering a backlash that concerns, first and foremost, the FET standard. This reaction can be traced back to Tecmed v. Mexico (see para 154), in which the tribunal portrayed the breach of the standard through a yes/no dichotomy. Although the standard has moved to a more nuanced approach (see e.g., Blusun v. Italy), Mr. Bastin regretted that the proportionality came into the picture “a little bit too late”. In this regard, the use of proportionality could have been an improvement in the early days of investment arbitration and FET breaches. It might already be too late in the current development of the system, as the backlash has happened and the consequences are unfolding. But all is not lost. Maybe, as a reaction to the backlash, we will see greater movement towards a balancing and nuanced analysis and the embracement of diagnostic tools. On her end, Ms. McArthur noted that the greater use of a proportionality tool might contribute to ameliorating that concern as it reassures states of the methodology under which their measures will be evaluated.

Arbitrators’ Role in the Proportionality Assessment

Balancing public interests and individual rights is a complicated task. For Lucas Bastin KC, expecting arbitrators to manage proportionality may be too much. The type of experience needed is rather there in Strasbourg, where people are trained in human rights litigation and are able to understand concepts of public interest and the degree of deference that is afforded to a sovereign state. Arbitrators are currently not equipped to do it. Alexandra Underwood opined that counsel also played a key role in the application of proportionality as they could help arbitrators by providing them with the necessary analytical tools to deal with proportionality.


To make sure you do not miss out on regular updates from the Kluwer Arbitration Blog, please subscribe here. To submit a proposal for a blog post, please consult our Editorial Guidelines.

Profile Navigator and Relationship Indicator

Includes 7,300+ profiles of arbitrators, expert witnesses, counsels & 13,500+ relationships to uncover potential conflicts of interest.

Learn how Kluwer Arbitration can support you.

Learn more about the newly-updated Profile Navigator and Relationship Indicator



Like, Share with your friends.



2023 PAW Recap – Day 3: Arbitrating Renewable Energy Disputes in the CEE Region | 2023 PAW Recap – Day 5: YSIAC – Witness Evidence and Preparation in International Arbitration: Cross-Cultural Perspectives

Leave a Reply

YOUR EMAIL ADDRESS WILL NOT BE PUBLISHED. REQUIRED FIELDS ARE MARKED *

COMMENT

NAME *

EMAIL *

WEBSITE

SAVE MY NAME, EMAIL, AND WEBSITE IN THIS BROWSER FOR THE NEXT TIME I COMMENT.

POST COMMENT




This site uses Akismet to reduce spam. Learn how your comment data is processed.

GET BLOG POSTS IN YOUR INBOX!

Email

BROWSE CATEGORIES

- by Jurisdiction...
- by Category...
- by Contributor...
- by Affiliate...
- by Date...

EDITORS & CONTRIBUTORS

- Roger Alford (General Editor) Notre Dame Law School
- Crina Baltag (Managing Editor) Stockholm University
- Arie C. Eernisse (Associate Editor) Shin & Kim
- Kiran Nasir Gore (Associate Editor) The George Washington University Law School
- Esmé Shirlow (Associate Editor) Australian National University
- Maria Fanou (Senior Assistant Editor)
- Dina Prokic (Senior Assistant Editor) Woods LLP
- Daniela Pérez-Salgado (Senior Assistant Editor) Herbert Smith Freehills
- Leila Kazimi (Assistant Editor)
- Titilope Simmi-Adetona (Assistant Editor) Aliko & Oyebo
- Maria José Alarcon (Assistant Editor for Investment Arbitration) Squire Patton Boggs - Paris
- Fabian Eichberger (Assistant Editor for Investment Arbitration) University of Cambridge
- Ajoo Kim (Assistant Editor for Investment Arbitration)
- Alexia GKoritsa (Assistant Editor for Technology)
- Raoul J. Renard (Assistant Editor for Technology) Kluwer Arbitration Blog
- David Isidore Tan (Assistant Editor for Technology) Rajah & Tann Asia
- Hannepes Taychayev (Assistant Editor for East and Central Asia)
- Hiroko Yamamoto (Assistant Editor for East and Central Asia)
- Youlin Yuan (Assistant Editor for East and Central Asia) Williams & Connolly LLP
- Yue Zhao (Assistant Editor for East and Central Asia)
- Anne Wang (Assistant Editor for Asia-Pacific)
- Yi-Jun Kang (Assistant Editor for Southeast Asia) Morrison & Foerster (Singapore) LLP
- Deborah Loh (Assistant Editor for Southeast Asia) Clifford Chance Asia
- Irene Mira (Assistant Editor for Southeast Asia)
- Shreya Jain (Assistant Editor for South Asia) Shardul Amarchand Mangaldas
- Piyush Prasad (Assistant Editor for South Asia) WongPartnership LLP
- Ashutosh Ray (Assistant Editor for South Asia)
- Ahmed Durrani (Assistant Editor for the MENA Region) Sultan Al-Raddadi & Partners
- Michael Farchakh (Assistant Editor for the MENA Region) Hadef & Partners
- Khushboo Shahdadpuri (Assistant Editor for the MENA Region) Al Tamimi & Company
- Ana Carolina Dall'Agnol (Assistant Editor for Africa) University of Oxford
- Antoine Cottin (Assistant Editor for Europe) Laborde Law
- Boris Pražtalo (Assistant Editor for Europe) Brunel University London
- Olga Sendetska (Assistant Editor for Europe) Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP
- Eric Lenier Ives (Assistant Editor for Canada and the United States) White & Case LLP
- Paige von Mehren (Assistant Editor for Canada and the United States) Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer US LLP
- Acacio Filipe Oliveira (Assistant Editor for South and Central America) Barbosa, Müssnich & Aragão Advogados – BMA
- Fabian Zetina (Assistant Editor for South and Central America) BakerHostetler
- Emma Garrett (Assistant Editor for Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific Islands)
- Sam Macintosh (Assistant Editor for Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific Islands) Wyn Williams
- Gordon Blanke (Blanke Arbitration LLC)
- Gary B. Born (Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP)
- Nikos Lavranos (NI-Investmentconsulting)
- Michael McIlwath (MDisputes)
- Mary Mitsi (Queen Mary University of London)
- Matthias Scherer (Editor in Chief, ASA Bulletin; LALVE)
- Maxi Scherer (WilmerHale & Queen Mary University of London)
- Georg von Segesser (von Segesser Law Offices)
- Weï Sun (Zhong Lun Law Firm)
- Patricia Živković (University of Aberdeen)
- ACICA 45 Members
- AfricArb Members
- AIAC Young Practitioners Group (AIAC YPG) Members
- Arbitrator Intelligence Affiliates
- ArbitralWomen Members
- Asian International Arbitration Centre (AIAC) Affiliates
- Bryan Cave Leighton Paisner LLP Attorneys
- Chartered Institute of Arbitrators (CIArb) Members
- CIETAC Hong Kong Arbitration Center Affiliates
- Clyde & Co. Attorneys
- Delos Affiliates
- Fililand Arbitration Institute (FAI) Affiliates
- Herbert Smith Freehills Attorneys
- HK45 Members
- ICC Young Arbitrators Forum (YAF) Members
- International Centre for Dispute Resolution (ICDR) Members
- Institute for Transnational Arbitration (ITA), Academic Council Members
- Jentet Attorneys
- KCAB Next Members
- Linklaters Attorneys
- Peter & Kim Attorneys
- Rising Arbitrators Initiative (RAI) Members
- Schoenherr Attorneys
- Shanghai International Arbitration Center (SHIAC) Members
- Three Crowns LLP Attorneys
- YIAG Members
- YSIAC Members
- Young ICCA Members
- Young ITA Members
- African Arbitration Association

Learn More. Subscribe to Kluwer Arbitration Blog.

RELATED SITES

- Kluwer Arbitration
- Kluwer Mediation Blog
- Author Portal

RSS FEEDS

- Summary Feed
- Article Feed

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

- Typography in Arbitration: An Underused Advocacy Tool? April 6, 2023
- Kompetenz-Kompetenz: Should the Arbitral Tribunal Exclusively Determine Whether a Right to Arbitrate Has Been Waived? April 5, 2023
- 2023 PAW Recap – Day 5: YSIAC – Witness Evidence and Preparation in International Arbitration: Cross-Cultural Perspectives April 4, 2023
- 2023 PAW Recap – Day 5: The Power of “Proportionality” – A Sleeping Giant of a Concept in Investment Arbitration? April 4, 2023
- 2023 PAW Recap – Day 3: Arbitrating Renewable Energy Disputes in the CEE Region April 4, 2023

RECENT COMMENTS

- James Rowland on 2023 PAW Recap – Day 1: In Conversation with Meg Kinnear, Toby Landau KC, and Prof. Alain Pellet on the Future of Investment Arbitration
- Michael Bond on Global Perspectives on Teaching International Investment Arbitration: An Investment Law Teaching Philosophy for De-Colonizing the Syllabus
- Ritik Kulkarni on India’s Treatment of Interconnected Agreements to Arbitrate
- Dr P Madhava Rao on The 2019 amendment to the Indian Arbitration Act: A classic case of one step forward two steps backward?
- James Rowland on 2022 Year in Review: Diversity in the Mainstream

TAKE THE AI QUESTIONNAIRE

INTELLIGENCE