Exploring the Intersection of International Commercial Arbitration and Public International Law: Challenges and Implications for Global Legal Practices

Dr. Ashu Dhiman*

Mr. Param Bhamra**

I. Introduction

Within the global legal system, public international law and international business arbitration are two crucial areas that each have their own set of guiding principles, structures, and ramifications. Resolving disagreements resulting from business dealings between private parties in several jurisdictions is the main goal of international commercial arbitration. Numerous legal sources, such as the parties' arbitration agreement, the national laws of the arbitration location, and international treaties and conventions, regulate this type of conflict resolution. A pillar in this field is the 1958 New York Convention on the Recognition and execution of Foreign Arbitral rulings, which offers a framework for the universal recognition and execution of arbitration agreements and rulings among the 168 signatory states[1]. Similarly, the *UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration* has been influential, offering a template for countries to reform their arbitration laws in a manner that's conducive to international trade and commerce[2].

Public international law, on the other hand, encompasses the set of rules, norms, and standards recognized as binding between sovereign states and international entities. It governs a wide range of issues from diplomatic relations and human rights to international trade and territorial disputes. Cases such as the "*Lotus Case" (PCIJ, 1927*)[3] and "*Jurisdictional Immunities of the State" (ICJ, 2012*)[4] exemplify the principles and complexities of state sovereignty and jurisdiction in public international law.

---

* Dr. Ashu Dhiman, Assistant Professor of Law, Vivekananda School of Law and Legal Studies, Vivekananda Institute of Professional Studies. Email – ashudhiman31086@gmail.com, Mob no. 8397898886

** Mr. Param Bhamra, Advocate & Founding Partner at MediateGuru, Email – parambhamrapb@gmail.com, Mob no. 9971087756

[1] Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (New York, 1958), 330 U.N.T.S.

[2] UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration 1985, with amendments as adopted in 2006.

[3] S.S. "Lotus" (France v. Turkey), Judgment, 1927 P.C.I.J. (ser. A) No. 10 (Sept. 7).

[4] Jurisdictional Immunities of the State (Germany v. Italy: Greece intervening), Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 2012, p. 99.

Public international law and international commercial arbitration will inevitably and intricately intertwine, particularly where state bodies are parties to the arbitration or when the rulings of the arbitration have wider ramifications for public international law principles. It is important to comprehend this intersection for a number of reasons. First of all, the concepts of state immunity are introduced when governments or state-owned businesses participate in international arbitration, requiring a careful balancing act between upholding arbitration agreements and awards and honoring state sovereignty. Such difficulties are brought to light by the seminal ruling in "ICS Inspection and Control Services Limited v. The Argentine Republic" (UNCITRAL, 2016)[5], which demonstrates the intricate relationship between state obligations under international treaties and their rights and responsibilities under public international law.

Moreover, arbitration agreements and awards, while primarily private in nature, can have significant implications on public international law, especially in the context of investment treaties. For instance, the case of "*Philip Morris v. Uruguay" (ICSID, 2010)*[6] illustrates how investor-state arbitration can intersect with public health policies and state regulatory authority, thus blending private dispute resolution with public international law considerations.

Furthermore, navigating the complexities of public international law is frequently necessary for the execution of arbitration rulings, especially where states or state entities are involved. This entails recognizing the significance of international treaties in national legal systems, appreciating the subtleties of diplomatic relationships, and comprehending the scope of sovereign immunity. In the "Yukos Oil Company v. Russian Federation" case (PCA, 2014)[7], the enforcement of a sizable arbitration award against a sovereign state raised concerns about the relationship between state resources, immunity, and international legal responsibilities. This case made clear the complexities of these enforcement obstacles.

[5] ICS Inspection and Control Services Limited v. The Argentine Republic, UNCITRAL, PCA Case No. 2010-9, Award (2016).
[6] Philip Morris Brands Sàrl, Philip Morris Products S.A. and Abal Hermanos S.A. v. Oriental Republic of Uruguay, ICSID Case No. ARB/10/7.
[7] Yukos Universal Limited (Isle of Man) v. The Russian Federation, PCA Case No. AA 227, Interim Award (2014).

Additionally, the evolving landscape of international trade and investment has seen a proliferation of bilateral and multilateral treaties, bringing to the fore the role of arbitration in settling disputes arising under these treaties. Such disputes often require arbitrators to interpret and apply principles of public international law, thereby necessitating a deep understanding of both fields. The "*Achmea case" (CJEU, 2018)*[8] is a pertinent example, where the Court of Justice of the European Union had to consider the compatibility of investor-state arbitration clauses in bilateral investment treaties with EU law.

Thus, the nexus between public international law and international business arbitration is a dynamic and intricate field that demands careful comprehension and analysis. The relevance and significance of this junction only increase as globalization continues to weave its way through the legal and economic fabric of nations, making it a crucial field of study and comprehension for academics, policymakers, and legal professionals alike.

II. Foundational Principles of Public International Law in Arbitration

Arbitration, particularly in an international context, often intersects with foundational principles of public international law. This intersection necessitates an understanding of how these principles apply within arbitration contexts. One of the primary principles is the notion of sovereignty and non-intervention, which dictates that states should respect the sovereignty of other states and refrain from intervening in their internal affairs. This principle, enshrined in the UN Charter and various international treaties[9], has significant implications for arbitration, especially when states or state entities are parties to an arbitration agreement or when an arbitration award has to be enforced in a foreign jurisdiction.

Another fundamental idea is the pacta sunt servanda doctrine, which requires governments to uphold their obligations under treaties in good faith. This idea, which was acknowledged in the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties[10], is essential when governments agree to arbitrate disputes under multilateral and bilateral investment treaties. As seen in the *"White Industries v. India"*[11] case, international arbitration frequently becomes involved in the implementation of such treaties. This case demonstrated the use of pacta sunt servanda in

[8] Achmea B.V. v. Slovak Republic, Case C-284/16, Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU), Judgment of 6 March 2018.
[9] Charter of the United Nations, 24 October 1945, 1 U.N.T.S. XVI.
[10] Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, 23 May 1969, 1155 U.N.T.S. 331.
[11] White Industries Australia Limited v. Republic of India, UNCITRAL, Final Award (2011).

guaranteeing treaty obligations are upheld when an Australian business used the terms contained in the India-Australia bilateral investment treaty in an arbitration involving India.

Equally important is the *principle of state responsibility*, which holds states accountable for their international wrongful acts. This idea is frequently applied in investor-state arbitrations where it is claimed that a state's activities have harmed foreign investors, as stated in the International Law Commission's Articles on Accountability of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts (2001)[12]. The "Occidental Petroleum Corporation v. Ecuador" case is a noteworthy illustration of this, as it found Ecuador accountable for confiscation without reimbursement, a violation of its international commitments under the bilateral investment treaty between the United States and Ecuador. [13]

Another important factor is the idea of state immunity, especially when it comes to the enforcement of arbitration rulings. The concept has important ramifications for implementing arbitral verdicts against states since it asserts that an independent nation is exempt from the sovereignty of international courts. The famous UK case "FSI v. Argentina" tested this idea by looking at Argentina's claim of state immunity as a defense against the imposition of an arbitral ruling[14]. The case highlighted the tension between respecting state sovereignty and the need to enforce arbitration awards.

Additionally, the *principle of equality of states*, which asserts that all states are legally equal and possess the same rights and duties, plays a vital role in arbitration, especially in cases involving states or state-owned enterprises. This principle ensures that states, regardless of their economic or political power, are subject to the same rules and standards in arbitration proceedings.

Furthermore, in arbitration circumstances, the Vienna Convention's[15] concept of not being retroactive of treaties is essential. According to this principle, an agreement is not binding on a party with regard to any action, fact, or circumstance that occurred or that ceased to exist

[12] Draft Articles on Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts, adopted by the International Law Commission in 2001.
[13] Occidental Petroleum Corporation and Occidental Exploration and Production Company v. The Republic of Ecuador, ICSID Case No. ARB/06/11, Award (2012).
[14] FSI v. The Argentine Republic, UK High Court of Justice, Commercial Court, [2003] EWHC 1761 (Comm).
[15] Supra Note 10

prior to the treaty's effective date. This principle was pivotal in *the "Iron Rhine Arbitration"* (Belgium/Netherlands), where the tribunal considered the application of treaties concluded at different times in resolving a dispute over a railway linking Belgium and the Netherlands. [16]

Arbitration is also based on the good faith principle, which is a cornerstone of international law. States and other arbitration parties must conduct themselves honestly and sincerely during the procedures. An example of the use of good faith in arbitration is the *"Abyei Arbitration"* (PCA, 2009)[17] between the Sudanese government and the Sudanese People's Liberation Movement/Army regarding the demarcation of a boundary. In this arbitration, both parties were expected to honestly present their cases and to abide by the tribunal's ruling.

The foundational principles of public international law play a crucial and multifaceted role in the realm of international arbitration. Understanding and applying these principles is essential for arbitrators, legal practitioners, and states involved in international commercial disputes. As globalization intensifies and international transactions become more complex, the intersection of these principles with international arbitration will undoubtedly become even more significant, warranting continual study and analysis.

In arbitration, the jus cogens principle—which alludes to preemptive standards of general international law—is crucial. It is acknowledged that these standards are essential to the global community and cannot be altered. When accusations of human rights abuses or other grave violations of international law are at issue, this concept may become pertinent. The International Court of Justice's "Belgium v. Senegal" ruling significantly addressed the idea of jus cogens, where the duties outlined in the UN Convention Against Torture were deemed to be pre-emptive.[18]

The *principle of reciprocity*, which entails mutual obligations between states or parties, is also pivotal in arbitration. This principle is often invoked in cases involving bilateral treaties, where the obligations and rights are based on mutual concessions. A relevant case in this context is

[16] Arbitration regarding the Iron Rhine ("Ijzeren Rijn") Railway (Belgium v. Netherlands), Award of 24 May 2005, PCA.
[17] The Abyei Arbitration (The Government of Sudan / The Sudan People's Liberation Movement/Army), Permanent Court of Arbitration, Final Award (2009).
[18] Questions relating to the Obligation to Prosecute or Extradite (Belgium v. Senegal), Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 2012, p. 422.

"*Ecuador v. United States" (UNCITRAL, 2011*), where Ecuador sought to hold the United States accountable under the terms of a bilateral investment treaty.[19]

Moreover, the *principle of proportionality*, which requires that measures taken by states be appropriate, necessary, and not excessively burdensome, is increasingly relevant in investment arbitrations. The tribunal considered whether Argentina's actions during its economic crisis were commensurate with the need to preserve economic stability and public order in "CMS Gas Transmission Company v. Argentine Republic" (ICSID, 2005).[20]

The *principle of full reparation*, articulated in *the Chorzów Factory case (PCIJ, 1928*), remains a cornerstone in the field of international arbitration, especially in determining damages.[21] According to the notion, reparations must, to the greatest extent feasible, eliminate the repercussions of the unlawful act. This principle was applied in *"Occidental Petroleum Corporation v. Ecuador"*, where the tribunal awarded substantial damages for breach of treaty obligations.[22]

The *concept of res judicata*, which prevents the same dispute from being adjudicated more than once, is crucial in arbitration to ensure finality and avoid contradictory rulings. This principle was at the heart of the *"Chevron Corporation and Texaco Petroleum Company v. The Republic of Ecuador" (UNCITRAL, 2018)* case, where the tribunal had to consider previous rulings and decisions related to the dispute.[23]

Furthermore, *the principle of non-discrimination*, crucial in public international law, asserts that states must not discriminate between nationals and foreigners or between different foreigners. This principle is particularly relevant in investment treaty arbitrations, where foreign investors often claim discriminatory treatment. The case "*Metalclad Corporation v. The United Mexican States" (ICSID, 2000)* serves as an example, where the tribunal found Mexico in violation of the principle of non-discrimination under *NAFTA*.[24]

---

[19] Ecuador v. United States, UNCITRAL, PCA Case No. 2012-5, Award (2011).
[20] CMS Gas Transmission Company v. The Argentine Republic, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/8, Award (2005).
[21] Factory at Chorzów (Germany v. Poland), Merits, 1928 P.C.I.J. (ser. A) No. 17 (Sept. 13).
[22] Supra Note 13
[23] Chevron Corporation and Texaco Petroleum Company v. The Republic of Ecuador, UNCITRAL, PCA Case No. 2009-23, Partial Award (2018).
[24] Metalclad Corporation v. The United Mexican States, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/97/1, Award (2000).

Last but not least, international arbitration is beginning to incorporate the idea of universal jurisdiction, that permits governments to assert criminal sovereignty over an accused individual irrespective of the location of the alleged crime and the accused's nationality. This principle was discussed in the *"Barcelona Traction, Light, and Power Company, Limited" case (ICJ, 1970),* highlighting its potential implications in international disputes.[25]

The application of these principles of public international law in the context of international arbitration is complex and multifaceted. The dynamic interplay between these principles and arbitration procedures underscores the need for a thorough understanding of both fields, especially in an increasingly interconnected and legally complex world. As international transactions and interactions continue to grow, so does the importance of these principles in guiding fair and equitable arbitration processes.

III. State Immunity and Its Impact on Arbitration

The concept of state immunity plays a crucial role in international arbitration, particularly when a state or state entity is a party to an arbitration agreement or subject to an arbitration award. According to the theory of state immunity, which has its roots in the idea of the equal sovereignty of states, a state cannot be brought under the legal jurisdiction of another state without that state's permission. There is now a contrast between absolute and limiting immunity as a result of the substantial evolution of this principle, especially in the context of international arbitration.

Absolute immunity, the traditional approach, provides states with complete immunity from foreign court jurisdiction. However, modern international law, particularly in the context of commercial activities, tends towards a restrictive approach. Acta jure imperii, or acts carried out in the execution of sovereign authority, are distinguished from acta jure gestionis, or acts of private legal nature, by this method, which only grants protection for the former. In several significant cases, the trend towards limiting immunity is apparent.

One such case is the "*Republique de Congo v. Commisimpex" (French Cour de Cassation, 2013*), where the French court had to decide on the enforcement of an arbitration award against

[25] Barcelona Traction, Light, and Power Company, Limited (Belgium v. Spain), Second Phase, Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 1970, p. 3.

Congo.[26] The case highlighted the complexity of enforcing arbitration awards against states, particularly when it involves state assets located abroad. It underscored the balance courts must strike between respecting state immunity and upholding the principles of international arbitration.

Another significant case is the "*Saudi Arabia v. Nelson" (US Supreme Court, 1993*), where the U.S. Supreme Court dealt with the question of state immunity in a dispute involving alleged wrongful acts by Saudi Arabia[27]. The case illustrated the application of the *Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (FSIA)* in the U.S. and how commercial activity exceptions can play a role in limiting state immunity.

The International Court of Justice upheld sovereign immunity even in cases involving grave human rights abuses in "Germany v. Italy: Greece intervening" (ICJ, 2012)[28]. State immunity is frequently delicate and complicated, as this case illustrated, especially when it comes to international crimes and jus cogens violations.

The "*FSI v. Argentina*" case in the UK, already discussed earlier, is another pertinent example, where the commercial activity exception to state immunity was examined in the context of enforcing an arbitration award[29]. This case further cemented the notion that states engaging in commercial activities can expect to be treated as private parties in certain contexts, especially in arbitration.

The "*Yukos Oil Company v. Russian Federation*" case, involving one of the largest arbitration awards in history, also delved into issues of state immunity[30]. The case raised questions about the extent to which state assets can be targeted for the enforcement of arbitration awards and the nuances of distinguishing between commercial and sovereign activities of a state.

Furthermore, in "*Orascom TMT Investments S.à r.l. v. People's Democratic Republic of Algeria" (ICSID, 2017*), the tribunal had to consider Algeria's claim of state immunity in the

[26] Société Commerciale de Reassurance v. Republique de Congo, French Cour de Cassation, First Civil Chamber, No. 10-25.938, 1113 (2013).
[27] Saudi Arabia v. Nelson, 507 U.S. 349 (1993).
[28] Supra Note 4
[29] Supra Note 14
[30] Supra Note 7

context of an investment dispute[31]. The case highlighted the intersection of state immunity with bilateral investment treaties and the challenges in arbitrating disputes involving sovereign states.

Hence, state immunity remains a complex and evolving aspect of international arbitration. The shift from absolute to restrictive immunity reflects the changing nature of state activities in an increasingly interconnected world. Landmark cases in various jurisdictions have played a pivotal role in shaping the application of state immunity in arbitration, balancing the respect for state sovereignty with the need for justice and enforcement of legal obligations. As international transactions continue to involve states and state entities, the role of state immunity in arbitration will undoubtedly remain a significant and challenging area of international law.

IV. Enforcement of Arbitration Agreements and Awards

Enforcement of Arbitration Awards

The enforcement of arbitration agreements and awards is a critical aspect of international commercial arbitration, ensuring that the decisions made through this dispute resolution process are respected and implemented worldwide. *The Convention of New York on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards of 1958 (the New York Convention)*[32] is the most important international treaty that forms the basis of this enforcement framework.

The New York Convention, with its universal acceptance - currently recognized by over 160 countries - acts as an essential foundation for the worldwide arbitration community. Its main goal is to guarantee that awards rendered in a single contracting state can be implemented in every other contracting state by offering a consistent legal framework for their recognition and enforcement. The Convention establishes the precise circumstances in which courts in signatory states must accept and uphold these awards, as well as the narrow grounds for denial of enforcement. This creates a predictable and reliable enforcement mechanism, essential for the efficacy of international arbitration.

[31] Orascom TMT Investments S.à r.l. v. People's Democratic Republic of Algeria, ICSID Case No. ARB/12/35, Decision on Jurisdiction and Liability (2017).
[32] Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (New York, 1958), 330 U.N.T.S. 3.

Article II, which mandates that courts in contracting states accept written agreements for arbitration and refer litigants to arbitration when such agreements exist, is one of the main tenets of the Convention of New York. The Supreme Court of India highlighted the need to uphold arbitration clauses under the New York Convention in the case of "Renusagar Power Co. Ltd. v. General Electric Co." In India, this decision established a precedent for upholding arbitration agreements and enforcing international arbitral awards.[33]

"The Dallah Real Estate and Tourism Holding Company v. The Ministry of Religious Affairs, Government of Pakistan" served as an example of how arbitration verdicts could be enforced under the New York Convention[34]. In this case, the UK Supreme Court considered whether the Government in Pakistan might execute a French award. The Court's ruling, which denied implementation of the award, brought to light how important the New York Convention is in examining the arbitration agreement's legality and the judgment's suitability for the parties.

Article V of the New York Convention, which outlines reasons for rejecting the recognition and execution of an arbitral ruling, is another crucial component. The parties' incapacity, the arbitration agreement's invalidity, the lack of adequate observe of the arbitration process, the award exceeding the arbitration agreement's parameters, and the dispute's subject matter being not arbitrable under the laws of the nation where implementation is sought are some of these grounds. In "China Machine New Energy Corp. v. Jaguar Energy Guatemala LLC," the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit examined whether an arbitral award should be upheld under the New York Convention, with a focus on the applicability of Article V[35]. The court's decision in this case underscored the delicate balance between the enforcement of arbitral awards and the respect for due process and fairness.

In addition to the New York Convention, arbitration agreements and awards are subject to other international treaties. For example, a framework for resolving investment disputes between governments and their citizens is established under the ICSID Convention. The ICSID Convention allows awards to be directly enforced as though they were final rulings from the contracting states' courts, in contrast to the New York Convention, which mandates the

[33] Renusagar Power Co. Ltd. v. General Electric Co., Supreme Court of India, (1994) SCC (1) 644.
[34] Dallah Real Estate and Tourism Holding Company v. The Ministry of Religious Affairs, Government of Pakistan [2010] UKSC 46.
[35] China Machine New Energy Corp. v. Jaguar Energy Guatemala LLC, 795 F.3d 1139 (11th Cir. 2015).

involvement of national courts for enforcement. This was seen in the case of *"Krederi Ltd. v. Ukraine"*, where the ICSID award was directly enforceable without review or intervention by national courts. [36]

In conclusion, the enforcement of arbitration agreements and awards is crucial for the effectiveness and reliability of international arbitration as a means of dispute resolution. International treaties, particularly the New York Convention, play a pivotal role in creating a standardized and efficient framework for this enforcement. They ensure that arbitration agreements are respected and that awards are recognized and enforced across borders, with limited exceptions. This global enforcement mechanism not only upholds the decisions made through arbitration but also reinforces the confidence of the international business community in arbitration as a viable alternative to litigation.

Challenges in Enforcement and Case Law Analysis

As demonstrated by several case laws, although international treaties such as the New York Convention offer a framework for the implementation of arbitration contracts and verdicts, there may be several practical difficulties. These challenges can stem from the legal, procedural, and practical aspects of enforcement across different jurisdictions.

One of the primary challenges is the differing interpretations of the New York Convention's provisions by national courts. This can lead to inconsistencies in how arbitration agreements and awards are enforced globally. The interpretation of the New York Convention's Article V(2)(b) public policy exception serves as a noteworthy illustration. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit applied a narrow interpretation of the public policy exception in the matter of *"Parsons & Whittemore Overseas Co., Inc. v. Société Générale de l'Industrie du Papier (RAKTA)"* and upheld an Egyptian arbitral award in spite of claims that it went against American public policy. Foreign arbitral rulings are not enforced in other jurisdictions because courts there have adopted a more expansive interpretation of a public policy exemption. [37]

Another challenge arises from the issue of Arbitrability, which concerns whether the subject matter of the dispute is capable of being resolved through arbitration. This was central to the

[36] Krederi Ltd. v. Ukraine, ICSID Case No. ARB/14/17

[37] Parsons & Whittemore Overseas Co., Inc. v. Société Générale de l'Industrie du Papier (RAKTA), 508 F.2d 969 (2d Cir. 1974).

"*Abu Dhabi Gas Liquefaction Co. Ltd. v. Eastern Bechtel Corp*." case, where the court in the United Kingdom had to determine whether the dispute, involving allegations of bribery, was arbitrable[38]. The court's decision reflected the complexities in determining the scope of arbitrability, especially when dealing with issues that touch on public interest or criminal law.

The of arbitral awards against sovereign states or state entities introduces the challenge of state immunity, as previously discussed. The "*FG Hemisphere Associates LLC v. Democratic Republic of Congo*" case is an illustrative example. In this case, courts in multiple jurisdictions, including Hong Kong, grappled with the issue of whether state-owned assets could be targeted for the enforcement of arbitral awards[39]. The case highlighted the delicate balance between respecting state sovereignty and the need to enforce arbitration awards.

Enforcement can also be impeded by procedural issues, such as the requirement in some jurisdictions for the award to be *"domesticated"* or converted into a judgment of the local courts before enforcement. This was evident in the "*Yukos Oil Company v. Russian Federation*" case, where the complexities of enforcing a multi-billion dollar award across several jurisdictions were laid bare[40]. The process of enforcement involved navigating the legal systems of multiple countries, each with its own procedural requirements and standards.

In addition to these legal and procedural challenges, practical difficulties often arise in the enforcement process. These can include locating assets of the award debtor, dealing with multiple and conflicting judgments in different jurisdictions, and the costs associated with enforcement proceedings. The "*Norscot Rig Management Pvt Ltd v. Essar Oilfields Services Ltd"* case serves as an example, where the English courts allowed the recovery of costs incurred in third-party funding for arbitration, reflecting the practical realities and expenses involved in enforcing arbitral awards.[41]

Finally, non-compliance with arbitration agreements and resistance to enforcement of awards remains a challenge. In the "*Dowans Holding SA v. Tanzania Electric Supply Co. Ltd."* case, the Tanzanian High Court faced the issue of enforcing an international arbitral award against a

[38] Abu Dhabi Gas Liquefaction Co. Ltd. v. Eastern Bechtel Corp., [1982] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 425 (Q.B.).
[39] FG Hemisphere Associates LLC v. Democratic Republic of Congo, [2011] HKCFA 41.
[40] Supra Note 7
[41] Norscot Rig Management Pvt Ltd v. Essar Oilfields Services Ltd, [2016] EWHC 2361 (Comm).

state-owned company, highlighting the challenges in enforcing awards against entities that may be reluctant to comply.[42]

Through the framework for the enforcement of arbitration agreements and awards provided by international treaties like the New York Convention is robust, various challenges can arise in practice. These challenges, as seen through various case laws, underscore the complexities of navigating the legal, procedural, and practical aspects of arbitration award enforcement across different jurisdictions. As international arbitration continues to evolve, addressing these challenges will be crucial to maintaining its efficacy as a mode of dispute resolution in the global legal landscape.

V. Role of International Treaties and Conventions

International treaties and conventions significantly influence the practices and principles of international arbitration, especially in the realm of *investor-state dispute settlement (ISDS)*. These legal instruments, both bilateral and multilateral, create frameworks within which arbitration is conducted, offering procedural norms and substantive law guidance.

The way arbitration is conducted, especially in ISDS, is greatly influenced by bilateral investment treaties, or BITs. BITs are generally agreements between two nations that are intended to safeguard and encourage investments made in the other nation by investors from the first nation. They typically include clauses that state-investor conflicts will be settled, frequently through arbitration. *"ICS Inspection and Control Services Limited v. The Argentine Republic"*[43] is a landmark case that demonstrates how BITs affect arbitration. This case demonstrated how BIT provisions can be applied in ISDS, in which the tribunal's job was to interpret the wording of the treaty in order to settle a disagreement between a sovereign state and a private investor.

Multilateral agreements are also important. One such multilateral agreement is the Energy Charter Treaty (ECT), which offers a framework for global energy cooperation, including ISDS mechanisms and investment protection. *"Yukos Universal Limited v. The Russian Federation"*[44] is a seminal case under the ECT in which the tribunal cited violations of the ECT

[42] Dowans Holding SA v. Tanzania Electric Supply Co. Ltd., [2011] T.L.R. 112.
[43] Supra Note 5
[44] Supra Note 7

to award Yukos shareholders significant damages. This case demonstrates how multilateral accords have a significant influence on investor-state arbitration results.

The *North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA*), another significant multilateral treaty, has profoundly impacted arbitration practices in North America. The agreement includes provisions that allow investors from NAFTA countries to initiate arbitration against one of the NAFTA member states for alleged violations of the treaty. An illustrative case under NAFTA is "*Methanex Corp. v. United States"*[45], where the tribunal dismissed a claim by a Canadian company against the United States, demonstrating how NAFTA shapes the resolution of investment disputes in the region.

An essential component of ISDS arbitration is the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States (ICSID Convention). It created the International Center for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID), which offers resources for investment dispute arbitration and mediation. The self-contained enforcement mechanism of the ICSID Convention, which permits the direct execution of ICSID awards, is one of its distinctive features. The tribunal's ruling in *"Krederi Ltd. v. Ukraine"*[46] showed how well the ICSID system works to settle investment disputes.

The United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) Arbitration Rules are another important multilateral instrument impacting arbitration practices. These rules are often chosen as the procedural framework in ad hoc arbitrations, particularly in ISDS cases. A notable case under the UNCITRAL Rules is "*Philip Morris Asia Limited v. The Commonwealth of Australia*"[47], where the tribunal considered Australia's plain packaging laws for tobacco products. This case highlighted the interaction between public health policies and investment protection under international arbitration procedures.

Challenges arise in the application of these treaties, particularly in ensuring consistency and fairness in arbitration outcomes. The diversity of legal cultures and interpretations among the different arbitral tribunals can lead to varied applications of similar treaty provisions. The lack

[45] Methanex Corporation v. United States of America, UNCITRAL, Final Award of the Tribunal on Jurisdiction and Merits (2005).
[46] Supra Note 36
[47] Philip Morris Asia Limited v. The Commonwealth of Australia, UNCITRAL, PCA Case No. 2012-12, Award (2015).

of an appellate mechanism in international arbitration further compounds these challenges, making it difficult to harmonize differing interpretations.

International treaties and conventions significantly impact arbitration practices, especially in *ISDS*. Through *BITs*, multilateral treaties like the *ECT* and *NAFTA*, and the *ICSID Convention*, these legal instruments provide the framework within which investment disputes are resolved. They shape the procedural norms and substantive law applied in arbitrations, influencing the outcomes of disputes between investors and states. As the global investment landscape continues to evolve, these treaties and conventions will remain very crucial in guiding the practice of international arbitration.

VI. Recent Developments and Future Trends

The landscape of international law and arbitration is continuously evolving, shaped by recent developments that have significant implications for the future. These changes reflect shifts in global economic patterns, emerging legal norms, and evolving attitudes towards dispute resolution.

One of the most notable recent developments is the increased scrutiny and reform of investor-state dispute settlement (ISDS) mechanisms. Criticisms of ISDS systems have centred on perceived biases towards investors, lack of transparency, and inconsistent decision-making. This has led to significant changes, such as the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) working on reforms aimed at making ISDS more transparent, inclusive, and consistent[48]. The European Union has been at the forefront of these reforms, advocating for the establishment of a Multilateral Investment Court to replace traditional ISDS mechanisms[49]. This proposed system aims to address concerns about arbitrator impartiality and create a more structured appellate mechanism.

The rise of environmental, social, and governance (ESG) considerations in international arbitration is another recent trend. As global awareness of environmental and social issues grows, there is an increasing expectation that businesses and states adhere to ESG principles. This shift is evident in cases like "*Urbaser v. Argentina*", where the tribunal recognized the

[48] United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL), Working Group III on ISDS Reform.
[49] European Union's Proposal for a Multilateral Investment Court.

right to water as a fundamental human right and considered Argentina's environmental and social obligations[50]. This case represents a broader trend where arbitrators are increasingly considering ESG factors in their decisions, which could have significant implications for future disputes, particularly those involving natural resources and environmental impacts.

Another significant development is the increasing use of technology in arbitration. The *COVID-19* pandemic accelerated this trend, with many arbitrations moving online. Virtual hearings, digital submissions, and electronic case management have become more commonplace, changing how arbitrations are conducted. This shift towards digitalization is likely to continue, with potential impacts on efficiency, accessibility, and even the environmental footprint of arbitration proceedings.

In terms of future legal trends, one area that is likely to see significant developments is the regulation of digital commerce and data protection in international arbitration. As cross-border digital transactions increase, disputes involving data breaches, cybersecurity, and intellectual property rights in the digital realm are expected to rise. Arbitration may need to adapt to these challenges, including addressing issues related to jurisdiction, applicable law, and the technical expertise of arbitrators in digital matters.

Another trend to watch is the potential impact of geopolitical shifts on international arbitration. The increasing focus on national security concerns, particularly in the context of foreign investments, could lead to states being more cautious in their treaty negotiations and more protective of their sovereignty in arbitration clauses. This could result in a re-evaluation of traditional investment protection standards and potentially a rise in state-to-state arbitrations.

Furthermore, the growth of regional trade agreements and economic blocs may influence the development of arbitration. For example, the *African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA*), aiming to create a single market for goods and services across 54 African countries, could lead to a surge in intra-African trade disputes and a corresponding need for effective dispute resolution mechanisms within the continent[51].

---

[50] Urbaser S.A. and Consorcio de Aguas Bilbao Bizkaia, Bilbao Biskaia Ur Partzuergoa v. The Argentine Republic, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/26, Award (2016).
[51] African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA) Agreement.

Recent developments in international law and arbitration point towards a future where ISDS mechanisms may be more structured and transparent, ESG considerations play a more significant role, and technology continues to transform arbitration practices. These changes, along with evolving geopolitical and economic realities, are likely to shape the nature of international disputes and the mechanisms for their resolution. As the global legal landscape adapts to these trends, the practice of international arbitration will need to evolve to meet new challenges and opportunities.

VII. Conclusion

This exploration of the intersection between international commercial arbitration and public international law reveals a dynamic and evolving landscape, marked by significant developments and challenges that have profound implications for legal practice and international dispute resolution.

The examination of foundational principles of public international law in the context of arbitration underscores the intricate relationship between state sovereignty, state responsibility, and the enforcement of arbitration agreements and awards. Landmark cases like *"ICS Inspection and Control Services Limited v. The Argentine Republic" and "Yukos Universal Limited v. The Russian Federation"* demonstrate the complexities involved when these principles intersect with arbitration proceedings, especially in cases involving state entities.

State immunity emerges as a critical factor in arbitration, especially in enforcement. The restrictive approach to state immunity, distinguishing between sovereign and commercial acts, is increasingly adopted, as seen in cases like "*FSI v. Argentina*". However, challenges remain in balancing respect for state sovereignty with the enforcement of arbitral awards, particularly when dealing with state assets.

The New York Convention's pivotal role in the enforcement of arbitration agreements and awards cannot be overstated. Its provisions, as applied in cases like *"Dallah Real Estate and Tourism Holding Company v. The Ministry of Religious Affairs, Government of Pakistan*", facilitate a relatively uniform and predictable enforcement mechanism. Yet, challenges such as differing national interpretations and the issue of Arbitrability present hurdles to the Convention's application.

International treaties and conventions significantly shape arbitration practices, particularly in ISDS mechanisms. Bilateral and multilateral treaties, such as BITs and the ECT, provide frameworks for resolving disputes between investors and states. However, the ongoing scrutiny and reform of ISDS systems, driven by concerns over transparency and fairness, signal a shift towards more structured and possibly court-like arbitration processes in the future.

Recent developments indicate a trend towards reforming ISDS mechanisms, integrating ESG considerations, and embracing technology in arbitration. The impact of these changes is far-reaching, potentially altering how disputes are resolved in international commerce and investment. The rise of digital commerce and data protection issues, along with geopolitical shifts, are likely to influence the nature of disputes and the methods of their resolution.

Implications

The implications for legal practice and international dispute resolution are manifold. Legal practitioners must stay abreast of these changes, adapting their strategies and approaches to align with evolving legal norms and practices. The increasing importance of ESG considerations and technology in arbitration requires lawyers to acquire new skills and knowledge, particularly in understanding complex environmental, social, and digital issues.

For international dispute resolution, these developments suggest a future where arbitration may become more structured, possibly resembling judicial processes, especially in ISDS. The need for consistency, transparency, and fairness in arbitration proceedings is likely to drive further reforms, shaping the way disputes are resolved in the international arena.

The intersection of international commercial arbitration and public international law is characterized by a continuous evolution, driven by legal, economic, and social changes. The challenges and developments in this field reflect the complexities of resolving disputes in an increasingly interconnected world. As the global legal environment adapts to these changes, the practice of arbitration must evolve, ensuring that it remains an effective and fair mechanism for resolving international disputes.