

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Setting the Scene: Responsibility of the EU and the Member States Under EU IIPAs	1
1.1.1	The Concept of IIPAs and ISDS: Abridged	2
1.1.2	The Emergence of EU IIPAs	2
1.1.3	With Power Comes Responsibility	4
1.1.4	The Dawn of a New Responsibility Regime	5
1.2	Aim and Structure of This Study	8
<b>2</b>	<b>International Obligations of the EU and the Member States Under EU IIPAs</b>	<b>11</b>
2.1	Capacity to Conclude IIPAs: The EU and the Member States as Subjects of International Law	12
2.2	Competence to Conclude IIPAs: The EU's and the Member States' Treaty-Making Competence in the Field of Foreign Investment	14
2.2.1	The Link Between Treaty-Making Competences Under EU Law and the Participation of the EU and the Member States in the Conclusion of a Treaty	15
2.2.2	The Division of Competences Between the EU and the Member States with Respect to IIPAs	17
2.2.2.1	Treaty-Making Competences Regarding Foreign Investment Before Lisbon: Member State BITs and the ECT as a Treaty of 'Shared Mixity'	18
2.2.2.2	Treaty-Making Competence Regarding Foreign Investment After Lisbon: EU-Only or 'Shared Mixity' as the Crossroads for Post-Lisbon IIPAs	20
2.3	International Obligations of the EU and the Member States Under EU IIPAs	26

2.3.1	Apportionment of Obligations Between the EU and the Member States Under Mixed IIPAs Along Competence Lines .....	26
2.3.1.1	Apportionment of Obligations Along Division of Competences Under Mixed Agreements Devoid of Contractual Delimitations .....	28
2.3.1.2	Apportionment of Obligations Under Mixed IIPAs Along Competence Lines as Per Contractual Delimitations .....	48
2.3.2	International Obligations Flowing from EU-Only IIPAs ...	71
2.3.2.1	Member States Do Not Assume International Obligations Under EU-Only IIPAs Under the Law of Treaties .....	72
2.3.2.2	Member States Do Not Assume International Obligations Under EU-Only IIPAs by Way of Article 216(2) TFEU .....	74
2.4	Conclusions Chapter 2: Obligations Under Mixed IIPAs Do Not Run Along Competence Lines .....	76
<b>3</b>	<b>International Responsibility of the EU and the Member States for Breaches of EU IIPAs Under Traditional Rules .....</b>	<b>79</b>
3.1	International Responsibility for Breaches of EU IIPAs Under the <i>Lex Generalis</i> of the ILC Articles and International Case Law ...	80
3.1.1	The ‘Organic’ Model of Attribution of Conduct Under the ARIO and ARS .....	83
3.1.2	Capturing the Decentralised Implementation of EU Law by the Member States Under the <i>Lex Generalis</i> of the ARIO and International Case Law .....	84
3.1.2.1	The ARIO’s (Non-)Recognition of the Decentralised Implementation of EU Law by Member States .....	86
3.1.2.2	(Incoherent) International Case Law Regarding the Decentralised Implementation of EU Law by the Member States .....	91
3.1.2.3	Result: No Uniformity Under International Case Law and the ARIO .....	98
3.1.2.4	The WTO Approach Is Not Transferable to IIPAs .....	99
3.1.3	Where Incumbency of Obligations and Attribution Go Astray: The Risk of Accountability Gaps Under EU-Only IIPAs Under the ILC Articles .....	100
3.1.4	Conclusions on International Responsibility for Breaches of EU IIPAs Under the <i>Lex Generalis</i> of the ARS and ARIO .....	103

3.2	International Responsibility for Breaches of EU IIPAs Under <i>Leges Speciales</i> . . . . .	104
3.2.1	Joint (and Several) Responsibility of EU and Member States Under Mixed IIPAs as <i>Lex Specialis</i> . . . . .	106
3.2.1.1	Joint Responsibility as Expressly Stipulated in a Mixed Agreement . . . . .	107
3.2.1.2	Joint Responsibility as the Default Rule Under a Mixed Agreement . . . . .	110
3.2.2	The Division of Competences Between the EU and the Member States Under the EU Treaties as <i>Lex Specialis</i> . . .	113
3.2.2.1	The Division of Treaty-Making Competences as the Criterion for International Responsibility . . .	115
3.2.2.2	The Division of Competences as Derives from the EU Treaties . . . . .	119
3.2.2.3	Conclusions on the Competence-Based Approach as <i>Lex Specialis</i> . . . . .	122
3.2.3	The ‘What-Is-Required-by-EU-Law’-Approach as <i>Lex Specialis</i> Under the ECT . . . . .	122
3.2.3.1	Electrabel v Hungary . . . . .	124
3.2.3.2	AES Summit v Hungary . . . . .	126
3.2.3.3	Conclusions on the ECT-Approach . . . . .	127
3.2.4	A Federal State Analogy as <i>Lex Specialis</i> Under EU-Only IIPAs . . . . .	128
3.2.4.1	International Responsibility of Federal States . . .	130
3.2.4.2	Applying a Federal State Analogy to the EU and the Member States Under EU-Only IIPAs . . .	133
3.2.5	Summary: The Various <i>Leges Speciales</i> Under EU IIPAs . .	136
3.3	Conclusions Chapter 3: The Traditional Rules of International Responsibility Are Not Designed to Capture the Inner Workings of the EU and the Member States . . . . .	137
4	<b>The Proceduralisation and Internalisation of International Responsibility Under Post-Lisbon Mixed IIPAs . . . . .</b>	139
4.1	The Rationale and Motives for a Proceduralisation of International Responsibility . . . . .	141
4.1.1	Guaranteeing Legal Certainty . . . . .	141
4.1.2	Protecting the Autonomy of EU Law . . . . .	144
4.2	The Form of Proceduralisation Under Post-Lisbon Mixed IIPAs . . . . .	150
4.2.1	The Functioning of the Respondent Determination from the Perspective of the Mixed IIPA . . . . .	150
4.2.1.1	The Procedure for Determining the Respondent Under Post-Lisbon Mixed IIPAs . . . . .	151
4.2.1.2	A Single-Respondent Model . . . . .	155

4.2.1.3	The Mandatory Nature of the Respondent Determination Mechanism .....	156
4.2.2	The Functioning of the Respondent Determination from the Perspective of the REG .....	163
4.2.2.1	Applicability of the REG .....	163
4.2.2.2	The Respondent Determination Under the REG .....	168
4.2.2.3	Settlement Rights and Duties Under the REG ...	187
4.2.2.4	Payment Obligations Vis-à-Vis the Investor Under the REG .....	190
4.3	The Constitutive Effect of the Respondent Determination Under Post-Lisbon Mixed IIPAs on the International Responsibility of the Determined Respondent .....	190
4.3.1	The Precondition to a Constitutive Effect of the Respondent Determination: ‘Respondent’ or Mere ‘Representative’? .....	192
4.3.2	The Scope of the Constitutive Effect: The ‘EU-Member State Responsibility Window’ .....	194
4.3.3	The Interpretation of the Respondent Determination Mechanism Under Post-Lisbon Mixed IIPAs with Respect to a Constitutive Effect .....	195
4.3.3.1	Textual Interpretation of Article 8.21(6)(7) CETA .....	198
4.3.3.2	Possible Accountability Gaps and a Denial of Justice .....	213
4.3.3.3	Protection of the Autonomy of EU Law .....	216
4.3.3.4	Result on Interpretation: The Respondent Determination Mechanism Under CETA Has a Constitutive Effect on International Responsibility .....	216
4.3.4	Capturing the Constitutive Effect Under the ILC Articles ...	217
4.3.4.1	The Respondent Determination as Adoption and Acknowledgment of Conduct Under Article 11 ARS and Article 9 ARIIO .....	217
4.3.4.2	The Respondent Determination Mechanism as a <i>Lex Specialis</i> of International Responsibility Under Article 55 ARS and 64 ARIIO .....	219
4.4	Excursus: Proceduralisation of International Responsibility Under EU-Only IIPAs .....	221
4.4.1	No Consent to Arbitration of Member States Under EU-Only IIPAs per se .....	223
4.4.2	No International Responsibility of Member States Under EU-Only IIPAs per se .....	224
4.4.3	Article 35 VCLT and Member State International Responsibility .....	225

4.4.4	Article 62 ARIO and Member State International Responsibility .....	226
4.4.5	Drafting Proposals for EU-Only IIPAs that Enable Member State Participation .....	229
4.4.6	Result: Member States Are Free to Enter the Fray Under EU-Only IIPAs .....	230
4.5	Conclusions Chapter 4: A New Responsibility Regime Under Post-Lisbon Mixed IIPAs .....	231
<b>5</b>	<b>The Internal Allocation of Financial Responsibility Under the REG .....</b>	<b>235</b>
5.1	The Case of Germany: Internal Allocation of Financial Responsibility Between the <i>Bund</i> and the <i>Länder</i> .....	238
5.1.1	Applicability of Article 104a(6) GG and the LastG .....	240
5.1.2	The Internal Reimbursement Claim of the <i>Bund</i> Against the <i>Länder</i> .....	242
5.1.3	The Allocation Criteria: Financial Responsibility Lies with the Originator of the Breach .....	242
5.1.4	The Apportionment of a Financial Burden Into a <i>Bund</i> and a <i>Länder</i> Share .....	245
5.1.5	Summary on Germany's Allocation System .....	251
5.2	Internal Allocation of Financial Responsibility Between the EU and the Member States Under the REG .....	251
5.2.1	The Limited Value of Drawing Analogies from the EU State Responsibility Regime for Interpreting and Complementing the Allocation Criteria Under the REG .....	253
5.2.2	The Allocation Criteria Pursuant to Article 3 REG .....	256
5.2.2.1	Article 3(1)(a) and (b) REG: Financial Responsibility Lies with the Originator of the Treatment That Led to the Financial Burden .....	257
5.2.2.2	Financial Responsibility of the EU Pursuant to Article 3(1)(c) REG for Member State Treatment 'Required by Union Law' .....	257
5.2.2.3	The Exception to Article 3(1)(c) REG .....	270
5.2.2.4	The Exception Provisions of Allocation Pursuant to Article 3(3) and (4) REG .....	272
5.2.3	The Reimbursement Claim Pursuant to Article 19 REG in Conjunction with Article 3 REG: The <i>Ex Post Facto</i> Allocation of Financial Responsibility .....	273
5.2.3.1	Conditions for the Reimbursement Claim Under Article 19 REG .....	273
5.2.3.2	The Exclusive Right of the EU to Recover from the Member States Creates Accountability	

	Gaps Under the REG When Member States Act as Respondent . . . . .	275
5.2.4	The Binding Effect of Arbitral Awards and Settlements on the <i>Ex Post Facto</i> Allocation of Financial Responsibility Under the REG . . . . .	280
5.2.4.1	The Binding Effect of the Amount of Damages as Awarded or Agreed Upon . . . . .	280
5.2.4.2	The Binding Effect of the Content of the Award or Settlement as to the Illegality of the Treatment(s) Under the EU IIPA . . . . .	282
5.2.5	Apportionment of a Financial Burden Into a EU and a Member State Share Under the REG . . . . .	290
5.2.5.1	Scenarios Under the REG Requiring the Apportionment of a Financial Burden Into a EU and a Member State Share . . . . .	290
5.2.5.2	The REG Foresees the Scenarios Where an Apportionment Is Required But Provides No <i>Modus Operandi</i> on How to Split a Financial Burden Into a EU and a Member State Share . . . . .	295
5.2.5.3	Possible Apportionment Criteria and Methods Under the REG for Splitting a Financial Burden Into a EU and a Member State Share . . . . .	296
5.3	Conclusions Chapter 5: Significant Steps Towards Federalisation Under EU IIPAs . . . . .	300
<b>6</b>	<b>Specific Problems Caused by the Interrelation Between the Application of EU IIPAs and the Application of the REG . . . . .</b>	<b>303</b>
6.1	The Commission Incorrectly Decides to Confer Respondent Status to the EU . . . . .	304
6.1.1	The Various Solutions to Accommodate Under the EU IIPA Challenges to the CJEU with Respect to the Commission's Decision on Respondent Status . . . . .	306
6.1.1.1	Deferment or Stay of Arbitral Proceedings . . . . .	306
6.1.1.2	Parallel Proceedings and Co-Respondents in the Arbitration . . . . .	307
6.1.1.3	Parallel Proceedings and a Single Respondent in the Arbitration . . . . .	307
6.1.2	Discussion: What Is Viable and Realistic? . . . . .	311
6.1.3	The Right to Effective Legal Protection Under EU Law Prevails over the Integrity of the Arbitration Proceedings and Their Smooth Functioning . . . . .	313
6.1.4	Final Drafting and Interpretation Proposals to Accommodate Arbitration Proceedings Under a EU	

	IIPA with CJEU Proceedings on the Commission Decision on Respondent Status . . . . .	316
6.2	The Content of the Decision on Respondent Status Under the REG Might Unduly Influence the Arbitral Tribunal's Finding on Illegality of the Challenged Treatment Under the EU IIPA . . . .	318
6.2.1	The Test Under Article 9(2)(a) REG in Conjunction with Article 3 REG Does Not Require an Assessment Whether the Actual Treatment Challenged by the Investor Breaches the EU IIPA . . . . .	318
6.2.2	The Outcome of the Hypothetical Causation-Test Under the REG Might Influence an Arbitral Tribunal in Its Own Assessment on Illegality of the Challenged Treatment Under the EU IIPA . . . . .	320
6.3	The Mandate of the Commission and the CJEU to Look into the Merits of the Arbitral Case for Allocating Financial Responsibility . . . . .	322
6.3.1	What Does the REG Imply? . . . . .	322
6.3.2	Risk of Inequitable Results . . . . .	324
6.3.3	Threats to the Validity of Awards and Settlements Versus Risks of Disruptions in the Allocation and Reimbursement Procedure . . . . .	328
6.3.4	Result: The Commission and the CJEU Should Have the Mandate to Look into the Merits of an Unclear Award or Settlement in Order to Find Out Which Treatment Is Illegal Under the EU IIPA . . . . .	331
6.4	Conclusions Chapter 6: The Interrelation Between EU IIPAs and the REG Is Not Invulnerable to Frictions . . . . .	332
<b>7</b>	<b>Epilogue</b> . . . . .	335
7.1	The ECT and the Application of Traditional Responsibility Rules . . . . .	335
7.2	Post-Lisbon Mixed IIPAs and the Proceduralisation of International Responsibility . . . . .	336
7.3	The Federalisation of Responsibility Under EU IIPAs . . . . .	337
7.4	Challenges Ahead . . . . .	338
	<b>Table of Cases</b> . . . . .	341
	<b>Table of Treaties and Legislative and Policy Instruments</b> . . . . .	349
	<b>Bibliography</b> . . . . .	355