

**REPORT OF
THE EXECUTIVE
DIRECTORS ON
THE CONVENTION ON
THE SETTLEMENT
OF INVESTMENT
DISPUTES BETWEEN
STATES AND
NATIONALS OF
OTHER STATES**

**INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR
RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT**

MARCH 18, 1965

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Paragraph	Page
I-III	1-14	30
IV	The International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes	33
	15-18 General	33
	19 Functions of the Administrative Council	34
	20 Functions of the Secretary-General	35
	21 The Panels	35
V	Jurisdiction of the Centre	35
	22	35
	23-25 Consent	36
	26-27 Nature of the Dispute	36
	28-30 Parties to the Dispute	37
	31 Notifications by Contracting States	37
	32 Arbitration as Exclusive Remedy	38
	33 Claims by the Investor's State	38
VI	Proceedings under the Convention	38
	34 Institution of Proceedings	38
	35-36 Constitution of Conciliation Commissions and Arbitral Tribunals	39
	37-40 Conciliation Proceedings; Powers and Functions of Arbitral Tribunals	39
	41-43 Recognition and Enforcement of Arbitral Awards	40
VII	44 Place of Proceedings	41
VIII	45 Disputes Between Contracting States	41
IX	46 Entry into Force	42

1. Resolution No. 214, adopted by the Board of Governors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development on September 10, 1964, provides as follows:

"RESOLVED:

- (a) The report of the Executive Directors on "Settlement of Investment Disputes," dated August 6, 1964, is hereby approved.
 - (b) The Executive Directors are requested to formulate a convention establishing facilities and procedures which would be available on a voluntary basis for the settlement of investment disputes between contracting States and Nationals of other contracting States through conciliation and arbitration.
 - (c) In formulating such a convention, the Executive Directors shall take into account the views of member governments and shall keep in mind the desirability of arriving at a text which could be accepted by the largest possible number of governments.
 - (d) The Executive Directors shall submit the text of such a convention to member governments with such recommendations as they shall deem appropriate."
2. The Executive Directors of the Bank, acting pursuant to the foregoing Resolution, have formulated a Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States and, on March 18, 1965, approved the submission of the text of the Convention, as attached hereto, to member governments of the Bank. This action by the Executive Directors does not, of course, imply that the governments represented by the individual Executive Directors are committed to take action on the Convention.
 3. The action by the Executive Directors was preceded by extensive preparatory work, details of which are given in paragraphs 6-8 below. The Executive Directors are satisfied that the Convention in the form attached hereto represents a broad consensus of the views of those governments which accept the principle of establishing by intergovernmental agreement facilities and procedures for the settlement of investment disputes which States and foreign investors wish to submit to conciliation or arbitration. They are also satisfied that the Convention constitutes a suitable framework for such facilities

and procedures. Accordingly, the text of the Convention is submitted to member governments for consideration with a view to signature and ratification, acceptance or approval.

4. The Executive Directors invite attention to the provision of Article 68(2) pursuant to which the Convention will enter into force as between the Contracting States 30 days after deposit with the Bank, the depositary of the Convention, of the twentieth instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval.
5. The attached text of the Convention in the English, French and Spanish languages has been deposited in the archives of the Bank, as depositary, and is open for signature.

II

6. The question of the desirability and practicability of establishing institutional facilities, sponsored by the Bank, for the settlement through conciliation and arbitration of investment disputes between States and foreign investors was first placed before the Board of Governors of the Bank at its Seventeenth Annual Meeting, held in Washington, D.C. in September 1962. At that Meeting the Board of Governors, by Resolution No. 174, adopted on September 18, 1962, requested the Executive Directors to study the question.
7. After a series of informal discussions on the basis of working papers prepared by the staff of the Bank, the Executive Directors decided that the Bank should convene consultative meetings of legal experts designated by member governments to consider the subject in greater detail. The consultative meetings were held on a regional basis in Addis Ababa (December 16-20, 1963), Santiago de Chile (February 3-7, 1964), Geneva (February 17-21, 1964) and Bangkok (April 27-May 1, 1964), with the administrative assistance of the United Nations Economic Commissions and the European Office of the United Nations, and took as the basis for discussion a Preliminary Draft of a Convention on Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States prepared by the staff of the Bank in the light of the discussions of the Executive Directors and the views of governments. The meetings were attended by legal experts from 86 countries.
8. In the light of the preparatory work and of the views expressed at the consultative meetings, the Executive Directors reported to the Board of Governors at its Nineteenth Annual Meeting in

Tokyo, in September 1964, that it would be desirable to establish the institutional facilities envisaged, and to do so within the framework of an intergovernmental agreement. The Board of Governors adopted the Resolution set forth in paragraph 1 of this Report, whereupon the Executive Directors undertook the formulation of the present Convention. With a view to arriving at a text which could be accepted by the largest possible number of governments, the Bank invited its members to designate representatives to a Legal Committee which would assist the Executive Directors in their task. This Committee met in Washington from November 23 through December 11, 1964, and the Executive Directors gratefully acknowledge the valuable advice they received from the representatives of the 61 member countries who served on the Committee.



9. In submitting the attached Convention to governments, the Executive Directors are prompted by the desire to strengthen the partnership between countries in the cause of economic development. The creation of an institution designed to facilitate the settlement of disputes between States and foreign investors can be a major step toward promoting an atmosphere of mutual confidence and thus stimulating a larger flow of private international capital into those countries which wish to attract it.
10. The Executive Directors recognize that investment disputes are as a rule settled through administrative, judicial or arbitral procedures available under the laws of the country in which the investment concerned is made. However, experience shows that disputes may arise which the parties wish to settle by other methods; and investment agreements entered into in recent years show that both States and investors frequently consider that it is in their mutual interest to agree to resort to international methods of settlement.
11. The present Convention would offer international methods of settlement designed to take account of the special characteristics of the disputes covered, as well as of the parties to whom it would apply. It would provide facilities for conciliation and arbitration by specially qualified persons of independent judgment carried out according to rules known and accepted in advance by the parties concerned. In particular, it would ensure that once a government or investor had given

consent to conciliation or arbitration under the auspices of the Centre, such consent could not be unilaterally withdrawn.

12. The Executive Directors believe that private capital will continue to flow to countries offering a favorable climate for attractive and sound investments, even if such countries did not become parties to the Convention or, having joined, did not make use of the facilities of the Centre. On the other hand, adherence to the Convention by a country would provide additional inducement and stimulate a larger flow of private international investment into its territories, which is the primary purpose of the Convention.
13. While the broad objective of the Convention is to encourage a larger flow of private international investment, the provisions of the Convention maintain a careful balance between the interests of investors and those of host States. Moreover, the Convention permits the institution of proceedings by host States as well as by investors and the Executive Directors have constantly had in mind that the provisions of the Convention should be equally adapted to the requirements of both cases.
14. The provisions of the attached Convention are for the most part self-explanatory. Brief comment on a few principal features may, however, be useful to member governments in their consideration of the Convention.

IV

THE INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR SETTLEMENT OF INVESTMENT DISPUTES

General

15. The Convention establishes the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes as an autonomous international institution (Articles 18-24). The purpose of the Centre is "to provide facilities for conciliation and arbitration of investment disputes * * *" (Article 1(2)). The Centre will not itself engage in conciliation or arbitration activities. This will be the task of Conciliation Commissions and Arbitral Tribunals constituted in accordance with the provisions of the Convention.
16. As sponsor of the establishment of the institution the Bank will provide the Centre with premises for its seat (Article 2) and, pursuant to arrangements between the two institutions, with other administrative facilities and services (Article 6(d)).

17. With respect to the financing of the Centre (Article 17), the Executive Directors have decided that the Bank should be prepared to provide the Centre with office accommodation free of charge as long as the Centre has its seat at the Bank's headquarters and to underwrite, within reasonable limits, the basic overhead expenditure of the Centre for a period of years to be determined after the Centre is established.
18. Simplicity and economy consistent with the efficient discharge of the functions of the Centre characterize its structure. The organs of the Centre are the Administrative Council (Articles 4-8) and the Secretariat (Article 9-11). The Administrative Council will be composed of one representative of each Contracting State, serving without remuneration from the Centre. Each member of the Council casts one vote and matters before the Council are decided by a majority of the votes cast unless a different majority is required by the Convention. The President of the Bank will serve *ex officio* as the Council's Chairman but will have no vote. The Secretariat will consist of a Secretary-General, one or more Deputy Secretaries-General and staff. In the interest of flexibility the Convention provides for the possibility of there being more than one Deputy Secretary-General, but the Executive Directors do not now foresee a need for more than one or two full time high officials of the Centre. Article 10, which requires that the Secretary-General and any Deputy Secretary-General be elected by the Administrative Council by a majority of two-thirds of its members, on the nomination of the Chairman, limits their terms of office to a period not exceeding six years and permits their re-election. The Executive Directors believe that the initial election, which will take place shortly after the Convention will have come into force, should be for a short term so as not to deprive the States which ratify the Convention after its entry into force of the possibility of participating in the selection of the high officials of the Centre. Article 10 also limits the extent to which these officials may engage in activities other than their official functions.

Functions of the Administrative Council

19. The principal functions of the Administrative Council are the election of the Secretary-General and any Deputy Secretary-General, the adoption of the budget of the Centre and the adoption of administrative and financial regulations, rules governing the institution of proceedings and rules of procedure for conciliation and arbitration proceedings. Action on all these matters requires a majority of two-thirds of the members of the Council.

Functions of the Secretary-General

20. The Convention requires the Secretary-General to perform a variety of administrative functions as legal representative, registrar and principal officer of the Centre (Articles 7(1), 11, 16(3), 25(4), 28, 36, 49(1), 50(1), 51(1), 52(1), 54(2), 59, 60(1), 63(b) and 65). In addition, the Secretary-General is given the power to refuse registration of a request for conciliation proceedings or arbitration proceedings, and thereby to prevent the institution of such proceedings, if on the basis of the information furnished by the applicant he finds that the dispute is *manifestly* outside the jurisdiction of the Centre (Article 28(3) and 36(3)). The Secretary-General is given this limited power to "screen" requests for conciliation or arbitration proceedings with a view to avoiding the embarrassment to a party (particularly a State) which might result from the institution of proceedings against it in a dispute which it had not consented to submit to the Centre, as well as the possibility that the machinery of the Centre would be set in motion in cases which for other reasons were obviously outside the jurisdiction of the Centre e.g., because either the applicant or the other party was not eligible to be a party in proceedings under the Convention.

The Panels

21. Article 3 requires the Centre to maintain a Panel of Conciliators and a Panel of Arbitrators, while Articles 12-16 outline the manner and terms of designation of Panel members. In particular, Article 14(1) seeks to ensure that Panel members will possess a high degree of competence and be capable of exercising independent judgment. In keeping with the essentially flexible character of the proceedings, the Convention permits the parties to appoint conciliators and arbitrators from outside the Panels but requires (Articles 31(2) and 40(2)) that such appointees possess the qualities stated in Article 14(1). The Chairman, when called upon to appoint a conciliator or arbitrator pursuant to Article 30 or 38, is restricted in his choice to Panel members.



JURISDICTION OF THE CENTRE

22. The term "jurisdiction of the Centre" is used in the Convention as a convenient expression to mean the limits within which

the provisions of the Convention will apply and the facilities of the Centre will be available for conciliation and arbitration proceedings. The jurisdiction of the Centre is dealt with in Chapter II of the Convention (Articles 25-27).

Consent

23. Consent of the parties is the cornerstone of the jurisdiction of the Centre. Consent to jurisdiction must be in writing and once given cannot be withdrawn unilaterally (Article 25(1)).
24. Consent of the parties must exist when the Centre is seized (Articles 28(3) and 36(3)) but the Convention does not otherwise specify the time at which consent should be given. Consent may be given, for example, in a clause included in an investment agreement, providing for the submission to the Centre of future disputes arising out of that agreement, or in a *compromis* regarding a dispute which has already arisen. Nor does the Convention require that the consent of both parties be expressed in a single instrument. Thus, a host State might in its investment promotion legislation offer to submit disputes arising out of certain classes of investments to the jurisdiction of the Centre, and the investor might give his consent by accepting the offer in writing.
25. While consent of the parties is an essential prerequisite for the jurisdiction of the Centre, consent alone will not suffice to bring a dispute within its jurisdiction. In keeping with the purpose of the Convention, the jurisdiction of the Centre is further limited by reference to the nature of the dispute and the parties thereto.

Nature of the Dispute

26. Article 25(1) requires that the dispute must be a "legal dispute arising directly out of an investment." The expression "legal dispute" has been used to make clear that while conflicts of rights are within the jurisdiction of the Centre, mere conflicts of interests are not. The dispute must concern the existence or scope of a legal right or obligation, or the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for breach of a legal obligation.
27. No attempt was made to define the term "investment" given the essential requirement of consent by the parties, and the mechanism through which Contracting States can make known in advance, if they so desire, the classes of disputes which they would or would not consider submitting to the Centre (Article 25(4)).

Parties to the Dispute

28. For a dispute to be within the jurisdiction of the Centre one of the parties must be a Contracting State (or a constituent subdivision or agency of a Contracting State) and the other party must be a "national of another Contracting State." The latter term as defined in paragraph (2) of Article 25 covers both natural persons and juridical persons.
29. It should be noted that under clause (a) of Article 25(2) a natural person who was a national of the State party to the dispute would not be eligible to be a party in proceedings under the auspices of the Centre, even if at the same time he had the nationality of another State. This ineligibility is absolute and cannot be cured even if the State party to the dispute had given its consent.
30. Clause (b) of Article 25(2), which deals with juridical persons, is more flexible. A juridical person which had the nationality of the State party to the dispute would be eligible to be a party to proceedings under the auspices of the Centre if that State had agreed to treat it as a national of another Contracting State because of foreign control.

Notifications by Contracting States

31. While no conciliation or arbitration proceedings could be brought against a Contracting State without its consent and while no Contracting State is under any obligation to give its consent to such proceedings, it was nevertheless felt that adherence to the Convention might be interpreted as holding out an expectation that Contracting States would give favorable consideration to requests by investors for the submission of a dispute to the Centre. It was pointed out in that connection that there might be classes of investment disputes which governments would consider unsuitable for submission to the Centre or which, under their own law, they were not permitted to submit to the Centre. In order to avoid any risk of misunderstanding on this score, Article 25(4) expressly permits Contracting States to make known to the Centre in advance, if they so desire, the classes of disputes which they would or would not consider submitting to the Centre. The provision makes clear that a statement by a Contracting State that it would consider submitting a certain class of dispute to the Centre would serve for purposes of information only and would not constitute the consent required to give the Centre jurisdiction. Of course, a statement

excluding certain classes of disputes from consideration would not constitute a reservation to the Convention.

Arbitration as Exclusive Remedy

32. It may be presumed that when a State and an investor agree to have recourse to arbitration, and do not reserve the right to have recourse to other remedies or require the prior exhaustion of other remedies, the intention of the parties is to have recourse to arbitration to the exclusion of any other remedy. This rule of interpretation is embodied in the first sentence of Article 26. In order to make clear that it was not intended thereby to modify the rules of international law regarding the exhaustion of local remedies, the second sentence explicitly recognizes the right of a State to require the prior exhaustion of local remedies.

Claims by the Investor's State

33. When a host State consents to the submission of a dispute with an investor to the Centre, thereby giving the investor direct access to an international jurisdiction, the investor should not be in a position to ask his State to espouse his case and that State should not be permitted to do so. Accordingly, Article 27 expressly prohibits a Contracting State from giving diplomatic protection, or bringing an international claim, in respect of a dispute which one of its nationals and another Contracting State have consented to submit, or have submitted, to arbitration under the Convention, unless the State party to the dispute fails to honor the award rendered in that dispute.

VI

PROCEEDINGS UNDER THE CONVENTION

Institution of Proceedings

34. Proceedings are instituted by means of a request addressed to the Secretary-General (Articles 28 and 36). After registration of the request the Conciliation Commission or Arbitral Tribunal, as the case may be, will be constituted. Reference is made to paragraph 20 above on the power of the Secretary-General to refuse registration.

Constitution of Conciliation Commissions and Arbitral Tribunals

35. Although the Convention leaves the parties a large measure of freedom as regards the constitution of Commissions and Tribunals, it assures that a lack of agreement between the parties on these matters or the unwillingness of a party to cooperate will not frustrate proceedings (Articles 29-30 and 37-38, respectively).
36. Mention has already been made of the fact that the parties are free to appoint conciliators and arbitrators from outside the Panels (see paragraph 21 above). While the Convention does not restrict the appointment of conciliators with reference to nationality, Article 39 lays down the rule that the majority of the members of an Arbitral Tribunal should not be nationals of the State party to the dispute or of the State whose national is a party to the dispute. This rule is likely to have the effect of excluding persons having these nationalities from serving on a Tribunal composed of not more than three members. However, the rule will not apply where each and every arbitrator on the Tribunal has been appointed by agreement of the parties.

Conciliation Proceedings; Powers and Functions of Arbitral Tribunals

37. In general, the provisions of Articles 32-35 dealing with conciliation proceedings and of Articles 41-49, dealing with the powers and functions of Arbitral Tribunals and awards rendered by such Tribunals, are self-explanatory. The differences between the two sets of provisions reflect the basic distinction between the process of conciliation which seeks to bring the parties to agreement and that of arbitration which aims at a binding determination of the dispute by the Tribunal.
38. Article 41 reiterates the well-established principle that international tribunals are to be the judges of their own competence and Article 32 applies the same principle to Conciliation Commissions. It is to be noted in this connection that the power of the Secretary-General to refuse registration of a request for conciliation or arbitration (see paragraph 20 above) is so narrowly defined as not to encroach on the prerogative of Commissions and Tribunals to determine their own competence and, on the other hand, that registration of a request by the Secretary-General does not, of course, preclude a Commission or Tribunal from finding that the dispute is outside the jurisdiction of the Centre.

39. In keeping with the consensual character of proceedings under the Convention, the parties to conciliation or arbitration proceedings may agree on the rules of procedure which will apply in those proceedings. However, if or to the extent that they have not so agreed the Conciliation Rules and Arbitration Rules adopted by the Administrative Council will apply (Articles 33 and 44).
40. Under the Convention an Arbitral Tribunal is required to apply the law agreed by the parties. Failing such agreement, the Tribunal must apply the law of the State party to the dispute (unless that law calls for the application of some other law), as well as such rules of international law as may be applicable. The term "international law" as used in this context should be understood in the sense given to it by Article 38(1) of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, allowance being made for the fact that Article 38 was designed to apply to inter-State disputes.¹

Recognition and Enforcement of Arbitral Awards

41. Article 53 declares that the parties are bound by the award and that it shall not be subject to appeal or to any other remedy except those provided for in the Convention. The remedies provided for are revision (Article 51) and annulment (Article 52). In addition, a party may ask a Tribunal which omitted to decide any question submitted to it, to supplement its award (Article 49(2)) and may request interpretation of the award (Article 50).
42. Subject to any stay of enforcement in connection with any of the above proceedings in accordance with the provisions of the Convention, the parties are obliged to abide by and comply with the award and Article 54 requires every Contracting State to recognize the award as binding and to enforce the pecuniary obligations imposed by the award as if it were a final decision of a domestic court. Because of the different legal techniques

¹ Article 38(1) of the Statute of the International Court of Justice reads as follows:

"1. The Court, whose function it is to decide in accordance with international law such disputes as are submitted to it, shall apply:

- international conventions, whether general or particular, establishing rules expressly recognized by the contesting states;
- international custom, as evidence of a general practice accepted as law;
- the general principles of law recognized by civilized nations;
- subject to the provisions of Article 59, judicial decisions and the teachings of the most highly qualified publicists of the various nations, as subsidiary means for the determination of rules of law."

followed in common law and civil law jurisdictions and the different judicial systems found in unitary and federal or other non-unitary States, Article 54 does not prescribe any particular method to be followed in its domestic implementation, but requires each Contracting State to meet the requirements of the Article in accordance with its own legal system.

43. The doctrine of sovereign immunity may prevent the forced execution in a State of judgments obtained against foreign States or against the State in which execution is sought. Article 54 require Contracting States to equate an award rendered pursuant to the Convention with a final judgment of its own courts. It does not require them to go beyond that and to undertake forced execution of awards rendered pursuant to the Convention in cases in which final judgments could not be executed. In order to leave no doubt on this point Article 55 provides that nothing in Article 54 shall be construed as derogating from the law in force in any Contracting State relating to immunity of that State or of any foreign State from execution.

VII PLACE OF PROCEEDINGS

44. In dealing with proceedings away from the Centre, Article 63 provides that proceedings may be held, if the parties so agree, at the seat of the Permanent Court of Arbitration or of any other appropriate institution with which the Centre may enter into arrangements for that purpose. These arrangements are likely to vary with the type of institution and to range from merely making premises available for the proceedings to the provision of complete secretariat services.

VIII DISPUTES BETWEEN CONTRACTING STATES

45. Article 64 confers on the International Court of Justice jurisdiction over disputes between Contracting States regarding the interpretation or application of the Convention

which are not settled by negotiation and which the parties do not agree to settle by other methods. While the provision is couched in general terms, it must be read in the context of the Convention as a whole. Specifically, the provision does not confer jurisdiction on the Court to review the decision of a Conciliation Commission or Arbitral Tribunal as to its competence with respect to any dispute before it. Nor does it empower a State to institute proceedings before the Court in respect of a dispute which one of its nationals and another Contracting State have consented to submit or have submitted to arbitration, since such proceedings would contravene the provisions of Article 27, unless the other Contracting State had failed to abide by and comply with the award rendered in that dispute.

IX ENTRY INTO FORCE

46. The Convention is open for signature on behalf of States members of the Bank. It will also be open for signature on behalf of any other State which is a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice and which the Administrative Council, by a vote of two-thirds of its members, shall have invited to sign. No time limit has been prescribed for signature. Signature is required both of States joining before the Convention enters into force and those joining thereafter (Article 67). The Convention is subject to ratification, acceptance or approval by the signatory States in accordance with their constitutional procedures (Article 68). As already stated, the Convention will enter into force upon the deposit of the twentieth instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval.