

Levashova, Yulia

Research Report

The way forward in reforming the legitimate expectations test

Columbia FDI Perspectives, No. 346

Provided in Cooperation with:

Columbia Center on Sustainable Investment (CCSI) - A joint center of Columbia Law School and the Earth Institute, Columbia University

Suggested Citation: Levashova, Yulia (2022) : The way forward in reforming the legitimate expectations test, Columbia FDI Perspectives, No. 346, Columbia University, Columbia Center on Sustainable Investment (CCSI), New York, NY

This Version is available at:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10419/268537>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



Columbia Center
on Sustainable Investment

A JOINT CENTER OF COLUMBIA LAW SCHOOL
AND THE EARTH INSTITUTE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Columbia FDI Perspectives

Perspectives on topical foreign direct investment issues

Editor-in-Chief: Karl P. Sauvant (Karl.Sauvant@law.columbia.edu)

Managing Editor: Abigail Greene (avg2129@columbia.edu)

The Columbia FDI Perspectives are a forum for public debate. The views expressed by the authors do not reflect the opinions of CCSI or our partners and supporters.

No. 346 December 12, 2022

The way forward in reforming the legitimate expectations test

by

Yulia Levashova*

The protection of an investor's legitimate expectations has become the most significant element in an assessment of fair and equitable treatment (FET) in ISDS cases. The frustration of an investor's legitimate expectations often translates to the breach of the FET standard. The common critique of the application of the legitimate expectations standard by tribunals is based on the broad interpretation of this concept *vis-à-vis* the state's right to regulate. The lack of any methodological approach in the assessment of legitimate expectations by tribunals has led to a growing body of contradictory decisions ([see Spanish energy cases](#)). The approach toward legitimate expectations proposed here is the integration of a structured reasoning by way of the application of some elements of proportionality.

The state's right to regulate has a key role in determining limits on the protection of the investor's legitimate expectations by arbitral tribunals. In recent cases, tribunals have underscored that the assessment of legitimate expectations implies an inherent balancing of a state's right to regulate and the rights of an investor.¹ Tribunals have developed a "checklist" for the assessment of legitimate expectations. Its starting point is the assessment of the type of commitments relied upon by the investor. Additional factors may play a role, such as the severity of economic impact; the extent of change and the procedure followed by a state; the public interest involved; external circumstances; and the due diligence done by an investor.² The problem, however, is a lack of clarity regarding the hierarchy and allocation of weight among these factors in a tribunal's final determination regarding the breach of legitimate expectations. More importantly, a state's legitimate objective in serving the public interest is only one among other intermediary factors in tribunals' assessments.³

Principles of proportionality, combined with the duty to defer to the margin of appreciation of states' authorities, may serve as an anchor for a consistent and methodological approach in FET cases. The latter approach is already integrated in several international investment

agreements (IIAs) with regard to indirect expropriation clauses (e.g., [Australia-Malaysia FTA](#)). These clauses tend to clarify the relevant factors in the balancing process and their hierarchical relationship, prioritizing the public interest. A comparable approach toward legitimate expectations can facilitate (i) more legal certainty and predictability for states and investors regarding the weight allocation in the balancing process, (ii) prioritization of the legitimate public interest in publicly sensitive cases and, at the same time, (iii) sufficient flexibility for arbitrators to make a decision.

The following proportionality elements might be considered in drafting guidelines for legitimate expectations under an FET standard for the determination of liability:

- Tribunals should take into consideration whether a state’s measure affecting the legitimate expectations of an investor pursues a legitimate public policy objective, e.g., the protection of public health or the environment.
- A state’s measure to achieve legitimate objectives must be adopted in a non-discriminatory and non-arbitrary manner.
- The tribunal should afford a wide margin of appreciation in assessing a state’s measures to achieve legitimate objectives.

The proposed formulation is still flexible regarding the competence of tribunals to interpret the concept of legitimate expectations. The goal of the above proposal is to stress that tribunals should explicitly attach significant weight to public interest and adopt a low standard of review when a legitimate public interest is involved.

The above criteria are based on the first prong of proportionality, namely the review of suitability. In this way, the pursued policy objective is prioritised and must be weighed in a systematic manner against the interests of investors. To ensure that the economic rights of investors are duly considered, states are required to adopt a non-discriminatory and non-arbitrary procedure in achieving their public policy objectives.

* Yulia Levashova (j.levashova@nyenrode.nl) is Assistant Professor, Nyenrode University; Associate Research Fellow, Utrecht University and Director, Dispute Prevention, Asia Pacific FDI Network. The author wishes to thank Stephan Schill, Giorgio Sacredoti and Joachim Karl for their helpful peer reviews.

¹ [InfraRed v. Spain](#), ICSID Case No. ARB/14/12, Award, para. 366 (August 2, 2019); [Mamidoil v. Albania](#), ICSID Case No. ARB/11/24, Award, para. 614 (March 30, 2015); [Cavalum v. Spain](#), ICSID Case No. ARB/15/34, Decision on Jurisdiction, Liability and Directions on Quantum, para. 423 (August 31, 2020).

² Yulia Levashova, “The legitimate expectations of investors under the fair and equitable treatment in times of pandemic and aftermath,” in Yulia Levashova and Pascale Lorfing, eds., *Balancing States’ Responses and the Protection of Foreign Investors in the (Post) Pandemic World* (Alphen: Kluwer, 2022).

³ In several assessments, where tribunals determined that investors’ expectations were raised by specific assurances of a host state, the proportionality and reasonableness of a state measure adopted in a public interest had little relevance. See, [ESPF v. Italy](#), ICSID Case No. ARB/16/5, Award, para. 581 (14 September 2020).

The material in this Perspective may be reprinted if accompanied by the following acknowledgment: “Yulia Levashova, ‘The way forward in reforming the legitimate expectations test,’ Columbia FDI Perspectives No. 346, December 12, 2022. Reprinted with permission from the Columbia Center on Sustainable Investment

(<http://ccsi.columbia.edu>).” A copy should kindly be sent to the Columbia Center on Sustainable Investment at ccsi@law.columbia.edu.

For further information, including information regarding submission to the *Perspectives*, please contact: Columbia Center on Sustainable Investment, Abigail Greene, at avg2129@columbia.edu.

The Columbia Center on Sustainable Investment (CCSI), a joint center of Columbia Law School and the Earth Institute at Columbia University, is a leading applied research center and forum dedicated to the study, practice and discussion of sustainable international investment. Our mission is to develop and disseminate practical approaches and solutions, as well as to analyze topical policy-oriented issues, in order to maximize the impact of international investment for sustainable development. The Center undertakes its mission through interdisciplinary research, advisory projects, multi-stakeholder dialogue, educational programs, and the development of resources and tools. For more information, visit us at <http://ccsi.columbia.edu>.

Most recent Columbia FDI Perspectives

- No. 345, Alejandro Carballo Leyda and Frauke Nitschke, “Investment dispute management: The importance of the domestic dimension,” *Columbia FDI Perspectives*, November 28, 2022
- No. 344, Julien Chaisse and Arjun Solanki, “Advancing climate-change goals: From reactive to proactive systemic integration,” *Columbia FDI Perspectives*, November 14, 2022
- No. 343, Carlo Pietrobelli, Roberta Rabellotti and Ari van Assche, “How are global value chains altering policy narratives?,” *Columbia FDI Perspectives*, October 31, 2022
- No. 342, Wolfgang Alschner, “Why omitting general public policy exceptions from investment treaties is a setback for the right to regulate,” *Columbia FDI Perspectives*, October 17, 2022
- No. 341, Vanessa Tsang, “Strengthening international negotiation assistance for developing host countries,” *Columbia FDI Perspectives*, October 3, 2022

All previous *FDI Perspectives* are available at <https://ccsi.columbia.edu/content/columbia-fdi-perspectives>.