

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>P.</i>
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	IX
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	XI
<i>Introductory remarks and analysis of the scope of the work</i>	XIII

### CHAPTER 1

#### INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT ARBITRATION AND THE NEED FOR COHERENCE

1.1. The taxonomy of multiple claims and the inevitability of parallel proceedings	2
1.1.1. Contract and treaty claims	3
1.1.2. Majority and minority shareholders (or company and its shareholders)	7
1.1.3. Chain of entities of the same group	13
1.1.4. Different adjudication systems provided in the same legal instrument	17
1.2. The reason behind parallel proceedings: the historical necessity to incentivize investments	18
1.3. Systemic features in investment arbitration: a network needing internal coherence	25
1.4. Policy considerations against parallel proceedings	37
1.4.1. Reliability and legitimacy of the adjudication process and the principle of legal certainty	38
1.4.2. Judicial economy and the need for efficiency in the decision-making process	42
1.4.3. Fairness and finality	45
1.5. The apparent lack of a general remedy for ensuring consistency and finality. The impossibility of finding a solution at the jurisdictional stage and the necessity to go beyond party autonomy	47

## CHAPTER 2

PRE-AWARD REMEDIES BASED ON PARTY AUTONOMY  
OR ON THE DISCRETION OF ARBITRATORS

2.1. Remedies based on party autonomy (and, secondarily, on arbitrators' discretion)	58
2.1.1. Forum selection options, fork-in-the-road and waiver clauses	58
2.1.2. Introduction to multiparty and multicontract situations in international commercial arbitration and possible applications in investment arbitration	65
2.1.2.1. Joinder (and intervention): Looking for an implied consent? The methodologies applied in international commercial arbitration and their fallacy if applied in investment arbitration	67
2.1.2.2. Consolidation	79
2.1.2.3. Quasi consolidation	84
2.1.3. Collective proceedings started by investors (in a nutshell)	86
2.2. Remedies based on arbitrators' discretion only	90
2.2.1. <i>Forum non conveniens</i> , comity and the suspension of proceedings	90
2.2.2. Arbitral anti-suit injunctions and the infringement of <i>kompetenz-kompetenz</i>	94
2.3. Conclusions	98

## CHAPTER 3

PRE-AWARD REMEDIES BASED ON  
INTERNATIONAL LAW SOURCES

3.1. Jurisdiction and admissibility. The legal basis for the distinction and its role in the fight against parallel proceedings	103
3.2. The applicability of general principles of international law in investment arbitration	109
3.3. An inadequate solution for the problem of parallel proceedings: The "first in time" rule	117
3.4. Sources of general international law providing for solutions to the problem of parallel proceedings: the principles of good faith and <i>ne bis in idem</i> and their concrete applications	121
3.5. Abuse of process in international investment arbitration	128
3.6. <i>Res judicata</i> (claim preclusion)	135
3.6.1. Definition of <i>res judicata</i> and its role in ensuring the goal of the process	135

	<i>p.</i>
3.6.2. The traditional approach to <i>res judicata</i> : The triple identity test and the requirement of the same legal order. The <i>CME/Lauder</i> cases and a critic to the triple identity test as an over-formalistic approach, which does not take into account substance	139
3.6.3. The requirements of <i>petitum</i> and <i>causa petendi</i> and the call for a more flexible approach. The <i>Southern Bluefin Tuna</i> case	142
3.6.4. The requirement of identical parties: The effects of international awards on related third parties	148
3.6.5. The same legal order (in brief)	154
3.7. Collateral estoppel (issue preclusion)	158
3.7.1. Development and requirements of collateral estoppel: A broader concept of privity and the necessity to respect due process	158
3.7.2. Collateral estoppel in international investment law: The <i>RSM</i> and <i>Apotex</i> cases, the call for a more flexible approach and the source of judges' power to apply such an approach	162
3.8. Concrete applications of the proposed solutions in investment arbitration	167
3.9. A solution <i>de jure condendo</i> in order to preserve due process in case of multiple claims by shareholders: the possible third parties' right to be informed and to intervene in the proceedings	169
3.10. Conclusions	172

#### CHAPTER 4

#### POST-AWARD REMEDIES

4.1. ICSID arbitration as a self-contained form of arbitration and the necessity to find a solution to parallel proceedings within its procedural boundaries	176
4.2. Non-ICSID investment arbitration and possible remedies to parallel proceedings at the enforcement and set aside stages of arbitral awards	181
4.2.1. The regime of the 1958 New York Convention and the possible applicability of the public policy exception to avoid the enforcement of duplicative awards	181
4.2.2. Concrete application of the proposed solution	192
4.3. Challenging non-ICSID awards arising from duplicative proceedings at the seat of arbitration (in brief)	196
<i>Conclusions</i>	199
<i>Selected bibliography</i>	207
<i>Table of cases</i>	243
<i>Index</i>	251