



# IIA ISSUES NOTE

## INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT AGREEMENTS




UNITED NATIONS  
UNCTAD

# FACTS ON INVESTOR–STATE ARBITRATIONS IN 2021: WITH A SPECIAL FOCUS ON TAX-RELATED ISDS CASES

## H I G H L I G H T S

- The total count of known investor–State dispute settlement (ISDS) cases reached 1,190 at the end of 2021. At least 68 ISDS cases were initiated under international investment agreements (IIAs) in 2021.
- The new ISDS cases in 2021 were brought against 42 countries. Five countries – Cambodia, Congo, Finland, Malta and the Netherlands – faced their first known ISDS claims.
- Two IIAs signed in the 1990s – the Energy Charter Treaty (ECT, 1994) and the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA, 1992) – continued to be the instruments invoked most frequently.
- UNCTAD data suggest that investors have challenged tax-related measures in 165 ISDS cases based on IIAs. High-profile examples include cases related to the imposition of capital gains taxes (*Cairn v. India*, *Vodafone v. India (I) and (II)*), tax investigations and large tax assessments (*Hulley Enterprises v. Russia*, *Veteran Petroleum v. Russia*, *Yukos Universal v. Russia*), and regulatory changes to feed-in tariffs for renewable energy production (*The PV Investors v. Spain*, *Charanne and Construction Investments v. Spain*).
- This IIA Issue Note expands on research published in UNCTAD’s World Investment Report 2022.

**Figure 1. Trends in known treaty-based ISDS cases, 1987–2021**



Source: UNCTAD, ISDS Navigator.

Note: Information has been compiled from public sources, including specialized reporting services. UNCTAD’s statistics do not cover investor–State cases that are based exclusively on investment contracts (State contracts) or national investment laws, or cases in which a party has signaled its intention to submit a claim to ISDS but has not commenced the arbitration. Annual and cumulative case numbers are continually adjusted as a result of verification processes and may not match exactly case numbers reported in previous years.

## 1. Trends in ISDS: new cases and outcomes

### a. New cases initiated in 2021

In 2021, investors initiated 68 publicly known ISDS cases under IIAs (figure 1; annex 1). As of 1 January 2022, the total number of publicly known ISDS claims had reached 1,190. As some arbitrations can be kept confidential, the actual number of disputes filed in 2021 and in previous years is likely higher. To date, 130 countries and one economic grouping are known to have been respondents to one or more ISDS claims. In 2022, the war in Ukraine brought into the spotlight past and potential future ISDS claims relating to armed conflict (box 1).

#### Box 1. IIA-based ISDS cases related to war and armed conflict: facts and examples

ISDS cases can arise out of events related to war and armed conflict. In the past, at least 30 ISDS cases brought against States arose out of destruction or harm caused to investments in the context of war, armed conflict, military operations and civil unrest (annex 2). This includes the first known ISDS case based on an IIA brought in 1987: *AAPL v. Sri Lanka*, which arose out of the alleged destruction of the claimant's investment during a military operation conducted by Sri Lankan security forces.

International courts and tribunals (e.g. the International Court of Justice and the International Criminal Court) may weigh in on specific elements of armed conflicts. Disputes may also occur in the trade context and at the WTO through the State–State dispute mechanism.

The stock of IIAs in force commonly protects covered investments in cases of direct and indirect expropriation, impairment and losses owing to war or armed conflict. They also include other substantive protection standards such as full protection and security, and fair and equitable treatment. Most of these IIAs grant covered investors direct access to international arbitration in case of treaty violations. Some 15 per cent of them include exceptions that could help countries ward off ISDS claims related to emergency measures taken for the protection of essential security interests. Generally, ISDS tribunals have not pronounced on the legality of the use of force. Instead, they have limited their assessments to the question of State responsibility for breaches of IIAs. The underlying events giving rise to ISDS claims related to armed conflicts are multifaceted and multi-layered.

Out of the 30 ISDS cases identified in this context, the Russian Federation and Libya were the most frequent respondents, with 10 cases each. The cases against the Russian Federation related to the events in Crimea in 2014, including nationalizations in different economic sectors. Ukrainian companies and businesspeople invoked the Russian Federation–Ukraine bilateral investment treaty (BIT, 1998), alleging expropriation of assets by the Russian Federation (e.g. *Ukrenergo v. Russia*; *Oschadbank v. Russia*; *Naftogaz and others v. Russia*). The cases against Libya mostly related to the alleged failure to protect foreign investments during times of war and civil unrest in the country (e.g. *Trasta v. Libya*; *Cengiz v. Libya*).

In addition to the 30 identified ISDS cases, several cases were related to economic sanctions and the suspension of diplomatic relations (e.g. *Qatar Pharma and Al Sulaiti v. Saudi Arabia*; *beIN v. Saudi Arabia*).


Source: UNCTAD.

Note: The ISDS cases related to war and armed conflict were identified on the basis of UNCTAD's ISDS Navigator and information from other public sources, including notices of arbitration, arbitral decisions and specialized reporting services.

### (i) Respondent States

The new ISDS cases in 2021 were initiated against 42 countries. Peru was the most frequent respondent, with six known cases, followed by Egypt and Ukraine with four known cases each. Five countries – Cambodia, Congo, Finland, Malta and the Netherlands – faced their first known ISDS claims. As in previous years, the majority of new cases (about 65 per cent) were brought against developing countries. In the past 10 years, Spain, Egypt and Venezuela have received the largest share of claims (figure 2). Looking at the 1,190 known ISDS cases filed since 1987 (the year of the first treaty-based ISDS case), Argentina (with 62 cases), Spain (55 cases) and Venezuela (55 cases) have been the most frequent respondent States.

**Figure 2. Most frequent respondent States, 2012–2021** (Number of known cases)




Source: UNCTAD, ISDS Navigator.

### (ii) Claimant home States

Developed-country claimants brought most – about 75 per cent – of the 68 known cases in 2021. The highest numbers of cases were brought by claimants from the United States (10 cases), France (5 cases), the Netherlands (5 cases) and the United Kingdom (5 cases). In the past 10 years, investors from the United States, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom have filed the largest number of claims (figure 3). Overall, these three countries have been the three most frequent home States of claimants in known ISDS cases filed from 1987 to 2021.

**Figure 3. Most frequent home States of claimants, 2012–2021** (Number of known cases)



Source: UNCTAD, ISDS Navigator.

### (iii) Applicable investment treaties

About 75 per cent of investment arbitrations in 2021 were brought under BITs and TIPs signed in the 1990s or earlier. The ECT (1994) was the IIA invoked most frequently in 2021, with seven cases, followed by NAFTA (1992) in combination with the United States–Mexico–Canada Agreement (USMCA, 2018), with four cases.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Under Annex 14-C of the USMCA, the parties consent to the submission of so-called “legacy investment claims” under NAFTA until three years after its termination, i.e. 1 July 2023.

Overall (1987–2021), about 20 per cent of the 1,190 known ISDS cases have invoked the ECT (145 cases), NAFTA (76 cases) or the Investment Agreement of the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC; 16 cases).

## b. ISDS outcomes

### (i) Decisions and outcomes in 2021

In 2021, ISDS tribunals rendered at least 54 substantive decisions in investor–State disputes, 31 of which were in the public domain at the time of writing: 11 of the public decisions principally addressed jurisdictional issues (including preliminary objections), with 4 upholding the tribunal’s jurisdiction and 7 declining jurisdiction. The remaining 20 public decisions were rendered on the merits, with 12 holding the State liable for IIA breaches and 8 dismissing all investor claims.

In addition, six publicly known decisions were rendered in annulment proceedings at the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID). ICSID ad hoc committees rejected the applications for annulment in five cases; in one case, the award at issue was partially annulled.


### (ii) Overall outcomes

By the end of 2021, at least 807 ISDS proceedings had been concluded. The relative share of case outcomes changed only slightly from previous years (figure 4).

Thirty-eight per cent of all concluded cases were decided in favour of the State (claims were dismissed either on jurisdictional grounds or on the merits), and 28 per cent were decided in favour of the investor, with monetary compensation awarded. Nineteen per cent of the cases were settled; in most cases, the terms of settlement remained confidential. In the remaining proceedings, either the cases were discontinued or the tribunal found an IIA breach but did not award monetary compensation.

Looking at the totality of decisions on the merits (i.e. where a tribunal determined whether the challenged measure breached any of the IIA’s substantive obligations), 56 per cent were decided in favour of the investor (breach found and damages awarded). The remainder were dismissed on the merits or breaches were found but no damages awarded (figure 5).


**Figure 4. Results of concluded cases, 1987–2021 (Per cent)**



Source: UNCTAD, ISDS Navigator.

<sup>a</sup> Decided in favour of neither party (liability found but no damages awarded).

**Figure 5. Results of decisions on the merits, 1987–2021 (Per cent)**



Source: UNCTAD, ISDS Navigator.


<sup>a</sup> Decided in favour of neither party (liability found but no damages awarded).

Note: Excludes cases (i) dismissed by tribunals for lack of jurisdiction, (ii) settled, (iii) discontinued for reasons other than settlement (or for unknown reasons).

## 2. Tax-related ISDS cases based on IIAs: facts and numbers

Investors have challenged tax-related measures in 165 ISDS cases based on IIAs (figure 6; annex 3). A wide working definition of the term “tax” was used to identify tax-related ISDS cases based on IIAs.<sup>2</sup> From 2000 to 2021, the absolute number of tax-related cases has grown at the same speed as overall ISDS cases (figure 7). Tax-related claims accounted for about 15 per cent of the 1,190 publicly known ISDS cases filed overall as of the end of 2021.<sup>3</sup>


**Figure 6. Tax-related ISDS cases based on IIAs, 1987–2021 (Number of known cases)**



Source: UNCTAD.

Note: Tax-related ISDS cases have been compiled based on UNCTAD’s ISDS Navigator and information from public sources, including notices of arbitration, arbitral decisions and specialized reporting services.

**Figure 7. Share of tax-related ISDS cases out of the total 1,190 cases (Per cent)**



Source: UNCTAD, ISDS Navigator.

Several tax-related ISDS cases and awards have attracted public attention. High-profile examples include cases challenging the following types of State conduct:

- Imposition of capital gains taxes (*Cairn v. India, Vodafone v. India (I) and (II)*)
- Initiation of tax investigations and large tax assessments (*Hulley Enterprises v. Russia, Veteran Petroleum v. Russia, Yukos Universal v. Russia*)
- Increases in windfall profit taxes and royalties (*Burlington v. Ecuador, ConocoPhillips v. Venezuela*)
- Legislative reforms in the renewable energy sector related to feed-in tariffs and incentives for solar energy (*The PV Investors v. Spain, Charanne and Construction Investments v. Spain*)
- Withdrawal of subsidies or tax exemptions (*Micula v. Romania (I)*)

Tax-related claims played a major role in many of the 165 ISDS cases. In other tax-related cases, tax measures were one element among the alleged breaches but did not feature as the major subject matter.

Overall, the types of tax-related ISDS claims that have arisen under IIAs were diverse (e.g. withdrawal of incentives, increases in windfall profit taxes) and often intertwined with non-tax measures (e.g. forced liquidation,

<sup>2</sup> These 165 cases were identified on the basis of UNCTAD’s ISDS Navigator and information from other public sources, including notices of arbitration, arbitral decisions and specialized reporting services. A wide working definition of the term “tax” was used, considering the controversy regarding the scope of the term in the context of ISDS practice. Whether or not a case involves “tax-related” matters can be subject to differing views between the claimant investor and the respondent State, especially if there is a tax exception under the relevant IIA. The analysis of this question rests with the arbitral tribunal deciding the specific case. In a number of tax-related cases, information on the challenged measures was limited or incomplete.

<sup>3</sup> UNCTAD’s statistics do not cover investor–State cases that are based exclusively on investment contracts (State contracts) or national investment laws, or cases in which a party has signaled its intention to submit a claim to ISDS but has not commenced the arbitration. Annual and cumulative case numbers are continually adjusted as a result of verification processes and may not match exactly case numbers reported in previous years.

interference with or termination of contracts). Tax-related ISDS cases can, but do not necessarily, overlap with the subject matter covered by double double-taxation treaties (DTTs) and the mutual agreement procedure.

### Respondent States


Sixty per cent of the tax-related cases were brought against developed countries; the remaining 40 per cent were directed at developing countries (figure 8). Spain was the most frequent respondent with 42 cases (about 25 per cent of all tax-related ISDS cases), followed by Ecuador and Italy with 10 cases each. Overall, 47 respondent States have faced at least one known tax-related ISDS claim.

### Claimant home States

Developed-country investors brought over 90 per cent of tax-related IIA claims (figure 9). The highest numbers of such cases were initiated by claimants from the Netherlands (30 cases), the United States (26 cases) and Germany (24 cases).


About 40 per cent of all tax-related ISDS cases were so-called intra-EU disputes brought by EU claimants against EU respondent States (63 cases).

**Figure 8. Respondent States in tax-related ISDS cases, by country category (Per cent)**



Source: UNCTAD, ISDS Navigator.

**Figure 9. Home States of claimants in tax-related ISDS cases, by country category (Per cent)**



Source: UNCTAD, ISDS Navigator.

### IIAs invoked

The ECT (1994) was the IIA invoked most frequently in tax-related ISDS cases, with 68 cases, followed by NAFTA (1992) with 12 cases and the Ecuador–United States BIT (1993) with 6 cases.

Most of the tax-related cases under the ECT were intra-EU disputes related to investments in the renewable energy sector (57 cases).

### Economic sectors involved

About 60 per cent of the tax-related ISDS cases related to activities in the services sector:

- Supply of electricity, gas, steam and air (75 cases)
- Information and communication, e.g. telecommunications (11 cases)
- Wholesale and retail trade (7 cases)
- Construction, e.g. construction of buildings and civil engineering (4 cases)
- Arts, entertainment and recreation, e.g. gambling and betting activities (3 cases)
- Transportation and storage (3 cases)
- Financial and insurance activities (3 cases)

Primary industries (mostly consisting of mining and quarrying activities) accounted for about 25 per cent of the new cases and manufacturing for about 15 per cent.

A [guide released in 2021](#) and the [World Investment Report 2022](#) (Chapters 2 and 3) consider the implications of IIAs for tax policymaking. They also present IIA reform options to minimize the risk of friction with tax measures.

## Annex 1. List of known IIA-based ISDS cases initiated in 2021

No.	Short case name	Respondent State	Home State of claimant	Applicable IIA
1	ADP and Vinci Airports v. Chile	Chile	France	Chile–France BIT (1992)
2	Alamos Gold v. Türkiye	Türkiye	Netherlands	Netherlands–Türkiye BIT (1986)
3	Alpene v. Malta	Malta	China	China–Malta BIT (2009)
4	Anglo American v. Colombia	Colombia	United Kingdom	Colombia–United Kingdom BIT (2010)
5	APG SGA and Alma Quattro v. Serbia	Serbia	Switzerland	Serbia–Switzerland BIT (2005)
6	Bahgat v. Egypt (II)	Egypt	Finland	Egypt–Finland BIT (2004)
7	Bayındır v. Pakistan (II)	Pakistan	Türkiye	Pakistan–Türkiye BIT (1995)
8	Congo Mining and Midus v. Congo	Congo	United Kingdom	Congo–United Kingdom BIT (1989)
9	Dayyani and others v. Korea (II)	Korea, Republic of	Iran, Islamic Republic of	Iran, Islamic Republic of–Korea, Republic of BIT (1998)
10	Discovery Global v. Slovakia	Slovakia	United States of America	Slovakia–United States of America BIT (1991)
11	EEPL v. Congo	Congo	Mauritius	Congo–Mauritius BIT (2010)
12	Enagás v. Peru (II)	Peru	Spain	Peru–Spain BIT (1994)
13	Enel v. Türkiye	Türkiye	Italy	Italy–Türkiye BIT (1995)
14	Energía y Renovación v. Guatemala	Guatemala	Panama	Central America–Panama FTA (2002)
15	ESSA2 and Enel v. Costa Rica	Costa Rica	Chile	Chile–Costa Rica BIT (1996)
16	Everyway v. Ghana	Ghana	China	China–Ghana BIT (1989)
17	Finetis v. Morocco	Morocco	France	France–Morocco BIT (1996)
18	Finley and others v. Mexico	Mexico	United States of America	NAFTA (1992); USMCA (2018)
19	First Majestic v. Mexico	Mexico	Canada	NAFTA (1992); USMCA (2018)
20	GEB and Trecca v. Guatemala (II)	Guatemala	Colombia	Colombia, El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras FTA (2007)
21	Glencore v. Colombia (III)	Colombia	Switzerland	Colombia–Switzerland BIT (2006)
22	HeidelbergCement and others v. Egypt	Egypt	Germany; France; Italy	Egypt–Germany BIT (2005); Egypt–France BIT (1974); Egypt–Italy BIT (1989)
23	HSBC v. El Salvador	El Salvador	United Kingdom	El Salvador–United Kingdom BIT (1999)
24	IBT and others v. Panama (III)	Panama	United States of America; Spain	Panama–United States FTA (2007); Panama–United States of America BIT (1982); Panama–Spain BIT (1997)
25	Imeks Insaat v. Turkmenistan	Turkmenistan	Türkiye	Türkiye–Turkmenistan BIT (1992)
26	Interconexión v. Chile	Chile	Colombia	Chile–Colombia FTA (2006)
27	Kaloti v. Peru	Peru	United States of America	Peru–United States FTA (2006)
28	KELAG and others v. Romania	Romania	Austria	ECT (1994)
29	KGL v. Egypt	Egypt	Kuwait	Egypt–Kuwait BIT (2001)
30	L1bre v. Mexico	Mexico	United States of America	NAFTA (1992); USMCA (2018)
31	Liberty v. Venezuela (II)	Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of	Spain	Spain–Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of BIT (1995)
32	Linares Sanoja and others v. Peru	Peru	Italy	Italy–Peru BIT (1994)
33	MacKenzie v. Hungary	Hungary	United Kingdom	Hungary–United Kingdom BIT (1987)
34	Mainstream Renewable and others v. Germany	Germany	Ireland	ECT (1994)



No.	Short case name	Respondent State	Home State of claimant	Applicable IIA
35	<a href="#">Misen v. Ukraine</a>	Ukraine	Sweden	Sweden–Ukraine BIT (1995)
36	<a href="#">Modus Energy v. Ukraine</a>	Ukraine	Netherlands	ECT (1994)
37	<a href="#">Montenero v. China</a>	China	Switzerland	China–Switzerland BIT (2009)
38	<a href="#">Montero Mining v. Tanzania</a>	Tanzania, United Republic of	Canada	Canada–United Republic of Tanzania BIT (2013)
39	<a href="#">Obuz and others v. Uzbekistan</a>	Uzbekistan	Türkiye	Türkiye–Uzbekistan BIT (1992)
40	<a href="#">Optima v. United States (I)</a>	United States of America	Ukraine	Ukraine–United States of America BIT (1994)
41	<a href="#">Optima v. United States (II)</a>	United States of America	Ukraine	Ukraine–United States of America BIT (1994)
42	<a href="#">Pavilniu and Modus v. Belarus</a>	Belarus	Lithuania	Belarus–Lithuania BIT (1999)
43	<a href="#">PETRONAS and Azhan Bin Ali v. Sudan</a>	Sudan	Malaysia	Malaysia–Sudan BIT (1998)
44	<a href="#">Philip Morris and others v. Ukraine</a>	Ukraine	Switzerland; United States of America	Switzerland–Ukraine BIT (1995); Ukraine–United States of America BIT (1994)
45	<a href="#">Qalaa and ASEC v. Algeria</a>	Algeria	Egypt	Algeria–Egypt BIT (1997)
46	<a href="#">Qiong Ye and Jianping Yang v. Cambodia</a>	Cambodia	China	ASEAN–China Investment Agreement (2009)
47	<a href="#">Quanta v. Peru</a>	Peru	Netherlands	Netherlands–Peru BIT (1994)
48	<a href="#">Riverside Coffee v. Nicaragua</a>	Nicaragua	United States of America	CAFTA–DR (2004)
49	<a href="#">RWE v. Netherlands</a>	Netherlands	Germany	ECT (1994)
50	<a href="#">Sanitek and others v. Armenia</a>	Armenia	Canada; Lebanon	Armenia–Canada BIT (1997); Canada–Lebanon BIT (1997)
51	<a href="#">Severgroup and KN v. France</a>	France	Russian Federation	France–Russian Federation BIT (1989)
52	<a href="#">Shell v. Nigeria (II)</a>	Nigeria	Netherlands	Netherlands–Nigeria BIT (1992)
53	<a href="#">Spanish Solar v. Spain</a>	Spain	Ireland	ECT (1994)
54	<a href="#">SREW v. Ukraine</a>	Ukraine	Belgium	BLEU (Belgium–Luxembourg Economic Union)–Ukraine BIT (1996)
55	<a href="#">Taheri v. United Arab Emirates</a>	United Arab Emirates	Sweden	Sweden–United Arab Emirates BIT (1999)
56	<a href="#">TC Energy and TransCanada v. USA (II)</a>	United States of America	Canada	NAFTA (1992); USMCA (2018)
57	<a href="#">Telefónica v. Peru</a>	Peru	Spain	Peru–Spain BIT (1994)
58	<a href="#">True Blue Development and others v. Grenada</a>	Grenada	United States of America	Grenada–United States of America BIT (1986)
59	<a href="#">TS Villalba and others v. Spain</a>	Spain	Germany	ECT (1994)
60	<a href="#">Uniper v. Netherlands</a>	Netherlands	Germany	ECT (1994)
61	<a href="#">United Group and others v. Serbia</a>	Serbia	Netherlands	Netherlands–Serbia BIT (2002)
62	<a href="#">Vicat v. Egypt</a>	Egypt	France	Egypt–France BIT (1974)
63	<a href="#">VINCI v. Peru</a>	Peru	France	France–Peru BIT (1993)
64	<a href="#">Visor Mühendislik and Arasli v. Turkmenistan</a>	Turkmenistan	Türkiye	Türkiye–Turkmenistan BIT (1992)
65	<a href="#">Wang v. Finland</a>	Finland	China	China–Finland BIT (2004)
66	<a href="#">WM Mining v. Mongolia</a>	Mongolia	United States of America	Mongolia–United States of America BIT (1994)
67	<a href="#">WNR v. Congo</a>	Congo	United Kingdom	Congo–United Kingdom BIT (1989)
68	<a href="#">Won v. Korea</a>	Korea, Republic of	United States of America	Republic of Korea–United States FTA (2007)

Source: UNCTAD, ISDS Navigator.



## Annex 2. List of IIA-based ISDS cases related to war, armed conflict, military operations and civil unrest, 1987–2021

No.	Year of initiation	Short case name <a href="#">↗</a>	Applicable IIA	Outcome
1	2019	<a href="#">Trasta v. Libya</a>	OIC Investment Agreement (1981)	Pending
2	2019	<a href="#">Ukrenergo v. Russia</a>	Russian Federation–Ukraine BIT (1998)	Pending
3	2018	<a href="#">DTEK v. Russia</a>	Russian Federation–Ukraine BIT (1998)	Pending
4	2018	<a href="#">Simplex v. Libya</a>	India–Libya BIT (2007)	Pending
5	2016	<a href="#">Cengiz v. Libya</a>	Libya–Türkiye BIT (2009)	Decided in favour of investor
6	2016	<a href="#">D.S. Construction v. Libya</a>	OIC Investment Agreement (1981)	Pending
7	2016	<a href="#">Güriş and Yamantürk v. Syria</a>	Syrian Arab Republic–Türkiye BIT (2004)	Decided in favour of investor
8	2016	<a href="#">Güriş v. Libya</a>	Libya–Türkiye BIT (2009)	Pending
9	2016	<a href="#">Naftogaz and others v. Russia</a>	Russian Federation–Ukraine BIT (1998)	Pending
10	2016	<a href="#">Oschadbank v. Russia</a>	Russian Federation–Ukraine BIT (1998)	Decided in favour of investor
11	2015	<a href="#">Aeroport Belbek and Kolomoisky v. Russia</a>	Russian Federation–Ukraine BIT (1998)	Pending
12	2015	<a href="#">Everest and others v. Russia</a>	Russian Federation–Ukraine BIT (1998)	Decided in favour of investor
13	2015	<a href="#">Lugzor and others v. Russia</a>	Russian Federation–Ukraine BIT (1998)	Pending
14	2015	<a href="#">Privatbank and Finilon v. Russia</a>	Russian Federation–Ukraine BIT (1998)	Pending
15	2015	<a href="#">Stabil and others v. Russia</a>	Russian Federation–Ukraine BIT (1998)	Decided in favour of investor
16	2015	<a href="#">Strabag v. Libya</a>	Austria–Libya BIT (2002)	Decided in favour of investor
17	2015	<a href="#">Tekfen and TML v. Libya</a>	Libya–Türkiye BIT (2009)	Pending
18	2015	<a href="#">Ukrnafta v. Russia</a>	Russian Federation–Ukraine BIT (1998)	Decided in favour of investor
19	2015	<a href="#">Way2B v. Libya</a>	Libya–Portugal BIT (2003)	Decided in favour of State
20	2013	<a href="#">Shinhan v. Libya</a>	Korea, Republic of–Libya BIT (2006)	Pending
21	2011	<a href="#">Gamesa v. Syria</a>	Spain–Syrian Arab Republic BIT (2003)	Decided in favour of investor
22	2011	<a href="#">Ghenia v. Libya</a>	Germany–Libya BIT (2004)	Pending
23	2007	<a href="#">Adria Beteiligungs v. Croatia</a>	Austria–Croatia BIT (1997)	Decided in favour of State
24	2007	<a href="#">Pantehniki v. Albania</a>	Albania–Greece BIT (1991)	Decided in favour of State
25	2006	<a href="#">Sistem v. Kyrgyzstan</a>	Kyrgyzstan–Türkiye BIT (1992)	Decided in favour of investor
26	2005	<a href="#">LESI v. Algeria</a>	Algeria–Italy BIT (1991)	Decided in favour of State
27	2004	<a href="#">Ulemek v. Croatia</a>	Canada–Croatia BIT (1997)	Decided in favour of State
28	1999	<a href="#">Mitchell v. Democratic Republic of the Congo</a>	Congo, Democratic Republic of the–United States of America BIT (1984)	Decided in favour of investor
29	1993	<a href="#">AMT v. Democratic Republic of the Congo</a>	Congo, Democratic Republic of the–United States of America BIT (1984)	Decided in favour of investor
30	1987	<a href="#">AAPL v. Sri Lanka</a>	Sri Lanka–United Kingdom BIT (1980)	Decided in favour of investor

Source: UNCTAD, ISDS Navigator.

### Annex 3. List of IIA-based ISDS cases related to tax matters, 1987–2021

No.	Year of initiation	Short case name	Applicable IIA	Outcome
1	2021	First Majestic v. Mexico	NAFTA (1992); USMCA (2018)	Pending
2	2021	Misen v. Ukraine	Sweden–Ukraine BIT (1995)	Pending
3	2021	Modus Energy v. Ukraine	ECT (1994)	Pending
4	2021	Spanish Solar v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Pending
5	2021	SREW v. Ukraine	BLEU (Belgium-Luxembourg Economic Union)–Ukraine BIT (1996)	Pending
6	2021	Telefónica v. Peru	Peru–Spain BIT (1994)	Pending
7	2020	Encavis and others v. Italy	ECT (1994)	Pending
8	2020	Fin.Doc and others v. Romania	ECT (1994)	Pending
9	2020	Freeport-McMoRan v. Peru	Peru–United States FTA (2006)	Pending
10	2020	Shift Energy v. Japan	Hong Kong, China SAR–Japan BIT (1997)	Pending
11	2020	SMM Cerro v. Peru	Netherlands–Peru BIT (1994)	Pending
12	2020	South32 v. Colombia	Colombia–United Kingdom BIT (2010)	Pending
13	2020	Telcell v. Georgia	Georgia–United States of America BIT (1994)	Pending
14	2019	Aecon v. Ecuador	Canada–Ecuador BIT (1996)	Pending
15	2019	Axiata and Ncell v. Nepal	Nepal–United Kingdom BIT (1993)	Pending
16	2019	IC Power v. Guatemala	Guatemala–Israel BIT (2006)	Decided in favour of State
17	2019	Legacy Vulcan v. Mexico	NAFTA (1992)	Pending
18	2019	Okuashvili v. Georgia	Georgia–United Kingdom BIT (1995)	Pending
19	2018	Ersoy v. Azerbaijan	Azerbaijan–Türkiye BIT (1994)	Settled
20	2018	European Solar Farms v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Pending
21	2018	Itochu v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Pending
22	2018	LSG Building Solutions and others v. Romania	ECT (1994)	Pending
23	2018	Manolium-Processing v. Belarus	Treaty on Eurasian Economic Union (2014)	Decided in favour of investor
24	2018	The Carlyle Group and others v. Morocco	Morocco–United States FTA (2004)	Pending
25	2017	Bursel Tekstil and others v. Uzbekistan	Türkiye–Uzbekistan BIT (1992)	Pending
26	2017	ConocoPhillips and Perenco v. Viet Nam	United Kingdom–Viet Nam BIT (2002)	Pending
27	2017	FREIF Eurowind v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of State
28	2017	ICL Europe v. Ethiopia	Ethiopia–Netherlands BIT (2003)	Decided in favour of State
29	2017	Mera Investment v. Serbia	Cyprus–Serbia BIT (2005)	Data not available
30	2017	Nissan v. India	India–Japan EPA (2011)	Settled
31	2017	Portigon v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Pending
32	2017	Triodos SICAV II v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Pending
33	2017	Vodafone v. India (II)	India–United Kingdom BIT (1994)	Pending
34	2016	Albacora v. Ecuador	Ecuador–Spain BIT (1996)	Decided in favour of State
35	2016	Alhambra v. Kazakhstan	Kazakhstan–Netherlands BIT (2002)	Data not available
36	2016	Biram and others v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of investor
37	2016	CIC Renewable and others v. Italy	ECT (1994)	Pending
38	2016	Cordoba Beheer and others v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Pending
39	2016	EDF v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Pending

No.	Year of initiation	Short case name	Applicable IIA	Outcome
40	2016	ESPF and others v. Italy	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of investor
41	2016	Eurus Energy v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Pending
42	2016	Glencore International and C.I. Prodeco v. Colombia (I)	Colombia–Switzerland BIT (2006)	Decided in favour of investor
43	2016	Green Power and Obton v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Pending
44	2016	Infracapital v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Pending
45	2016	Lao Holdings v. Laos (II)	Lao People's Democratic Republic–Netherlands BIT (2003)	Pending
46	2016	Shell Philippines v. Philippines	Netherlands–Philippines BIT (1985)	Pending
47	2016	Sun Reserve v. Italy	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of State
48	2016	Vedanta v. India	India–United Kingdom BIT (1994)	Pending
49	2015	9REN Holding v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of investor
50	2015	Alten Renewable v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Pending
51	2015	BayWa r.e. v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of investor
52	2015	Belenergia v. Italy	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of State
53	2015	Cairn v. India	India–United Kingdom BIT (1994)	Decided in favour of investor
54	2015	Cavalum SGPS v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Pending
55	2015	CEF Energia v. Italy	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of investor
56	2015	Cube Infrastructure and others v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of investor
57	2015	E.ON SE and others v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Pending
58	2015	Eskosol v. Italy	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of State
59	2015	Foresight and others v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of investor
60	2015	Greentech and NovEnergia v. Italy	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of investor
61	2015	Hanocal and IPIC International v. Korea	Korea, Republic of–Netherlands BIT (2003)	Discontinued for unknown reasons
62	2015	Hydro and others v. Albania	Albania–Italy BIT (1991)	Decided in favour of investor
63	2015	Hydro Energy 1 and Hydroxana v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of investor
64	2015	JGC v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of investor
65	2015	Kruck and others v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Pending
66	2015	KS and TLS Invest v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Pending
67	2015	Landesbank Baden-Württemberg and others v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Pending
68	2015	Novenergia v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of investor
69	2015	OperaFund and Schwab v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of investor
70	2015	Silver Ridge v. Italy	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of State
71	2015	Solarpark v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Discontinued for unknown reasons
72	2015	SolEs Badajoz v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of investor
73	2015	Stadtwerke München and others v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of State

No.	Year of initiation	Short case name	Applicable IIA	Outcome
74	2015	Total E&P v. Uganda	Netherlands–Uganda BIT (2000)	Settled
75	2015	Watkins and others v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of investor
76	2014	Blusun v. Italy	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of State
77	2014	InfraRed and others v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of investor
78	2014	Longyear v. Canada	NAFTA (1992)	Discontinued for unknown reasons
79	2014	Luxtona v. Russia	ECT (1994)	Pending
80	2014	Masdar v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of investor
81	2014	NextEra v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of investor
82	2014	RENERGY v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Pending
83	2014	RWE Innogy v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of investor
84	2014	Unión Fenosa v. Egypt	Egypt–Spain BIT (1992)	Decided in favour of investor
85	2014	Vodafone v. India (I)	India–Netherlands BIT (1995)	Decided in favour of investor
86	2013	Alghanim v. Jordan	Jordan–Kuwait BIT (2001)	Decided in favour of State
87	2013	Antaris and Göde v. Czechia	Germany–Slovakia BIT (1990); ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of State
88	2013	CSP Equity Investment v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Pending
89	2013	Eiser and Energía Solar v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of investor
90	2013	Europa Nova v. Czechia	Cyprus–Czechia BIT (2001); ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of State
91	2013	Federal Elektrik Yatirim and others v. Uzbekistan	Türkiye–Uzbekistan BIT (1992); ECT (1994)	Settled
92	2013	Güneş Tekstil and others v. Uzbekistan	Türkiye–Uzbekistan BIT (1992)	Decided in favour of investor
93	2013	I.C.W. v. Czechia	Czechia–United Kingdom BIT (1990); ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of State
94	2013	Infrastructure Services and Energia Termosolar (formerly Antin) v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of investor
95	2013	Isolux v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of State
96	2013	JSW Solar and Wirtgen v. Czechia	Czechia–Germany BIT (1990)	Decided in favour of State
97	2013	Natland and others v. Czechia	Czechia–Netherlands BIT (1991); Cyprus–Czechia BIT (2001); BLEU (Belgium–Luxembourg Economic Union)–Czechia BIT (1989); ECT (1994)	Pending
98	2013	Photovoltaik Knopf v. Czechia	Czechia–Germany BIT (1990); ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of State
99	2013	RREEF v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of investor
100	2013	Spentex v. Uzbekistan	Netherlands–Uzbekistan BIT (1996)	Decided in favour of State
101	2013	Voltaic Network v. Czechia	Czechia–Germany BIT (1990); ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of State
102	2012	Ampal-American and others v. Egypt	Egypt–United States of America BIT (1986); Egypt–Germany BIT (2005)	Settled
103	2012	Bidzina Ivanishvili v. Georgia	France–Georgia BIT (1997)	Discontinued for unknown reasons
104	2012	Bogdanov v. Moldova (IV)	Moldova, Republic of–Russian Federation BIT (1998)	Decided in favour of State
105	2012	Charanne and Construction Investments v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of State

No.	Year of initiation	Short case name	Applicable IIA	Outcome
106	2012	Lao Holdings v. Laos (I)	Lao People's Democratic Republic–Netherlands BIT (2003)	Decided in favour of State
107	2012	LSF-KEB v. Korea	BLEU (Belgium-Luxembourg Economic Union)–Korea, Republic of BIT (1974)	Pending
108	2012	Orascom v. Algeria	Algeria–BLEU (Belgium-Luxembourg Economic Union) BIT (1991)	Decided in favour of State
109	2012	Sanum Investments v. Laos (I)	China–Lao People's Democratic Republic BIT (1993)	Decided in favour of State
110	2011	Bawabet v. Egypt	Egypt–Kuwait BIT (2001)	Settled
111	2011	Murphy v. Ecuador (II)	Ecuador–United States of America BIT (1993)	Decided in favour of investor
112	2011	Ryan and others v. Poland	Poland–United States of America BIT (1990)	Decided in favour of State
113	2011	The PV Investors v. Spain	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of investor
114	2010	Bozbey v. Turkmenistan	Türkiye–Turkmenistan BIT (1992)	Discontinued for unknown reasons
115	2009	Bogdanov v. Moldova (III)	Moldova, Republic of–Russian Federation BIT (1998)	Decided in favour of investor
116	2009	Mærsk v. Algeria	Algeria–Denmark BIT (1999)	Settled
117	2009	MTN v. Yemen	United Arab Emirates–Yemen BIT (2001)	Settled
118	2008	Burlington v. Ecuador	Ecuador–United States of America BIT (1993)	Decided in favour of investor
119	2008	Murphy v. Ecuador (I)	Ecuador–United States of America BIT (1993)	Decided in favour of State
120	2008	Perenco v. Ecuador	Ecuador–France BIT (1994)	Decided in favour of investor
121	2007	ConocoPhillips v. Venezuela	Netherlands–Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of BIT (1991)	Decided in favour of investor
122	2007	Domtar v. USA	NAFTA (1992)	Discontinued for unknown reasons
123	2007	Mobil and others v. Venezuela	Netherlands–Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of BIT (1991)	Decided in favour of investor
124	2007	Paushok v. Mongolia	Mongolia–Russian Federation BIT (1995)	Data not available
125	2007	Renta 4 S.V.S.A and others v. Russia	Russian Federation–Spain BIT (1990)	Decided in favour of investor
126	2007	TCW v. Dominican Republic	CAFTA–DR (2004)	Settled
127	2007	Tza Yap Shum v. Peru	China–Peru BIT (1994)	Decided in favour of investor
128	2006	Nations Energy v. Panama	Panama–United States of America BIT (1982)	Decided in favour of State
129	2006	Oostergetel v. Slovakia	Netherlands–Slovakia BIT (1991)	Decided in favour of State
130	2006	Phoenix Action v. Czechia	Czechia–Israel BIT (1997)	Decided in favour of State
131	2006	Quiborax v. Bolivia	Bolivia, Plurinational State of–Chile BIT (1994)	Decided in favour of investor
132	2006	Rompetrol v. Romania	Netherlands–Romania BIT (1994)	Neither investor nor the State (liability found but no damages awarded)
133	2006	Roussalis v. Romania	Greece–Romania BIT (1997)	Decided in favour of State
134	2005	Amto v. Ukraine	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of State
135	2005	Binder v. Czechia	Czechia–Germany BIT (1990)	Decided in favour of State
136	2005	Bogdanov v. Moldova (II)	Moldova, Republic of–Russian Federation BIT (1998)	Decided in favour of State
137	2005	Cargill v. Mexico	NAFTA (1992)	Decided in favour of investor
138	2005	EDF v. Romania	Romania–United Kingdom BIT (1995)	Decided in favour of State
139	2005	Hulley Enterprises v. Russia	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of investor

No.	Year of initiation	Short case name	Applicable IIA	Outcome
140	2005	<a href="#">Micula v. Romania (I)</a>	Romania–Sweden BIT (2002)	Decided in favour of investor
141	2005	<a href="#">Noble Energy v. Ecuador</a>	Ecuador–United States of America BIT (1993)	Settled
142	2005	<a href="#">RosInvest v. Russia</a>	Russian Federation–United Kingdom BIT (1989)	Decided in favour of investor
143	2005	<a href="#">Veteran Petroleum v. Russia</a>	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of investor
144	2005	<a href="#">Yukos Universal v. Russia</a>	ECT (1994)	Decided in favour of investor
145	2004	<a href="#">ADM v. Mexico</a>	NAFTA (1992)	Decided in favour of investor
146	2004	<a href="#">BP v. Argentina</a>	Argentina–United States of America BIT (1991)	Settled
147	2004	<a href="#">Corn Products v. Mexico</a>	NAFTA (1992)	Decided in favour of investor
148	2004	<a href="#">Duke Energy v. Ecuador</a>	Ecuador–United States of America BIT (1993)	Decided in favour of investor
149	2004	<a href="#">Grand River v. USA</a>	NAFTA (1992)	Decided in favour of State
150	2004	<a href="#">Telenor v. Hungary</a>	Hungary–Norway BIT (1991)	Decided in favour of State
151	2004	<a href="#">Tembec v. USA</a>	NAFTA (1992)	Settled
152	2004	<a href="#">Terminal Forest v. USA</a>	NAFTA (1992)	Settled
153	2003	<a href="#">El Paso v. Argentina</a>	Argentina–United States of America BIT (1991)	Decided in favour of investor
154	2003	<a href="#">Encana v. Ecuador</a>	Canada–Ecuador BIT (1996)	Decided in favour of State
155	2003	<a href="#">Pan American v. Argentina</a>	Argentina–United States of America BIT (1991)	Settled
156	2003	<a href="#">Plama v. Bulgaria</a>	ECT (1994); Bulgaria–Cyprus BIT (1987)	Decided in favour of State
157	2002	<a href="#">Ahmonseto v. Egypt</a>	Egypt–United States of America BIT (1986)	Decided in favour of State
158	2002	<a href="#">Canfor v. USA</a>	NAFTA (1992)	Settled
159	2002	<a href="#">Occidental v. Ecuador (I)</a>	Ecuador–United States of America BIT (1993)	Decided in favour of investor
160	2002	<a href="#">Tokios Tokelés v. Ukraine</a>	Lithuania–Ukraine BIT (1994)	Decided in favour of State
161	2001	<a href="#">Crespo and others v. Poland</a>	Poland–Spain BIT (1992)	Neither investor nor the State (liability found but no damages awarded)
162	2001	<a href="#">Enron v. Argentina</a>	Argentina–United States of America BIT (1991)	Decided in favour of investor
163	1999	<a href="#">Feldman v. Mexico</a>	NAFTA (1992)	Decided in favour of investor
164	1999	<a href="#">Link Trading v. Moldova</a>	Moldova, Republic of–United States of America BIT (1993)	Decided in favour of State
165	1995	<a href="#">Goetz v. Burundi (I)</a>	BLEU (Belgium-Luxembourg Economic Union)–Burundi BIT (1989)	Settled

Source: UNCTAD, ISDS Navigator.



This IIA Issues Note was prepared by UNCTAD's IIA team, under the supervision of Joerg Weber and the overall guidance of James Zhan. The IIA team is managed by Hamed El-Kady.

The note is based on research conducted by Diana Rosert. Josef Ostřanský and Magdalena Bulit Goňi provided contributions to box 1 and annex 2. We wish to thank Sebastian Wuschka for feedback on the draft version of box 1.

The compilation of tax-related ISDS cases based on IIAs (section 2 and annex 3) benefited from background research in collaboration with the team at the WU Global Tax Policy Centre led by Jeffrey Owens, including Siddhesh Rao, Angelina Papulova, Joy W. Ndubai, Sudarshan Rangan, Iva Uljanić Skreblin, Svitlana Buriak, Martha Caziero and Maria Tambunan.

### UNCTAD Investment Policy Online Databases

International Investment Agreements Navigator

<https://investmentpolicy.unctad.org/international-investment-agreements>

IIA Mapping Project

<https://investmentpolicy.unctad.org/international-investment-agreements/iaa-mapping>

Investment Dispute Settlement Navigator

<https://investmentpolicy.unctad.org/investment-dispute-settlement>

Investment Laws Navigator

<https://investmentpolicy.unctad.org/investment-laws>



# IIA ISSUES NOTE

## INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT AGREEMENTS

For the latest investment trends and policy developments, please visit the website of the UNCTAD Investment and Enterprise Division

 [unctad.org/diae](https://unctad.org/diae)

 [investmentpolicy.unctad.org](https://investmentpolicy.unctad.org)

 @unctadwif

For further information, please contact  
Mr. James X. Zhan  
Director  
Investment and Enterprise Division UNCTAD

 [diaeinfo@unctad.org](mailto:diaeinfo@unctad.org)  +41 22 917 57 60



UNITED NATIONS  
UNCTAD