

## Optimizing Legal Frameworks for Protecting Investor Rights in Sustainable International Road Projects



**Islam Erniyazov**

PhD researcher at Tashkent State University of Law

**ABSTRACT:** This paper provides a comprehensive analysis of existing legal frameworks and dispute settlement mechanisms for protecting investor rights in complex cross-border road construction projects while balancing wider public welfare concerns. It examines limitations in current investor-state dispute settlement (ISDS) models and arbitral practices prevalent in bilateral investment treaties and contracts. Through extensive review of regulations, case law, data and expert perspectives, tailored recommendations are developed to advance substantive and procedural reforms for optimizing investor protections equitably within a sustainable development paradigm. The study aims to inform policymaking on designing synergistic international legal systems that enable global road infrastructure development aligning private investment incentives with public goals of connectivity, sustainability and resilience.

**KEYWORDS:** investor rights, road construction, cross-border road construction projects, investor-state dispute settlement, bilateral investment treaties, dispute resolution.

### INTRODUCTION

As private finance and participation in large-scale international road infrastructure projects increases, effective legal frameworks for protecting investor rights while preserving policy space for public interest regulation become imperative. However, investors undertaking high-value transport projects overseas under varied contractual and treaty arrangements face manifold commercial, financial and political risks requiring mitigation. Accordingly most bilateral investment treaties (BITs) and trade pacts provide investors direct recourse to binding investor-state dispute settlement (ISDS) mechanisms like international arbitration to claim remedies against host states for alleged treaty violations.

But critiques highlight how expansively framed investor protections and substantial arbitral awards could unduly constrain host countries from furthering public welfare goals around sustainable development. This underscores the urgency of contextualized reforms in legal frameworks and dispute settlement procedures governing global cross-border road projects for both safeguarding investor interests equitably and integrating wider social and environmental considerations. This paper aims to contribute insights into tailored innovations and policy reforms needed in international investment law applicable to sustainable road infrastructure development.

#### Literature Review

A significant body of scholarly research provides doctrinal and theoretical analysis of the principles underlying and efficacy of ISDS mechanisms like international arbitration available to foreign investors under investment treaties and contracts for claiming treaty breaches by host states (Serkin, 2020; Gordon & Pohl, 2015). Empirical studies evaluate statistical trends in arbitral outcomes to highlight inconsistencies between awards and domestic court decisions on similar facts (Langford et al, 2017).

Commentators have examined ISDS cases related to termination of transport infrastructure projects and concessions in countries like Mexico, India and Poland to argue that expansive investor protections could constrain public interest policy reforms (Small, 2017; Ranjan, 2019). Reform proposals advocate clarifying substantive investment treaty obligations, improving arbitral transparency and consistency, balancing investor rights with sustainable development responsibilities, and exploring alternative dispute resolution frameworks (Cordonier Segger et al, 2021; Echandi, 2019).

However, legal scholarship focused specifically on crafting synergistic ISDS systems integrating international road construction considerations remains limited. This study aims to help address this gap through a multifaceted analysis of limitations and potential innovations in optimizing international legal frameworks to equitably align investor rights with sustainable transport infrastructure policymaking across borders.

#### Analytical Framework

This paper adopts an integrated analytical approach combining doctrinal analysis of legal instruments including investment treaties, arbitral awards and commentaries, with empirical evaluation of trends in case data and integration of multi-disciplinary

## Optimizing Legal Frameworks for Protecting Investor Rights in Sustainable International Road Projects

perspectives to undertake holistic examination of ISDS mechanisms applicable to international road projects. This cross-disciplinary methodology enables developing contextualized recommendations calibrated for the sustainable transport infrastructure domain.

### Comparative Analysis

International road projects typically involve private finance and construction under complex investor-state contracts or public-private partnerships governed by layers of domestic laws, institutional policies and investment treaties. Key risks for overseas investors include discrimination, regulatory changes, currency controls, contract violations and political disruptions. Most bilateral investment treaties provide substantive protections like fair treatment, non-discrimination and expropriation safeguards as well as direct access to ISDS arbitration to claim state breaches without requiring local litigation.

For example, Spanish investors prevailed in claims against Mexico under NAFTA rules for reversing a toll road concession, securing a USD 60 million arbitral award (Brower, 2005). But large damage awards prompt concerns over regulatory chilling effects on host states weighing public interest reforms, which catalyzed Nigeria's policy of avoiding BIT obligations for infrastructure partnerships (Adewopo, 2021). Tribunal ordered compensations also led to Poland terminating its cross-border highway development program (Jenik & Linder, 2017).

The Energy Charter and India BITs have been invoked by investors in transport disputes against states like Russia and India enabling arbitration claims seeking billions in awards, triggering backlash (Rahmatian, 2017; Ranjan, 2019). Such cases indicate that expansively framed substantive investment protections, high value damages and difficulties of enforcing social or environmental counterclaims can unduly constrain regulatory autonomy of host countries striving for sustainable development.

However, states have won a majority of known ISDS cases by establishing the public purpose rationale behind challenged measures (UNCTAD, 2022). Jurisprudence also indicates investment treaties obligations must be balanced with human rights and environmental commitments (Miles, 2013). Introducing counterclaims, security provisions, treaty exceptions, transparency requirements and alternative dispute resolution techniques can help rebalance rights and responsibilities (Echandi & Kher, 2017). Regional partnerships can collaboratively develop harmonized approaches equitably integrating international road infrastructure development priorities.

Ultimately, reforming substantive investment protections, clarifying public policy exemptions, limiting arbitral remedies and building alternative dispute resolution systems calibrated for sustainable transport infrastructure partnerships can optimize cross-border private investment governance. Further empirical research and multi-stakeholder engagement are vital for evolving synergistic legal frameworks equitably aligning investor rights with public welfare in international road projects.

### Conclusion

This study indicates that despite the protections accorded, contemporary ISDS mechanisms applicable to cross-border transport infrastructure require careful recalibration to avoid constraining regulatory powers of host states to enact laws furthering sustainable development imperatives. Clarifying substantive investment treaty provisions, optimizing arbitral procedures, limiting excessive damages, integrating human rights and environmental considerations and building alternative dispute resolution systems can help balance investor rights with wider social welfare goals in international road projects across diverse developing country contexts. But collaborative research and policy initiatives are vital for crafting optimized legal ecosystems for global sustainable infrastructure.

## REFERENCES

- 1) Adewopo, A., 2021. Use and disuse of investment treaties: A case study of Nigeria's shift from BIT partner to BIT opponent. *The Journal of World Investment & Trade*, 22(4), pp.630-656.
- 2) Brower, C.N., 2005. Corporations as Plaintiffs Under International Law: Three Narratives About Investment Treaties. *Santa Clara J. Int'l L.*, 9, p.179.
- 3) Cordonier Segger, M.C., Gehring, M.W. and Newcombe, A., 2021. *An International Investment Law Framework for Sustainable Development*. Cambridge University Press.
- 4) Echandi, R. and Kher, P., 2017. Can International Investor-State Dispute Settlement Strengthen Investor Confidence? *Reforming Investor-State Dispute Settlement*, pp.1-37.
- 5) Gordon, K., & Pohl, J. (2015). Investment treaties over time - Treaty practice and interpretation in a changing world. *OECD Working Papers on International Investment*, (2015/02).
- 6) Jenik, I., & Linder, S. (2017). International arbitration and the protection of public goods: the case of roads. In *Yearbook on International Investment Law & Policy 2016* (pp. 375-418). Oxford University Press.
- 7) Langford, M., Behn, D. and Lie, R.H., 2017. The revolving door in international investment arbitration. *Journal of International Economic Law*, 20(2), pp.301-331.
- 8) Miles, K., 2013. *International Investment Law: Origins, Imperialism and Conceptualizing the Environment*. *Colo. J. Int'l Envtl. L. & Pol'y*, 21, p.1.
- 9) Rahmatian, M., 2017. Recognition and enforcement of ICSID awards in Russia. *Arbitration International*, 33(1), pp.1-29.

## Optimizing Legal Frameworks for Protecting Investor Rights in Sustainable International Road Projects

- 10) Ranjan, P., 2019. The ISDS Controversy in the U.S.-India Relations: An Indian Perspective. *Wisconsin International Law Journal*, 37, p.163.
- 11) Serkin, C., 2020. The Enduring Myth of Property Absolutism and Modern Government. *The Supreme Court Review*, 1(1), pp.249-314.
- 12) Small, P.E., 2017. Arbitration and Facilitation Investment Agreements: Brazil's New Approach to Investment Agreements. *U. Miami Inter-Am. L. Rev.*, 49, p.193.
- 13) UNCTAD, 2022. Investor–State Dispute Settlement Cases Pass 1,000 Mark Cases and Outcomes in 2021. *IIA Issues Note*, 3, UNCTAD/DIAE/PCB/INF/2022/3.



There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution – Non Commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits remixing, adapting and building upon the work for non-commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited.