

[< Previous Chapter](#)

IV.5.5.10: International Investment Law and Human Rights

Fabrizio Marrella

in [Elgar Encyclopedia of International Economic Law](#)

Category: Chapter

Published: 28 Jun 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800882324.international.investment.law.human.rights>

Publisher: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited



I Introduction

International investment law (hereinafter IIL) and international human rights law (hereinafter IHRL) share common roots and a debate about the limits of self-contained regimes, including legitimacy.¹ Both regimes are designed to provide legal foundations to individuals' rights *vis-à-vis* the State and offer solutions when national courts are dysfunctional, corrupt or politically influenced. Corporations have been treated as individuals in order to benefit from IIL.

The 1948 Universal Declaration of IHRL classifies 'the right to own property' (both domestic and foreign) as a human right in Article 17. However, only IIL has developed treaty rules for the protection of foreign property, offering arbitration to investors claiming compensation in case of breach of such rules.

Even if in some circumstances investment issues may be addressed before IHRL Courts or even UN Treaty Bodies,² undoubtedly the main debate is focused on IHRL issues in the context of investment arbitration.

This happens when IIL has an impact, *inter alia*, on equitable land reform, indigenous rights, human health, access to water, social rights or environmental protection. The evolving regulatory regime after the UN Guiding Principles on Business & Human Rights (hereinafter UNGPs) is also closely linked to IIL.

1 Investment arbitration and human rights: the gateway issues

The *Metalclad case*³ represents a classic jurisprudence on these matters. Here, an arbitration tribunal held in favour of the investor against the Mexican government that blocked the investor's project to build a hazardous waste landfill. Despite the investment's potential for causing environmental and IHRL damage, the protection of foreign property ultimately prevailed.

However, a new trend has recently emerged as evidenced by the famous *Philip Morris v Uruguay*⁴ arbitration. In this case, Uruguay anti-smoking policy measures were challenged through investment

arbitration. In a majority decision, the arbitration tribunal dismissed claims made by Philip Morris and upheld the legality of the two tobacco control measures enacted by Uruguay for the purpose of protecting public health. The tribunal accordingly ordered Philip Morris to bear all arbitral costs and to pay Uruguay USD 7 million as partial reimbursement of the country's legal expenses.

Contemporary International Investment Arbitration practice reveals that IHRL issues may intervene at different stages of the arbitration proceedings: (1) at the admissibility stage, invoking IHRL violations of the investor as a counterclaim; (2) within the *lex arbitri*; (3) at the level of interpretation of the applicable law to the merits; (4) through *amicus curiae* participation; and finally (5) as contributory negligence in calculation of damages.

a Admissibility of claims and counterclaims

The first intersection between IIL and human rights may be found in objections to a tribunal's jurisdiction or the admissibility of claims. Counterclaims allow host States to respond to legal action against them by challenging the investor's wrongful conduct for alleged breaches of IHRL standards, such as gross violations of environmental rights and social rights.

In a number of investment cases against Argentina related to emergency measures taken by the State in the context of the 2001–2 economic crisis, Argentina defended itself as having acted to protect its citizens' human rights. The response by different arbitration tribunals seems inconsistent and rather confused, but the relationship between IIL and human rights has become clearer over time. In *Urbaser v Argentina*,⁵ the investor was a corporation that was a shareholder in a concessionaire for the distribution of water and servicing of sewage treatment in Buenos Aires as part of the country's water privatization plans. When *Urbaser* initiated arbitral proceedings against Argentina, the State launched a counterclaim that the private investor had breached IHRL by failing to provide the necessary minimum level of investment to ensure that its operations were successful and ensured the respect for the human right to water.

The Arbitration tribunal accepted jurisdiction over Argentina's counterclaim, dismissing the investor's argument that the observation of its IHRL responsibilities fell outside the scope of the tribunal's jurisdiction. The arbitration tribunal concluded that Article X of the 1991 Spanish–Argentine BIT was broad enough to include counterclaims by Argentina, even though the basis for its counterclaims was IHRL law. In particular, the *Urbaser* Tribunal pointed to Article 31 3 (c) of the 1969 Vienna Convention rules on interpretation of treaties, observing in paragraph 1200 that

The BIT cannot be interpreted and applied in a vacuum. The Tribunal must certainly be mindful of the BIT's special purpose as a Treaty promoting foreign investments, but it cannot do so without taking the relevant rules of international law into account. The BIT has to be construed in harmony with other rules of international law of which it forms part, including those relating to human rights.

At the same time, the *Urbaser* tribunal held that BIT-based investor–state arbitrations do not exist exclusively for the benefit of investors and disagreed that the human right to water is a duty that may be borne solely by the State. It maintained in paragraph 1194 that the principle 'according to which corporations are by nature not able to be subjects of international law and therefore not capable of holding obligations' had 'lost its impact and relevance'. Five paragraphs later, the tribunal consequently admitted that 'the human right for everyone's dignity and its right for adequate housing and living conditions are complemented by an obligation on all parts, public and private parties, not to engage in activity aimed at destroying such rights'.

Clearly, when human-rights-based counterclaims are admissible, they may be a deterrent for IHRL abuses as well as the abuse of the arbitration process.



b IHRL as part of the applicable procedural law

IHRL apply to arbitral proceedings *per se*. For example in relation to due process, the impartiality and independence of the tribunal must be protected. IHRL Courts, such as the European Court of Human Rights, exercise some supervision of arbitrations related to their jurisdiction and will ultimately enforce IHRL that arise within the conduct of such proceedings.⁶

c IHRL considerations resulting from the applicable law to the merits

In some cases,⁷ Tribunals have drawn on IHRL in interpreting and applying norms invoked by states, such as the proportionality principle, the police powers doctrine, denial of justice and other public interest or regulatory-based exceptions and defenses.

In addition to that, many investment treaties contain provisions limiting the scope of the State's *offer of arbitration* to situations where the investment has been made 'in accordance with host state law', and some tribunals have found that, absent such wording, there is even an implicit obligation upon investors to conduct their affairs lawfully – according to domestic law – in order to qualify for international investment substantive protections. An objection commonly raised by hosts is that claimants procured the investment through corruption, or the investment was otherwise linked to corrupt activities.

Some IIAs are designed to limit the scope of investor's protection by means of clauses making the treaty benefits conditional to certain facts. While tribunals have held that respondent States bear the burden of proving that the elements of a "denial of benefits" clause have been satisfied, it is equally true that States may increase IHRL protection by crafting such clauses in IIAs. Hence, conduct by any investor in violation of IHRL may receive the sanction of the same treaty that it has invoked.

d Amicus curiae submissions

Amicus curiae briefs are the traditional gateway for IHRL defenders to introduce sustainable development, the environment and human rights issues in any dispute settlement mechanism.

Today, *amici curiae* submissions are often made by NGOs, by individuals and even international organizations, such as the European Union. *Amicus* briefs must, however, relate concretely to the dispute. One of the key goals of *amicus* intervention has been to ensure that tribunal decisions take into account IHRL obligations and/or take into account the perspective of right holders impacted by the decision.

After a long debate, the capacity for a third party to participate as *amicus curiae* in an Investment Arbitration has been recognized by the 2022 ICSID Rules of Procedure for Arbitration Proceedings (in Article 67 on Submission of Non-Disputing Parties) as well as by the 2014 UNCITRAL Rules on Transparency in Treaty-based Investor-State Arbitration.

As the tribunal in *Biwater v United Republic of Tanzania*, (ICSID Case No ARB/05/22) made clear, the ICSID Arbitration Rules expressly regulate two specific types of participation by non-parties, namely the filing of a written submission and the attendance at arbitration hearings. The Tribunal must consult both disputing parties involved in the arbitration and neither party has a veto right with respect to the granting of such an application.

e IHRL considerations on calculation of damages

Other arbitration tribunals have limited the damages recoverable by investors due to failures in relation to IHRL standards. Here, arbitrators have considered IHRL issues to assess the value of compensatory damages claimed by investors. This was the case, for example, in the November 2017 award in *Bear Creek Mining Corporation v Republic of Peru* (ICSID Case No ARB/14/21). While the tribunal found that Peru had indirectly expropriated Canadian investor Bear Creek when it revoked a concession to construct a silver mine, the arbitrators ultimately reduced the recoverable damages claimed by Bear Creek from USD 522m

to just USD 18.20m, discussing Bear Creek's *contributory fault and liability* to the social unrest resulting from the investor's mining activity in Peru. This approach is in line with general principles of law *ex* Article 38 of the ICJ Statute and is furtherly evidenced in *Occidental v Ecuador* (ICSID Case No ARB/06/11, para 680) where the arbitrators clearly see that 'the Claimants should pay a price for having committed an unlawful act which contributed in a material way to the prejudice which they subsequently suffered when the *Caducidad Decree* was issued' by the State.

2 Investment-related treaty-based human rights provisions: the evolving regime

Since 2011, the UNGPs have provided a common framework and triggered an international law process promoting a new generation of IIAs as well as Business & Human Rights Arbitration.

a Putting IHRL into IIAs

One regulatory solution to combine investment and IHR protection is to have a multilateral treaty on Business & Human Rights (B&HR). Hence, on 28 October 2022, UN Member States concluded negotiations over a third revised draft of a proposed treaty on B&HR. Its future is still uncertain.

At the other end of the spectrum, some Governments are negotiating new bilateral or regional IIAs with more carefully drafted treaty clauses requesting investors to respect environmental, social and IHRL norms. Investment protection is thereby conditional on each investor's conduct in this respect. For example, Article 7 (1) of the 2019 Netherlands Model BIT includes a specific requirement that '[i]nvestors and their investments shall comply with domestic laws and regulations of the host state, including laws and regulations on human rights, environmental protection and labor laws'.

Canada, too, has attempted to include sustainable development objectives in its BITs with both developed and developing states since 2010. These include provisions on labour, the environment, human rights, community relations and anti-corruption.

Article 26.3 of India Model BIT instead directs tribunals to reduce damages to reflect mitigating factors, including 'unremedied harm or damage that the investor has caused to the environment or local community or other relevant considerations regarding the need to balance public interest and the interests of the investor'.

b The Hague Rules on Business and Human Rights Arbitration

Following on the UNGPs, on 12 December 2019, the Hague Rules on B&HR Arbitration were launched. They establish a fairer procedural framework for arbitration between victims and corporations, between business partners, and between third-party beneficiaries and corporations. When they are chosen as the body of rules governing the arbitration, they provide tailored provisions on evidence gathering taking into account the problem of victims' lack of financial resources.

II Conclusion

Classic investment arbitration case law and old generation IIAs did not typically envisage IHRL obligations on investors, leaving arbitrators ill equipped to address IHRL arguments. Today, the regime is gradually evolving in order to fine tune both the protection of investors' rights and the regulatory space of States, in view of a common achievement of sustainable development objectives and human rights protection.

Notes

¹ See, for example, the *Report of the Independent Expert on the promotion of a democratic and equitable international order*, 5 August 2015, UNGA Doc. A/70/285 and compare J Alvarez, *The Public International Law Regime Governing International Investment* (The Hague Pocketbooks 2011) 260 ff.; A De Nanteuil, 'Droits de

l'homme et arbitrage d'investissement/Human Rights and Investment Arbitration' (2023) *Revue De Droit des Affaires Internationales/International Business Law Journal* 397–405; FD Donovan and R Zamour, 'Arbitrating Business and Human Rights Disputes: Consent to Arbitrate and Applicable Law' in F Marrella and N Soldati (eds) *Studies in Honor of Giorgio Bernini* (Giuffrè–Francis Lefebvre 2021) 387 ff.; U Kriebaum, Ch Schreuer and R Dolzer, *Principles of International Investment Law* (3rd edn, OUP 2022); C Blair, 'International Arbitration and Human Rights: Exciting Opportunity or Existential Threat?' in *International Arbitration Law Review* (2022) 85–98; I Bantekas and MA Stein (ed), *The Cambridge Companion to Business & Human Rights Law* (CUP 2021); J Chaisse, L Choukroune and S Jusoh (eds), *Handbook of International Investment Law and Policy* (Springer 2021); F Balcerzak, *Investor–State Arbitration and Human Rights* (Brill/Nijhoff 2017); F Marrella, 'On the Changing Structure of International Investment Law: The Human Right to Water and ICSID Arbitration', in PM Dupuy, F Francioni and EU Petersmann (eds) *International Community Law Review* (2010) 335–59; PM Dupuy, F Francioni and EU Petersmann (eds), *Human Rights in International Investment Law and Arbitration* (OUP 2009); M Kamminga and M Scheinin, *The Impact of Human Rights on General International Law* (OUP 2009).

2. See, for example, Guide on Article 1 of Protocol No 1 to the European Convention on Human Rights, 31 August 2022, www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/Guide_Art_1_Protocol_1_ENG, as well as CESCR, General comment No 24 on State obligations under the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in the context of business activities, UN Doc E/C.12/GC/24 (10 August 2017).


3. *Metalclad Corporation v United Mexican States*, ICSID Case No ARB(AF)/97/1, Award, 30 August 2000. The arbitrators were Professor E Lauterpacht (President), Mr B Civiletti and Mr JL Siqueiros.

4. *Philip Morris Brands Sarl, Philip Morris Products S.A. and Abal Hermanos S.A. v Oriental Republic of Uruguay*, ICSID Case No ARB/10/7. The arbitrators were Professor P Bernardini (President), Professor J Crawford and Professor G Born (dissenting).

5. *Urbaser SA and Consorcio de Aguas Bilbao Bizkaia, Bilbao Biskaia Ur Partzuergoa v The Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No ARB/07/26, Award (8 December 2016). The composition of the arbitral tribunal was the following: Professor A Bucher (President); PJ Martínez-Fraga, Professor I Brownlie then replaced by Professor CA McLachlan. See also, *inter multos*, *Phoenix Action Ltd v The Czech Republic*, ICSID Case No ARB/06/5, Award, 15 April 2009, 78, where the arbitrators articulated a limit to investor protection where 'the most fundamental rules of protection of human rights', are at stake, like investments made 'in pursuance of torture or genocide or in support of slavery or trafficking of human organs'.

6. See, for example, W Gao, 'The ECHR in Action: its Applicability and Relevance for Arbitration' (2022) *The International Journal of Human Rights* 1608–29.

7. For example, *Técnicas Medioambientales Tecmed, SA v United Mexican States*, ICSID Case No ARB (AF)/00/2, Award, 29 May 2003, para 122 and *Azurix Corp v Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No ARB/01/12, Award, 14 July 2006, paras 311–2.



Elgar Encyclopedia of International Economic Law

Edited by [Krista Nadakavukaren Schefer](#) and [Thomas Cottier](#)

Encyclopedia

Published: 28 Aug 2026

Print ISBN: 9781800882317

eISBN: 9781800882324

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800882324>

[Buy Print](#)

^ Table of Contents

- > Front Matter
- > PART I: FOUNDATIONS, ARCHITECTURE AND PRINCIPLES
- > PART II: THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK
- > PART III: REGULATORY AREAS
- ✓ PART IV: REGULATORY CHALLENGES
 - > IV.1: International Economic Law and National Security
 - > IV.2: Multilayer Governance and Public Goods
 - >

IV.3: International Economic Law and the Private Sector

- IV.4: Combatting Poverty
- ▼ IV.5: International Economic Law and Sustainability
 - IV.5.1: Sustainable Development
 - IV.5.2: Climate Change
 - IV.5.3: International Economic Law and Social Rights
 - IV.5.4: International Economic Law and the Environment
 - ▼ IV.5.5: International Economic Law and Human Rights

IV.5.5.1: Right to Water: Trade in Virtual Water and Product Standards

IV.5.5.2: Right to Water: Trade in Bulk Water

IV.5.5.3: The Rights of Peasants

IV.5.5.4: Right to Water

IV.5.5.5: Right to Electricity

IV.5.5.6: Rights of Persons with Disabilities

IV.5.5.7: Rights of Indigenous Peoples

IV.5.5.8: Trade and Indigenous Peoples

IV.5.5.9: IEL, Culture and Indigenous Peoples

IV.5.5.10: International Investment Law and Human Rights

- IV.5.6: International Economic Law and Animal Law
- IV.5.7: International Economic Law and Women
- IV.5.8: International Economic Law and Culture
- IV.5.9: International Economic Law and Health



- › IV.6: International Economic Law and Unlawful Behaviour
- › IV.7: The Economy of Innovation and The Innovation Economy
- › PART V: NATIONAL LAWS

Subjects



Privacy & Cookies Policy

Economics and Finance



Law and Economics

Terms & Conditions

Law / Academic



Credits

International Economic Law, Trade Law


Law and Economics

Technical Support

Accessibility

EU GPSR Info

Connect with us:



Copyright © 2026

