Vol. 3(4), 118-126

Journal of Energy & Environmental Policy Options

Balancing Investor Rights and Sustainable Development in International Investment Arbitration

Albert Diaz[a], Ortuno Weber[b]

Abstract
International investment has increasingly become a focal point of controversies and debates, particularly when intersecting with sustainable development issues. These tensions are most pronounced within the context of international investment arbitration, where the unique characteristics of the international investment law regime come into sharp focus. The regime's dispute resolution mechanism, the types of measures that are often challenged in tribunals, and the substantial monetary compensations sought by investors—and frequently awarded by tribunals—bring sustainable development concerns to the forefront of legal and political discourse. As sustainable development has emerged as a key component of major global initiatives, political agendas, and social movements, the intersection of these issues with international investment disputes has attracted significant international attention. The growing prominence of sustainable development in international policy has led to heightened scrutiny of how investment arbitration addresses—or fails to address—these critical concerns. This paper aims to shed light on the controversies surrounding some of the most notable international investment arbitration cases that involve sustainable development issues. By examining these cases, the paper seeks to illustrate how the tension between investor rights and sustainable development objectives plays out in international tribunals. The analysis highlights the complex dynamics at play, where the pursuit of economic interests by investors often clashes with the broader goals of environmental protection, social equity, and long-term sustainability. The paper underscores the need for a more balanced approach in international investment law that can better accommodate the imperatives of sustainable development. It calls for reforms that would allow for a more equitable consideration of environmental and social factors in investment arbitration, ensuring that the pursuit of economic growth does not come at the expense of the planet and future generations.
Keywords: International Investment, Sustainable Development, Arbitration, Investor Rights, Legal Reform
JEL Codes: F21, K33, Q56

1. INTRODUCTION

Discussing sustainable development in the context of international investment is essential because international investment plays a pivotal role in shaping economic growth, social well-being, and environmental outcomes on a global scale. As investment flows across borders, it can significantly impact the sustainability of development, influencing issues such as climate change, resource depletion, social inequality, and environmental degradation. Consequently, sustainable development issues have become increasingly relevant for international investment, prompting the need for a response that aligns economic objectives with sustainable practices. International investment is not only about capital flows and profit generation; it also affects the natural environment and local communities where investments take place. Projects in sectors such as mining, energy, manufacturing, and agriculture often involve the use of natural resources, emissions of pollutants, and land use changes that can have long-term ecological consequences. Thus, integrating sustainable development principles into investment decisions is crucial for minimizing negative environmental impacts and fostering positive social outcomes. Furthermore, sustainable development issues are directly linked to risk management in international investment. Investors are increasingly aware that environmental, social, and governance (ESG) factors can pose significant risks to the long-term profitability and resilience of their investments. Climate change, for example, poses risks through physical impacts on assets, regulatory changes, and shifts in market preferences toward sustainable products and services. By addressing sustainable development concerns, investors can mitigate these risks, ensuring that their investments are resilient to future challenges.

The growing recognition of the relationship between international investment and sustainable development has led to the development of frameworks, such as the United Nations' Principles for Responsible Investment (PRI) and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which encourage investors to consider sustainability in their decision-making processes. These frameworks promote the alignment of investment activities with sustainable development objectives, ensuring that economic growth does not come at the expense of environmental health or social equity.

---

[a] Joint Research Centre, European Commission Sevilla, Spain
[b] Joint Research Centre, European Commission Sevilla, Spain

Moreover, the demand for sustainable investment opportunities is on the rise, driven by both public policy initiatives and changing consumer preferences. Many governments have introduced regulations and incentives to promote sustainable investment, such as green bonds, carbon pricing, and sustainability reporting requirements. At the same time, consumers are increasingly favoring companies that demonstrate a commitment to sustainability. As a result, sustainable development considerations are becoming a key factor in attracting international investment, offering competitive advantages to businesses that adopt sustainable practices. Therefore, addressing sustainable development in international investment is not merely an ethical or regulatory obligation; it is a strategic approach that can enhance economic performance, reduce risks, and create value for society and the environment. Integrating sustainable development considerations into investment decisions helps align global financial flows with the broader goal of achieving a sustainable and inclusive future for all. The intersection of international investment and sustainable development has indeed become prominent in the realm of investment disputes brought before international investment tribunals. These disputes often highlight the challenges and tensions that arise when pursuing economic development goals while also aiming to meet sustainable development objectives.

The characteristics of the international investment dispute resolution mechanism, the types of measures challenged by investors, and the significant financial compensation sought are central to these debates, particularly when sustainable development issues are at stake. These disputes typically arise under bilateral investment treaties (BITs), multilateral agreements, or investor-state dispute settlement (ISDS) provisions, which allow foreign investors to sue host states for alleged breaches of investment protection standards. One key characteristic of the international investment dispute resolution mechanism is its ability to bypass domestic legal systems, allowing investors to bring claims directly to international arbitration. While this mechanism aims to protect investors' rights, it can also pose challenges to host states' regulatory sovereignty, particularly when measures taken in the public interest—such as environmental protection, health regulations, or social policies—are challenged. This raises concerns about whether international investment law adequately accommodates sustainable development considerations and the public interest.

The types of measures being questioned in these tribunals often involve regulatory actions taken by states to protect the environment, safeguard public health, or promote social welfare. For instance, disputes may arise when a host state implements stricter environmental regulations, bans harmful substances, or enforces measures to protect indigenous communities. Investors may argue that such actions constitute "indirect expropriation" or violate "fair and equitable treatment" standards by negatively impacting their investments. In this context, the arbitration proceedings become a battleground where the rights of investors are weighed against the regulatory authority of states to pursue sustainable development policies. The size of financial compensation sought by investors in these disputes can be substantial, sometimes reaching billions of dollars. Large compensation claims can have significant financial implications for developing countries, potentially discouraging governments from adopting robust environmental or social regulations due to fears of litigation and liability. This phenomenon, known as "regulatory chill," raises critical concerns about the impact of international investment law on sustainable development goals. It suggests a need to balance investor protection with the legitimate right of states to regulate in the public interest. Disputes that involve sustainable development issues have fueled debates about the adequacy of the current international investment law framework in addressing environmental and social considerations. Some argue that investment treaties should explicitly include provisions that recognize the importance of sustainable development, allowing states to defend measures taken for environmental or public health purposes without facing liability. Others advocate for reforming the ISDS system to ensure that arbitrators consider sustainable development objectives, or even for including mandatory exhaustion of local remedies before proceeding to international arbitration.

Moreover, recent developments in international investment agreements show a trend toward incorporating sustainable development considerations, such as exceptions for regulatory measures aimed at environmental protection or public health, and provisions that emphasize the need for responsible investment practices. These evolving treaty practices aim to create a more balanced framework that supports both investor protection and sustainable development objectives. Overall, investment disputes before international tribunals bring to light the complex relationship between economic development, investor rights, and sustainable development. They underscore the importance of reforming the investment dispute resolution system to better align with sustainable development principles, ensuring that states retain the necessary policy space to address environmental and social challenges while protecting legitimate investor interests.

The increasing prominence of sustainable development on global initiatives, political agendas, and social movements has placed a spotlight on international investment disputes where economic interests of foreign investors clash with the sustainable development objectives of states. Such conflicts have drawn significant international attention, particularly as investment disputes challenge regulatory measures that aim to protect the environment, promote social welfare, or enhance economic resilience. When states implement measures to achieve sustainable development goals—such as stricter environmental regulations, renewable energy incentives, or public health protections—they may inadvertently impact the interests of foreign investors. These investors often claim that the new regulations adversely affect the profitability or viability of their investments, invoking provisions in investment treaties that guarantee protection from expropriation, ensure fair and equitable treatment, or mandate non-discriminatory

treatment. When such disputes arise, investors can seek redress through international investment arbitration under mechanisms such as Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS), which allows them to directly challenge host states' actions. International investment tribunals then become the arena where the competing interests of sustainable development and economic protection converge. These tribunals evaluate the claims based on the specific language of the relevant investment treaties and the circumstances surrounding the regulatory actions taken by the state. The central issues usually revolve around whether the state's actions constitute an indirect expropriation or violate other investor protections, such as the obligation to provide fair and equitable treatment. The challenge in these disputes lies in balancing the legitimate right of states to regulate for public welfare and sustainable development with the protection of foreign investors' economic interests. Tribunals often face the difficult task of determining whether regulatory measures aimed at sustainable development are a genuine exercise of the state's regulatory powers or an unjustifiable infringement on investor rights. For example, when a state enacts new environmental legislation that results in reduced profitability or even closure of an investor's operations, the tribunal must decide if such measures are a legitimate part of sustainable development policies or if they amount to compensable expropriation.

These disputes are resolved by weighing various factors, including the purpose of the regulation, the extent of the impact on the investment, and the investor's legitimate expectations. Tribunals may consider whether the regulatory changes were foreseeable, whether the state had provided assurances to investors, and if there was a fair balance between the public interest and the investor's rights. Some arbitral awards have upheld the state's right to regulate for sustainable development, recognizing that measures taken for environmental or public health reasons are within the state's regulatory space. Other decisions, however, have favored investors, awarding substantial compensation for regulatory actions that were deemed to be unfair or disproportionately burdensome. The outcomes of such cases can have broader implications beyond the individual dispute, potentially setting precedents that influence future regulatory actions by states. For instance, large compensation awards against states for enacting sustainability-oriented regulations can create a "regulatory chill," where governments may hesitate to implement robust environmental or social policies due to the risk of costly arbitration. This situation underscores the ongoing tension between attracting foreign investment and upholding sustainable development goals.

Recent efforts to reform international investment law have sought to address these challenges by incorporating explicit references to sustainable development within treaties, such as carve-out clauses for regulatory measures aimed at protecting public health, the environment, or human rights. Additionally, some newer investment agreements include provisions that emphasize the importance of corporate social responsibility, sustainable investment, and dispute prevention mechanisms. When the economic interests of foreign investors clash with the sustainable development agenda of states, international investment tribunals play a critical role in adjudicating these conflicts. The resolution of such disputes requires a careful balancing act to ensure that states retain their regulatory autonomy to pursue sustainable development while also protecting the legitimate rights of investors. As the global push for sustainable development continues to grow, the evolution of international investment law will be crucial in shaping the ways these complex disputes are addressed.

2. DISCUSSION

International investment, which involves a foreign investor making an investment in the territory of a host state, is regulated by the legal framework known as international investment law (Sornarajah, 2010). This area of law is relatively new but dynamic and rapidly expanding, with states acting as the primary lawmakers. International investment law is primarily shaped through international investment treaties, which can be bilateral, multilateral, or regional agreements. These treaties often appear in the form of Bilateral Investment Treaties (BITs) or as part of broader trade or economic partnership agreements that include entire chapters dedicated to investment protections. The global network created by these investment treaties is extensive (Guzman, 1997). According to the World Investment Report 2015, there were 2,926 BITs in place by the end of 2014, and an additional nine BITs signed by the end of 2015. The UNCTAD international investment treaties database listed 361 investment treaties, aside from BITs, as of April 2016. While there are still regions outside this network, such as Andorra, the Faroe Islands, or Gibraltar, they remain the exception. Generally, the content of investment treaties is not considered controversial (Newcombe and Paradell, 2009), as they typically include provisions such as reciprocal guarantees to promote and protect investors, fair and equitable treatment, free transfer of funds, and assurances against expropriation.

However, a particularly unique and revolutionary aspect of these treaties is the inclusion of investor-state dispute settlement (ISDS) provisions. This mechanism has been described as a "silent revolution" or the beginning of a "new era" in international investment law (Subedi, 2012). It represents a significant paradigm shift, allowing private investors to sue host states directly before international investment tribunals for breaches of treaty obligations. This development began in 1990 with the landmark case of AAPL v. Sri Lanka, in which an ICSID tribunal for the first time adjudicated a dispute brought by a foreign investor under an investment treaty. The case marked a turning point in international investment law, as it demonstrated that private investors could initiate arbitration against sovereign states based solely on a treaty's provisions, without the need for a contractual relationship between the parties. In AAPL v. Sri Lanka, the tribunal was convened based on the state's blanket consent to arbitration, which was embedded in a broadly drafted international treaty. This opened new possibilities, fundamentally altering the landscape of

investment law by enabling private investors to challenge sovereign actions in a legal forum typically reserved for interstate or contractual disputes. The ISDS mechanism allows investors to sue states for breaching guarantees and protections stipulated in investment treaties, including fair and equitable treatment, protection from expropriation, and other obligations. Unlike domestic legal processes, where the investor would need a contractual agreement with the state, ISDS permits claims based purely on the terms of an international treaty. Disputes are typically resolved in private, confidential tribunals specifically convened for each case, with the parties appointing arbitrators. The decisions of these tribunals are generally final and binding, with very limited opportunities for appeal.

This ability of private investors to question sovereign actions—ranging from regulatory measures to legislation and policies—has sparked significant debate. States can be held liable to pay compensation if their actions or policies are deemed to have negatively impacted the economic interests of foreign investors. Consequently, international investment law, through ISDS, has introduced a new dimension of accountability for states, compelling them to balance the pursuit of public policy objectives, such as environmental protection or public health, with the economic interests of foreign investors. As a result, ISDS has become a focal point in discussions about the impact of international investment law on sustainable development. The inclusion of such provisions has brought to light concerns about "regulatory chill," where states may hesitate to enact policies for fear of arbitration claims, potentially compromising sustainable development efforts. This tension underscores the ongoing debate about reforming the ISDS system to better align it with sustainable development goals while maintaining investment protection.

The international investment regime has proven to be a powerful tool for investors, offering significant leverage through arbitration claims. According to the UNCTAD database, there were 696 known investment arbitration cases as of April 2016. However, the true number is likely higher, as some cases remain confidential. The potency of the regime is underscored by the substantial awards granted in some cases. For instance, three disputes involving Russia and the bankrupt oil company Yukos resulted in a combined compensation of over US$50 billion. The awards included US$40 billion in *Hulley Enterprises v. Russia*, US$8.2 billion in *Veteran Petroleum v. Russia*, and US$1.8 billion in *Yukos Universal v. Russia*. Other notable cases include *Occidental v. Ecuador*, where Ecuador was ordered to pay US$1.76 billion, and *Venezuela Holdings v. Venezuela*, where the tribunal awarded US$1.6 billion. Argentina has faced the highest number of arbitration cases, with 59 claims, while Venezuela follows with 36 cases.

The clash between the economic interests of investors and the sustainable development policies of states has become a recurring issue in investment disputes. When sustainable development concerns arise in the context of investment arbitration, the outcomes are highly uncertain. There is no uniform approach by tribunals, leading to inconsistent and often contradictory rulings, even in cases brought under the same treaty or based on similar claims. This lack of consistency poses a significant challenge for both investors and states, as it makes it difficult to predict the outcomes of arbitration proceedings. The international investment regime was initially designed to prioritize the protection of investors and their economic interests. The system's core objective is to ensure fair and equitable treatment of foreign investments, safeguard against expropriation, and guarantee the free transfer of funds. Sustainable development, by contrast, encompasses broader public interests, merging social and environmental concerns with a focus on current and future generations. These goals can be at odds with the commercial focus of investment arbitration, which is a private legal forum intended to protect investors' financial interests. This creates a controversial backdrop for addressing sustainable development issues in arbitration, where public interest considerations are debated in a forum not traditionally designed for such matters.

As the number of investment arbitration cases involving sustainable development principles continues to grow, the challenges inherent in this legal framework have become more evident. Disputes frequently involve issues such as environmental damage, natural resource exploitation, and the imposition of substantial damages on states. These cases have highlighted the tensions between the goals of sustainable development and the investor-centric nature of international investment law. One of the primary concerns with the current regime is the perceived lack of visibility, stability, and predictability in the arbitration system. The inconsistent jurisprudence and perceived bias in favor of foreign investors undermine the legitimacy of the system. Both investors and states struggle to assess the risks involved, as arbitration decisions do not offer a clear or consistent precedent. Additionally, the system allows investors to bypass domestic legal systems and pursue arbitration directly, with financial compensation being the primary remedy rather than regulatory compliance. This approach raises questions about the appropriateness of using a commercial arbitration framework to resolve disputes over public policy issues, such as environmental regulations and sustainable development policies. Scholars have identified several pathologies within the international investment law framework.

Pauwelyn (2000) highlights issues such as the use of commercial-style arbitration for treaty disputes that involve regulatory matters, the lack of a requirement to exhaust domestic legal remedies before pursuing arbitration, and the emphasis on financial compensation rather than requiring compliance with public policy goals. These characteristics contribute to the growing controversy surrounding the use of investment arbitration to address disputes involving sustainable development. The intersection of international investment and sustainable development remains complex and contentious. The international investment regime's emphasis on investor protection often collides with sustainable development goals, which prioritize public interests. The resulting legal uncertainty and inconsistent rulings highlight the need for reforms to better align the system with sustainable development principles, ensuring a balance between

protecting investors and advancing environmental and social objectives. During the peak of the neoliberal era in the 1990s, international investment experienced unprecedented growth and dynamism (Stiglitz, 2003). This period was marked by the widespread acceptance of neoliberal economic policies, often referred to as the Washington Consensus, which emphasized market liberalization, deregulation, and the promotion of free trade. Supported by a robust legal framework, international investment law protected foreign investments and facilitated their global expansion. Institutions like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund played crucial roles in promoting these policies, encouraging foreign direct investment (FDI) across the world.

The 1990s witnessed a significant surge in the number of investment treaties, arbitration cases, and overall economic activity geared towards expanding capital and investment. The fervor of neoliberalism led to a rapid proliferation of Bilateral Investment Treaties (BITs) and other international investment agreements, aimed at providing legal safeguards for foreign investors. The legal regime evolved to prioritize investor protection, often expanding the scope of treaty applications and broadening the definition of expropriation to include regulatory actions that might lead to the depreciation of an investment's value. Several legal concepts gained prominence during this time, further strengthening investor rights. The notion of "corporate nationality" allowed companies to choose favorable jurisdictions for investment protection, making it easier for investors to access arbitration. The definition of expropriation was extended to include not just direct seizure of assets but also any regulatory measures that indirectly diminished the value of an investment, a concept often referred to as "indirect expropriation." Additionally, the inclusion of "umbrella clauses" in treaties ensured that states honored all commitments made to investors, thereby elevating contractual obligations to the level of international law.

The use of stabilization clauses also became widespread, which guaranteed that the legal and regulatory framework would not change in a way that adversely affected an investment. This practice gave rise to the doctrine of "legitimate expectations," where investors claimed protection under the "fair and equitable treatment" standard, arguing that any significant changes to laws or regulations violated their expectations of a stable and predictable business environment. These legal innovations created a powerful regime of investor protection, often giving foreign investors substantial leverage over host states. By expanding the reach of investment treaties, the system enabled investors to challenge a wide range of state actions, from regulatory changes aimed at environmental protection to public health measures. This led to a significant increase in the number of investment arbitration cases, as investors sought compensation for policies they claimed had negatively impacted their investments.

While the legal framework provided a conducive environment for the expansion of FDI, it also sparked controversy. Critics argued that the system disproportionately favored investors at the expense of state sovereignty and public interest. The broadened definitions of expropriation and the enforcement of stabilization clauses often limited states' ability to implement policies aimed at sustainable development, environmental protection, and social welfare. The aggressive expansion of investor rights in the 1990s laid the groundwork for ongoing debates about the balance between protecting foreign investments and allowing states the regulatory flexibility to pursue sustainable development goals. The legacy of this era continues to shape contemporary international investment law. The principles and legal standards established during the neoliberal peak have persisted, even as states and international organizations seek to reform the system to better align it with sustainable development objectives. As the investment landscape evolves, the tensions between investor protections and state regulatory autonomy remain at the forefront of debates surrounding the future of international investment law.

As the optimism of the 1990s faded, several significant events signaled a shift in international investment law and policy. The Russian and Asian financial crises at the end of the twentieth century, coupled with a growing dissatisfaction with the rigid foreign investment protection regime, marked a turning point. The new millennium brought with it economic uncertainty, the global spread of panic due to financial crises, and a broader paradigm shift toward sustainable development. Social movements, human rights groups, environmental organizations, and other advocates for global values began to challenge the inflexibility of the existing investment framework, which was seen as prioritizing investor rights over broader public interests. The rising tide of criticism was driven by states' increased exposure to arbitration cases, where investors sought substantial financial compensation, often for policies intended to address public interest concerns such as health, environmental protection, or social welfare. The scope of the domestic policy space and the right of sovereign states to regulate became key points of contention. Many questioned the legitimacy of the investment arbitration system, particularly the expansive mandate of arbitrators who could adjudicate on matters involving significant policy decisions made by democratically elected governments. As economic conditions grew more uncertain, with crises and social upheavals challenging the neoliberal status quo, the calls for a more balanced approach to international investment law intensified. The concept of sustainable development emerged as a rallying point in this context. It reflected the growing diversification of interests, heightened environmental awareness, and the recognition of social dimensions in economic policy. Sustainable development became a versatile term, symbolizing the need to integrate economic growth with environmental protection and social equity. It also provided a framework for defending states' regulatory measures in the face of investor claims, particularly when policies aimed at safeguarding public welfare or natural resources came under legal challenge.

The increasing pressure from various stakeholders led to changes in the investment landscape, especially in developed countries like the United States, which had long been proponents of the neoliberal order. Now, even the architects of

the investment regime were reasserting their sovereignty before investment tribunals, pushing back against expansive claims under treaties. This shift was partly driven by concerns over the far-reaching implications of investor-state dispute settlement (ISDS), which had empowered foreign investors to challenge a wide range of government policies. In response, a new generation of investment treaties began to emerge, incorporating more balanced provisions. These treaties introduced safeguards for states, allowing them to defend measures taken in the public interest, such as environmental protection, labor standards, and public health regulations. The updated agreements sought to clarify the limits of investor protections, establish exceptions for legitimate regulatory actions, and redefine the scope of investment protections to ensure they did not infringe on a state's right to pursue sustainable development objectives. Countries and regions started to reconsider their approaches to investment policymaking. The European Union, for instance, began including sustainable development chapters in its trade and investment agreements, emphasizing labor rights and environmental standards. Some countries, such as South Africa, opted to terminate or renegotiate their bilateral investment treaties to better align with their national policy goals. Others, like India and Brazil, sought alternative dispute resolution mechanisms outside the traditional ISDS framework.

The shift also led to innovative approaches in treaty drafting, such as including explicit language to protect the regulatory space of states and provisions that prioritize public interest considerations over investor rights. As a result, modern investment treaties often include clauses allowing states to take measures necessary to protect health, safety, and the environment without being considered breaches of investment obligations. These changes reflect a growing recognition that international investment law must evolve to accommodate diverse global interests and the imperative of sustainable development.

The ongoing efforts to reform the investment regime illustrate the broader challenges and opportunities in reconciling investor protections with states' rights to regulate in the public interest. While progress has been made in addressing some of the criticisms, the debate over the balance between protecting investors and safeguarding public policy space remains central to the future of international investment law. As countries continue to revise their treaties and policies, the investment landscape is likely to keep evolving, with sustainable development becoming an increasingly integral part of investment regulation and dispute resolution.

3. CONCLUSIONS

The interplay between international investment and sustainable development presents a complex and evolving landscape. As highlighted, sustainable development issues are increasingly central to international investment law, fueling arbitration cases and shaping the development of legal norms in this dynamic area. With growing global environmental concerns and the expansion of regulatory frameworks in both developed and developing nations, conflicts between investors' economic interests and state policies aimed at sustainable development are becoming more common. The investment arbitration system has long been an effective mechanism for investors seeking to protect their economic interests. It offers a powerful tool for foreign investors to challenge state actions perceived as infringing upon their rights under investment treaties. These disputes often bring sustainable development issues to the forefront, prompting discussion and contributing to the evolving body of arbitral jurisprudence. As governments adopt more stringent environmental and social regulations, especially in response to urgent global challenges such as climate change, water scarcity, and biodiversity loss, the likelihood of arbitration cases involving sustainable development continues to rise. However, a key challenge remains: determining whether arbitration tribunals are the appropriate forum for addressing sustainable development concerns. Unlike traditional courts, investment tribunals are private, ad hoc bodies with a primary mandate to adjudicate investor-state disputes based on treaty obligations. Their focus is on protecting investors' rights, rather than on balancing these rights with broader public policy objectives. As a result, when arbitration involves sustainable development, the broader social and environmental interests often take a backseat to the legal and economic considerations that underpin the arbitral process.

Furthermore, investment tribunals have not consistently approached sustainable development issues. There is no uniform standard for how these matters are reviewed or resolved, leading to inconsistent outcomes even in cases with similar facts or treaty provisions. For instance, in some cases, tribunals have ruled in favor of states, recognizing the legitimacy of regulatory measures taken to protect public health or the environment. In other instances, tribunals have sided with investors, awarding substantial compensation for regulatory changes deemed to constitute indirect expropriation or a breach of fair and equitable treatment. The lack of consistency in arbitration decisions reflects the broader challenge of integrating sustainable development considerations into the international investment regime. Investment treaties were originally designed to promote economic growth by protecting foreign investors, with little emphasis on environmental or social objectives. Although some modern treaties have begun to include provisions addressing sustainable development, such as exceptions for regulatory measures in the public interest, the application of these provisions remains unpredictable.

Moreover, the absence of agreed standards or criteria for reviewing sustainable development matters means that tribunals often rely on the specific wording of each treaty and the discretion of arbitrators, resulting in varied interpretations. For example, what constitutes "legitimate regulatory action" versus "indirect expropriation" can differ significantly from one case to another, depending on the treaty's language and the arbitrators' perspectives. To address these challenges, there is an emerging consensus on the need for reforms in the international investment system.

Proposals include the adoption of more explicit treaty language to safeguard states' regulatory space for sustainable development, the inclusion of sustainable development experts on arbitration panels, and the establishment of appellate mechanisms to enhance consistency in arbitral decisions. Some states have begun to incorporate sustainable development chapters in their investment agreements, aiming to clarify the balance between investor protections and public interest measures. The growing incorporation of sustainable development principles into new-generation treaties reflects the recognition that investment law must evolve to address contemporary global challenges. However, the path forward remains complex, with ongoing debates about how best to reconcile investor rights with states' ability to pursue policies in the public interest. As arbitration tribunals continue to face cases involving sustainable development issues, their decisions will likely play a crucial role in shaping the future of international investment law and its alignment with global sustainability goals. Ultimately, the integration of sustainable development into investment arbitration remains a work in progress, marked by significant uncertainty and evolving jurisprudence. The ongoing efforts to reform investment treaties and dispute resolution mechanisms indicate a shift toward a more balanced approach, where economic, environmental, and social interests are given due consideration. However, achieving consistency and clarity in addressing sustainable development within the investment arbitration framework will require continued dialogue, legal innovation, and perhaps a reimagining of the roles and responsibilities of both investors and states in the pursuit of sustainable development.

Sustainable development's role in international investment law remains supplementary, often invoked by parties to bolster their claims rather than serving as a primary legal standard. For sustainable development to exert a significant impact on investment disputes, it must be more thoroughly integrated into the normative framework of international investment law. This integration would require explicit inclusion in treaty language, as well as alignment with sustainable development principles found in domestic and international legal norms. Currently, however, the legal status of sustainable development within investment law is ambiguous, lacking a clear normative foundation. Despite the global proliferation of sustainable development initiatives, the concept's legal clarity remains elusive. Its evolving nature continues to expand into new areas, resulting in varied interpretations and diluting its impact. While certain sustainable development elements, such as environmental protection and social responsibility, have begun to gain recognition in some investment disputes, the broader picture remains unfocused. This lack of a unified approach contributes to the uncertainty surrounding the extent to which sustainable development can influence investment arbitration outcomes. The complexity of integrating sustainable development into international investment law is compounded by the broader context of international law itself, which consists of diverse and expanding bodies of rules. Investment law operates alongside numerous other legal regimes, including environmental, human rights, and trade law, all of which continuously interact, overlap, and sometimes conflict.

There is no established hierarchy among these different layers of legal rules, making it challenging to prioritize sustainable development principles over established investor protections. Furthermore, international investment law is characterized by a high degree of fluidity due to its uncodified nature. It lacks a single authoritative body or a set of universally applied rules, with various treaties and dispute settlement mechanisms contributing to a fragmented legal landscape. This multiplicity of adjudicative bodies and applicable rules adds to the uncertainty regarding sustainable development's role, as different tribunals may interpret and apply the principles inconsistently. In this context, sustainable development is just one of many factors with which international investment law interacts. It may clash with established investor protections, overlap with emerging regulatory trends, or be sidelined in favor of more pressing legal considerations. The integration of sustainable development into investment law remains a dynamic process, requiring ongoing adjustments and legal innovation to establish its normative status. Efforts to strengthen the position of sustainable development within international investment law continue, with newer investment treaties increasingly incorporating language that seeks to balance investor rights with public policy objectives. These treaties aim to protect the right of states to regulate in the public interest, including sustainable development goals, thus providing a legal foundation for tribunals to consider such principles in their rulings. Nevertheless, without more consistent treaty drafting and greater integration with complementary legal norms, sustainable development's influence on international investment law will remain limited, serving as a supplementary consideration rather than a central legal tenet.

The challenge lies in finding ways to elevate sustainable development from a peripheral concern to a normative standard within the legal framework governing international investment. This requires not only reforming treaty language but also fostering a more cohesive approach to the intersection of investment and other areas of international law. As the global legal landscape continues to evolve, the role of sustainable development in shaping investment law will depend on ongoing efforts to reconcile economic, environmental, and social interests within an increasingly interconnected international legal system. States face considerable risks when they extend protections to investors through international investment treaties. These treaties introduce a legal regime that operates independently of domestic law, establishing its own standing within international law. By consenting to such agreements, host states commit themselves to a system where investors possess powerful legal tools to challenge government actions that they perceive as infringing on their treaty-guaranteed rights. This can be especially challenging for countries with less developed regulatory frameworks or disorganized administrative structures, as these states may struggle to enforce domestic environmental standards effectively or conduct regulatory activities competently. The risk for states lies in

the potential for investor claims that challenge their regulatory measures, including those aimed at protecting the environment. Once a state enters into an investment treaty, it grants investors the ability to bypass domestic legal systems and pursue international arbitration if they believe that state actions violate the treaty's provisions. This can lead to substantial financial liability if the tribunal finds in favor of the investor, sometimes awarding significant compensation. For states with limited administrative capacities, this external pressure can complicate efforts to implement robust environmental protection measures or pursue sustainable development goals.
The presence of such a potent legal regime may be particularly problematic for developing countries or those undergoing regulatory transitions, as their legal and administrative institutions might not be fully equipped to handle the complexities of investment arbitration. The challenge is further compounded when international standards differ from or exceed the requirements of domestic laws, creating a disconnect between what is expected under the treaty and the regulatory capabilities of the host state. Consequently, signing an investment treaty can expose states to arbitration risks that are difficult to manage, especially if their legal systems do not provide sufficient safeguards or consistency in policy application. Understanding the dynamics of international investment law from this perspective, including the place of sustainable development within the framework, is essential for an informed and constructive discourse about the future of both fields. There is a need to find a balance between protecting investors' rights and maintaining the state's sovereign right to regulate in the public interest, including for sustainable development. An evolving legal landscape that incorporates sustainable development goals into the structure of international investment agreements can help achieve this balance, ensuring that states can pursue environmental and social objectives without unduly exposing themselves to arbitration risks. By integrating sustainable development principles into investment treaties—through explicit provisions that recognize states' rights to regulate for environmental and social purposes or by creating exceptions for public interest measures—states can strengthen their ability to defend against investor claims. This shift towards a more balanced approach is already reflected in newer treaties that seek to accommodate sustainable development considerations, suggesting that the future of international investment law may increasingly support the sustainable development agenda. However, for these efforts to be effective, they must be accompanied by improvements in domestic regulatory frameworks and administrative practices, enabling states to fulfill their international obligations while advancing sustainable development objectives.

REFERENCES

Asian Agricultural Products Ltd. (AAPL) v. Republic of Sri Lanka, ICSID Case No. ARB/87/3, Award 27 June 1990.
Biwater Gauff (Tanzania) Ltd v. Tanzania, ICSID Case No. ARB/05/22, Award 24 July 2008.
Chevron Corporation and Texaco Petroleum Company v. The Republic of Ecuador, PCA Case No. 34877, Partial Award on the merits 30 March 2010, Final Award 31 August 2011.
Compañía del Desarrollo de Santa Elena S.A. v. Republic of Costa Rica, ICSID Case No. ARB/96/1, Final Award 17 February 2000.
Gold Reserve Inc. v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/09/1, Award 22 September 2014.
Guzman, A. (1997). Why LDCs Sign Treaties That Hurt Them: Explaining the Popularity of Bilateral Investment Treaties. *Virginia Journal of International Law,* 38, 639.
Hulley Enterprises Ltd. v. Russian Federation, PCA Case No. AA 226, Final Award 18 July 2014.
Metalclad Corporation v. Mexico, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/97/1 (NAFTA), Award 30 August 2000.
Methanex v. United States, UNCITRAL, Final Award of the Tribunal on Jurisdiction and Merits, 3 August 2005.
Newcombe, A., & Paradell, L. (2009). *Law and Practice of Investment Treaties.* Kluwer Law International.
North American Free Trade Agreement between Canada, The United States, and Mexico signed on 17 December 1992 and entered into force on 1 January 1994.
Occidental Petroleum Corporation and Occidental Exploration and Production Company v. Republic of Ecuador (II), ICSID Case No. ARB/06/11, Award 5 October 2012.
Pac Rim Cayman LLC v. Republic of El Salvador, ICSID Case No. ARB/09/12.
Pauwelyn, J. (2000). At the Edge of Chaos? Foreign Investment Law as a Complex Adaptive System, How it Emerged and How it Can Be Reformed. *ICSID Review – Foreign Investment Law Journal,* 29, 372-418.
Peter A. Allard v. The Government of Barbados, PCA Case No. 2012-06.
Sornarajah, M. (2010). *The International Law on Foreign Investment.* Cambridge University Press.
Stiglitz, J. (2003). *The Roaring Nineties: A New History of the World's Most Prosperous Decade.* New York: Norton.
Subedi, S. (2012). *International Investment Law: Reconciling Policy and Principle.* Oxford: Hart Publishing.
Tecnicas Medioambientales Tecmed, S. A. v. United Mexican States, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/00/2, Award 29 May 2003.
United Nations. Conference on Trade and Development. (2015). *World Investment Report 2015: Reforming International Investment Governance.* New York: United Nations.
Venezuela Holdings B.V. and others v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/27, Award 9 October 2014.
Veteran Petroleum Limited v. The Russian Federation, PCA Case No. AA 228, Final Award 18 July 2014.

Weiler, T. (2005). *International Law and Arbitration Leading Cases from the ICSID, NAFTA and Bilateral Treaties and Customary International Law.* London, England: Cameron May.

Windstream Energy LLC v. The Government of Canada, Canada´s Response to the Notice of Arbitration (Amended), 5 December 2013.

Yukos Universal Limited (Isle of Man) v. The Russian Federation, PCA Case No. AA 227, Final Award 18 July 2014.