went well beyond what would generally be understood as the "administrative." It is difficult to see how Mr. Valasek could have billed such a very large number of hours—2,625—in the decisive phase of the arbitrations without having been allowed to participate in the review and assessment of the arguments and evidence and/or drafting of the Awards.

Independent of these numbers, I have been provided with an expert report submitted before The Hague District Court by Dr. Carole Chaski, who is an expert in forensic linguistics and who analyzed the authorship of the Final Awards.81

Dr. Chaski’s Report concludes that it is "extremely likely" that Mr. Valasek wrote the majority of at least three substantive—and unquestionably vital—sections of the Final Awards, namely, 78.57% of the Preliminary Objections section, 65.38% of the Liability section and 71.43% of the Quantification of Claimant’s Damages.

Dr. Chaski’s Report substantiates my conclusion that the Tribunal must have allowed Mr. Valasek to play a very substantive role in the arbitral proceedings, and notably in drafting substantive parts of the Final Awards.

Conclusion

International arbitration is distinctive, among other ways, in the prerogative of parties to name the members of the adjudicatory body that will hear and decide their dispute. This is among the factors behind arbitration’s great appeal as a mode of international dispute resolution. Parties select their arbitrators in consideration of their highly personal characteristics and in the legitimate expectation that those chosen will themselves perform all core substantive arbitral functions.

Simply stated, parties involved in arbitration rely on the notion that their chosen arbitrators will personally study the record, assess the evidence and legal arguments, and make a judgment on their claims. These functions cannot be delegated to administrative secretary or assistant.

The functions commonly viewed as administrative, and thus appropriate for secretarial performance, do not include discussion or sharing of views on any substantive matters in the case (as the drafting of substantive portions of an award would entail), or indeed any activity not essentially ministerial in character.

From the available indications, the functions performed by Mr. Valasek in this case greatly exceeded the legitimate expectations of the parties. Nor is there any indication that the parties were clearly put on notice of, much less approved, this reassignment of essential arbitral functions.


124. Here I consider the question whether enforcement of the Awards would violate public policy within the meaning of Article V(2)(b) of the New York Convention. That determination turns in large part on the answers to the two questions that follow.

- **Question 1:** In international practice, would enforcement of an arbitral award condoning or failing to address fraud or illegality be proper under Article V(2)(b) of the New York Convention?

- **Question 2:** Was the Tribunal free to disregard the allegations and evidence of fraud or illegality raised by the Russian Federation?

***

**Question 1:** In international practice, would enforcement of an arbitral award condoning or failing to address fraud and illegality be proper under Article V(2)(b) of the New York Convention?

125. Article V(2)(b) of the New York Convention provides that a court in the country where recognition and enforcement of a foreign award is sought may decline to recognize or enforce that award if “[t]he recognition or enforcement of the award would be contrary to the public policy of that country” 82 (emphasis added).

126. According to the International Law Association’s Final Report on Public Policy as a Bar to Enforcement of International Arbitral Awards, public policy justifying a court’s refusal to enforce a foreign award includes “fundamental principles, pertaining to justice or morality, that the State wishes to protect even when it is not directly concerned.” 83

127. In international practice, courts regularly refuse to give effect on public policy grounds to arbitral awards condoning or failing properly to address serious fraud or illegality. In *Soleimany v. Soleimany*, 84 the English Court of Appeal refused to enforce an award giving effect to a contract between a father and son, which required the smuggling of carpets out of Iran, in breach of Iranian revenue laws and export controls. The French

---

82 See Parsons & Whittmee Overseas v. Société Générale de l’Industrie du Papier, 508 F.2d 969, 974 (2d Cir. 1974): “Enforcement of foreign arbitral awards may be denied on [the basis of public policy] only where enforcement would violate the forum state’s most basic notions of morality and justice.”


courts have likewise made clear that, while arbitrators are empowered to determine whether a contract is tainted by serious illegality (for example, corruption), their determination in this respect is subject to de novo review by the courts at the award enforcement stage and an award condoning such illegality would be of no effect:

Fraud overrides all other rules and, when established, justifies setting aside the award or refusing its incorporation into the national legal order ... as contrary to international public policy; such is the case where the decision of the arbitrators was obtained, in all or in part, through the fraudulent conduct of one of the parties and also where the contract the enforcement of which is sought had at its origin and as its object influence-peddling.85

128. Similarly, the European Court of Justice has on several occasions required courts of the Member States to annul or deny enforcement to an arbitral award that fails to satisfy the public policy requirements of EU law.86

129. Likewise in the United States, the U.S. Supreme court has made it clear that, should an arbitral tribunal fail to address properly issues of fraud and serious illegality, its award will be denied recognition. In its watershed decision in Mitsubishi Motors Corp. v. Soler Chrysler-Plymouth, Inc., the Court stated clearly that an arbitral tribunal, though sitting in Tokyo and deciding a dispute under Swiss contract law, could entertain claims of violation of U.S. antitrust laws. However, a U.S. court, the Court emphasized, must stand ready to deny recognition of the resulting award under the New York Convention’s public policy defense if the award failed to do justice to those laws. Likewise, in its earlier ruling in Scherk v. Alberto-Culver Co., the Court, in sending a securities law claim to arbitration, expressly stated that “presumably the type of fraud alleged here could be raised, under Art. V of the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, in challenging the enforcement of whatever arbitral award is produced through arbitration.”88

130. In the United States, the judicial policy against assisting a fraud is sufficiently strong and well-anchored to justify a court in refusing to give effect to an arbitral award condoning or disregarding fraud. In a leading U.S. decision, Commercial Union Ins. v. Lines,

85 See Thomson CSF v. Société Brunner Sociiedade Civil de Administracao Limitada and Société Frontier AG Bern, Paris Court of Appeal (Sept. 10, 1998), Revue de l’arbitrage (2001), 583, at 585 (“[L]a fraude fait exception à toutes les règles et lorsqu’elle est établie, elle justifie l’annulation d’une sentence ou fait obstacle à son intégration dans l’ordre juridique national ... en raison de sa contrariété à l’ordre public international ; tel est précisément le cas lorsque des manoeuvres frauduleuses accomplies par l’une des parties ont déterminé en tout ou partie la décision des arbitres ou encore lorsqu’il s’avère que le contrat dont l’exécution est poursuivie avait pour cause et pour objet l’exercice d’un trafic d’influence.”).


court refused to affirm an award that the tribunal had issued notwithstanding its own finding that the prevailing party had acted fraudulently. The court viewed the case as "pitting" the public policy favoring arbitration against the judicial obligation to avoid assisting or protecting a fraud, and concluded that to enforce the award would violate the principle, "fundamental in our jurisprudence," to the effect that "a wrongdoer shall not be permitted to profit through his own wrongdoing." 89

131. While courts applying Article V(2)(b) generally consult their own jurisdiction’s conception of what public policy interest may justify denying effect to a foreign award, they may legitimately take into consideration principles that reflect a consensus within the international community. Thus, the International Law Association specifically recommends as follows:

[In order to determine whether a principle forming part of its legal system must be considered sufficiently fundamental to justify a refusal to recognise or enforce an award, a court should take into account, on the one hand, the international nature of the case and its connection with the legal system of the forum, and, on the other hand, the existence or otherwise of a consensus within the international community as regards the principle under consideration (international conventions may evidence the existence of such a consensus). When said consensus exists, the term “transnational public policy” may be used to describe such norms. 90

132. If such a consensus, sometimes referred to as “transnational public policy” or “truly international public policy,” can be established, it further strengthens the case for denying recognition or enforcement of an award. While U.S. courts have so far not explicitly endorsed the concept of “transnational public policy,” Justice Breyer recently suggested that courts may legitimately look beyond national borders to ascertain public policy for the purposes of the New York Convention. 91 In my opinion, it is therefore proper for a U.S. court to take into account such consensus as may exist within the international community.

133. According to the same ILA Recommendation referred to earlier, 92 determining whether an international public policy consensus exists on any given issue requires consideration of various sources, including international conventions, the practice of other courts, and

---


91 STEPHEN BREYER, THE COURT AND THE WORLD 195 (2015) (noting that “an open question is how U.S. courts should apply the ‘public policy’ exception of the New York Convention so as to avoid serious conflict with other countries or undermining arbitration’s advantages.”).

the writings of commentators. These sources establish the prevalence of a sufficient consensus within the international community condemning serious fraudulent and illegal conduct, treating such practices as violative of public policy, and justifying the non-recognition or non-enforcement of awards tainted by misconduct of that kind. I have referenced above examples of judicial practice. The writings of commentators are also to the same effect.

134. Arbitral tribunals have also pronounced on the issue. By way of example, the arbitral tribunal in *Plama v. Republic of Bulgaria* held:

[T]he Tribunal has decided that the investment was obtained by deceitful conduct that is in violation of Bulgarian law. The Tribunal is of the view that granting the ECT’s protections to Claimant’s investment would be contrary to the principle nemo auditor propriam turpitudinem allegans invoked above. It would also be contrary to the basic notion of international public policy – that a contract obtained by wrongful means (fraudulent misrepresentation) should not be enforced by a tribunal.

135. Likewise, the tribunal in *Inceysa Vallisoletana, S.L. v. Republic of El Salvador* stated:

This Tribunal considers that assuming competence to resolve the dispute brought before it would mean recognizing for the investor rights established in the BIT for investments made in accordance with the law of host country. It is not possible to

---

93 Id., ¶ 41-42.

94 The legal literature treating serious fraud and illegality as contrary to transnational public policy is abundant. See, for example:


To conclude this section of our inquiry, we would propose that transnational public policy contains both prohibitions and positive obligations. On the prohibition side, we would list corruption; fictitious schemes; tax evasion; abuse of dominant position and other unfair practices; and dealing in dangerous goods (emphasis added).


[International arbitrators have also developed rules of international public policy involving such important topics as bribery and corruption, tax evasion, and money laundering.


[There is no doubt today that the suppression of corruption and money laundering is an established part of international public policy and must be respected by international arbitrators. The place of fraud in international public policy is more complex, but certainly some manifestations of fraud [NB: with specific reference to accounting fraud], particularly those that might conceal corruption and money laundering or serious crime, are also proscribed by international public policy.

95 *Plama v. Republic of Bulgaria,* ICSID Case No. ARB/03/24, Decision on Jurisdiction, ¶ 143 (Feb. 8, 2005).
recognize the existence of rights arising from illegal acts, because it would violate the respect for the law which, as already indicated, is a principle of international public policy.\textsuperscript{96}

136. The consensus to this effect is so strong that, as a corollary to the preceding discussion, arbitral tribunals are required to treat seriously allegations and evidence of fraud or illegality in connection with the cases before them and, on their own initiative, to investigate them. Recent international arbitral awards so state.

137. For example, in the case of Metal-Tech Ltd. v. Republic of Uzbekistan,\textsuperscript{97} the tribunal became aware during oral testimony of evidence suggesting the possibility of corruption on the claimant’s part. The tribunal accordingly demanded explanations, invoking its authority under Article 43 of the ICSID Convention.\textsuperscript{98} Based on responses to this request for information, the tribunal ordered the parties at the end of the hearing to produce still further information and to submit two rounds of post-hearing briefs.\textsuperscript{99} On that basis, the tribunal proceeded still further, directing “the [c]laintant to submit information about the payments made to each individual consultant, identifying (a) the specific services rendered, (b) which consultant rendered the service, and (c) when the services were rendered,” and also asked claimant to respond to a series of questions related to its consultants. There followed additional witness statements, as well as an additional hearing solely for this purpose.\textsuperscript{100}

138. The notion that an arbitral tribunal must, if need be at its own initiative, investigate suspicions of serious illegality is also clearly supported in the international arbitration literature. Cremades and Cairns write:

The position today is that the international arbitrator has a clear duty to address issues of bribery, money laundering or serious fraud whenever they arise in the arbitration and whatever the wishes of the parties and to record its legal and factual conclusions in its award. This is the only course available to protect the enforceability of the award and the integrity of the institution of international commercial arbitration.\textsuperscript{101}

\textsuperscript{96} Inceysa Vallisoletana, S.L. v. Republic of El Salvador, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/26, Award, ¶ 249 (Aug. 2, 2006).

\textsuperscript{97} Metal-Tech Ltd. v. Republic of Uzbekistan, ICSID Case No. ARB/10/3, Award, ¶¶ 239-41 (Oct. 4, 2013).

\textsuperscript{98} Id. ¶¶ 86-97, 239-41, 246. Article 43 provides that: “[e]xcept as the parties otherwise agree, the Tribunal may, if it deems it necessary at any stage of the proceedings, (a) call upon the parties to produce documents or other evidence ...”

\textsuperscript{99} Id. ¶ 86-87.

\textsuperscript{100} Id. ¶¶ 93-97.

To the same effect, Elaine Wong writes:

If a tribunal proceeds to issue an award in an arbitration where issues of fraud are raised, this very fact may lead to a challenge at the enforcement stage. In particular, such an award may be liable to be set aside under the public policy exception if it is found at the enforcement stage that the tribunal had failed to adequately investigate issues of fraud.  

Conclusion

139. Fraud and illegality are among the forms of misconduct that reappear with regularity across jurisdictions in judicial refusals to give effect to arbitral awards – so much so that their condemnation is firmly viewed as an aspect of public policy – indeed of “transnational public policy” – justifying a denial of enforcement. There is a strong consensus within the international community in this regard, and it is proper for a court in this country to take into account such consensus under Article V(2)(d) of the New York Convention.

140. Arbitral tribunals are not free to disregard allegations and evidence of fraud and illegality. Indeed, there is considerable authority for the proposition that an arbitral tribunal should, on its own motion, investigate suspicions of serious illegality. Fraud and illegality are considered to be such violations of public policy that international arbitral tribunals are expected to act upon any serious indications that fraud or illegality may have occurred, by which I mean not only fraud or illegality in connection with the arbitral proceeding itself, but also in connection with the underlying transaction.

141. It follows that enforcement of awards condoning, disregarding or failing to address serious fraud or illegality is contrary to public policy within the meaning of Article V(2)(b) of the New York Convention.

Question 2: Was the Tribunal free to disregard the allegations and evidence of fraud and illegality raised by the Russian Federation?

142. In these arbitrations, the Russian Federation raised a number of allegations of serious fraud and illegalities, including with respect to the fraudulent acquisition of Yukos in the mid-1990s and the subsequent aggressive tax optimization scheme adopted by Yukos.


103 Final Awards, ¶¶ 1283-90.

104 Final Awards, ¶¶ 1291-1308.
143. However, the Tribunal declined to consider the allegations regarding the fraudulent acquisition of Yukos on the ground that the fraud was the work not of the Petitioners themselves, but of the individuals behind the Petitioners (and the bank they controlled at the time, Bank Menatep).\textsuperscript{105}

It is common ground between the Parties that these actions were taken before Claimants became shareholders of Yukos in 1999, 2000 and 2001 and, consequently, were not taken by Claimants themselves, but by other actors, such as Bank Menatep and the Oligarchs. Claimants submit that these actions are thus irrelevant to these arbitrations, as the conduct complained of was not that of Claimants’ themselves and, in any event, pre-dates Claimants’ investment.

...In the present case, however, Respondent has failed to demonstrate that the alleged illegalities to which it refers are sufficiently connected with the final transaction by which the investment was made by Claimants. The transactions by which each Claimant acquired its investment were their purchases of Yukos shares. As established in the Interim Award, these purchases were legal and occurred starting in 1999. On the other hand, the alleged illegalities connected to the acquisition of Yukos through the loans-for-shares program occurred in 1995 and 1996, at the time of Yukos’ privatization. They involved Bank Menatep and the Oligarchs, an entity and persons separate from Claimants, one of which—Veteran—had not even come into existence.

144. I note that the Tribunal made this finding on the basis that the fraud was committed by the “Oligarchs”, not “Claimants,” even though it acknowledged elsewhere that the “Oligarchs” beneficially owned and controlled Petitioners/Claimants. In its Final Awards, the Tribunal thus defined “Oligarchs” as “the individuals who have or had a beneficial interest in the trusts behind Claimants, namely Messrs. Khodorkovsky, Lebedev, Nevzlin, Dubov, Brudno, Shakhnovsky, and Golubovitch.”\textsuperscript{106} In the Interim Awards, the Tribunal also set out the holding structure of Petitioners, confirming the roles of Messrs. Khodorkovsky, Lebedev, Nevzlin, Dubov, Brudno, Shakhnovsky, and Golubovitch.\textsuperscript{107}

145. Given the gravity of the Russian Federation’s allegations, the Tribunal’s decision to disregard them on the basis that the fraud was committed by the “Oligarchs,” not the “Claimants,” is troubling and highly formalistic. As the Tribunal itself acknowledged, “[a]n investor who has obtained an investment in the host State only by acting in bad

\textsuperscript{105} Final Awards, ¶¶ 1367, 1369-70.

\textsuperscript{106} Final Awards, p. xv.

\textsuperscript{107} Hulley Interim Award, Appendix; Yukos Interim Award, Appendix.
faith or in violation of the laws of the host state, has brought itself within the scope of application of the ECT through wrongful acts. Such an investor should not be allowed to benefit from the Treaty."\textsuperscript{108}

146. In its Awards, the Tribunal also explicitly found that Yukos breached Russian tax laws and abused certain low-tax regimes through the use of sham entities and \textit{prima facie} abused certain double taxation agreements.

147. More specifically, the Tribunal ruled as follows:

While there is ample evidence in the record that nearly all Russian oil companies also availed themselves of such tax optimization arrangements which were permitted by law, there is no evidence that the operation of those other oil companies, in any respect, breached the legislation and abused the low tax regimes as the Tribunal has found Yukos did through the sham-like nature of some elements of its operations in at least some of the low-tax regions notably in the ZATOs of Lesnoy and Trekhgorny.\textsuperscript{109}

***

\textit{It seems clear to the Tribunal, on the facts, that Yukos’ operations under the DTA were wholly conducted by Mr. Lebedev from Yukos’ established offices in Moscow, that his ‘place of management’ where he habitually concluded contracts relating to operations under the Treaty was in Moscow, which of itself demonstrates that Yukos’ avoidance of hundreds of millions of dollars in Russian taxes through the Cyprus-Russia DTA, was questionable. Hulley appears to the Tribunal to have falsely declared on Cypriot withholding tax forms that ‘income’— dividends from Yuko — ‘was not connected with activities carried on in the Russian Federation despite Mr. Lebedev’s activities in Moscow.\textsuperscript{110}

In any event, even if there was an abuse by Yukos of that treaty, as in the Tribunal’s \textit{prima facie} view there was, such conduct would be subsumed into and enlarge the abuse by some of Yukos’ trading companies in some of the low tax regions, which the Tribunal has already found amounted to contributory fault on the part of Yukos.}

\textsuperscript{108} Final Awards, ¶ 1352.
\textsuperscript{109} Final Awards, ¶ 1611.
\textsuperscript{110} Final Awards, ¶ 1611
148. The Tribunal further found that these fraudulent actions constituted “material and significant mis-conduct by Claimants and by Yukos (which they controlled)”\textsuperscript{111} and that “Claimants should pay a price for Yukos’ abuse of the low-tax regions by some of its trading entities, including its questionable use of the Cyprus-Russia DTA, which contributed in material way to the prejudice which they subsequently suffered at the hands of the Russian Federation.”\textsuperscript{112}

149. Notwithstanding these unequivocal findings, the Tribunal did not consider that these fraudulent actions barred the claim, justifying its refusal on the ground that public international law does not recognize an “unclean hands” doctrine.\textsuperscript{113}

Since the Tribunal will not read into the ECT any legality requirement with respect to the conduct of the investment, it must consider Respondent’s more general proposition that a claimant who comes before an international tribunal with “unclean hands” is barred from claiming on the basis of a “general principle of law.”\textsuperscript{114}

***

The Tribunal therefore concludes that “unclean hands” does not exist as a general principle of international law which would bar a claim by an investor, such as Claimants in this case.\textsuperscript{115}

***

It follows that the alleged instances of “unclean hands” listed in Subsections IX.B.2(b), (c) and (d) above – specifically, the instances related to the alleged abuse of the Russia–Cyprus DTA, the tax optimization scheme and the obstruction of Russia’s enforcement of tax claims against Yukos, all of which relate to actions that were taken after the making of Claimants’ investment, cannot have any impact on the availability of ECT protection for Claimants.\textsuperscript{116}

Instead, the Tribunal decided to decrease the damages awarded to Claimants by 25% (without offering any explanation for that specific percentage), but nonetheless still awarded in excess of US$ 50 billion, to my knowledge, the largest amount of damages ever awarded by an arbitral tribunal.\textsuperscript{117}

\textsuperscript{111} Final Awards, ¶ 1637.
\textsuperscript{112} Final Awards, ¶ 1634.
\textsuperscript{113} Final Awards, ¶ 1363.
\textsuperscript{114} Final Awards, ¶ 1357.
\textsuperscript{115} Final Awards, ¶ 1363.
\textsuperscript{116} Final Awards, ¶ 1365.
\textsuperscript{117} Final Awards, ¶ 1637.
150. The Tribunal accordingly did not merely fail to investigate suspicions of serious wrongdoing on the part of the Petitioners (and those behind them), but found such wrongdoing and did not adequately address it. As noted above, arbitral tribunals are not free to turn a blind eye to indications of serious fraud and illegality. Enforcement of an award predicated on such a failure would offend the public policy of this forum.

Conclusion

151. The Tribunal was faced with serious indications of fraud, deceitful practice and other illegalities by Petitioners in connection with the transactions at issue in the present case. With respect to the allegations of fraudulent conduct, the Tribunal fundamentally disregarded the realities of the case and shielded parties effectively responsible for that conduct from any accountability in that regard, in violation of public policy. With respect to the other allegations of fraud and misconduct, the Tribunal found that Petitioners had in fact perpetrated such serious wrongdoing, but removed the notion of “unclean hands” from consideration, thus enabling Petitioners to profit from that wrongdoing. Recognition or enforcement of an award that knowingly refuses to hold Petitioners accountable for such misconduct and, here too, allows them to profit thereby, notwithstanding fundamental and universally recognized principles of good faith, would be offensive to public policy within the meaning of New York Convention Article V(2)(b).

III. CONCLUSION

152. The conclusions I have reached in this Opinion are several.

153. First, I find that the Russian Federation has invoked solid reasons for concluding that an agreement between it and the Petitioners to arbitrate the dispute in this case was never formed. The Russian Federation signed the ECT on the understanding that the treaty would be applicable to it only provisionally and only to the extent such application would be in conformity with all of Russian law. That is the express understanding on which Russia’s signature of the ECT was conditioned. Insofar as Article 26 of the ECT, which incorporates the Contracting Parties’ standing offer to arbitrate is contrary to Russian law (as the Russian Federation argues), no offer to arbitrate was extended to the Petitioners and no agreement to arbitrate can have been formed. An enforcement court should make a determination on this matter on a de novo basis. Similarly, an offer to arbitrate under the ECT cannot be accepted unless the party purporting to accept it qualifies as an “Investor of another Contracting Party.” De novo inquiry into these matters is called for as well. Denial of enforcement of the Awards is justified under New York Convention Article V(1)(a).
154. Second, in the arbitral proceeding itself, the Tribunal adopted and applied a critical damages valuation methodology of which the parties were unaware and on which they were therefore unable to present their views. This constituted a surprise ruling. A party faced with an award based on such a ruling will have been effectively deprived of the right to be heard on that issue and is entitled to defeat the award’s recognition or enforcement under New York Convention Article V(1)(b).

155. Another precondition of an award worthy of recognition and enforcement is respect by an arbitral tribunal of the parties’ specifications as to composition of the tribunal. Parties to arbitration select the arbitrators on the reasonable understanding that the latter will personally perform all functions relating to the merits of the case in all respects as well as the award’s drafting. According to a fundamental principle governing composition of a tribunal, the arbitrators must perform those tasks themselves delegating to arbitral secretaries or others only tasks of an administrative nature. The latter may include composing ministerial portions of the award, but they do not include discussion of or influence upon substantive aspects of the case or drafting of substantive portions of the award. All indications made available to me strongly suggest that the Tribunal did not observe these basic precepts – and to such an extent as to warrant denial of enforcement of the Awards under New York Convention Article V(1)(d).

156. Lastly, the Awards in this case appear to be tone-deaf to serious allegations of fraudulent conduct – misconduct that runs afoul of public policy in any and all of its manifestations. Recognition or enforcement of an award under those circumstances itself is contrary to public policy and should be denied on the basis of New York Convention Article V(b)(2).
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Restatements and International Law (paper at Tribute to Prof. Andreas Lowenfeld, New York University Law School, April 16, 2009)
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Transatlantic Regulatory Dialogue, speech at the Center for European Legal Studies, University College London (UCL), University of London (Nov. 15, 2006)


Bilingualism and Translation in the US Legal System: A Study of the Louisiana Experience, paper at 17th International Congress of Comparative Law (Utrecht, the Netherlands, July 20, 2006)

Transatlantic Regulatory Dialogue, paper delivered at the annual Leiden/London Meeting on European Law (Europea Institute, Leiden University, Netherlands, June 24, 2006)

European Union Law in Transatlantic Perspective, general course of the annual Academy of European Law (European University Institute, Fiesole, Italy, June 10-13, 2006)


Commentator, “Nested and Overlapping Institutions in International Law (Princeton University, Feb. 24, 2006)

Commentator, Implementation of WTO Rulings (at conference on the WTO at 10: Governance, Dispute Settlement and Developing Countries, Columbia University, April 7, 2006)
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The Transnational Civil Procedure Rules and Parallel Litigation (paper presented at the University of Trieste, Italy, Institute of Comparative Private Law, Dec. 2, 2005)
The “Highest” Court in Federal Systems (paper presented on conference on the future of the European Judiciary, Humboldt University, Berlin, Germany, Nov. 3, 2005)
Americanization and Europeization: Some Legal Perspectives (paper delivered at conference of Oxford University, St. Anthony’s College, UK, Apr. 15-17, 2005)
The Influence of European Union Law on French Administrative Law (paper delivered at conference at University of San Diego and University of California at San Diego, Jan. 21, 2005)
Transnational Law in the First-Year Curriculum (paper presented at annual meeting of the Association of American Law Schools, San Francisco, California, Jan. 8, 2005)
The European Constitution (paper delivered at International Conference on Comparative Constitutional Law, University of Nice, France, July 12, 2004)
Commentator on Professor Paul Craig’s “Executive Power under the Draft European Constitution” (conference at NYU Law School, and Princeton University, Apr. 29-30, 2004)
Parallel Litigation in the United States (panel at ABA International Law Section Annual Meeting, New York, NY, Apr. 14, 2004)
The Institutions and the New Draft Constitution of Europe (paper delivered at conference at University of Lisbon, Portugal Sept. 26, 2003)
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Discussant (with G. deBurca), European Union Governance after Enlargement (conference at Columbia Law School, on Law and Governance in an Enlarged European Union, Apr. 4, 2003)
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Discussant, Developments in Law and Federalism in the EU (paper delivered at 7th biennial conference of the European Union Studies Association, Nashville, Tenn., Mar. 29, 2003)


The Precautionary Principle in WTO Case Law (paper delivered at conference at School of International and Public Affairs, Columbia University, NY, NY, Nov. 8, 2002)


Discussant, Trade Diplomats Meet Academics (conference at European University Institute, Florence, Italy, Sept. 13-14, 2002)

Contracts, International Law and Constitutions (general report to the XVIth Congress of the International Academy of Comparative Law, Brisbane, Australia, July 2002)

Policy Recommendations for Dispute Prevention and Dispute Settlement in Transatlantic Relations: Legal Perspectives (conference at European University Institute, Florence, Italy, May 10-11 2002)

Discussant, Non-Discriminatory Sanitary and Phytosanitary Standards: Lessons from the Disputes over Hormones and Genetically Modified Organisms (comment delivered at conference on Dispute Prevention and Dispute Settlement in Transatlantic Partnership, European University Institute, Florence, Italy, July 5, 2001)

The Common Core Project (paper delivered at the 2001 session of the Common Core Project, Trento, Italy, July 14, 2001)

International Tribunals and United States Courts: A New Relationship for the New Millennium (comment delivered at panel at Second Circuit Judicial Conference, Sagamore Resort, Bolton Landing, N.Y. June 16, 2001)

Developments in International Trade and Regulatory Law (Columbia Law School, European alumni reunion, European University Institute, Fiesole, Italy, June 11, 2001)

Transatlantic Regulatory Cooperation: Legal Problems and Political Prospects (paper delivered at 6th biennial conference of the European Community Studies Association, Madison, Wis., June 1, 2001)

Discussant, Making Member States Comply with Community Law (paper delivered at 6th biennial conference of the European Community Studies Association, Madison, Wis., June 1, 2001)

Comment on «Proceduralization of Law and the Transformation of Adjudicative Functions in the EC and the WTO” (Oliver Gerstenberg) and «Indeterminacy and the Establishment of a Working Law of Market Administration” (Michelle Everson) (comments delivered at workshop on Law and New Approaches to Governance in Europe, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis., May 29, 2001)

Proportionality and Subsidiarity (paper delivered at workshop on The Legal Foundations of the Single Market: Unpacking the Premises, Cambridge University, Cambridge UK (April 27, 2001)


The Future of Comparative Law (paper delivered at Centennial Congress of Comparative Law, Tulane University, New Orleans, La., Nov. 4, 2000)


European Law: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow (paper delivered at conference of Texas International Law Journal in honor of Prof. Hans Baade, University of Texas, Austin, Texas, Sept. 29, 2000)

Comment, The WTO and Human Health and Safety (paper delivered at World Trade Institute, University of Berne, Berne, Switzerland, August 21, 2000)
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The Federalism Dimension of Transatlantic Regulatory Cooperation (paper delivered at conference on Transatlantic Regulatory Cooperation, Columbia University School of Law, Apr. 16-17, 1999)

Judicial Enforcement of Federalism Principles (paper delivered at inaugural conference of Walter Hallstein Institute of European Constitutional Law, Humboldt University, Berlin, Nov. 10-11, 1998)

The Supreme Court’s Role in Policing U.S. Federalism (paper delivered at Joint U.S. Supreme Court-European Court Justice Symposium, European Court of Justice, Luxembourg, July 5, 1998)


The Treaty of Amsterdam: Institutional Reforms (paper delivered at 1997 International Law Weekend, New York City Bar Association, Nov. 8, 1997)


An American Perspective on the Intergovernment Conference (paper delivered at colloquium of the Free University of Brussels, Belgium, May 23, 1997)


Civil Procedure: Trends and Recent Developments in Civil Procedure: Towards a Modern ius commune, in International Association of Legal Science, 1995 Colloquium 253 (Universidad Argentina de la Empresa, Buenos Aires, Argentina, 1999) (paper delivered at colloquium of International Association of Legal Science (IALS), Buenos Aires, Argentina, Sept. 6, 1995)

The Constitutional Amendment Process, in THE EUROPEAN CONSTITUTIONAL AREA (R. Bieber & P. Widmer, eds.) 291 (Schulthess Polygraphischer Verlag, Zurich 1995) (paper delivered at colloquium on the European Constitutional Area, Swiss Institute of Comparative Law and University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland, April 11, 1995)


Decisionmaking Aspects of the European Commission (paper delivered at annual meeting of the Association of American Law Schools, New Orleans, Jan. 6, 1995)
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Post-Maastricht Europe (paper delivered at 1993 International Law Weekend, New York City Bar Association, Oct. 29, 1993)


Taking Subsidiarity Seriously (paper delivered at conference of Department of Justice of Canada on Federalism, Economic Union and Subsidiarity: Canadian and European Perspectives, Ottawa, Canada, April 30, 1993)


Moderator, Foreign Sources of Financing Privatization, at conference on Privatization in Eastern Europe (Parker School of Foreign and Comparative Law at Columbia University, New York, New York, Feb. 18, 1993)

The Contemporary Use of Comparative Law in Law Reform (paper presented at annual meeting of the Association of American Law Schools, San Francisco, California, Jan. 9, 1993)


Moderator, Communitarianism and the Law (annual meetings of American Society of Comparative Law and International Association of Legal Science, Provo, Utah, Sept. 1992)

Commentator, The Impact of European Integration on Private Law (comment on papers delivered at the Eason-Weinmann Colloquium of the Tulane Law School at University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland, June 4, 1992)


Anti-suit Injunctions in International Litigation, and moderator of panel on Provisional Relief from Foreign Courts in International Litigation (1989 International Law Weekend, New York City Bar Association, Nov. 4, 1989)


Moderator of panel on Equality, Minorities and Pluralism, at Conference of Columbia University Center for the Study of Human Rights on The Declaration of the Rights of Man: France and the United States (Columbia University, April 5-6, 1989)

The Autonomy of the International Arbitral Process (paper delivered at the Third Journées Juridiques Franco-Américaines, New Orleans, Louisiana, Nov. 11-12, 1988)
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Le régime juridique des fondations aux Etats-Unis, in LE DROIT DES FONDATIONS EN FRANCE ET A L’ETRANGER (La Documentation Française, Notes et Etudes Documentaires, no. 4879) 65 (Paris 1989) (paper delivered at colloquium organized by the CollIge de France, Paris, France, Jan. 29-30, 1988)


Public Law in the Conflict of Laws, in LAW IN THE USA FACES SOCIAL AND SCIENTIFIC CHANGE (Reports for the Twelfth World Congress of Comparative Law, Sydney-Canberra, Australia), published in 34 Am. J. Comp. L. (Supp.) 157 (1986)


Proliferation of Legislation and Regulation: The United States (paper delivered at symposium of the Institut International des Sciences Administratives, Karlovy-Vary, Czechoslovakia, May 20-21, 1982)


OTHER PUBLICATIONS:

Book Review, Thomas Carbonneau, Toward a New Federal Arbitration Act (Oxford), reviewed in Global Arbitration Review

Litigation in the Civil law and Common Law: The Basics, in Litigation Strategies and Practice (Barton Legum & Ethan A. Berghoff eds.) (2d edition forthcoming 2014)

A Reply to Chip Brower’s “Hollow Spaces” (forthcoming Buffalo Law Review 2014)


Preface, Legal Unification in Comparative Perspective (Proceedings of Intermediate Congress of International Academy of Comparative Law, Mexico City (2013)

Comparative Law and International Organizations, in The Cambridge Companion to Comparative Law (Mauro Bussani & Ugo Mattei, eds.) (Cambridge Univ. Press 2012)


Preface to “The Impact of Uniform Law on National Law: Limits and Possibilities” (proceedings of International Academy of Comparative Law, First Intermediate Congress, Mexico City (Universidad nacional autónoma de México, 2010)
Professor G.A. Bermann

Jurisdictional and Forum non Conveniens Limitations on the Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (co-authored report for the NYC Bar Association, committee on international dispute resolution, forthcoming, 2006, in the American Review of International Arbitration)
General Editor, Columbia Law Series on WTO Law and Policy (Cambridge University Press)
French Public Law, in THE WORLD’S LEGAL SYSTEMS: PAST AND PRESENT (G. Bermann & J. Hazard, eds.) (Condyne Audio Tape Series 1985)
The Law of the European Economic Community, in THE WORLD’S LEGAL SYSTEMS: PAST AND PRESENT (G. Bermann & J. Hazard, eds.) (Condyne Audio Tape Series 1985)

GUEST LECTURES AND KEYNOTE ADDRESSES:

Cravath, Swain & Moore LLP (2014)
« International commercial Arbitration : Past, Present and Future »
McGill University, Montreal (2012)
« The Arbitrability Trap » (John E. C. Brierley Memorial Lecture)
« Exceptionalism in the U.S. Law of international Arbitration »
Professor G.A. Bermann

« A Conversation with George Bermann » (« fireside chat » luncheon conversation with David Caron)

Loyola University School of Law, Chicago, Ill, Wing-Tat Lee Distinguished Lectureship in International and Comparative Law (2011)
« American Exceptionalism in International Arbitration »

« American Exceptionalism in International Arbitration »

Gateway Issues in International Commercial Arbitration (luncheon keynote address to International Chamber of Commerce, Young Arbitrators Forum, Global Conference, Paris, France (2011)

University of Freiburg, Germany (keynote address for opening of Institute on Media and Information Law) (2011)
« Data Privacy Protection : Cooperation and Conflict between the EU and US »

Max-Planck Institut für Privatrecht und Internationales Privatrecht, Hamburg, Germany (2011)
“The Gateway Problem in International Commercial Arbitration “


International Chamber of Commerce, Court of Arbitration (2011)
“The Gateway Problem in International Commercial Arbitration “

University of Stockholm, Sweden (2011)
“Domesticating the New York Convention in American Law”

Deutsche-Amerikanische Juristen-Vereinigung, Stuttgart, Germany (2011)
“Adapting the Federal Arbitration Act to the New York Convention in American Law ”

University of Vienna (2011)

University of Geneva, Institut des Hautes Etudes (2010)
« Domesticating the New York Convention in American Law »

City University of Hong Kong, graduation speaker for Program in legal education for mainland Chinese judges (City University of Hong Kong, 2010)
“Solving the Puzzles of Parallel Litigation”

Practicing Law Institute, New York (2010)
“The Restatement of International Commercial Arbitration: An Update”

International judicial Academy (2009)
Seminar on International Arbitration Issues for U.S. Judges, held at U.S. district court for the eastern district of New York


International Law Weekend West (Willamette Law School, Salem, Oregon, 2009)
“The American Law Institute Goes Global”

American Society of International Law (ASIL), 2009 annual meeting, Washington DC, 2009
“Restating the U.S. Law of International Commercial Arbitration”

“Restating the U.S. Law of International Commercial Arbitration”

New York Law School, C.V. Starr Lecture (2009)
“The Restatement of International Commercial Arbitration”


University of Kansas (Lawrence, Kansas), Inaugural Lecture of the endowed Robert Casad Lecture Series (2008)
“U.S. Class Actions and the ‘Global Class’”
Professor G.A. Bermann

University of Paris I (2007)
« La Concertation Reglementaire entre l’Union Europeen et les Etats-Unis »
“A Transatlantic Perspective on EU Law”
“The European Union as a Constitutional Experiment”
Cour de Cassation (Supreme Court) of France (2003)
“Le droit compare et le droit international: allié ou ennemi?”
“The Expatriation of US Statutory Claims”
Cambridge University (UK), Center for European Law, Cambridge, UK (2002)
“The Judicial Role in Policing Federalism: The US and the EU”
“The Judicial Role in Policing Federalism: The US and the EU”
European Community Studies Association, 6th biennial conference, Madison, Wis (2001)
«Law in an Enlarged European Union», published in 4 European Union Studies Association (EUSA) Review, no. 3 (summer 2001)
British Institute of International and Comparative Law, London, UK (2001)
“European Law and European Enlargement”
Institut de Droit Comparé, University of Paris II, Paris, France (2001)
“Proportionality and Federalism in Recent Supreme Court Case Law”
Federal Judicial Center and Princeton University, Princeton, NJ (2001)
“European Union: Between Law and Politics”
European University Institute, Florence, Italy (2001)
“Litigating in the Other’s Court: A New Forum for Fashioning EU/US Relations”
Columbia University, School of International and Public Affairs (1999-2001)
“Law in an Enlarged European Union”
Princeton University, Center of International Studies, Princeton, New Jersey (2000)
“The States and Foreign Affairs”
Tulane University, School of Law, New Orleans, Louisiana (2000) «Introduction to the Centennial World Congress of Comparative Law»
European University Institute, Florence, Italy (2000)
“Federalism and the Treaty Power”
School of International and Public Affairs, Columbia University (2000)
University of Paris I, France (1998)
“Constitutional Jurisdiction of U.S. Courts over Non-Nationals
Legal Service of the Commission of the European Communities, Brussels, Belgium (1998)
“Federalism Obstacles to Effective US Participation in International Legal Regimes”
Princeton University, Woodrow Wilson School of International Affairs, New Jersey (1998)
“Subsidiarity: An Update”
Princeton University, Alumni College, New Jersey (1997)
“The Idea of Europe: A Legal Dimension”
Universities of Berlin (Humboldt University), Bonn, Erlangen-Nuremberg and Munich, Germany (1997)
“An American Perspective on the 1996 European Intergovernmental Conference”
Universities of Rome (La Sapienza), Italy, and Lausanne, Switzerland (1997)
Subsidiarity: Does it Have a Future?” (published in Centro di studi e ricerche di diritto comparato e straniero, «Saggi, Conferenze e Seminari» (No. 26) (Rome, 1997))
Professor G.A. Bermann

American Bar Association, Section of Administrative Law and Regulatory Practice 1996 Mid-year Meeting, Baltimore, Maryland (1996)
"Regulatory Practice in the European Commission"
University of Barcelona, Spain (1995)
"U.S. Administrative Law in Comparative Perspective"
"European Community Law from a US Perspective"
Legal Service of the Commission of the European Communities, Brussels, Belgium (1994)
"The Interstate Commerce Clause: Lessons for the European Community"
Association of the Bar of the City of New York, Comparative and Foreign Law Committee (1992)
"Europe after the French Referendum on Maastricht"
Association of the Bar of the City of New York, International Law Weekend (1992)
"The Maastricht Treaty"
National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China (Legislative Affairs Commission, Administrative Litigation Research Group), Beijing, China (1991)
"Administrative Procedure in the United States and in Western Europe"
National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China (Legislative Affairs Commission, Administrative Litigation Research Group) Beijing, China (1989)
"Government Liability in the United States, France, West Germany and the European Economic Community"
New York State Bar Association annual meeting, New York, New York (1989)
"1992: Its Constitutional Significance"
"The Single European Act: A New Constitution for the Community?"
"Introduction to the American Legal System" (orientation seminar for African jurists)
University of Clermont-Ferrand, Clermont-Ferrand, France (1982)
"Vermont Yankee and Judicial Review of Agency Rulemaking" and
"Trends in Governmental and Officer Liability in the United States"
"Trends in Governmental and Officer Liability in the United States"
University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland (1982)
"Legislative Control of Administrative Action in the United States,"
"Executive Control of Administrative Action in the United States," and
"Judicial Control of Administrative Action in the United States"
"Freedom of Information in the United States" and "Proceduralism in American Administrative Law"
Max-Planck-Institut, Hamburg, Germany (1980)
"Governmental Liability Reform in Germany and the United States"
University of Bonn, Bonn, Germany (1980)
"Governmental Liability Reform in Germany and the United States"

HONORARY DEGREES AND AWARDS:

Université de Versailles-St. Quentin (France), doctorate honoris causa (conferred Oct. 2011)
Honorary Member, Group of the 100 of the Center of Legal Innovation, Development and Research for Latin America (Feb. 2011)
Honorary Member, American Association of Private International Law (ASEDIP) (Nov. 2009)
C.V. Starr Award, New York Law School (Apr. 2009)
Honorary Member, American Bar Association, Section of Administrative Law and Regulatory Practice (Aug. 2008)
Professor G.A. Bermann

Director, American Arbitration Association
Tocqueville-Fulbright Distinguished Professorship (University of Paris) (June-Dec. 2006)
Arbitration recognition
   Chambers USA (2006 to date)
   Who’s Who Legal (2005 to date)
   Juris Guide to International Arbitrators (2001 to date)
Distinguished Service Award, American Foreign Law Association (conferred June 2005)
Honorary President, American Society of Comparative Law (conferred Oct. 2004)
Jean Monnet Chair of European Law (conferred July 2001)

BAR ADMISSIONS:

Supreme Court of the United States (1992)
Southern District of New York (Federal) (1980)
Eastern District of New York (Federal) (1980)
New York State (1972)

LEGISLATIVE TESTIMONY:

House Committee on Foreign Affairs: Colombian practice in international arbitration and Andean legislation benefits (2002)

FOREIGN LANGUAGES:

French, German
Spanish (reading)
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<tbody>
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<td>AT&amp;T Techs., Inc. v. Commc'ns Workers of Am., 475 U.S. 643 (1986)</td>
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<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Exh. #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>United States v. Morrison</em>, 529 U.S. 598 (2000)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. International Legal Authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Exh. #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>ADC Affi li ate Ltd. and ADC &amp; ADMC Mgmt. Ltd. v. The Republic of Hungary, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/16, Award (Oct. 2, 2006)</em></td>
<td>RLA-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td><em>BIN CHENG</em>, <em>General Principles of Law As Applied by International Courts and Tribunals</em> (1952)</td>
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<td><em>Catherine Kes sedjian</em>, <em>Transnational Public Policy, in International Arbitration 2006: Back to Basics?</em> (Albert Jan van den Berg ed. ICCA Congress Series 2007)</td>
<td>RLA-7</td>
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<td><em>CDC Group Plc v. Republic of the Seychelles</em>, ICSID Case No. ARB/02/14, Annulment Proceedings, Decision (June 29, 2005)</td>
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<td>FOUCHEARD, GAILLARD, GOLDMAN ON INTERNATIONAL COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION 925 (Emmanuel Gaillard &amp; John Savage eds., 1999) (excerpt)</td>
<td>RLA-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fraport AG Frankfurt Airport Services Worldwide v. The Republic of the Philippines, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/25, Annulment Proceedings, Decision (Dec. 23, 2010)</em></td>
<td>RLA-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARY BORN, INTERNATIONAL COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION (2d ed. 2014) (excerpt)</td>
<td>RLA-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIOS PETROCHILOS, PROCEDURAL LAW IN INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION 145 (Oxford University Press 2004) (excerpt)</td>
<td>RLA-20</td>
</tr>
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<td><em>Gold Reserve Inc. v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/09/1, Award (Sept. 22, 2014)</em></td>
<td>RLA-21</td>
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<td><em>Metal-Tech Ltd. v. Republic of Uzbekistan</em>, ICSID Case No. ARB/10/3, Award (Oct. 4, 2013)</td>
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<td><em>Michael Hwang</em>, <em>Introduction: Musings on International Arbitration, in SELECTED ESSAYS ON INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION</em> 16 (SIAC 2013)</td>
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<td>RLA-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>National Grid Plc. v. Argentine Republic</em>, Award (UNCITRAL Nov. 3, 2008)</td>
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