



ICLG

The International Comparative Legal Guide to:

International Arbitration 2018

15th Edition

A practical cross-border insight into international arbitration work

Published by Global Legal Group, in association with CDR, with contributions from:

Ali Budiardjo, Nugroho, Reksodiputro

Andersen Tax & Legal

Anderson Mori & Tomotsune

Attorneys at law Ratiolex Ltd

Baker McKenzie

BDO LLP

BDO USA LLP

Bekina, Škurla, Durmiš and Spajić

BMT LAW

Boss & Young, Attorneys-at-Law

BRISDET

Cases & Lacambra

Costa e Tavares Paes Advogados

DLA Piper France LLP

DLA Piper Studio Legale Tributario Associato

Dr. Colin Ong Legal Services

Eric Silwamba, Jalasi and Linyama

Legal Practitioners

Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP

Georgiev, Todorov & Co.

GrahamThompson

HFW

Homburger

International Advocate Legal Services

JAŠEK LEGAL

Jung & Sohn

Kachwaha and Partners

Kennedys Chudleigh Ltd.

Linklaters

Luke and Associates

Marxer & Partner Attorneys at Law

Matheson

Montezuma Abogados

Moroğlu Arseven

Njeri Kariuki Advocate

Norburg & Scherp

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton

& Garrison LLP

Pierre Thielen Avocats S.à r.l

Popovici Nițu Stoica & Asociații

Portolano Cavallo

PUNUKA Attorneys and Solicitors

Quevedo & Ponce

Salazar & Asociados

SBH Law Office

SyCip Salazar Hernandez & Gatmaitan

Taylor Wessing

Partnerschaftsgesellschaft mbB

Von Wobeser y Sierra, S.C.

Weber & Co.

Williams & Connolly LLP

Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP

YKVN





Contributing Editors
Steven Finizio and
Charlie Caher, Wilmer Cutler
Pickering Hale and
Dorr LLP

Sales Director
Florjan Osmani

Account Director
Oliver Smith

Sales Support Manager
Toni Hayward

Sub Editor
Oliver Chang

Senior Editors
Suzie Levy
Caroline Collingwood

CEO
Dror Levy

Group Consulting Editor
Alan Falach

Publisher
Rory Smith

Published by
Global Legal Group Ltd.
59 Tanner Street
London SE1 3PL, UK
Tel: +44 20 7367 0720
Fax: +44 20 7407 5255
Email: info@glgroup.co.uk
URL: www.glgroup.co.uk

GLG Cover Design
F&F Studio Design

GLG Cover Image Source
iStockphoto

Printed by
Ashford Colour Press Ltd
July 2018

Copyright © 2018
Global Legal Group Ltd.
All rights reserved
No photocopying

ISBN 978-1-912509-24-9
ISSN 1741-4970

Strategic Partners



Preface:

■	Preface by Gary Born, Chair, International Arbitration Practice Group & Charlie Caher, Partner, Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP	
---	--	--

General Chapters:

1	Summary Disposition Procedures in International Arbitration – Charlie Caher & Jonathan Lim, Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP	1
2	Pre-award Interest, and the Difference Between Interest and Investment Returns – Gervase MacGregor & David Mitchell, BDO LLP	8
3	Arbitrating in New York: The NYIAC Advantage – James H. Carter & John V.H. Pierce, Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP	12
4	Determining Delay and Quantifying Delay-Related Damages – Robert Otruba & Mark Baker, BDO USA LLP	16

Asia Pacific:

5	Overview	Dr. Colin Ong Legal Services: Dr. Colin Ong, QC	21
6	Australia	HFW: Nick Longley & Brian Rom	36
7	Brunei	Dr. Colin Ong Legal Services: Dr. Colin Ong, QC	47
8	China	Boss & Young, Attorneys-at-Law: Dr. Xu Guojian	56
9	Hong Kong	HFW: Peter Murphy & Fergus Saurin	69
10	India	Kachwaha and Partners: Sumeet Kachwaha & Dharmendra Rautray	77
11	Indonesia	Ali Budiardjo, Nugroho, Reksodiputro: Sahat A.M. Siahaan & Ulyarta Naibaho	88
12	Japan	Anderson Mori & Tomotsune: Yoshimasa Furuta & Aoi Inoue	99
13	Korea	Jung & Sohn: Dr. Kyung-Han Sohn & Alex Heejoong Kim	108
14	Philippines	SyCip Salazar Hernandez & Gatmaitan: Ricardo Ma. P.G. Ongkiko & John Christian Joy A. Regalado	115
15	Singapore	HFW: Paul Aston & Suzanne Meiklejohn	123
16	Vietnam	YKVN: K. Minh Dang & Do Khoi Nguyen	134

Central and Eastern Europe and CIS:

17	Overview	Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP: Franz Schwarz	143
18	Austria	Weber & Co.: Stefan Weber & Katharina Kitzberger	153
19	Belarus	SBH Law Office: Timour Sysouev & Alexandre Khrapoutski	162
20	Bulgaria	Georgiev, Todorov & Co.: Tsvetelina Dimitrova	173
21	Croatia	Bekina, Škurla, Durmiš and Spajić: Željko Bekina & Damir Kevilj	183
22	Czech Republic	JAŠEK LEGAL: Vladimír Jašek & Adam Novotný	191
23	Romania	Popovici Nițu Stoica & Asociații: Florian Nițu & Raluca Petrescu	199
24	Russia	Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP: Noah Rubins & Alexey Yadykin	210
25	Turkey	Moroğlu Arseven: Orçun Çetinkaya & Burak Baydar	226

Western Europe:

26	Overview	DLA Piper France LLP / DLA Piper Studio Legale Tributario Associato: Maxime Desplats & Milena Tona	236
27	Andorra	Cases & Lacambra: Miguel Cases	240
28	Belgium	Linklaters: Joost Verlinden & Matthias Schelkens	250
29	England & Wales	Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP: Charlie Caher & John McMillan	260
30	Finland	Attorneys at law Ratiollex Ltd: Timo Ylikantola & Tiina Ruohonen	276
31	France	DLA Piper France LLP: Maxime Desplats & Audrey Grisolle	284
32	Germany	Taylor Wessing Partnerschaftsgesellschaft mbB: Donata von Enzberg & Peter Bert	294

Continued Overleaf →

Further copies of this book and others in the series can be ordered from the publisher. Please call +44 20 7367 0720

Disclaimer

This publication is for general information purposes only. It does not purport to provide comprehensive full legal or other advice. Global Legal Group Ltd. and the contributors accept no responsibility for losses that may arise from reliance upon information contained in this publication. This publication is intended to give an indication of legal issues upon which you may need advice. Full legal advice should be taken from a qualified professional when dealing with specific situations.

Western Europe, cont.:

33	Ireland	Matheson: Nicola Dunleavy & Gearóid Carey	303
34	Italy	Portolano Cavallo: Micael Montinari & Martina Lucenti	313
35	Liechtenstein	Marxer & Partner Attorneys at Law: <i>Dr. iur.</i> Mario A. König	323
36	Luxembourg	Pierre Thielen Avocats S.à r.l: Peggy Goossens	332
37	Netherlands	BRISDET: Fanny-Marie Brisdet & Bo Pietersz	341
38	Spain	Andersen Tax & Legal: Iñigo Rodríguez-Sastre & Elena Sevilla Sánchez	351
39	Sweden	Norburg & Scherp: Fredrik Norburg & Pontus Scherp	359
40	Switzerland	Homburger: Felix Dasser & Balz Gross	366

Latin America:

41	Overview	Baker McKenzie: Luis M. O’Naghten & Jessica Marroquin	377
42	Bolivia	Salazar & Asociados: Ronald Martin-Alarcon & Rodrigo Jimenez-Cusicanqui	392
43	Brazil	Costa e Tavares Paes Advogados: Vamilson José Costa & Antonio Tavares Paes Jr.	399
44	Ecuador	Quevedo & Ponce: Alejandro Ponce Martinez & Maria Belen Merchan	407
45	Mexico	Von Wobeser y Sierra, S.C.: Adrián Magallanes	415
46	Peru	Montezuma Abogados: Alberto José Montezuma Chirinos & Mario Juan Carlos Vásquez Rueda	424

Middle East / Africa:

47	Overview – MENA	International Advocate Legal Services: Diana Hamadé	432
48	Overview – Sub-Saharan Africa	Baker McKenzie: John Bell & Terrick McCallum	437
49	Botswana	Luke and Associates: Edward W. Fashole-Luke II & Tendai Paradza	440
50	Kenya	Njeri Kariuki Advocate: Njeri Kariuki	449
51	Nigeria	PUNUKA Attorneys and Solicitors: Elizabeth Idigbe & Emuobonuvie Majemite	456
52	Sierra Leone	BMT LAW: Gelaga King	473
53	South Africa	Baker McKenzie: John Bell & Terrick McCallum	480
54	United Arab Emirates	International Advocate Legal Services: Sarah Malik	490
55	Zambia	Eric Silwamba, Jalasi and Linyama Legal Practitioners: Joseph Alexander Jalasi, Jr. & Eric Suwilanji Silwamba, SC	497

North America:

56	Overview	Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP: H. Christopher Boehning & Johan E. Tatoy	506
57	Bermuda	Kennedys Chudleigh Ltd.: Mark Chudleigh & Alex Potts QC	515
58	Canada	Baker McKenzie: Matthew J. Latella & Christina Doria	525
59	Turks and Caicos Islands	GrahamThompson: Stephen Wilson QC	534
60	USA	Williams & Connolly LLP: John J. Buckley, Jr. & Jonathan M. Landy	541

Pre-award Interest, and the Difference Between Interest and Investment Returns

Gervase MacGregor



David Mitchell



BDO LLP

Even in these times of historically low interest rates, it is often the case that a significant part of any award rendered by an arbitral tribunal in favour of a claimant is interest. This is particularly the case where the tribunal only arrives at its award many years after the events that gave rise to the claim, and the tribunal quite rightly has a duty to compensate the claimant for not having had the use of the award monies over the period from the valuation date to the award. Indeed, in some cases the claim for interest can be the single largest element of damages.

The interest rate, and therefore the amount of interest awarded, was traditionally regarded as being something that was simply left to the tribunal to determine, with very little submission by the parties' counsel or by the quantum experts even though, when base rates everywhere were above 5%, interest could have such an enormous impact on the quantum of the award.

However, interest has now become much more a subject of submission and argument. After all, an award for compounded pre-award interest at a rate of 7% will be four times greater than an award at 2% after five years and nearly five times greater after 10 years.

Interest is part of the award in favour of the claimant and, as such, its purpose is to place the claimant in the same position as it would have been absent the breach or expropriatory event that gave rise to the claim. The underlying logic of interest is that "a dollar today is worth more than a dollar in a year's time".

In this article, we consider various approaches to calculating pre-award interest and, in particular, we explain the difference between interest and an award based on investment returns.

Rates of Interest

Various different bases are often put forward for calculating interest. The first is that the rate of interest should be based on the claimant's borrowing rate. This rate is supported by the Chartered Institute of Arbitrators' Guideline on Drafting Arbitral Awards which states:

"the amount of interest should be designed purely to compensate a receiving party for being kept out of its money and provide it with a form of commercially realistic restitution without punishing the paying party".

The basis for using this interest rate is effectively that, if it had received the award at the time it suffered its loss, the claimant would not have had to borrow as much money as it did in fact borrow – it thus assumes a fairly normal scenario in which the claimant company borrows money to invest in its activities.

Thus, the claimant should be compensated with the rate of interest which it actually had to pay as a result of being kept out of its money.

This interest rate should be able to be established as a matter of fact by the parties – it may be disclosed in the claimant's accounts or it may be simply a matter of submission by the claimant. A reasonable proxy for this rate of interest may be LIBOR plus a margin of say 2% – which is also a rate of interest commonly awarded in the English High Court in commercial cases. A very large multinational may, in fact, be able to borrow at a lower margin of say LIBOR plus 0.5%, and a smaller company may have to pay LIBOR plus 4% or more to borrow money from a bank.

Alternatively, if the claimant was never in a net borrowing position, and a reasonable assumption is that what it would have done with the award money if it had received it at an earlier date is to have placed the money on deposit, then the rate of interest may be based on the rate of interest it could have earned on a bank deposit.

Investment Rates and Opportunity Cost

Interest is sometimes claimed based on the claimant's Weighted Average Cost of Capital ("WACC") or the investment rate that the claimant states it would have earned on alternative investments to the project on which its claim is based. The WACC reflects the cost to a company of financing its operations with debt and equity, i.e. the return it needs to pay to compensate investors for investing in companies of comparable risk. The WACC, therefore, is a measure of the opportunity cost to a company of investing in one project rather than another.

Stepping back from the legal arguments regarding using a WACC rate, there is one overall reason for claimants to use this rate – it will always lead to a higher and, indeed, a much higher claim. Shareholder equity commands a higher return than debt and while the WACC is a blend of the costs of debt and equity, the lower the gearing of an entity the higher its WACC will be.¹ It is also important to bear in mind that the reason equity has a higher cost than debt is because, from the point of view of the lender/investor, it is riskier.

The WACC is not, however, a measure of interest, and it should not generally be used, in our opinion, as a proxy for pre-award interest. This is because it does not compensate the claimant for the losses which an award of interest should be compensating claimants for.

The reasons why opportunity cost or the WACC should not be used for the calculation of pre-award interest, in our opinion, include the following:

1. It would result in the elimination of investment risk over and above any borrowing cost, and thus would provide the claimant with a guaranteed return equivalent to an investment return. A company may hope to make high investment returns on some of its projects, but it is also likely to make lower returns on other

projects – and it would be wrong to compensate the claimant solely on the basis of its above-average investment returns.

2. It assumes that there are, in fact, alternative projects that would have yielded the WACC that the claimant could have invested in – whereas in reality there may have been all sorts of other limitations on the company’s ability to win and carry out work profitably on alternative projects, including the company’s failure to win particular tenders simply because competitors won them for whatever reason.
3. It would have the result that a claimant that invests in higher risk ventures, some of which fail, receive a higher interest rate than a well-managed claimant that invests in a portfolio of high and low risk projects, and thus has a lower WACC. Indeed, a company with poor corporate governance and therefore higher risk would receive far greater compensation than a company with good corporate governance.
4. Where a company can borrow money on the capital markets, it over-compensates the claimant for its loss. This is because, if the assumption is that the claimant would have been able to generate profits from its alternative investment, logically it should simply have borrowed money anyway and invested in those projects. Compensating a claimant on the basis of its WACC even though it did not actually borrow money to invest in such potentially profitable projects would be to over-compensate the claimant.
5. There is insufficient causal nexus between the event giving rise to the claim, and the alleged loss of opportunities.

Similar arguments apply to claims for interest based on specific returns that could have been earned on projects, actual returns on projects generally, or other measures of corporate performance such as return on equity or returns on assets.

One rare situation in which we would agree that the WACC or a similar measure might be appropriate as a measure of the pre-award interest rate is where there is some element of guarantee or warranty of returns by the respondent. But clearly this is some way from a claim for interest.

Coerced Loan Theory

The “coerced loan” theory or “forced debtor” approach is an economic approach to interest, based on the concept that the funds subject to delay have not been subject to any risk associated with the claimant’s projects; rather the risk to which the funds have been exposed is the default risk of the respondent. According to this theory, the appropriate pre-award interest rate to apply becomes the respondent’s unsecured borrowing rate.

There is logic in using a coerced loan theory rate of interest for post-award interest, where the claimant may still be at risk of the respondent’s bankruptcy or other inability to pay, and thus arguably should be compensated for this risk. While the economic theory may be attractive, tribunals may balk at awarding amounts of interest on this basis. Developing countries will have a higher borrowing rate than more developed countries and in investor-state disputes tribunals may prefer to exercise their discretion and use a LIBOR-based interest rate.

There is less logic in using a coerced lender interest rate for pre-award interest. This is because, once the tribunal has reached its award, the risk of the respondent going bankrupt or defaulting is no longer there. The award wipes out this risk and the reality is known, whatever might or might not have happened.

Ultimately, this is a legal issue – if the tribunal intends to compensate the claimant on the basis that the award was a “forced loan” from the claimant from the time of the breach, it may be right for interest to be based on the coerced loan theory.

Other Rates of Interest

Other rates of interest we have seen claimed include a risk-free rate or a statutory rate.

The argument for a risk-free rate is that all the risks to which the claimant is exposed are taken into account by the arbitration itself, so that by the time of the award, the only remaining requirement to be covered by interest is simply the cost suffered by the claimant for not having had its money earlier, and this can be calculated by using the risk-free rate of interest, such as a US Treasury bill rate.

A statutory post-award interest rate may exist, which may be used as the interest rate for a claim, depending on the applicable law and on the jurisdiction. For example, in England, the High Court post-judgment interest rate is currently 8%, whilst in New York it is 9% – which currently is likely to be a far higher rate than any other interest rate the claimant can use. Bank rates have been low since the financial crisis in 2008, whereas these judgment interest rates have not been adjusted to follow the decline in actual interest rates. Clearly, it may benefit a claimant if it is able to claim interest based on a New York statutory interest rate. However, it needs to be recognised that the purpose of these judgment interest rates is different, in that they are high partly to encourage losing respondents to actually pay the award quickly, as a matter of public policy – and thus they should not be used as proxies for pre-award interest.

Compound Interest

There has long been a debate over whether interest should be calculated on a simple basis or a compound basis, with the latter resulting in a higher award. Traditionally, the accepted view was that interest should only be awarded on a simple basis, and this was set down in the law of many countries, and it still remains the statutory basis of interest in a number of jurisdictions.

However in our experience, tribunals generally now award interest on a compound basis, as this more properly reflects the economic interest rate that the claimant would actually have had to pay to its bankers in the real world.

The Impact of Currency

There is a fundamental economic relationship between a currency and the interest rate on loans and deposits in that currency, and this must not be ignored when calculating interest. In simple terms, the value of a currency takes account of the interest rate offered on bank deposits in that currency and anticipated inflation, so that a country with a high interest rate is associated with a depreciating currency.

Consequently, it would be wrong for a tribunal to make an award in US Dollars and then to add interest based on the interest rate in, for example, Venezuela – as this would over-compensate the claimant, and would not take account of the fact that the US Dollar is expected to have appreciated against the Venezuelan Bolivar over the period of the claim.

Other Points

It may be the case that a commercial contract actually specifies an interest rate or interest rate basis in the event of a breach – and in those circumstances, that interest rate may well be the most reliable rate to use in an award based on such a contract.

We have referred to interest commonly being awarded on the basis of LIBOR or EURIBOR plus a premium, which is because these are

the benchmarks most commonly used as the basis for commercial interest rates, rather than other benchmarks such as Base rate in the UK. However, if US Prime rate is used as the basis for commercial interest rates, then logically that could be used for the pre-award interest rate. It is also the case that LIBOR has been tainted by well-known scandals in the last five years, so that some tribunals (for example, the Yukos tribunal) decided to choose a different benchmark simply because of concern that LIBOR may have been manipulated.

Finally, we do accept that interest is one of those aspects of an award that remain clearly within the control of the tribunal, and it may use its discretion on the rate of interest as part of the subjective element of an award, which may be designed to compensate a claimant in a way which the tribunal actually considers is most fair. So, for example, in the Yukos award, the tribunal considered the evidence in favour of compound interest in other awards, but then decided to award interest on a simple interest basis.

Endnote

- Ignoring the implications of optimal gearing.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to acknowledge the third author of this chapter, Andrew Maclay.

Andrew Maclay is Forensic Services Principal at BDO LLP. He has an M.A. in Economics from the University of Cambridge and has specialised in all aspects of Forensic Accounting since 1996.

He is a Chartered Accountant, a Certified Fraud Examiner, an accredited Accountant Expert Witness and a member of the Chartered Institute of Arbitrators. He is the forensic accounting officer of the International Bar Association's Asset Recovery subcommittee.

He specialises in the quantification of damages in international arbitration, and has worked on disputes in many jurisdictions, particularly France, Switzerland, West and East Europe, Africa, the Middle East and the CIS. Between 1991 and 1994, he worked in Burundi, Africa and is fluent in French.

He has given evidence in ICC and ICSID tribunals, the English High Court, a criminal court and by way of deposition in US proceedings.

Tel: +44 20 7486 3487. Email: andrew.maclay@bdo.co.uk.

**Gervase MacGregor**

BDO LLP
55 Baker Street
London, W1U 7EU
United Kingdom

Tel: +44 20 7893 2665
Email: gervase.macgregor@bdo.co.uk
URL: www.bdo.co.uk

Gervase MacGregor is Head of Forensic Services at BDO LLP. He has a Bachelor's Degree in Geology from the University of Liverpool and a Master's Degree from HEC in Paris.

He is a Chartered Accountant and a Certified Fraud Examiner. He joined BDO in 1982, qualified in 1986, was made a partner in BDO in 1991 and became head of the London-based Litigation Support and Forensic Accounting Department in 1994.

His first forensic investigation, in 1985, was into a contested takeover by a client of his firm, Caparo Plc. His work into accounting irregularities gave rise to the Caparo case on auditors' liability.

He has a particular expertise in valuation and damages disputes and share purchase agreement disputes in the energy sector. Through his extensive experience of international arbitrations, Gervase has worked on cases in Paris, London, Stockholm, Geneva, Zurich and Rotterdam. He has also worked on cases before the Court of First Instance of the European Communities.

Gervase has acted as an expert witness in a large number of legal actions and has given evidence more than 50 times in the High Court, County Court, Crown Court, in front of the Copyright Tribunal and courts overseas, and in many international arbitrations.

**David Mitchell**

BDO LLP
55 Baker Street
London, W1U 7EU
United Kingdom

Tel: +44 20 7893 2505
Email: david.mitchell@bdo.co.uk
URL: www.bdo.co.uk

David Mitchell is Head of the Valuations team at BDO LLP. He has over 15 years' valuation experience and works in a variety of industries, jurisdictions, and forums, including the UK Courts and international arbitrations.

He is a fellow of the Association of Chartered Certified Accountants and is a Chartered Tax Adviser. He is also a member of the Society of Share & Business Valuers, the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors, and a guest lecturer at Brunel University.

He has been appointed as an expert on over 30 occasions and has given oral testimony in the UK courts, Deposition, the Dubai International Financial Centre Court, and to arbitral tribunals in a number of jurisdictions.



BDO offers the breadth of services you would expect from one of the world's largest accountancy networks. We bring real leadership across the HNW market, and BDO's commitment to delighting our clients was recently independently verified by the *Mid-Market Monitor*, which placed us number one for client satisfaction for the fourth year running.

With more than 3,500 talented people in 18 offices in the UK, we work closely with our international network giving our clients access to more than 64,500 experts in over 1,400 offices across 154 countries. So wherever you and your clients are, we'll be right there with you.

Other titles in the ICLG series include:

- Alternative Investment Funds
- Anti-Money Laundering
- Aviation Law
- Business Crime
- Cartels & Leniency
- Class & Group Actions
- Competition Litigation
- Construction & Engineering Law
- Copyright
- Corporate Governance
- Corporate Immigration
- Corporate Investigations
- Corporate Recovery & Insolvency
- Corporate Tax
- Cybersecurity
- Data Protection
- Employment & Labour Law
- Enforcement of Foreign Judgments
- Environment & Climate Change Law
- Family Law
- Fintech
- Franchise
- Gambling
- Insurance & Reinsurance
- Investor-State Arbitration
- Lending & Secured Finance
- Litigation & Dispute Resolution
- Merger Control
- Mergers & Acquisitions
- Mining Law
- Oil & Gas Regulation
- Outsourcing
- Patents
- Pharmaceutical Advertising
- Private Client
- Private Equity
- Product Liability
- Project Finance
- Public Investment Funds
- Public Procurement
- Real Estate
- Securitisation
- Shipping Law
- Telecoms, Media & Internet
- Trade Marks
- Vertical Agreements and Dominant Firms



59 Tanner Street, London SE1 3PL, United Kingdom
Tel: +44 20 7367 0720 / Fax: +44 20 7407 5255
Email: info@glgroup.co.uk

www.iclg.com