

Third-Party Funding in International Arbitration and Its Impact on Procedure

Jonas von Goeler



Wolters Kluwer

Table of Contents

Foreword	xxiii
Preface	xxvii
List of Abbreviations	xxix
CHAPTER 1	
Introduction	1
§1.01 The Dilemma of Costs in International Arbitration and a Way Out	1
§1.02 Terminology: Litigation Funding and Third-Party Funding	2
§1.03 Litigation Funding: Perspectives, Perceptions, and Emotions	3
§1.04 Dealing with Reality: International Arbitral Procedures Involving Funded Parties	4
§1.05 Aim and Method of This Work	6
§1.06 Scope and Structure of This Work	7
PART I	
Third-Party Funding in International Arbitration	9
CHAPTER 2	
The Various Forms of Third-Party Funding in International Arbitration	11
§2.01 Litigation Funding Agreements	12
[A] Case Assessment	13
[1] The Assessment Process	13
[a] Initiative and Timing	13
[b] A Multi-step Process	14
[c] A Multi-disciplinary and Rigorous Process	14
[d] Time and Costs	16
[e] Exclusivity Period, Confidentiality Agreement, and Waiver of Counsel's Professional Secrecy	17

Table of Contents

[2]	The Assessment Criteria	18
	[a] Quantum of the Claim	18
	[b] Investment Costs and Time until Expected Recovery	19
	[c] Facts, Law, and Evidence	20
	[d] Respondent Solvency and Enforceability of the Award	20
	[e] The Claimant's Legal Team	21
	[f] The Decision Makers Involved	21
	[g] Portfolio Management Considerations and Investment Policy	22
	[h] Previous Unsuccessful Attempts at Obtaining Funding for the Claim	22
[3]	The Assessment Methodology	23
	[a] Approaches	23
	[b] The Claim's Probability of Success; Selection Rates	25
[4]	Case Assessment and the Funder's Ability to Exert Control over the Claim	26
[B]	The Litigation Funding Agreement: Investment and Return	28
	[1] The Funder's Investment	28
	[a] Cost Categories	28
	[b] Case Budget	29
	[2] The Funder's Return	30
[C]	The Litigation Funding Agreement and Ancillary Agreements: Further Essential Terms	32
	[1] Obligations of the Funded Party Relating to Case Assessment and Case Monitoring	32
	[2] Risk Sharing with Counsel	33
	[3] Priorities Agreement	34
	[4] Control Rights of the Funder	35
	[5] Termination Rights of the Funder	35
	[6] Dispute Resolution Clauses	37
	[7] Confidentiality Agreement and Nondisclosure Agreement	38
[D]	Case Monitoring	39
	[1] The Monitoring Process	39
	[2] Case Monitoring and the Funder's Ability to Exert Control over the Claim	41
	[a] Control via Contractual Rights to Control Strategic Decisions	41
	[b] Control via Case Budgeting	42
	[c] Control via Termination Rights and Provisions on the Consequences of Settlement	44
	[d] Restrictions on Control Depending on Applicable Law	45

	[3] Case Monitoring and Alignment of Interests	46
	[4] Result	48
	[E] Litigation Funding Agreements for Respondents	49
	[F] Related but Less Standardized Transactions: Litigation Finance	50
§2.02	Other Forms of Third-Party Funding	51
	[A] Success Based Legal Fee Arrangements	51
	[1] Contingency Fee Arrangements	52
	[2] Conditional Fee Arrangements	52
	[B] Insurance Policies	53
	[1] Legal Expenses Insurance	53
	[a] Before-the-Event Insurance	53
	[b] After-the-Event Insurance	53
	[2] Liability Insurance	54
	[a] Before-the-Event Insurance for Liability	54
	[b] After-the-Event Insurance for Liability	54
	[3] Political Risk Insurance in the Context of Investment Protection	56
	[C] Loan Agreements	56
	[D] Corporate Finance Instruments	56
	[E] Factoring	57
	[F] Legal Aid	57
	[G] Strategic Third-Party Funding	58
§2.03	Comparison of Litigation Funding with Other Forms of Third-Party Funding	59
	[A] Qualification of the Litigation Funding Agreement as an Existing Type of Contract under German Law and French Law	60
	[1] German Law: Atypical Silent Partnership	60
	[2] French Law: Contract Sui Generis	61
	[B] The Debate in International Arbitration: In Search of Definitions	61
	[1] The Relevance and Purposes of Developing Definitions	62
	[2] Litigation Funding and Other Forms of Third-Party Funding: Differences and Similarities	63
	[a] Litigation Funding as For-Profit Funding	63
	[b] Litigation Funding as a Direct Investment in the Claim	64
	[c] Litigation Funding as a Specialized Investment in the Claim	65
	[d] Litigation Funding and Professional Rules	65
	[e] Litigation Funding and the Ability to Pool and Spread Risk	66
	[f] Litigation Funding and Secondary Markets in Legal Claims	66
	[g] Litigation Funding and Success Based Legal Fee Arrangements	67

Table of Contents

	[h] Litigation Funding and Insurance	68
	[i] Litigation Funding and Loans	68
	[3] <i>Consequences for Approaching Disclosure in International Arbitration Proceedings</i>	68
[C]	Result	70
CHAPTER 3		
	Litigation Funding in International Arbitration	73
§3.01	The Rise of Litigation Funding as a Means of Financing International Arbitration Proceedings	74
	[A] The Supply	74
	[1] Funders of International Arbitration Proceedings	75
	[2] Capital Raised and Investment Activity	77
	[B] The Demand	80
§3.02	The Policy Debate: Benefits and Risks Associated with Litigation Funding in International Arbitration	82
	[A] Potential Benefits of Litigation Funding	82
	[1] Promotes Access to Justice	82
	[a] Financially Distressed and Financially Stable Parties	83
	[b] Limitations	84
	[c] Impecunious Parties and Agreement to Arbitrate	85
	[2] Levels the Playing Field	87
	[B] Potential Risks of Litigation Funding	88
	[1] Commodifies Claims	88
	[2] Stirs Up Disputes	91
	[a] Contributes to More Arbitration Disputes	91
	[b] Encourages Frivolous Claims	92
	[3] Discourages Settlement	95
	[4] Burdens the Attorney-Client Relationship	96
	[a] Litigation Funders Will Assume Control	97
	[b] Threatens Counsel's Independence and Impartiality	98
	[c] Compromises Loyalty to the Client	99
	[d] Conflicts with Professional Secrecy Obligations	100
	[e] Might Cause Waiver of Otherwise Applicable Privilege Protection	101
	[f] Creates Additional Duties for Counsel to Inform and to Advise about Litigation Funding	101
	[C] The Debate in the Context of International Investment Arbitration	102
§3.03	The Regulation of Litigation Funding in International Arbitration	104
	[A] Structuring the Discussion	105
	[B] The ALF Code	106
	[C] Further Regulatory Attempts and Future Directions	108
	[1] Holistic Approaches to the Regulation of Litigation Funding	109

	[a]	General Prohibition	109
	[b]	Regulation on the Arbitration Level	109
	[c]	Regulation in the United States	110
	[d]	Regulation in Australia	110
	[e]	Regulation in France	111
	[f]	Regulation on the European Union Level	111
	[2]	Regulating Financial Aspects	111
	[a]	Capital Adequacy	111
	[b]	Capital Markets	112
		[i] Securitization of Claims	112
		[ii] Corporate Governance Rules for the Funding of Listed Companies	113
	[3]	Regulating Professional Conduct	116
	[4]	Regulating Procedural Aspects	117
§3.04		Summary	117
PART II			
		Impact of Third-Party Funding on Arbitral Procedure	121
	A	Fact-Finding and Evidence-Taking	123
CHAPTER 4			
		Disclosure of Third-Party Funding in International Arbitration Proceedings	125
§4.01		No General Duty or Practice to Disclose Third-Party Funding as Such	126
	[A]	No General Duty or Practice to Disclose	126
	[B]	Voluntary Disclosure and Inadvertent Disclosure	127
	[C]	Disclosure for Reasons Not Linked to the Arbitration Proceedings	128
		[1] Disclosures by Listed Funded Parties and Funders to Comply with Public Disclosure Requirements	128
		[2] Disclosure Following Disputes between Funded Party and Funder	128
	[D]	Interim Result	130
	[E]	Statutory Disclosure Rules in the Context of (Class) Litigation	130
§4.02		Duties to Disclose Facts Related to Third-Party Funding in Order to Handle Specific Procedural Issues	131
	[A]	Handling Disclosure Based on Established Rules and Practices	132
		[1] IBA Guidelines 2014	133
		[2] Standards Governing Document Production	133
	[a]	Arbitral Cases Handling Disclosure of Funding Agreements Based on General Standards of Document Production	134
	[b]	Approaching Disclosure of Funding Agreements Based on Articles 3 and 9 IBA Rules on Evidence	137

Table of Contents

	[3] Interim Result	140
[B]	Trends towards a General Duty to Disclose Third-Party Funding – And Why They Should Not Be Followed	141
	[1] Broader Implications of Third-Party Funding Invoked to Justify Disclosure: A Closer Look	142
	[a] Regulating the Relationship between Funded Party and Funder	142
	[b] Ensuring Procedural Equality	145
	[c] Taking into Account Ethical Rules Prohibiting the Funding Structure behind a Party in Arbitration	146
	[d] Procedural Good Faith and Counsel’s Duty of Candour	146
	[e] Arbitrator Proactivity	148
	[2] Interim Result: Approaches towards Disclosure – Thinking inside the Box versus Thinking outside the Box	149
	[3] Maintaining the Current Disclosure Regime is Preferable	150
	[a] Imposing General Disclosure of Third-Party Funding Is Unworkable	151
	[b] Imposing General Disclosure of Third-Party Funding Is Unnecessary	154
	[c] Addressing Privilege Concerns and Risks of Adverse Influence on the Tribunal	158
§4.03	Conclusion	160
CHAPTER 5		
	Privilege Protection of Documentary Evidence and Third-Party Funding	163
§5.01	Privilege and Waiver in International Arbitration Proceedings: Legal Framework and Discretionary Approaches	165
	[A] <i>Lex Arbitri</i>	165
	[B] Party Agreement	165
	[C] Arbitrator Discretion	166
	[D] Result and Consequences for the Following Analysis	169
§5.02	Privilege Applicable to Litigation Funding-Related Documents and Potential Waiver of Privilege by Exchange of Documents with Litigation Funders	169
	[A] Disclosure of Litigation Funding in the Context of Document Production Requests	171
	[1] Disclosure of a Litigation Funder’s Existence as a Precondition for Document Production Requests	171
	[2] Interrelationship between Specificity/Relevance/Materiality and Privilege Defences	172
	[3] Can Document Production Be Ordered Directly against the Litigation Funder?	173

[B]	Documents Created by Counsel and Shared with Litigation Funders	174
[1]	Arguments against Privilege Protection	175
[a]	Leader Techs. v. Facebook	175
[b]	Main Argument Flowing from Leader Techs. v. Facebook: Lack of ‘Common Interest’ with Litigation Funder, in Particular Where No Funding Agreement Has Been Concluded	177
[i]	Approaching the ‘Common Interest’ Issue from a Reasonable Expectations Perspective	178
[ii]	Where No Funding Agreement Has Been Concluded	180
[iii]	Result: Formal Distinction between Common Legal and Commercial Interests Unpersuasive from a Reasonable Expectations Perspective	180
[c]	Bray & Gillespie Management LLC v. Lexington Insurance Co.	181
[d]	Lack of Industry-Specific Confidentiality Requirements for Litigation Funders	181
[2]	Arguments in Favour of Privilege Protection	182
[a]	Mondis Technology Ltd. v. LG Electronics, Inc.	182
[b]	Devon IT, Inc. v. IBM Corp.	184
[c]	Walker Digital, LLC v. Google, Inc.	186
[d]	Arguments by Analogy between Litigation Funders and Other Third Parties	187
[i]	Independent Auditors	187
[ii]	Prospective Buyers of Companies in Litigation	188
[iii]	Insurers and Counsel Operating under Success Based Legal Fee Arrangements	188
[3]	Summary Assessment	190
[4]	Result	192
[C]	Documents Created by Litigation Funders and Shared with Counsel	192
[1]	Applicability of Privilege: Discussion	192
[2]	Result	194
[D]	Litigation Funding Agreements and Related Communications	195
[1]	Applicability of Privilege	195
[a]	Interrelationship with Specificity, Relevance, and Materiality	195
[b]	Discussion	196
[c]	Synthesis	198
[2]	Waiver of Applicable Privilege	199
[a]	In Case of Voluntary Disclosure	200

Table of Contents

	[b] Where the Litigation Funding Agreement Enters the Public Domain	200
§5.03	Conclusions: Guidelines	201
	[A] Guideline 5a	202
	[B] Guideline 5b	202
	[C] Guideline 5c	202
	[D] Concluding Remarks	203
B	Arbitration-Specific Issues	205
CHAPTER 6		
	Jurisdictional Issues and Third-Party Funding	207
§6.01	Jurisdictional Issues in International Commercial Arbitration	208
	[A] The Funder as a Non-signatory to the Arbitration Agreement	209
	[B] Relevant Procedural Scenarios for Determining Jurisdiction	210
	[1] Inclusion of the Funder as an Additional Party by Way of Joinder	210
	[a] Inclusion to Establish Liability	211
	[b] Inclusion to Establish Liability for Costs	211
	[c] Other Potential Reasons for Inclusion	211
	[d] Procedural Mechanism: Joinder	212
	[2] Substitution of the Funded Party by Virtue of Assignment or Subrogation	212
	[C] Inclusion of the Funder as an Additional Party to the Arbitration	214
	[1] Implied Consent	214
	[2] Group of Companies Doctrine	216
	[3] Non-consensual Theories	217
	[a] Estoppel	217
	[b] Alter Ego	218
	[4] Jurisdictional Approach	219
	[5] Result and Consequences for the Conduct of Arbitral Proceedings	219
	[D] Substitution of the Funded Party by the Funder	221
	[1] Assignment	221
	[a] Where the Funding Agreement Stipulates an Express Assignment of Rights under the Main Contract	222
	[b] Where the Funding Agreement Does Not Stipulate an Express Assignment	222
	[2] Subrogation	223
	[E] Conclusion: Guidelines	224
	[1] Guideline 6.01a	224
	[2] Guideline 6.01b	224

	[3] Concluding Remarks	224
§6.02	Jurisdictional Issues in International Investment Arbitration	225
	[A] Third-Party Funding in the Context of Investment Treaty Jurisdiction	225
	[B] The Funded Claimant and the Funding Agreement's Impact on the Funded Claim's Admissibility	228
	[1] Analysis of Arbitral Case Law	228
	[a] CSOB v. Slovakia	228
	[b] Compañía de Aguas del Aconquija S.A. and Vivendi Universal S.A. v. Argentine Republic	230
	[c] Teinver S.A., Transportes de Cercanías S.A. and Autobuses Urbanos del Sur S.A. v. The Argentine Republic	231
	[d] RosInvestCo UK Ltd. v. The Russian Federation	233
	[e] Saluka Investments BV v. The Czech Republic	234
	[f] Quasar de Valores v. the Russian Federation	235
	[g] L.E.S.I. – DIPENTA v. Algeria / BIVAC B.V. v. Paraguay	236
	[h] Abaclat and Others v. The Argentine Republic / Ambiente Ufficio S.P.A. and Others v. The Argentine Republic / Giovanni Alemanni and Others v. The Argentine Republic	237
	[2] Summary Assessment: Guidelines	239
	[a] Guideline 6.02a: Funding Agreement Does Not Affect Jurisdiction if Effective after the Initiation of Proceedings	240
	[b] Guideline 6.02b: Transfer of Economic Interest to the Funder before Initiation of Proceedings Does Not Affect Jurisdiction	240
	[c] Guideline 6.02c: Transfer of Case Control to the Funder before Initiation of Proceedings Does Not Affect Jurisdiction	241
	[i] Why Transfer of Case Control Might Matter	242
	[ii] How to Evaluate whether a Relevant Transfer of Case Control Has Occurred	242
	[iii] Result	244
	[d] Guideline 6.02d: Transfer of the Claim to the Funder before Initiation of Proceedings Affects Jurisdiction	244
	[C] The Funder as Claimant and the Limits of Treaty Claim Assignment	245
	[1] The Definition of 'Investment'	245
	[2] The Principle 'nemo potiore potest transfere quam ipse habet'	247

Table of Contents

	[3] Treaty Shopping and the Limits of Free Assignability	248
	[a] Treaty Shopping	248
	[b] Limits of Free Assignability in the Absence of Treaty Shopping?	249
	[4] Concluding Remark	249
§6.03	Conclusion and Outlook	250
CHAPTER 7		
	Impartiality and Independence of Arbitrators and Third-Party Funding	253
§7.01	When to Disclose: Evaluating Relationships between Arbitrators, Litigation Funders, and Funded Parties	255
	[A] The Requirement of Arbitrator Impartiality and Independence	255
	[1] Arbitration Laws and Rules	255
	[2] IBA Guidelines 2014	257
	[a] Overview of Relevant Changes	257
	[b] Amendments Relating to Funding: Analysis	259
	[i] General Standard 6	259
	[ii] General Standard 7	263
	[3] Own Approach: A Broader Concept of ‘Affiliate’ Based on the IBA Guidelines 2004	263
	[B] A Broader Concept of ‘Affiliate’ Based on the IBA Guidelines 2004: Application to Select Situations and Examples	267
	[1] One of the Parties Is Funded by a Litigation Funder That Supports a Client of the Arbitrator’s Law Firm in a Separate Dispute	267
	[a] Materiality	267
	[b] Involvement with the Claim	268
	[c] Result	269
	[2] The Arbitrator’s Law Firm Currently Renders Professional Services for the Litigation Funder	269
	[3] The Arbitrator Is Biased towards or against Parties Supported by Litigation Funders	271
	[a] Bias towards Parties Supported by Litigation Funders	271
	[b] Bias against Parties Supported by Litigation Funders	272
	[4] The Arbitrator Has Repeatedly Been Appointed Thanks to the Same Litigation Funder	274
	[C] Conclusions	275
§7.02	How to Disclose: Implementing Disclosure to Prevent Conflicts of Interest	276
	[A] The Risks for Arbitrator Impartiality and Independence Arising from Undisclosed Third-Party Funding	276
	[1] When Funding Is Discovered in the Course of the Arbitral Proceedings	276

	[2] When Funding Is Discovered after the Rendition of the Arbitral Award	279
	[3] Result	280
[B]	The Different Approaches to Counter These Risks	280
	[1] Mandatory Disclosure of Third-Party Funding (Supported by Arbitral Institutions)	281
	[2] Duty of Funded Party and Funder to Disclose Potential Conflicts	282
	[3] Discussion	283
	[a] The Advantages of Mandatory Disclosure	283
	[b] The Disadvantages of Mandatory Disclosure	283
	[i] Lack of Conceptual Clarity; Split Conflicts Standards	283
	[ii] Lack of Coherence and Feasibility: The 'Third-Party Funding Conflicts Check Torpedo'	285
	[iii] Internal Review by Arbitral Institutions Raises Due Process Concerns	286
	[iv] The Idea to Prohibit Arbitrators from Taking into Account Funding Other Than in Relation to Conflicts of Interest Is Paternalistic	287
	[v] Who Would Be Willing and Able to Enforce Mandatory Disclosure?	288
	[vi] Mandatory Disclosure Is Unnecessary	289
	[c] Interim Result	290
[C]	Result	291
CHAPTER 8		
	Confidentiality in International Arbitration Proceedings and Third-Party Funding	293
§8.01	The Existence and Scope of Confidentiality in Commercial and ICSID Arbitration: Overview	294
	[A] International Commercial Arbitration	295
	[B] ICSID Arbitration	296
§8.02	Conflicts between Confidentiality and Litigation Funding	298
	[A] Disclosures from Funded Parties to Funders for Purposes of Case Assessment and Case Monitoring	299
	[1] Confidentiality Interests Affected	299
	[a] Trial by Press Release	300
	[b] Distraction from and Aggravation of the Dispute	301
	[c] Misuse of Information Obtained by the Funder for Future Transactions	301
	[d] Do Confidentiality Obligations Apply Already during Case Assessment?	301
	[2] Potential Exceptions to Confidentiality	302

Table of Contents

	[a]	Disclosure to Protect the Funded Party’s Rights	302
	[b]	Disclosure to Advisors	304
	[c]	Interim Result	305
	[3]	Assessment	305
	[a]	Exception to Confidentiality Should Apply	306
	[b]	Scope of the Exception: How to Protect Confidentiality Interests	306
	[c]	Disclosure of Confidential Information Only to Disclosed Funders?	308
	[d]	Potential Consequences of Undisclosed Funding and Issues Associated with Disclosure	309
	[e]	Interim Result	311
	[4]	Result	312
[B]		Disclosures from Listed Funded Parties and Funders to the Public to Comply with Statutory Disclosure Requirements	314
	[1]	Public Disclosure Exceptions to Confidentiality and the Disclosure of Funding	314
	[a]	Disclosure of International Arbitrations	315
	[b]	Disclosure of Funding of International Arbitrations by Listed Funded Companies	316
	[c]	Disclosure of Funding of International Arbitrations by Listed Funders	318
	[2]	Interim Result: Transparency Prevails	318
	[3]	How to Protect Confidentiality Interests	320
	[a]	Limiting the Amount and Type of Information Disclosed to the Public	320
	[b]	Reasonable Limits regarding Disclosure of Arbitration	320
	[c]	Reasonable Limits regarding Disclosure of Funding of an Arbitration	321
	[d]	Public Disclosure Only Following Disclosure of Listed Funder to the Opponent and the Tribunal?	322
	[4]	Result	324
[C]		Other Conflicts	325
	[1]	Privacy of Arbitral Hearings and Attendance of the Funder	326
	[2]	Submissions of the Funder as Amicus Curiae	327
	[3]	Litigation Funding and Accountability towards the Public	327
§8.03		Conclusions: Guidelines	328
	[A]	Guideline 8a	328
	[B]	Guideline 8b	329
	[C]	Concluding Remarks	329

C	Costs	331
CHAPTER 9		
	Security for Costs and Third-Party Funding	333
§9.01	The Tribunal's Power to Order Security for Costs and Relevant Criteria	334
	[A] Power to Order Security for Costs	334
	[B] Synthesis of Relevant Criteria	336
§9.02	The Impact of Litigation Funding on Ordering Security for Costs	338
	[A] General Criteria Not Affected by the Presence of a Funder	338
	[B] Financial Circumstances of the Funded Party and Related Questions of Evidence	339
	[1] Disclosure of Funding-Related Facts to Assess the Security for Costs Request	339
	[2] Funding Agreement as an Indication of the Funded Party's General Financial Situation	341
	[3] Funding Agreement as Additional Quantitative Factor Due to Increased Defence Costs?	343
[C]	Funding as a Material Change of Circumstances?	344
	[1] Starting Point: The Conclusion of a Litigation Funding Agreement	344
	[2] Arbitral Case Law	346
	[a] Order of ICC Tribunal Dated 3 August 2012	346
	[i] Summary	346
	[ii] Comment	347
	[b] <i>Guaracachi and Rurelec v. Bolivia</i>	349
	[c] <i>Commerce Group Corp. and San Sebastian Gold Mines v. El Salvador</i>	350
	[d] <i>RSM Production Corporation v. Saint Lucia</i>	352
	[i] Summary	352
	[ii] Comment	353
	[e] <i>Kardassopoulos and Fuchs v. Georgia</i>	355
	[3] Interim Result	355
	[a] The Situation in Investment Arbitration	356
	[b] The Situation in Commercial Arbitration	356
[D]	Conduct of the Funded Party	357
	[1] Bad Faith: Moving Assets to Shield against Liability	357
	[2] Obtaining Litigation Funding while Funder Is Not Responsible for Adverse Costs	358
[E]	Policy Considerations	360
	[1] Avoiding Asymmetries in Treatment between Claimants and Respondents	360
	[a] Ordering Security Payment against Respondents?	360

Table of Contents

	[b] Holding Respondents Liable for the Cost of Posting Security?	361
	[2] Risk of Stifling (Exceptionally) Meritorious Claims?	362
	[a] Does a Respondent Act in Bad Faith by Seeking Security from a Funded Claimant?	362
	[b] The Future of the Claim Where the Tribunal Orders Security Payment	362
	[3] Ordering Security Payment Directly against a Litigation Funder?	363
	[4] Considering Security for Costs Orders against Funded Parties Creates Additional Costs and Delays	364
§9.03	Conclusions: Guidelines	365
	[A] Guideline 9a	365
	[B] Guideline 9b	365
	[C] Guideline 9c	365
	[D] Guideline 9d	366
	[E] Guideline 9e	366
CHAPTER 10		
	Awarding of Costs and Third-Party Funding	367
§10.01	Allocation of Party Costs: Overview	369
	[A] <i>Lex Arbitri</i> : Mandatory and Non-mandatory Provisions on Costs Allocation	370
	[B] Party Agreement	371
	[C] Arbitrator Discretion	372
	[1] General Factors	372
	[a] Domestic Rules on Costs Allocation	372
	[b] Case-Specific Factors Susceptible to Affect the Applicable Costs Allocation Scheme	373
	[2] Funding-Specific Factors	374
	[D] Trends in Arbitral Practice	375
§10.02	Recovery of Costs by the Prevailing Funded Party	377
	[A] Funded Legal Costs and Funding Costs Contingent on Success	377
	[1] Did the Funded Party Incur Costs at All Where They Have Been Paid by a Third Party?	378
	[a] The Significance of the Applicable Costs Provisions	379
	[b] Requirements: Arbitral Case Law	380
	[i] <i>Supplier v. First Distributor, Second Distributor</i>	381
	[ii] ICC Case No. 13645	381
	[iii] <i>Price Waterhouse SARL and PW Conseil SARL v. PricewaterhouseCoopers International Limited</i>	382
	[iv] <i>Quasar de Valores v. the Russian Federation</i>	382
	[v] Synthesis	383
	[c] Conclusion: Guidelines	386

	[i] Guideline 10a	386
	[ii] Guideline 10b	386
[2]	Amount of Recoverable Costs: Actual Legal Expenses or Funder's Return?	387
	[a] Limits Imposed by Applicable Costs Provisions	388
	[b] Reasonableness: Policy Perspective	388
	[j] No Costs Recoverable At All Where a Party Need Only Pay Them in Case of Success?	388
	[ii] <i>Kardassopoulos and Fuchs v. Georgia</i> : 'No Principle Why Any Such Third Party Financing Arrangement Should Be Taken into Consideration in Determining the Amount of Recovery by the Claimants of Their Costs'	390
	[iii] Interim Result	392
	[iv] No Costs Recoverable when Incurred under Contingency Fee Arrangements?	393
	[c] Reasonableness: Consent Perspectives	394
	[i] Perspective of the Funded Party	394
	[ii] Perspective of the Opponent	394
	[iii] Decision	395
	[d] Interim Result: Legal Costs Should Be Recoverable as if No Funding Agreement Existed	396
	[e] Level of Substantiation and Duty to Disclose in Costs Submissions	398
	[i] Where the Funded Party Claims the Higher Fees Payable to the Funder	399
	[ii] Where the Funded Party Claims Fees Based on a Normal Hourly Rate	401
	[iii] Concluding Remark	404
[3]	Amount of Recoverable Costs: The Significance of Domestic Laws on Funding	404
	[a] Where Ethical Rules Prohibit Specific Funding Structures	404
	[i] Approaching the Issue: Recognition and Enforcement of Cost Rulings Connected with an Agreement that May Violate Public Policy	405
	[ii] Situation under the Standards of the New York Convention	406
	[b] Where Cost Rules Allow or Prohibit Recovery of Funding Costs	407
	[i] Parties' Expectations Stemming from Their Home Jurisdictions	407
	[ii] Costs Rules at the Seat of the Arbitration	408

Table of Contents

[4] Conclusions: Guidelines on the Losing Party's Liability for Costs	410
[a] Guideline 10a	410
[b] Guideline 10b	410
[c] Guideline 10c	410
[d] Guideline 10d	411
[e] Guideline 10e	411
[B] Funding Costs Not Contingent on Success	411
[1] Costs for Case Assessment	412
[2] Costs for Before-the-Event Insurance Policy	413
[3] Interest Charged on Loan	414
[C] Funding Costs as Damages	414
§10.03 Recovery of Costs by the Prevailing Non-funded Party from the Funder	416
[A] Costs Award from an Arbitral Tribunal against the Funder	416
[1] Case Law from National Courts in Support of Costs Awards against Funders	416
[2] Significance of the Case Law for International Arbitration	418
[a] Significance for Costs Awards from Arbitral Tribunals	419
[b] Judicial Assistance?	421
[B] Damages Award from a State Court against the Funder	423
 PART III	
Summary	425
 CHAPTER 11	
Summary of Part I and Part II	427
§11.01 Summary of Part I	427
§11.02 Summary of Part II	431
 CHAPTER 12	
Concluding Remarks	437
 Bibliography	439
 Table of Cases and Arbitral Awards	463
 Index	475