

The **International Courts and Tribunals** *Bulletin*

CENTRE FOR INTERNATIONAL LAW
NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF SINGAPORE

Issue No. 6

Reporting period 29 May – 24 September 2026



INTER-STATE
COURTS



ISDS
INSTITUTIONS
AND TRIBUNALS



HUMAN RIGHTS
COURTS



OTHER
INSTITUTIONS



CIL

CENTRE FOR INTERNATIONAL LAW
National University of Singapore

Introduction

The *CIL International Courts & Tribunals Bulletin* is an e-publication prepared by the International Dispute Resolution (IDR) Team at the Centre for International Law (CIL). It offers neutral, comprehensive, and timely updates on significant legal and institutional developments concerning major international courts and tribunals engaged in State-level dispute resolution.

The *Bulletin* also tracks relevant aspects of State practice in relation to these bodies. Designed to serve policymakers, international legal practitioners, and scholars, the *Bulletin* provides valuable insights into the evolving landscape of international adjudication.

To receive the latest issue, please follow us on LinkedIn ([IDR Programme](#)), or subscribe to the [CIL Mailing List](#) (make sure to select “International Dispute Resolution” as one of your areas of interest).

This Bulletin is prepared by the International Dispute Resolution team at the Centre for International Law on the basis of publicly available information. While every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy and timeliness of the information presented, readers should not rely on this Bulletin as a substitute for legal advice or official sources. The views expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those of any affiliated institutions or editors. References to specific cases, proceedings, or decisions are for informational purposes only and do not constitute endorsement or commentary.

Contents

I. Inter-State Courts	2
1. International Court of Justice (ICJ)	2
2. Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA).....	4
3. International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea (ITLOS).....	9
II. ISDS Institutions and Tribunals	13
1. International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID)	13
2. Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA).....	33
III. Human Rights Courts	38
1. African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights (AfCHPR).....	38
2. European Court of Human Rights (ECHR)	43
3. Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACtHR).....	53
IV. Other Institutions	60
1. International Organization for Mediation (IOMed)	60
2. UNCITRAL Working Group III: Investor-State Dispute Settlement Reform....	61
3. Multilateral International Investment Tribunal.....	61
4. Special Tribunal for the Crime of Aggression against Ukraine & Claims Commission for Ukraine.....	62

I. INTER-STATE COURTS

1. International Court of Justice (ICJ)

Docket

Alleged Violations of Human Rights by Rwanda on the Territory of the Congo (Democratic Republic of the Congo v. Rwanda) — The Democratic Republic of the Congo institutes proceedings against Rwanda

On **26 June 2026**, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (the “DRC”) filed an application instituting proceedings against Rwanda concerning “abuses attributable to Rwanda over a period extending from 1996 to the present day”. The alleged activities principally targeted but were not limited to the Hutu ethnic group in Zairian, and subsequently, Congolese territory.

The DRC seeks to found the Court’s jurisdiction on the following compromissory clauses under multilateral treaties:

- Article IX of the Genocide Convention (1948);
- Article 22 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (1966);
- Article 29 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (1979); and
- Article 30 of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (1984).

See [Press Release](#) and [Application Instituting Proceedings](#) (French).

Alleged Smuggling of Migrants (Lithuania v. Belarus) — Poland and Russia file declarations of intervention

On **30 June** and **20 July 2026** respectively, Poland and Russia filed declarations of interventions under Article 63 of the Statute of the Court. Article 63 of the Statute provides for a right to intervention in cases concerning the construction of a convention is at issue, where States not parties to the proceedings are parties to the convention. This case concerns alleged violations of the Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (2000), to which Poland and Russia are parties.

See [Press Release for Poland](#) and [Russia](#).

***Alleged Smuggling of Migrants (Lithuania v. Belarus)* — European Union
furnishes observations**

On **20 July 2026**, the European Union furnished observations under Article 43, paragraph 2, and Article 69, paragraph 2, of the Rules of the Court. Together, these provisions entitle public international law organisations, at their initiative, to furnish information relevant to a case before the Court in the form of a Memorial, where the case involves the construction of a convention to which the international organisation a party. In this case, the EU is a party to the aforementioned treaty.

See [Press Release](#).

***Alleged Breaches of Certain International Obligations in respect of the Occupied Palestinian Territory (Nicaragua v. Germany)* — Public hearings
concluded**

Between **7 September to 10 September 2026**, the ICJ held public hearings on the preliminary objections raised by Germany in *Nicaragua v. Germany*. The case principally concerns Nicaragua's claims that Germany, through the supply of arms, ammunitions, and other forms of support to Israel, is in breach of its obligations under the Genocide Convention (1948) and international humanitarian law.

At this phase, Germany argues that the Court lacks jurisdiction because Nicaragua's claims exceed the scope of Germany's compulsory acceptance of the ICJ's jurisdiction, or that the Court should not exercise its jurisdiction because Israel is a missing and indispensable third party. The Court will now begin deliberations.

See [Press Release](#).

Vanuatu files an application concerning a dispute with France

On **1 September 2026**, Vanuatu filed an Application before the ICJ regarding a dispute with France concerning "Vanuatu's sovereignty over Umaenupne (Matthew) and Umaeneg/Leka (Hunter) Islands (...) and concerning the establishment of a single maritime boundary between the exclusive economic zones and continental shelf of Vanuatu and France (with respect to New Caledonia)".

Vanuatu seeks to found the Court's jurisdiction on Article 38, paragraph 5, of the Rules of the Court, inviting France's consent thereof for this specific case (*forum prorogatum*). No action will be taken in the proceedings unless and until France consents to the Court's jurisdiction. In the past, France has consented by way of *forum prorogatum* in [two previous cases](#) before the Court.

See [Press Release](#).

Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide in the Gaza Strip (South Africa v. Israel)

On **22 September 2026**, it was reported that on 18 September 2026, Colombia informed the Court that it had decided to withdraw the Declaration of intervention that it had filed under Article 63 of the Statute in the aforementioned case.

See [Press Release](#), which includes a list of States that have filed intervention applications in the case thus far.

Institutional updates

Visit of the Emperor of Japan to the International Court of Justice and the Permanent Court of Arbitration

On **18 June 2026**, His Majesty Emperor Naruhito of Japan, accompanied by a high-level delegation, paid a visit to the ICJ and the Permanent Court of Arbitration at the Peace Palace in The Hague, the seat of both organisations.

See [Press Release](#).

2. Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA)

Docket

***Arbitration pursuant to the Asylum Partnership Agreement (The Republic of Rwanda v. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)* —
Issuance and Publication of the Award**

On **1 June 2026**, the arbitral tribunal issued its Award in this case concerning Rwanda's claims that the United Kingdom (UK) breached its obligations under their Agreement for the Provision of an Asylum Partnership to Strengthen International Commitments on the Protection of Refugees and Migrants. The Parties had exchanged verbal notes following this agreement to formalise financial arrangements.

By a 2:1 majority, the tribunal, through an application of the law of treaties, rejected Rwanda's claim that £50 million remained due and payable to it under the UK's Note Verbale 101/2024 dated 20 June 2024. Rwanda's remaining claims were rejected unanimously.

The three-member tribunal comprised H.E. Judge Peter Tomka (the Chair), Professor (Dr) Mohamed Abdel Wahab, and Judge Joan Donoghue. The PCA acted as the Registry for the proceedings. Professor (Dr) Mohamed Abdel Wahab appended a Dissenting and Separate Opinion to the Award.

See [Press Release](#), [Award](#), and [Dissenting and Separate Opinion](#) of Professor (Dr) Mohamed Abdel Wahab.

**[Indus Waters Western Rivers Arbitration \(Pakistan v. India\)](#) — Award
Concerning Maximum Pondage Supplemental to the Award on Issues of
General Interpretation of the Indus Waters Treaty**

On **5 June 2026**, the Court of Arbitration constituted pursuant to Article IX(5) and Annexure G to the Indus River Water Treaty (1960) between India and Pakistan rendered its Award on “certain discrete issues with respect to the calculation of pondage for run-of-river hydro-electric plants”. The decisions under the Award are supplemental to the Award on Issues of General Interpretation of the Indus Waters Treaty dated 8 August 2025. India did not participate in the proceedings.

The tribunal comprises Sean D. Murphy (as the Chair), Wouter Buytaert, Jeffrey P. Minear, Awn Shawkat Al-Khasawneh, and Donald Blackmore. The PCA acts as the secretariat in accordance with the Court’s decision to that effect.

See [Press Release](#) and [Award](#) Concerning Maximum Pondage Supplemental to the Award on Issues of General Interpretation of the Indus Waters Treaty.

[Dispute Concerning Coastal State Rights in the Black Sea, Sea of Azov, and Kerch Strait \(Ukraine v. the Russian Federation\)](#) — Publication of Award

On **15 June 2026**, the tribunal constituted under Annex VII to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (1982) (UNCLOS) published its Award.

In its Award on Preliminary Objections (2020), the tribunal had found it lacked jurisdiction *ratione materiae* on a number of Ukrainian claims, which implicated issues outside the subject-matter scope of UNCLOS. In the present Award, the tribunal affirmed it had jurisdiction over most remaining claims and found them admissible.

On the merits, it found that Russia breached Article 206 of UNCLOS by conducting environmental impact assessments (EIAs) for the Kerch Strait bridge, power cables, and gas pipelines in a manner inconsistent with the provision; that Russia breached Articles 205-206 of UNCLOS by failing to publish the reports of these EIAs; and finally, that Russia breached Articles 123, 192, and 194 of UNCLOS by conducting the EIAs.

The tribunal rejected all other claims made by Ukraine. However, considering that these findings constituted appropriate declaratory relief, the tribunal did not make any further orders of cessation or reparation.

The tribunal comprised Judge Jin-Hyun Paik (as the Presiding arbitrator), Judge Boualem Bouguetaia, Judge Alonso Gómez-Robledo, Professor Vaughan Lowe KC, and Professor Alexander Vylegzhanin (as of 30 May 2023) who had replaced Judge Vladimir Golitsyn (until 26 March 2023). The PCA acted as the Registry for the arbitration.

See [Press Release](#) and [Award](#).

Indus Waters Treaty Neutral Expert Proceedings (India v. Pakistan) —
Pakistan’s applications for the publication of pleadings and the disclosure of documents, adoption of Terms of Reference for a modelling exercise, and Fifth Meeting

On **31 July 2026**, certain developments in the Neutral Expert proceedings under the Indus Waters Treaty were publicised by the PCA.

Pakistan had applied to the Neutral Expert to disclose certain documents from these proceedings to parallel proceedings ongoing at the Court of Arbitration constituted in the *Indus Waters Western Rivers Arbitration (Pakistan v. India)*. The Neutral Expert permitted this disclosure to the Court on the condition of their strictest confidentiality.

The Neutral Expert also formally adopted the Terms of Reference governing the technical modelling exercise and finalised a framework for the “Modelling Exercise and Calibration Approach” for the Baglihar Hydroelectric Plant. Lastly, the Fifth Meeting between the Neutral Expert and the Parties was held, following which a revised Work Programme moving forward was decided. India did not participate in these phases.

See [Press Release](#).

Conciliation between the Kingdom of Cambodia and the Kingdom of Thailand

On **2 June 2026**, Cambodia initiated a conciliation with Thailand pursuant to Article 298 and Annex V of UNCLOS, to which Thailand responded on **19 June 2026**.

On **13 August 2026**, the party-appointed members of the Conciliation Commission, namely, Ambassador Peter Taksøe-Jensen, Professor Jean-Marc Thouvenin, Judge Albert Hoffmann, and Judge Rüdiger Wolfrum, decided, after consultation with the Parties, to appoint Katrina Cooper as the Chair of the Commission. The PCA is acting as the Registry in the proceedings.

Between **14 to 16 September 2026**, the Commission held its first meeting with the Parties in Singapore, which opened with a procedural session where the Terms of

Appointment were signed and the Rules of Procedure governing the proceedings finalised. The Commission and the Parties are expected to hold further meetings in the coming months.

See [Press Release](#) on appointments and [Press Release](#) on the first meeting.

Indus Waters Western Rivers Arbitration (Pakistan v. India) — Award on the Status of the Indus Waters Treaty and Order on Interim Measures concerning the Ratle Hydro-Electric Plant

On **31 August 2026**, the Court of Arbitration rendered an Award concerning the present status of the Indus Waters Treaty, considering India's decision in April 2025 to hold the treaty “in abeyance” following terror attacks in Pahalgam. The Court considered that this action could be characterised only either as the suspension or as termination of the treaty, and found, unanimously, that the conditions for both claims were lacking. Thus, the treaty remained fully in force, and India must observe its obligations, including with respect to the design and operation of the hydro-electric projects on the Western Rivers.

In an Order of Interim Measures, the Court unanimously imposed measures prohibiting India from concreting the Ratle Hydro-Electric Plant, pending the Neutral Expert's decision on whether its design complies with the treaty. India did not participate in the proceedings.

See [Press Release](#), [Award](#) on the Status of the Indus Waters Treaty in Respect of India's Decision on Abeyance, and [Order on Interim Measures](#).

Institutional updates

PCA publishes Contribution to 2026 Report of United Nations Secretary-General on Oceans and the Law of the Sea

On **8 June 2026**, the PCA published its Contribution to the 2026 Report of the United Nations Secretary-General on Oceans and the Law of the Sea. Among other things, the Report notes that during the reporting period (since June 2025), the following UNCLOS arbitration remains pending under the PCA: *Dispute Concerning the Detention of Ukrainian Naval Vessels and Servicemen (Ukraine v. the Russian Federation)*, PCA Case No. 2019-28.

See [Press Release](#) and [Contribution](#).

PCA publishes 2025 Annual Report

On **22 June 2026**, the PCA published its Annual Report for 2025, notably recording that it administered 251 cases, including 53 newly initiated proceedings during the reporting period.

See [Press Release](#) and [2025 Annual Report](#).

PCA enters into Host Country Agreement with the Kingdom of Spain, the Kingdom of Thailand, and the Slovak Republic

On **7 July, 2 September, and 8 September 2026** respectively, the Kingdom of Spain, the Kingdom of Thailand, and the Slovak Republic each entered into Host Country Agreements with the PCA, that will facilitate the conduct of PCA proceedings within the respective countries.

See [Press Release for Spain](#), [Thailand](#), and [Slovakia](#).

Accession of Somalia to the 1899 and 1907 Hague Conventions

On **20 July 2026**, the Federal Republic of Somalia deposited its instruments of accession to the 1899 and 1907 Hague Conventions for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, the depository of the Conventions. As a result, Somalia became the 129th Contracting Party of the PCA.

See [Press Release](#).

PCA will act as Registry and Appointing Authority under the new UN Administrative Instruction for Consultants and Individual Contractors

On **1 August 2026**, the revised Administrative Instruction of the United Nations for consultants and individual contractors was promulgated, which included in it Annex II the “General Conditions of Contract for the Services of Consultants and Individual Contractors”. The General Conditions include a revised dispute resolution clause providing for arbitration under the UNCITRAL Expedited Arbitration Rules, with the PCA acting as the Registry and the PCA Secretary-General serving as the Appointing Authority.

See [Press Release](#), [Administrative Instruction](#), and [more information](#) on the PCA Secretary General’s role as Appointing Authority.

Expansion of the PCA Buenos Aires Office

On **3 September 2026**, the PCA announced that the Argentine Ministry of Foreign Affairs facilitated the relocation of its Buenos Aires office to new premises within the Palacio San Martín, marking an expansion of its office.

See [Press Release](#).

3. International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea (ITLOS)

Docket

Dispute concerning delimitation of the maritime boundary between Ghana and Togo in the Gulf of Guinea (Ghana/Togo) — formation of Special Chamber

By an Order dated **12 June 2026**, ITLOS formed a Special Chamber to deal with a dispute concerning the delimitation of the maritime boundary between Ghana and Togo in the Gulf of Guinea. This Special Chamber consists of President Heidar (as the Chair), Vice-President Chadha, Judges Caracciolo, Rhee, and Marciniak; and Judges ad hoc Dapo Akande nominated by Ghana, and Makane Moïse Mbengue nominated by Togo, as under their Special Agreement and Notification reached on **3 June 2026**.

The Parties had agreed to transfer the arbitral proceedings instituted by Ghana under Annex VII to UNCLOS, pursuant to Article 15, paragraph 2 of the Statute of ITLOS.

See [Press Release](#), [Order](#), and [Special Agreement and Notification](#).

Dispute concerning delimitation of the maritime boundary between Ghana and Togo in the Gulf of Guinea (Ghana/Togo) — President of the Special Chamber fixes time limits for the filing of the Memorial and Counter-Memorial

By an Order dated **6 July 2026**, the President of the Special Chamber fixed 6 January 2027 and 6 July 2027 respectively as the deadlines for Ghana's Memorial and Togo's Counter-Memorial. Should the Special Chamber find it necessary to authorise the presentation of a Reply and Rejoinder, the deadlines thereof were further fixed as 6 December 2027 and 6 May 2028.

See [Order](#).

Nauru Ocean Resources Inc. and Tonga Offshore Mining Ltd. institute proceedings against the International Seabed Authority and request the prescription of provisional measures

On **5 June 2026**, Nauru Oceans Resources Inc. and Tonga Offshore Mining Ltd. instituted proceedings against the International Seabed Authority, before the Seabed Disputes Chamber of ITLOS. The respective applicants contended that they were in disputes with the Authority regarding the manner in which it was conducting inquiries against them, allegedly requiring “specific attention” for possible non-compliance with its contractual obligations arising out of direct or indirect actions related to activities in the Area.

Established in accordance with Part XI, Section 5 of UNCLOS and Article 14 of the Statute of ITLOS, the Seabed Disputes Chamber comprises Judges Attard (as the President), Jesus, Kulyk, Kittichaisaree, Kolodkin, Lijnzaad, Duan, Brown, Caracciolo, Armas Pfrirter and Joyini. The cases were registered on the General List as Case Nos. 34 and 35 respectively.

See Press Release for [Nauru Ocean Resources Inc.](#) and [Tonga Offshore Mining Ltd.](#)

***Case concerning an inquiry by the International Seabed Authority (Nauru Ocean Resources Inc. v. International Seabed Authority)* (Case No. 34) and *Case concerning an inquiry by the International Seabed Authority (Tonga Offshore Mining Ltd. v. International Seabed Authority)* (Case No. 35) — Orders on Provisional Measures**

On **18 July 2026**, the Seabed Disputes Chamber made Orders on the Requests for the prescription of provisional measures by the Applicants in Cases No. 34 and 35. The Chamber unanimously prescribed the following provisional measures in both Orders pending the final decision, among others: that the Authority shall act in accordance with the relevant legal framework, including due process rules; that the Parties shall not act in a manner that aggravates the dispute; and also provided for certain reporting obligations.

See [Press Release](#) for Case No. 34 and [Order](#) in Case No. 34.

See [Press Release](#) for Case No. 35 and [Order](#) in Case No. 35.

***Case concerning an inquiry by the International Seabed Authority (Nauru Ocean Resources Inc. v. International Seabed Authority)* (Case No. 34) and *Case concerning an inquiry by the International Seabed Authority (Tonga Offshore Mining Ltd. v. International Seabed Authority)* (Case No. 35) — Orders of extension for submitting Defence of the International Seabed Authority**

By an Order dated **4 August 2026**, the President of the Seabed Disputes Chamber in these cases extended the time-limit for the submission of the Defence of the International Seabed Authority to 30 March 2027.

See [Order](#) in Case No. 34 and [Order](#) in Case 35.

Institutional updates

President of ITLOS addressed the thirty-sixth Meeting of States Parties to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea

On **15 June 2026**, President Tomas Heidar addressed the thirty-sixth Meeting of States Parties to UNCLOS, presenting the tribunal's annual report for 2025, and informing delegates about the judicial work, organisational matters, and capacity-building activities of the tribunal in the reporting period.

See [Press Release](#) and [Statement](#).

Election of seven Members of ITLOS

On **18 June 2026**, seven Members of ITLOS were elected at the thirty-sixth Meeting of States Parties to UNCLOS. The Judges were elected for a nine-year term beginning on 1 October 2026.

The States Parties re-elected Judges Kolodkin (Russian Federation) and Lijnzaad (The Netherlands). The States Parties also elected Ms Sylvia Ama Adusu (Ghana), George Rodrigo Bandeira Galindo (Brazil), Mr Slim Laghmani (Tunisia), Ms Lan-Anh Thi Nguyen (Viet Nam) and Mr Bimal N. Patel (India).

See [Press Release](#).

ITLOS announces passing of Judge Alonso Gómez-Robledo Verduzco

ITLOS announced the passing of Judge Alonso Gómez-Robledo Verduzco (Mexico) on 16 July 2026. Judge Gómez-Robledo Verduzco was a member of ITLOS from 2014 to 2023, a member of the PCA, and was a professor of Public International Law at the School of Law. He also served as Legal Counsellor of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Mexico and participated in the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea as a member of the Mexican delegation.

See [Press Release](#).

**New arbitrator appointed in the arbitral proceedings instituted by Ukraine
against the Russian Federation ([PCA Case No. 2019-28](#))**

On **24 July 2026**, President Tomas Heidar appointed Alberto Székely y Sánchez (Mexico) as an arbitrator in *Dispute Concerning the Detention of Ukrainian Naval Vessels and Servicemen (Ukraine v. the Russian Federation)*, PCA Case No. 2019-28. This was following Professor Nguyen Hong Thao's notice of withdrawal as an arbitrator in the proceedings, and Russia's non-appointment of a replacement arbitrator pursuant to Article 3(c) of Annex VII to UNCLOS. Thus, the President of ITLOS appointed a replacement following Ukraine's request to that effect under Article 3, subparagraphs (c), (e), and (f) of Annex VII to UNCLOS.

See [Press Release](#).

ITLOS Fisheries Workshop opens in Malta

Between **18-20 August 2026**, ITLOS organised a Workshop in Malta focusing on the "Sustainable Use of Living Marine Resources and the Role of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea in the Settlement of Fisheries Disputes" at the IMO International Maritime Law Institute. The Workshop was held in collaboration with the Institute and the Food and Agriculture Organization.

See [Press Release](#).

ITLOS Workshop for Legal Advisers in Korea

On 18 September 2026, ITLOS organised the Fifth Workshop for Legal Advisers (sponsored by the Republic of Korea), welcoming 20 participants from the Asian region. The workshop, which was designated for Asian legal advisors, ran between 18-23 September 2026, including presentations by Members of ITLOS and leading academics on topics relevant to ITLOS, UNCLOS, and the BBNJ (Biodiversity Beyond National Jurisdiction) Agreement.

See [Press Release](#).

25th Anniversary of ITLOS

On **25 September 2025**, ITLOS held a commemorative ceremony to mark the 30th anniversary of its establishment. After UNCLOS entered into force on 16 November 1994, Judges of ITLOS had convened for their first ever meeting in Hamburg on 1 October 1996. See [ITLOS News](#), and a [telecast link](#) to the ceremony.

II. ISDS INSTITUTIONS AND TRIBUNALS

1. International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID)

Docket

From **29 May to 20 September 2026**, ICSID added 23 [cases](#) (18 newly registered proceedings and 5 post-award applications in existing cases) to its docket:

- [Jihad Abdul Qader Saleh Quzmar v. United Arab Emirates \(ICSID Case No. ARB/26/24\)](#);
- [Karam Salah Al Din Awni Al Sadeq v. United Arab Emirates \(ICSID Case No. ARB/26/23\)](#);
- [John Wood Group Limited v. Republic of Colombia \(ICSID Case No. ARB/26/25\)](#);
- [Roberto Cuadrado and Luis Fuentealba Meier v. Republic of Ecuador \(ICSID Case No. ARB/26/26\)](#);
- [Jupiter Lithium Ltd and others v. Federal Republic of Nigeria \(ICSID Case No. ARB/26/27\)](#);
- [Vukašin Lale v. Republic of Slovenia \(ICSID Case No. ARB/26/28\)](#);
- [AngloGold Ashanti plc and AngloGold Ashanti UK Colombia Holdings Ltd v. Republic of Colombia \(ICSID Case No. ARB/26/29\)](#);
- [INEOS Limited, INEOS AG and INEOS Europe AG v. Kingdom of Belgium \(ICSID Case No. ARB/26/30\)](#);
- [Galp Energia, SGPS, S.A., Galp Energia Portugal Holdings B.V. and Galp East Africa B.V. v. Republic of Mozambique \(ICSID Case No. ARB/26/31\)](#);
- [Promigas S.A. E.S.P. v. Republic of Peru \(ICSID Case No. ARB/26/32\)](#);
- [Access Business Group LLC v. United Mexican States \(ICSID Case No. ARB/26/33\)](#);
- [Theodoros Adamakopoulos and others v. Republic of Cyprus \(ICSID Case No. ARB/15/49\)](#) — *Application for annulment filed by Cyprus*;
- [Glenfarne Asset Company, LLC and others v. Republic of Colombia \(ICSID Case No. ARB/26/34\)](#);
- [Société de Promotion Hôtelière Moretti S.A.R.L v. People's Democratic Republic of Algeria \(ICSID Case No. ARB/26/35\)](#);
- [Cadence Minerals Plc and REM Mexico Limited v. United Mexican States \(ICSID Case No. ARB/26/36\)](#);

- [Espíritu Santo Holdings, LP and L1bre Holding, LLC v. United Mexican States \(ICSID Case No. ARB/20/13\)](#) — *Application for partial annulment filed by Espíritu Santo Holdings, LP and L1bre Holding, LLC (proceeding suspended pursuant to the parties' agreement)*;
- [Plaza Centers N.V. v. Romania \(ICSID Case No. ARB/22/15\)](#) — *Application for annulment filed by Plaza Centers*;
- [Libyan Foreign Bank v. Burkina Faso \(ICSID Case No. ARB\(AF\)/26/3\)](#);
- [Mondi Investments Limited v. Republic of Poland \(ICSID Case No. ARB\(AF\)/24/1\)](#) — *Request for rectification of the award filed by the Republic of Poland*;
- [Siamgas and Petrochemicals Public Company Limited v. Malaysia \(ICSID Case No. ARB\(AF\)/26/4\)](#);
- [Mikalai Vinitiski v. Republic of Armenia \(ICSID Case No. ARB/26/37\)](#);
- [Petersen Energía S.A.U. and Petersen Energía Inversora S.A.U. v. Argentine Republic \(ICSID Case No. ARB/26/38\)](#); and
- [Veolia Propreté SAS v. Italian Republic \(ICSID Case No. ARB/18/20\)](#) — *Application for annulment of the award filed by the Italian Republic*.

From **29 May to 20 September 2026**, 25 tribunal/ad hoc committee constitution or reconstitution developments were recorded:

- [Travizory Border Security SA v. Republic of Kenya \(ICSID Case No. ARB/25/54\)](#);
- [Igor Viktorovich Makarov v. Canada \(ICSID Case No. ARB/26/6\)](#);
- [Sinolam International Pte Ltd v. Republic of Panama \(ICSID Case No. ARB/26/12\)](#);
- [Rami Levy and others v. Republic of Bulgaria \(ICSID Case No. ARB/18/47\)](#) — *Composition of ad hoc Committee on 10 June 2026*;
- [Axis International Limited v. Republic of Guinea \(ICSID Case No. ARB/26/3\)](#);
- [VC Holding II S.à.r.l. and others v. Italian Republic \(ICSID Case No. ARB/16/39\)](#) — *Composition of ad hoc Committee on 15 June 2026*;
- [EDP Renováveis S.A. v. Republic of Colombia \(ICSID Case No. ARB/25/53\)](#);
- [Bacanora Lithium Limited, Sonora Lithium Ltd., and Ganfeng International Trading \(Shanghai\) Co. Ltd. v. United Mexican States \(ICSID Case No. ARB/24/21\)](#) — *Tribunal reconstituted on 1 July 2026, Stephen L. Drymer appointed following the resignation of arbitrator Donald Donovan*;
- [Estate of Ian Colin Orr-Ewing and others v. United Mexican States \(ICSID Case No. ARB/25/30\)](#);
- [ETA Star International LLC v. Republic of Angola \(ICSID Case No. ARB/25/21\)](#);
- [Tanganyika Gold S.A. v. Republic of Burundi \(ICSID Case No. ARB\(AF\)/26/2\)](#);
- [Optim Holding GmbH v. Ukraine \(ICSID Case No. ARB/25/47\)](#);

- [Ntega Holding Burundi S.A. v. Republic of Burundi \(ICSID Case No. ARB\(AF\)/26/1\)](#);
- [Webuild S.p.A. v. Argentine Republic \(ICSID Case No. ARB/26/7\)](#);
- [Nimba Investment LLC and others v. Republic of Guinea \(ICSID Case No. ARB/25/56\)](#);
- [GR Mining \(Barbados\) Inc. v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela \(ICSID Case No. ARB\(AF\)/25/2\)](#);
- [Koninklijke Ahold Delhaize N.V. and Delhaize 'The Lion' Nederland B.V. v. Republic of Serbia \(ICSID Case No. ARB/26/11\)](#);
- [Basel LLC and Ronald Waldmann v. Georgia \(ICSID Case No. ARB/23/23\)](#) — *Tribunal reconstituted on 6 August 2026, Joongi Kim appointed following the resignation of Mr. Eduardo Zuleta Jaramillo*;
- [Aqip Caspian Sea B.V. and others v. Republic of Kazakhstan \(ICSID Case No. ARB/26/10\)](#);
- [Aria Capital LLC and Publio Administration LLC v. United Mexican States \(ICSID Case No. ARB/25/49\)](#);
- [Ye Cheng and others v. Commonwealth of Australia \(ICSID Case No. ARB/26/18\)](#);
- [Ferrer Internacional S.A. v. Republic of Ecuador \(ICSID Case No. ARB/25/46\)](#);
- [Theodoros Adamakopoulos and others v. Republic of Cyprus \(ICSID Case No. ARB/15/49\)](#) — *Composition of ad hoc Committee on 11 September 2026*;
- [Akfel Commodities Pte. Ltd. and I-Systems Global B.V. v. Republic of Türkiye \(ICSID Case No. ARB/20/36\)](#);
- [Jupiter Lithium Ltd and others v. Federal Republic of Nigeria \(ICSID Case No. ARB/26/27\)](#).

From **29 May to 20 September 2026**, four Awards, one Decision on the Application for Partial Annulment of the Award, one Decision on the Stay of Enforcement of the Award, one Decision on Annulment, and one Decision on Bifurcated Jurisdictional Objections [were published](#) during the reporting period in the following cases:

[*Emergofin B.V. and Velbay Holdings Ltd. v. Ukraine \(ICSID Case No. ARB/16/35\)*](#) — (Award, 1 May 2026)

On **1 May 2026**, an ICSID tribunal (comprising Zachary Douglas KC as the President, with co-arbitrators John Beechey CBE and Sir Michael Wood KCMG KC) issued an Award allocating quantum and costs, ordering Ukraine to pay the claimants \$71 million.

In its previous Decision on Jurisdiction, Admissibility and Liability of 1 July 2021, the tribunal found Ukraine liable for breaches of the Netherlands-Ukraine BIT. In particular, it upheld the “Renationalisation” claim by the claimants, finding Ukraine responsible for a denial of justice and unlawful expropriation under Articles 3(2) and 6 of the BIT.

This arose from the judicial rescission of a share purchase agreement, and the transfer of a 68.01% stake in the Zaporozhye Aluminium Combine. Moreover, the tribunal found breaches of the fair and equitable treatment (FET) standard with reference to their “shareholder interference claim” and the “sanctions claim”.

However, the claimants’ “electricity prices claim”, on which they claimed \$1 billion, failed. The successful claims gave rise to the \$71 million damages. Further, Ukraine was to contribute towards half the arbitration costs and a portion of the claimants’ costs.

See [Award](#).

Rand Investments Ltd. and others v. Republic of Serbia (ICSID Case No. ARB/18/8) — (Decision on the Application for Partial Annulment of the Award, 20 May 2026)

On **20 May 2026**, an ICSID ad hoc Committee (comprising Lawrence Boo as President, with Members Claudia Annacker and Colm Ó hOisín SC) dismissed the partial annulment application in its Decision on the application for partial annulment of the Award.

In the original proceedings, a Canadian national alleged breaches of the Canada-Serbia BIT in connection with investments in a Serbian dairy farm, BD Agro AD. The claimant took issue with Serbia’s seizure of his Beneficially Owned Shares, indirect shareholding in, and certain payments made on behalf of the farm. The tribunal found that only the Beneficially Owned Shares satisfied the *Salini* criteria. Therefore, the indirect shareholding and payments did not qualify as “investments” under Article 25(1) of the ICSID Convention. Thus, the tribunal declined jurisdiction *ratione materiae* over these items.

Seeking partial annulment, the claimant submitted that the tribunal manifestly exceeded its powers by failing to exercise jurisdiction. Recalling the high threshold for annulment, the Committee found the tribunal’s interpretation of “investments” to be at least arguable. The claimant further argued that the tribunal failed to state reasons in its quantification of his assets and liabilities. The Committee disagreed, as the reasoning, even if sometimes concise, was intelligible.

Therefore, the Committee dismissed the partial annulment and ordered the applicant to bear all costs.

See [Decision](#).

Abdallah Andraous v. Kingdom of the Netherlands (ICSID Case No. UNCT/23/3)
— (Award, 20 May 2026)

On **20 May 2026**, an ICSID tribunal (comprising Claudia Solomon as the President, with co-arbitrators Nassib G. Ziadé and José Emilio Nunes Pinto) issued its Final Award, finding it lacked jurisdiction *ratione materiae* because the claimant did not possess an “investment” as defined under the Dutch-Lebanese BIT.

The claimant’s alleged investment consisted of (a) his shareholding in the Ennia Group, one of the largest insurance companies in Curaçao, a constituent country of the Netherlands; and (b) his salary and pension rights from Ennia group. According to claimant, his investment was unlawfully expropriated through a series of depleting actions. However, the tribunal found that the claimant had not held title to the alleged shareholding for years since before the dispute arose. Similarly, his salary and pension rights could not qualify as protected investments, since the aim of the BIT was to promote the flow of capital; not to protect payments due to employees. As such, lacking an “investment”, the tribunal declined jurisdiction.

In arguing that the salary and pension qualified as an “investment”, the claimant also sought to invoke proprietary rights under the European Convention on Human Rights, allegedly incorporated through the Most Favoured Nation protection under Article 3(5) of the BIT. The tribunal found that it could not incorporate external provisions that would significantly alter the definition of “investment” under the BIT.

The tribunal awarded the respondent 60% of its legal costs and 60% of its share of the arbitration fees.

See [Award](#).

Silver Bull Resources, Inc. v. United Mexican States (ICSID Case No. ARB/23/24) — (Award, 29 May 2026)

In its Award of **29 May 2026**, an ICSID tribunal (comprising Ian Glick KC as President, with co-arbitrators Stephen Drymer and Philippe Sands KC) addressed alleged breaches of Section A, Chapter 11 of North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) by Mexico. The tribunal found that certain claims were outside its jurisdiction *ratione temporis* and that others were time-barred under NAFTA.

The request for arbitration was filed by the claimant on 28 June 2023, whereas NAFTA was terminated on 30 June 2020. To institute the proceedings, the claimant relied on Annex 14-C to the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA), titled, “Legacy Investment Claims and Pending Claims”.

The tribunal found that Annex 14-C was procedural in nature. It provided consent to arbitrate claims for breaches that occurred prior to 30 June 2020, rather than extending NAFTA’s scope of application to after this date. Thus, the claimant’s indirect

expropriation claim could not be heard, since the alleged expropriation crystallized after NAFTA's termination on 30 June 2020.

Moreover, under Article 1116, paragraph 2 of NAFTA, investors were time-barred from making claims after three years since they knew or should have known about alleged breach and loss. On the facts, the claimant's other claims were excluded because of this time-bar.

The claimant was ordered to pay 60% of the costs of the arbitration and the respondent's legal fees.

See [Award](#).

IC Power Ltd and Kenon Holdings Ltd v. Republic of Peru (ICSID Case No. ARB/19/19) — (Decision on Annulment, 26 June 2026)

In its decision on annulment of **26 June 2026**, an ICSID ad hoc Committee (comprising José-Miguel Júdece as the President, with Members Carmen Núñez-Lagos and Yannick Radi) dismissed Peru's application for the partial annulment of an award, which included \$110.7 million as compensation, besides costs.

Peru advanced three separate grounds of annulment under Article 52, paragraph 1, subparagraphs (b), (d), and (e) of the ICSID Convention. Alleging a manifest excess of powers, Peru argued that the tribunal failed to properly examine State practice and *opinio juris* in determining whether, under customary international law, there was an obligation not to act in a "seriously arbitrary" manner. Asserting a serious departure from a fundamental rule of procedure, Peru argued the tribunal erroneously excluded expert evidence that Peru had submitted belatedly, and that the tribunal relied on Peru's pleadings from unrelated, extraneous arbitrations. Lastly, alleging a failure to state reasons, Peru argued the tribunal did not clarify why it equated the higher threshold of "egregious" conduct with the lower threshold of "serious" conduct.

All grounds were rejected. The Committee found that the tribunal correctly identified the content of customary international law by referring to judicial practice as a subsidiary means of determining rules of law. The tribunal also had wide discretion as to admissibility of evidence, which Peru failed to submit within the prescribed timeline. Secondly, the tribunal's reference to Peru's external pleadings was not outcome-determinative. Finally, the terms "serious" and "egregious" reflected the same substantive content.

Accordingly, Peru was ordered to bear all costs concerning the proceedings, and to reimburse 50% of the claimant's legal costs.

See [Decision](#).

Webuild S.p.A. (formerly Salini Impregilo S.p.A.) v. Argentine Republic (ICSID Case No. ARB/15/39) — (Decision on the Stay of Enforcement of the Award, 3 July 2026)

On **3 July 2026**, an ICSID ad hoc Committee (comprising Fernando Piérola Castro as President, with Members Alexis Mourre and Carita Wallgren-Lindholm) rejected an application by Argentina for the continuance of the stay on an award. Subsequent to Argentina's application for annulment of the Award in the original proceedings under Article 52 of the ICSID Convention, the ICSID Secretary-General had provisionally stayed enforcement of the award of over \$97.4 million.

In its decision of stay of enforcement of the award, the Committee observed that a stay may only be granted where the applicant demonstrates that circumstances so necessitate under Article 52, paragraph 5 of the Convention. The Committee was not persuaded by Argentina's concerns over the impact of the award over its macroeconomic priorities and of possible prejudice to Argentina's compliance with its International Monetary Fund linked obligations.

Though Argentina submitted that any prejudice to Webuild from the delay of payment could be adjusted through post-award interest, the Committee found that the absence of prejudice to the creditor, did not, by itself, justify continuing the stay. The tribunal, therefore, lifted the provisional stay, and reserved decisions as to costs.

See [Decision](#).

Fernando Paiz Andrade and Anabella Schloesser de León de Paiz v. Republic of Honduras (ICSID Case No. ARB/23/43) — (Decision on the Bifurcated Jurisdictional Objections, 20 July 2026)

In its decision on the bifurcated jurisdictional objections of **20 July 2026**, an ICSID tribunal (comprising Nicolas Angelet as the President, with co-arbitrators Stephen L Drymer and Brigitte Stern) upheld some of Honduras' jurisdictional objections and rejected others. The tribunal ordered the continuation of the proceeding to the merits phase, and by majority, reserved decisions on cost allocation. Arbitrator Stern authored a dissenting opinion on certain findings.

The proceedings were instituted by Guatemalan nationals on the basis of the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA-DR) and the ICSID Convention. The tribunal first rejected Honduras' objection on the non-exhaustion of local remedies. Although Honduras declared this a prerequisite to instituting claims when it ratified the ICSID Convention, the text of Article 10.17 of the CAFTA-DR superseded this declaration, removing the requirement.

The tribunal also dismissed Honduras' view that certain documents did not constitute an "investment agreement", finding that the Power Purchase Agreement (PPA), State Guarantee, and Operations Agreement together constituted an investment agreement.

However, the tribunal found it lacked jurisdiction over claims of breaches of contract, noting that the most-favoured-nation clause of CAFTA-DR could not incorporate umbrella clauses from third-party BITs, these being an “abstract substantive protection”.

Lastly, the tribunal, by majority, partially upheld and partially dismissed Honduras’ objection that the claimants lacked ownership and control of the alleged investment. As per the majority, the shares and assets of the local enterprise, Pacific Solar, which were placed in trust to secure project finance loans, were “investments”. Arbitrator Stern dissented, finding that the alleged rights were merely contingent, speculative, or uncertain, with the claimants having no control over Pacific Solar. The majority, nevertheless, found that the claimants lacked standing to claim reparation on their own behalf, as the right to recover the assets was contingent upon the full repayment of the loans. Arbitrator Brigitte Stern also dissented on this point, given her principal finding on the absence of rights.

See [Decision](#), including the Dissenting Opinion of Arbitrator Brigitte Stern.

Legacy Vulcan, LLC v. United Mexican States (ICSID Case No. ARB/19/1) —
(Award, 27 July 2026)

On **27 July 2026**, an ICSID tribunal (comprising Albert Jan van den Berg as President, with co-arbitrators Sergio Puig and Guido Santiago Tawil) found that Mexico had breached NAFTA by violating the FET standard under Article 1105, ordering compensation of \$15.8 million for Mexico’s shutdown of the quarrying operations of the claimant subsidiary, Calizas Industriales del Carmen, S.A. de C.V. (CALICA). The damages sought by claimant, however, were \$1.7 billion.

The claimant sought cumulative damages for alleged breaches of NAFTA with respect to the shutdown of operations in Le Adelita, El Corchalito, and La Rosita. The tribunal found that it lacked jurisdiction with respect to the claim concerning the shutdown of operations at La Rosita, because on the facts, it was not a “legacy investment” as defined under paragraph 6, subparagraph (a) of Annex 14-C of the USMCA.

Regarding the operations in El Corchalito, the tribunal found that its shutdown was arbitrary, and inconsistent with Article 1105 of NAFTA, forming the basis of the \$15.8 million award. As to Le Adelita, although the tribunal found Mexico’s conduct was arbitrary, the claimant did not prove causation, i.e., that non-arbitrary conduct would have resulted in a permit to quarry the site. Thus, in the absence of causality, no damages were awarded, despite a breach.

Arbitrator Guido Santiago Tawil authored a Dissenting Opinion, opining that the tribunal had jurisdiction over the La Rosita claim; that the tribunal ought to have granted compensation with respect to the Le Adelita claim; and that the tribunal erred in its compensation quantum methodology for the El Corchalito claim.

The tribunal found Mexico's counterclaims concerning alleged environmental harm in the three sites at issue inadmissible, because they were filed after the counter-memorial was already submitted, and without justification for the delay, inconsistently with Rule 40, paragraph 2 of the ICSID Arbitration Rules.

The tribunal, by majority, ordered that the parties would bear the costs in equal shares.

See [Award](#), including the Dissenting Opinion of Arbitrator Guido Santiago Tawil.

Reported awards and decisions

Reported award in [International Mining Company Invest, Inc. v. Kyrgyz Republic \(ICSID Case No. ARB/22/25\)](#) — (Award, 4 June 2026)

It has been reported that on **4 June 2026**, an ICSID tribunal (comprising Juan Fernández-Armesto as Chair, with co-arbitrators Stanimir A Alexandrov and Zachary Douglas KC) issued its Award, finding Kyrgyzstan liable for treating the investor arbitrarily, thus breaching the FET standard under the US-Kyrgyzstan BIT.

The dispute stemmed from Kyrgyzstan's 2019 nationwide prohibition on uranium exploration and extraction, which impacted the claimant's production license for the Kamyschanovskoye uranium deposit. The tribunal rejected Kyrgyzstan's jurisdictional objections and counterclaim. On the merits, it found a breach of the FET standard and awarded the sunk costs and arbitration costs to the claimant, together amounting to 4-7% of the damages it had sought.

With this, Kyrgyzstan faces no further pending ICSID claims, although enforcement actions from previous arbitral awards in Sweden and the US are ongoing.

See [GAR Report](#).

Reported award in [JCDecaux SE v. Czech Republic \(ICSID Case No. ARB/20/33\)](#) — (Award, 5 June 2026)

It has been reported that on **5 June 2026**, an ICSID tribunal (comprising Lord Mance as the Chair, with co-arbitrators Kaj Hobér and Raúl Vinuesa) fully dismissed a \$25.95 million (CZK 550 million) intra-EU BIT claim brought by French advertising firm JCDecaux against the Czech Republic.

The dispute centred on the 2016 termination of a long-term lease for transit advertising space between JCDecaux's Czech subsidiary, RENCAR, and the Prague Public Transit Company (DPP). JCDecaux alleged that local political directives prompted the cancellation, breaching BIT protections against indirect expropriation and unfair treatment.

However, the tribunal determined that DPP's decision was an independent commercial action based on internal audits and legal invalidity assessments, rather than state instruction. Because DPP's conduct was not attributable to the Czech Republic under international law, the tribunal dismissed the claims in their entirety without assessing the BIT merits and ordered JCDecaux to pay approximately CZK 33 million (\$1.55 million) in costs.

See Czech Ministry of Finance [Press Release](#).

**Reported award in [Orange S.A. v. Republic of Iraq \(ICSID Case No. ARB/20/42\)](#)
— (Award, 11 June 2026)**

It has been reported that on **11 June 2026**, an ICSID tribunal (comprising James Hosking as the Chair, with co-arbitrators Horacio Grigera Naón and Claus von Wobeser) rendered its final award dismissing a claims package valued at up to \$950 million brought by French telecommunications operator Orange S.A. against Iraq.

The dispute arose from a 2014 regulatory order annulling Orange's joint-venture stake in Kurdistan-based mobile operator Korek Telecom, culminating in the physical takeover of the shares in 2019. The claimant asserted that the regulatory action was procured through corrupt practices and claimed treaty violations under the France-Iraq BIT, pointing to post-2016 court proceedings as constituting a denial of justice.

However, the tribunal upheld Iraq's objection to its jurisdiction *ratione temporis*, determining that the France-Iraq BIT (which entered into force in 2016) could not retroactively cover a dispute rooted in pre-BIT events. Since the post-BIT measures were inextricably linked to the 2014 regulatory decree, the tribunal dismissed the claims in their entirety.

The claimant was ordered to reimburse Iraq over US\$10 million, covering 90% of Iraq's legal costs.

See [GAR Report](#).

**Reported award in [Suffolk \(Mauritius\) Limited, Mansfield \(Mauritius\) Limited and Silver Point Mauritius v. Portuguese Republic \(ICSID Case No. ARB/22/28\)](#)
— (Award, 12 June 2026)**

It has been reported that on **12 June 2026**, an ICSID tribunal (comprising Jeremy K Sharpe as the Chair, with Stephan Schill and Brigitte Stern as arbitrators) issued a final award dismissing the first-known BIT claim against Portugal. The claimants were Mauritian entities owned by US hedge funds, seeking approximately \$85 million.

The dispute stemmed from the 2014 collapse and resolution of Banco Espírito Santo, where \$835 million in loans were left in the "bad bank" entity prior to liquidation. The

claimants invoked the Mauritius-Portugal BIT, alleging unlawful expropriation and failure to make required “no creditor worse off” payments.

Following a bifurcated proceeding on preliminary objections, the majority upheld Portugal’s jurisdictional objections, affirming that the claimants were non-qualifying investors, had engaged in abusive restructuring, and acquired their positions in violation of domestic law. Arbitrator Schill appended a dissenting opinion.

See [GAR Report](#).

Reported decision in [GMS Ventures and Investment Holdings Co. LLC/Jordan \(Exempt\) and GMS Ventures and Investments Holdings Company — Jordan \(Free Zones\) v. Republic of Iraq \(ICSID Case No. ARB/22/8\)](#) — (Decision on Preliminary Objections and Liability, 24 June 2026)

It has been reported that on **24 June 2026**, an ICSID tribunal (comprising Gabrielle Kaufmann-Kohler as the Chair, with co-arbitrators Michael Nolan and Philippe Sands KC) issued a decision on preliminary objections and liability in a claim brought by Jordanian investor GMS Ventures against Iraq.

The dispute arose from an 18-year contract awarded in 2014 to rehabilitate and manage a pharmaceutical facility in Mosul, which was subsequently seized by ISIS and later destroyed in an air strike. The tribunal found that all claims asserted by GMS’s free-zone entity were inadmissible, while also dismissing the main entity’s claims for expropriation and arbitrary and discriminatory measures. However, the majority sustained the claim for a denial of justice under the Jordan-Iraq BIT, finding that domestic court proceedings regarding the contract cancellation suffered from undue delays and inadequate reasoning.

The tribunal deferred the assessment of damages to a subsequent phase of the proceeding.

See [GAR Report](#).

Reported award in [Ascent Resources Plc and Ascent Slovenia Ltd v. Republic of Slovenia \(ICSID Case No. ARB/22/21\)](#) — (Award, 7 July 2026)

It has been reported that on **7 July 2026**, an ICSID tribunal gave an award dismissing a €598.7 million (approximately \$687 million) claim based on the Energy Charter Treaty (ECT) and brought by UK-based investor Ascent Resources Plc and Ascent Slovenia Ltd against the Republic of Slovenia.

The dispute arose from regulatory measures concerning gas extraction at the Petišovci oil and gas field; specifically, a decision requiring an environmental impact assessment for hydraulic stimulation, and subsequent 2022 amendments to the

Slovenian Mining Act that completely banned fracking. The claimants alleged that these measures constituted unjustified expropriation and breached fair, equitable, and non-discriminatory treatment obligations under Articles 10 and 13 of the ECT.

The tribunal accepted jurisdiction over all of the claims but rejected the claims on the merits, concluding that the measures were not arbitrary or discriminatory and were adopted in the context of legitimate environmental protection objectives. Accordingly, the tribunal denied the claimants' request for compensation.

The claimants were ordered to pay Slovenia €3 million (approximately \$3.4 million) towards legal costs, with the arbitration costs divided equally between the parties.

See Ascent Resources LSE [Report](#) and Slovenia's [Statement](#).

**Reported decision in [*West African Aquaculture Ltd, Kurt Lennart Hansson and Martje Bolt Hansson v. Republic of The Gambia \(ICSID Case No. ARB/18/10\)*](#) —
(Decision on Annulment, 17 July 2026)**

It has been reported that on **17 July 2026**, an ICSID ad hoc committee (comprising Veijo Heiskanen as the President, with Members Erica Stein and Githu Muigai) issued a decision on 17 July 2026 annulling in its entirety a 2024 award that had held The Gambia liable for \$33 million, including accrued interest.

The underlying dispute arose from the June 2015 military seizure of a shrimp farming business operated by the claimants, under instructions from then-President Yahya Jammeh. In a 25 March 2024 majority award, the original tribunal upheld jurisdiction under Article 25(1) of the ICSID Convention and found that The Gambia had unlawfully expropriated the investment. The Gambia applied for annulment, alleging that the tribunal manifestly exceeded its powers and failed to state reasons regarding five outcome-determinative jurisdictional findings on written consent.

The ad hoc committee annulled the award in full under Article 52(1)(e) of the ICSID Convention due to the tribunal's failure to state reasons on jurisdiction, marking the first reported instance of an ICSID award being fully annulled solely on this ground.

The committee also issued a costs order in The Gambia's favour.

See [Daily Jus report](#).

**Reported award in [*Cyrus Capital Partners, L.P. and Contrarian Capital Management, LLC v. United Mexican States \(ICSID Case No. ARB/23/33\)*](#) —
(Award, 30 July 2026)**

It has been reported that on **30 July 2026**, an ICSID tribunal unanimously issued a final award dismissing a \$219 million claim brought under NAFTA by US hedge funds Cyrus Capital Partners and Contrarian Capital Management against Mexico.

The dispute arose from debt bonds issued by Mexican broadcaster TV Azteca, acquired by the claimants through Cayman Islands subsidiaries. The claimants alleged that a domestic court ruling in Mexico City breached NAFTA protections. Mexico raised preliminary objections, arguing the dispute was private and commercial. The tribunal upheld Mexico's jurisdictional objections, finding that the claimants failed to establish status as qualifying investors or demonstrate qualifying investments under NAFTA.

The tribunal dismissed the arbitration in its entirety for lack of jurisdiction and awarded costs to Mexico.

See [Mexico's Statement](#).

Reported award in [*SMM Cerro Verde Netherlands B.V. v. Republic of Peru*](#) (ICSID Case No. ARB/20/14) — (Award, 31 August 2026)

It has been reported that on **31 August 2026**, an ICSID tribunal (comprising Juliet Blanch as the Chair, with co-arbitrators Oscar Garibaldi and Claus von Wobeser) gave a final award, ordering Peru to pay \$141.2 million in damages to SMM Cerro Verde, a subsidiary of Japan's Sumitomo Metal Mining.

The dispute concerned retroactive tax assessments, royalties, interest, and penalties relating to a concentrator plant expansion at the Cerro Verde copper mine. The claimant argued that the project fell within a 1998 stability agreement concluded for an earlier \$237 million mine-expansion project. The claimant, thus, alleged breaches of the stability agreement, the Dutch-Peruvian BIT's umbrella clause and non-impairment provision, and the FET standard.

The tribunal found that Peru breached the BIT's FET standard through its treatment of interest and penalties associated with the assessments, its refusal to reimburse special mining tax overpayments, and its calculation of certain taxes without recognising the stabilised status of Cerro Verde's leaching facilities.

However, the tribunal, by majority, rejected the stability-agreement and umbrella-clause claims concerning the later concentrator project, and found no breach of the BIT's non-impairment provision. Arbitrator Garibaldi dissented on both points, observing that the stability agreement extended to subsequent investments in the same concessions, including the concentrator.

The tribunal awarded the claimant \$7.6 million towards legal costs, and approximately \$547,000 in arbitration costs.

See [GAR Report](#).

Reported decision in [Samvel Karapetyan v. French Republic \(ICSID Case No. ARB/25/26\)](#) — (Decision on the Respondent's objections pursuant to ICSID Arbitration Rule 41(1), 27 August 2026)

It has been reported that on **27 August 2026**, an ICSID tribunal (comprising Gabrielle Kaufmann-Kohler as the President, with co-arbitrators Cavinder Bull SC, and Loretta Malintoppi) issued a decision on preliminary objections raised by France against claims by Russian-Armenian billionaire Samvel Karapetyan.

The dispute arose following a 2022 French Ministry of Justice circular reminding judges and prosecutors of broad powers to seize assets, leading the Paris prosecutor's office to seize Karapetyan's €120 million (approximately \$134 million) French Riviera property amid a criminal investigation into his assets. Karapetyan alleges that the measures were politically motivated and violated due process, including prolonged asset freezes without scheduled appeal hearings.

In its decision, the tribunal dismissed France's preliminary objection against Karapetyan's fair and equitable treatment (FET) claim, allowing that portion of the dispute to proceed.

However, under ICSID Rule 41 (concerning claims that are manifestly without legal merit), the tribunal excluded the expropriation claim, finding that an expropriation of the real estate investment had not yet occurred.

See [GAR Report](#).

Reported decision in [Sauna UK BidCo Limited v. Republic of Finland \(ICSID Case No. ARB/24/38\)](#) — (Decision on a Preliminary Objection, 31 August 2026)

It has been reported that on **31 August 2026**, an ICSID tribunal (comprising Audley Sheppard KC as the President, with co-arbitrators Brian King, and Eduardo Silva Romero) issued a decision rejecting a preliminary denial-of-benefits objection raised by Finland against a treaty claim brought by British entity Sauna UK over its interests in Finnish electricity distributor Caruna.

The dispute follows regulatory changes in 2024 where Finnish regulators lowered revenue caps, leading Caruna to halve its planned investments; and resulting in simultaneous ICSID claims by investors in Caruna.

In its decision, the tribunal rejected Finland's preliminary denial-of-benefits objection during a bifurcated preliminary phase, while joining Finland's remaining preliminary objections to the merits of the case.

The proceeding represents one of the first ICSID claims brought against Finland since its ratification of the ICSID Convention in 1969. See [GAR Report](#).

Reported decision in [Fengzhen Min v. Republic of Korea \(ICSID Case No. ARB/20/26\)](#) — (ad hoc Committee decision on annulment, 11 September 2026)

It has been reported that on **11 September 2026**, an ICSID ad hoc committee (comprising Cavinder Bull SC as the President, with co-arbitrators Mairée Uran Bidegain and David Pawlak) issued a decision rejecting Chinese investor Fengzhen Min's application to annul a 2024 jurisdictional award in South Korea's favour.

The underlying dispute under the China-Korea BIT concerned Min's \$191.5 million claim (reduced from \$1.4 billion) following the forced sale of his shares in real estate vehicle Pi Korea to recover defaulted loans.

In 2024, the original tribunal (comprising Ian Glick KC as the President, with co-arbitrators Stephen L Drymer and Donald McRae) declined jurisdiction, finding that Min lacked a protected investment because the venture was part of an illegal domestic financing scheme; and Min had been convicted for providing benefits to Woori Bank employees in connection with loans.

Dismissing the claimant's annulment application, the Committee awarded South Korea approximately 1.51 billion Korean Won (approximately \$1.14 million) in costs.

See [GAR Report](#).

Reported award in [EP Wind Project \(Rom\) Six Ltd. v. Romania \(ICSID Case No. ARB/20/15\)](#) — (Award, 14 September 2026)

It has been reported that on **14 September 2026**, an ICSID tribunal (comprising Maxi Scherer as the President, with co-arbitrators Charles Poncet and Joe Smouha KC) made an award on quantum, awarding no damages to Cypriot investor EP Wind Project (Rom) Six Ltd., despite finding that Romania breached the ECT.

The dispute concerned regulatory changes between 2013 and 2019 to Romania's green certificate scheme, affecting the Chirnogeni wind farm. In March 2025, the tribunal found Romania breached the ECT regarding three specific measures: deferring secondary certificates, altering certificate eligibility bases, and reducing statutory maximum trading prices; while rejecting claims on six other measures. Because initial expert valuations (\$12.4 million to \$138 million) assumed liability on all claims, the tribunal ordered a separate quantum phase using the discounted cashflow method based solely on the three established breaches.

In the quantum award, the tribunal adopted Romania's counterfactual model and midpoint certificate pricing, concluding EP Wind suffered zero recoverable loss across all probable scenarios.

Given the balanced result, the tribunal ordered each party to bear its own legal costs and split arbitration costs equally.

See [GAR Report](#).

Reported potential cases

Potential new case — Codere América treaty claims against Panama over gaming halls

It was reported on **3 June 2026** that Spanish gaming group Codere had served Panama with a notice of dispute on 9 April 2026 under the 1997 Spain-Panama BIT, triggering the treaty's six-month cooling-off period before arbitration. Codere alleges that Panama failed to adequately protect its gaming investments by allowing its main competitor, Grupo Cirsá, to continue operating slot-machine rooms unlawfully in Panama City and Arraiján.

Despite a Panamanian Supreme Court ruling in 2023 finding amendments to Cirsá's concession illegal and ordering the relocation of 12 of its 20 gaming rooms in the designated area, the Gaming Control Board allegedly continued to permit their operation, causing Codere losses that it attributes to the unlawful and arbitrary operation of competitors' gaming rooms.

See [GAR Report](#) and Grupo Codere [Statement](#).

Potential new case — Swiss investor treaty claims against the Czech Republic over blood-plasma dispute

It was reported on **2 July 2026** that Swiss firm Towit Machinery Trading AG and two Swiss nationals had requested a meeting with the Czech government as a final effort to reach an amicable resolution, while threatening to initiate international arbitration claiming CZK 3.97 billion (\$188 million) under the Czech Republic-Switzerland BIT.

The claim stems from the state's decades-long dispute over the collapse of blood plasma business Diag Human. Towit asserts entitlement to a portion of Diag Human's claims, acquired from Jiří Oršula, Diag Human's former counsel, who had been assigned a 30% interest in the underlying claim.

This follow-on treaty dispute follows a 2022 UNCITRAL BIT award rendered against the Czech Republic in favour of Diag Human and its founder Josef Štáva; originally

valued at \$350 million and now worth around \$750 million, with challenges to the award continuing in the UK courts.

See [GAR Report](#).

Potential new case — Jingye treaty claims against the United Kingdom over British Steel nationalisation

It was reported on **11 June 2026** that Chinese conglomerate Jingye Steel is preparing a potential investment treaty claim against the UK under the China-UK BIT, following the state's nationalisation of its subsidiary British Steel.

The dispute stems from the UK taking British Steel into public ownership on national security grounds under the Steel Industry (Nationalisation) Act, following operational intervention at the Scunthorpe plant. Jingye, which acquired British Steel in 2020, initiated consultations under the BIT last month; triggering the treaty's six-month cooling-off period, and accused the UK of treachery after seeking £1 billion (approximately \$1.31 billion) in compensation, while saying the state had offered virtually no compensation. If initiated, the claim could be submitted to ICSID or UNCITRAL arbitration.

See [GAR Report](#) and [Sky News Report](#).

Potential new case — Veridos treaty claims against Uruguay over unpaid border-control fees

It was reported on **21 August 2026**, that German state-backed joint venture Veridos served a notice of dispute under Uruguay's bilateral investment treaties with Germany and Mexico over \$10.7 million in unpaid border control service fees.

The dispute arises from a 2023 ten-year contract awarded to Veridos to implement and maintain a biometric border control system across 17 maritime and overland crossings. To fund the system, Uruguay issued a January 2024 decree instructing ferry operators to collect a \$2.10 security charge per passenger and transfer it to Veridos. Ferry operators refused to collect the charge and challenged the decree, alleging system malfunctions. Following an administrative opinion recommending annulment of the decree, Veridos gave Uruguay six months to resolve the dispute, claiming the state had failed to ensure the payment mechanism operated as required.

See [GAR Report](#).

Potential new case — MABCO Constructions treaty claims against Albania over termination of Vlora Airport concession

It was reported that on **24 August 2026**, Swiss company Mabco Construction SA, majority-owned by former Kosovar President Behgjet Pacolli served a notice of dispute against Albania under the 1992 Switzerland-Albania BIT, threatening an ICSID claim over a cancelled airport concession.

The dispute concerns Albania's termination of the Vlora airport concession, in which Mabco holds a 98% stake. Mabco alleges it was deprived of control and site access following a disputed attempt to transfer 47% of its shares to minority shareholder 2A. Mabco estimates its project exposure at €320 million (approximately \$374 million), while the concession's business plan projected revenues of around €720 million (approximately \$842 million). An LCIA arbitration seeking declaratory relief against the termination may also be pursued.

See [GAR Report](#).

Potential New Case — Treaty claims against Ukraine over seizure of drinks company IDS Ukraine

It was reported on **7 September 2026** that the heirs of deceased Georgian tycoon Badri Patarkatsishvili, acting through British-linked New World Value Fund Limited, have threatened international legal action against Ukraine following the state's freezing of beverage producer IDS Ukraine.

Ukraine's Asset Recovery and Management Agency froze IDS Ukraine in 2022 over the involvement of sanctioned Russian investors and is currently seeking to appoint an external manager citing concerns over money laundering and potential value extraction. The Patarkatsishvili family, holding a 34% non-sanctioned stake, alleges that its interest should not be taken from non-sanctioned shareholders.

If initiated, this claim would run parallel to an existing ICSID arbitration brought against Ukraine by Fridman-linked CTF Holdings under the Belgium-Luxembourg Economic Union-Ukraine BIT concerning the same asset, as well as Fridman's \$1 billion ICSID claim (*ABH Holdings v. Ukraine*) over the nationalization of Sense Bank.

See [GAR Report](#).

Potential New Case — Green fertiliser company Atome's treaty claim against Paraguay

It was reported on **17 September 2026** that London-listed green fertilizer company Atome PLC served a notice of dispute against Paraguay under the UK-Paraguay BIT, threatening an ICSID claim over its \$665 million Villeta green ammonia project.

The dispute stems from Paraguay President Santiago Peña's June revocation of a decree that had established a fixed power tariff for green hydrogen projects. In particular, the power purchase agreement with state electricity provider ANDE had incorporated US-dollar-denominated fixed tariffs for 145 megawatts of power to supply the facility using hydroelectricity from the Itaipu dam.

Atome alleges that the revocation, which followed reports that some within ANDE considered the tariff too low to cover costs and effectively a subsidy, gave rise to breaches of BIT protections, including provisions on expropriation and most-favoured-nation treatment, with independent damages experts valuing the claim at well into nine figures in USD.

See [GAR Report](#).

Institutional updates

ICSID publishes First Study on Contract-Based Cases, with Statistics and new Model Clauses

On **30 June 2026**, ICSID published a background paper on "Contract-Based ICSID Arbitration". Based on 175 cases, it is the first extensive examination of the practicalities of contract-based investment dispute resolution at ICSID, including an analytical guide for interested stakeholders. According to the study, 16% of ICSID's total caseload comprises contract-based cases.

See [Press Release](#) and [Background Paper](#).

Honduras Ratifies the ICSID Convention

On **17 July 2026**, Honduras deposited its instrument of Ratification of the ICSID Convention with the World Bank, becoming the 159th Contracting State to the Convention. The ICSID Convention entered into force for Honduras with effect from 16 August 2026.

It is noteworthy that Honduras had denounced the ICSID Convention on 24 February 2024, with effect from 25 August 2024. The re-ratification marks Honduras' return to the ICSID Convention.

See [Press Release](#).

ICSID Releases Caseload Statistics for the 2026 Fiscal Year

On **14 August 2026**, ICSID published the latest edition of the “ICSID Caseload — Statistics”, spanning the period from 1 July 2025 to 30 June 2026, where it administered 363 cases, the highest in its history in a given reporting period. ICSID also provided services for 15 cases under non-ICSID rules, 12 of which were under the UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules.

See [Press Release](#) and [Caseload Statistics](#).

ICSID and KCAB Sign Cooperation Agreement to Strengthen International Dispute Resolution

On **19 August 2026**, ICSID and the Korean Commercial Arbitration Board (KCAB) entered into a cooperation agreement towards advancing the use of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms such as arbitration, conciliation, and mediation.

Besides building structures for collaboration on knowledge-sharing and capacity-building, parties to ICSID proceedings may now choose to hold hearings at the KCAB facilities in Seoul, in accordance with Article 63 of the ICSID Convention.

See [Press Release](#).

ICSID Launches Office in Singapore

On **26 August 2026**, the Singapore Office of ICSID was officially inaugurated by Minister for Law and Second Minister for Home Affairs Edwin Tong SC and ICSID Secretary-General Martina Polasek. This followed the signing of a Letter of Intent between the Ministry and ICSID to this effect on 25 August 2025.

Notably, this is ICSID’s first staffed office outside its headquarters in Washington, D.C. The office will be housed at 10 Marina Boulevard, alongside other World Bank Group Organisations.

See [Press Release](#).

SAC and ICSID enter into cooperation agreement

On **4 September 2026**, the Scottish Arbitration Centre (SAC) entered into a cooperation agreement to advance international dispute resolution with ICSID. SAC also offered the use of its facilities in Scotland for ICSID hearings.

See [Press Release](#).

2. Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA)

Reported developments and awards

Windstream Energy LLC (USA) v. The Government of Canada — (Decision on Correction of the Award, 11 June 2026)

On **11 June 2026**, a tribunal (comprising Wendy Miles KC as the President, with co-arbitrators John Gotonda and Rt. Hon. Beverly McLachlin) issued corrections of clerical errors contained in the Award in the aforementioned proceedings, pursuant to Article 38 of the UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules. The corrections implemented were pursuant to the parties' agreement to that effect. This followed from a request thereof from the respondent, although the respondent withdrew some of the corrections originally requested after some objections from the claimant.

See [Correction of the Award](#).

KN Holding LLC and Severgroup LLC v. The French Republic — Amicus Curiae Submissions, Written Phase on Jurisdiction and Merits, and Hearing on Jurisdiction and Merits

On **12 June 2026**, certain procedural developments were reported in the above-mentioned proceedings (comprising Klaus Sachs as the Presiding arbitrator, with co-arbitrators Anne K Hoffman and Brigitte Stern).

The tribunal granted leave to three civil society and indigenous groups to submit amicus curiae filings following a selective application process. Further, the parties concluded their written submissions on jurisdiction and liability alongside expert evidence on French domestic law, while document production disputes regarding privileged materials were addressed in Procedural Orders No 3 and 4.

Most recently, a two-day evidentiary hearing on preliminary objections and liability took place in Singapore on 18-19 May 2026, with the parties now scheduled to submit post-hearing briefs by 31 July 2026 and cost submissions by 15 September 2026.

See [Press Release](#).

Elliott Associates, L.P. (U.S.A.) v. Republic of Korea — Public Hearing Scheduled

On **14 July 2026**, the PCA reported that a public hearing would be held in the aforementioned proceedings (comprising Veijo Heiskanen as the President, with co-

arbitrators Oscar M Garibaldi and Christopher Thomas KC) in Washington D.C. The hearings were held between 28-29 July 2026.

See [Press Release](#) and transcripts for [Day 1](#) and [Day 2](#).

Mr. Mikhail Maratovich Fridman (Russian Federation, Israel) v. The Kingdom of the Netherlands — Newly Public PCA Case

On **26 March 2026**, Russian-Israeli billionaire Mikhail Fridman reportedly initiated an UNCITRAL arbitration administered by the PCA against the Netherlands under the 1989 Netherlands-USSR BIT, alleging that state enforcement of EU sanctions permanently damaged his banking, retail, and telecom investments.

The dispute stems from the implementation of EU sanctions following Russia's 2022 invasion of Ukraine. Fridman claims the measures constitute an arbitrary, discriminatory application of executive discretion that breaches BIT standards regarding expropriation, fair and equitable treatment, and the free transfer of funds, with damages expected to exceed €1 billion.

The tribunal (comprising Dyalá Jiménez as the Chair, with co-arbitrators Vladimir Pavić and Christopher Thomas KC) selected the Dubai International Financial Centre as the seat of arbitration.

The dispute marks Fridman's third BIT proceeding over Western sanctions, alongside parallel claims against Luxembourg and the UK.

See [GAR Report](#).

Reported Award in Liberty Seguros, Compañía de Seguros y Reaseguros S.A. (Spain) v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela (30 July 2026)

On **30 July 2026**, an UNCITRAL tribunal administered by the PCA (comprising Campbell McLachlan KC as the Chair, with co-arbitrators Charles Poncet and Hélène Ruiz Fabri) reportedly ordered Venezuela to pay over \$1.5 billion to a Spanish affiliate of Liberty Mutual Insurance under the Spain-Venezuela BIT, finding that foreign exchange restrictions from 2010 to 2018 breached free-transfer protections and constituted indirect expropriation.

The dispute arose after exchange controls trapped hundreds of millions of dollars in Venezuela, leading to a \$690 million write-down and the eventual \$2 million sale of the business in 2019. The tribunal rejected Venezuela's jurisdictional objections and found that it had failed to guarantee the unrestricted transfer of investment income within three months.

It awarded \$997 million in damages, with the total award valued at \$1.57 billion, plus \$15.5 million in legal fees and €1.2 million (approximately \$1.38 million) in costs.

See [GAR Report](#).

Reported Award in *Mr. Goh Chin Soon (Singapore) v. People's Republic of China* (13 August 2026)

Reportedly, on **13 August 2026**, an UNCITRAL tribunal administered by the PCA (comprising Lucy Reed as the Chair, with co-arbitrators Michael J. Moser and Zachary Douglas KC) rejected claims seeking up to \$20 billion brought by Singaporean investor Goh Chin Soon against China under the China-Singapore BIT but ordered the state to pay \$70 million outstanding under an earlier compensation agreement.

The dispute arose from the claimant's real estate investments in Qingdao's High-tech Industrial Park, including the Qingdao International Beer Festival, where he alleged his assets were expropriated following an unlawful arrest, detention and house arrest in 2004. In 2013, local government entities agreed to pay 1 billion renminbi (approximately \$163 million) in compensation, but halted payments after disbursing half the sum due to third-party partner disputes.

The tribunal held that it had jurisdiction under the BIT to determine the existence of an expropriation but found that the 2013 agreement remained binding and therefore precluded recovery beyond the agreed compensation.

The tribunal awarded the unpaid \$70 million principal plus 3.83% compound annual interest from November 2013, bringing the award's current value to approximately \$113 million, alongside 20% of the claimant's legal costs.

See [GAR Report](#).

Reported Award in *Yves Martine Garnier v. The Dominican Republic*

On **19 August 2026**, an UNCITRAL tribunal (comprising Lord Lawrence Collins as the Chair, with co-arbitrators Hamid Gharavi and Raúl Vinuesa) administered by the PCA reportedly issued an award, dismissing a treaty claim, where French businessman Yves Martine Garnier sought more than \$100 million in damages against the Dominican Republic under the Dominican Republic-France Bilateral Investment Treaty (BIT).

The dispute arose from the municipality of Santo Domingo Este's termination of a solid waste collection and management concession granted to Garnier's company, EGTT Dominicana. Garnier initiated arbitration in 2021, with initial reports indicating damages sought in excess of \$224 million, while the state's later announcement said he sought more than \$100 million.

In its award, the tribunal held that the termination of the concession was valid under Dominican law due to deficiencies in EGTT Dominicana's performance of waste management services. The tribunal further concluded that the alleged conduct did not constitute a breach of the state's obligations under the BIT.

See [GAR Report](#).

(1) María de la Concepción Felipe Velázquez, (2) Daniel Nava Felipe and (3) Maitte Josefina Nava Felipe v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela — (Award, 26 August 2026)

On **26 August 2026**, an UNCITRAL tribunal administered by the PCA (comprising David Unterhalter SC as the Chair, with co-arbitrators Jorge E Viñuales and Judith Gill KC) declined jurisdiction over a \$1.2 billion Spain-Venezuela Bilateral Investment Treaty (BIT) claim against Venezuela brought by Spanish-Venezuelan investors María de la Concepción Felipe Velázquez and her two children.

The third-party funded dispute arose from the 2015 temporary seizure and subsequent transfer to state-owned entities of the claimants' assets in dairy producer Zuly Milk, with the investors seeking \$800 million in damages plus \$400 million in interest.

However, the tribunal by majority held that Spanish-Venezuelan dual nationals do not qualify as protected investors under the BIT. The majority concluded that extending jurisdiction to dual nationals would create conceptual incoherence within the treaty's substantive protections and noted that the BIT's primary recourse to ICSID, which does not permit claims by dual nationals, indicated the contracting parties did not intend their inclusion.

Arbitrator Judith Gill KC dissented, arguing that the language of the BIT encompassed dual nationals, noting that other Venezuelan BITs explicitly excluded dual citizens while this BIT did not.

See [Award](#).

Reported potential cases

Potential new case — Oleg and Irina Nasobin treaty claim against Italy over seized Cellini painting

It was reported on **16 July 2026** that Russian art historian Oleg Nasobin and his wife Irina Nasobin served a notice of dispute against Italy under the 1996 Russia-Italy BIT, following the seizure, alleged physical deterioration, and disputed authenticity of a

painting valued at €107 million (approximately \$120 million), which they claim is a rare 16th-century self-portrait by Florentine artist Benvenuto Cellini.

The dispute arose after Italian authorities seized the artwork in June 2024, refused an export licence for exhibition in France, and initiated criminal charges against Oleg Nasobin for circulating an allegedly altered or inauthentic work. The Nasobins, who transferred ownership of the painting to their Italian company, Cellini Art Fund, allege that state measures, including unlawful detention, night-time searches, procedural violations during criminal investigations, and the alleged mould contamination of the painting while in state custody, constituted indirect expropriation, denial of justice, and breaches of fair and equitable treatment and full protection and security standards.

The notice triggered the BIT's six-month cooling-off period prior to potential ad hoc UNCITRAL arbitration. The claimants intend to seek full compensation, including the market value of the painting, restitution, lost profits, and damages for physical deterioration.

See [GAR Report](#).

Potential new case — ExxonMobil affiliates' ECT claim against the European Union over Net-Zero Industry Act obligations

It was reported on **29 July 2026** that affiliates of US energy major ExxonMobil incorporated in Belgium, Luxembourg, and the UK served a notice of dispute against the European Union under the Energy Charter Treaty (ECT), challenging mandatory carbon dioxide storage quotas under the EU's 2024 Net Zero Industry Act (NZIA).

The dispute arises from NZIA obligations requiring oil and gas producers to contribute to building 50 million tonnes of annual underground CO₂ injection capacity across the EU by 2030, implemented via 2025 regulations that imposed individual annual injection quotas of 330,000 tonnes on ExxonMobil's Dutch subsidiary and 400,000 tonnes on its German subsidiary. ExxonMobil argues that the mandatory targets impose costly obligations, while parallels challenges proceed before the EU courts.

The potential dispute, subject to the ECT's six-month cooling-off period, would join existing ECT proceedings against the EU, including an \$8 billion pipeline claim by Gazprom and a windfall profit levy claim brought by the Klesch Group.

See [GAR Report](#).

III. HUMAN RIGHTS COURTS

1. African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights (AfCHPR)

Decided cases

**05/06/2026 — Judgments in three death penalty cases against Tanzania:
Mandatory imposition of death penalty denies due process, and hanging as a
method of the death penalty negates human dignity**

In *Masudi Said Selemani v. Tanzania*, *Godfrey Gabinus and others v. Tanzania*, and *Chacha Jeremiah Murimi and Others v. Tanzania*, the AfCHPR reiterated its established position (*Ally Rajabu and others v. Tanzania*) that the mandatory imposition of the death penalty violates due process, because it denies the possibility of judicial discretion. As such, it constitutes an arbitrary deprivation of life and a breach of Article 4 of the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (1981) (Charter).

In the present cases, the Court further held that death by hanging as a method of execution encroaches upon human dignity, in light of the prohibition of torture and cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment, violating Article 5 of the Charter.

Across the three cases, Tanzania was ordered to take “all necessary” measures to, “without delay”, remove under its legal system the mandatory imposition of the death penalty, and “hanging” as a method of execution. The Court rejected the respective applicants' requests for release, retrial, or conversion of the sentence to imprisonment, emphasising that it was not sitting on appeal. Rather, the Court ordered a rehearing of the case on sentencing, where judges would exercise discretion on the matter. The Court also ordered Tanzania to submit a compliance status report within six months.

Justices Blaise Tchikaya and Dumisa B. Ntsebeza dissented in all three cases, opining in their respective Declarations that the imposition of the death penalty, in and of itself, violates Articles 4-5 of the Charter, given its inherent cruelty and irreversibility, among other reasons. Therefore, they opined, there is also no humane method for executions, given which the Court ought not to have pinpointedly taken issue with hanging. Justice Rafaâ Ben Achour dissented in *Masudi Said Selemani*, reiterating his position in previous cases that the death penalty inherently “constitutes a fundamental denial of human dignity”.

05/06/2026 — Judgment in Idd Kiture v. United Republic of Tanzania: Tanzania should have provided free legal assistance; no other violations of the Charter

The applicant was incarcerated at Ukonga Central Prison in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, having been convicted and sentenced to 30 years' imprisonment for rape of a minor and an unnatural offence. He alleged violations of his rights during the national proceedings.

The Court rejected Tanzania's objection based on non-exhaustion of local remedies, holding that review of the Court of Appeal's decision was an extraordinary remedy that the applicant was not required to exhaust.

The Court found one violation of the Charter, concerning the applicant's right to legal representation, holding that Tanzania should have provided free legal assistance given the seriousness of the offence and potential 30-year sentence.

The Court found no violation of the right to appeal, noting that the applicant had appealed to Tanzania's highest court. It also found no violation of the right to be tried within a reasonable time, holding that the 48-hour pre-trial detention and six years, five months and one day of proceedings were reasonable, including because the case had been restarted *de novo* before a new judge. The Court found that the failure to record the offence on the charge sheet was a procedural irregularity that did not result in a miscarriage of justice, and that the applicant had not proved a violation of his right to dignity based on alleged police brutality.

24/09/2026 — Applications declared inadmissible

Souleymane Camara v. Republic of Mali: Application inadmissible — non exhaustion of local remedies.

The Court found that, although the applicant asserted that he appealed the Assize Court's judgment, he failed to submit any supporting evidence, such as a copy of the notice of appeal or proof of filing, demonstrating that the remedy had in fact been pursued.

Goore Bi Youzan Jean v. Republic of Côte d'Ivoire: Application inadmissible — non exhaustion of local remedies.

The Court found that the applicant had not pursued a cassation appeal against the Abidjan Court of Appeal's judgment. The Court noted that it has consistently held that, in the Republic of Côte d'Ivoire's judicial system, a cassation appeal is an available, effective and sufficient remedy.

Fea Charles and Others v. the Republic of Côte d'Ivoire: Application inadmissible — non exhaustion of local remedies.

In these two cases against the Republic of Côte d'Ivoire, the Court emphasised that, in accordance with its established jurisprudence, the fact of not being assisted by counsel, or not being aware of the existence of a legal remedy, cannot justify the failure to exercise that remedy, as no one is deemed to be ignorant of the law. It further held that an applicant cannot merely allege that a remedy is ineffective, but must, at the very least, attempt to exercise it.

Mohamed Al Bousifi v. Republic of Niger: Application inadmissible — non exhaustion of local remedies.

The Court found that the applicant failed to establish that he brought proceedings before the Republic of Niger's courts concerning a title to landed property.

24/09/2026 — Judgment in Ibrahim Touré v. the Republic of Mali regarding compulsory health insurance

The applicant argued that mandatory, non-consensual salary deductions for national health insurance had caused him and his family psychological suffering amounting to torture, violating his right to dignity as protected by Article 5 of the African Charter. The Court linked the deduction issue to the right to health under Article 16 of the Charter. It held that mandatory health insurance guaranteed the effective enjoyment of this right by pooling risks, and that the principle of national solidarity takes precedence over individual consent, unless such deductions jeopardise one's ability to meet basic needs. In this case, the Court found that the deduction made from the applicant's salary did not jeopardise his right to a dignified existence. It also found no evidence supporting the claimed psychological suffering and concluded there was no violation of Article 5.

The applicant also argued that the insurance scheme was discriminatory because it applied only to employees rather than all citizens. The Court found that employees are in a legally and economically distinct position from self-employed persons, that the scheme pursued the legitimate aim of guaranteeing healthcare access through objective, technical criteria, and that the modest contribution involved was proportionate. It therefore held that the scheme was not discriminatory.

24/09/2026 — Judgment in Kambeyo Ka-Kaunda & Emmie Chenda Mkandawire v. Republic of Malawi: violations of the of the right to a fair trial

The applicants alleged violations of their right to a fair trial and right to property arising from a protracted land dispute, spanning proceedings before the High Court of Malawi, the Malawi Supreme Court of Appeal (MSCA), and a subsequent review before the MSCA. They complained of the unavailability of legible court decisions, procedural irregularities in the composition of the Review Bench, and delays exceeding a decade. The Republic of Malawi filed no pleadings, and the Court, having found the conditions for a judgment in default satisfied, and taking into account the first applicant's severe illness, decided to expedite the matter and to render the judgment in default.

The Court found that the Republic of Malawi violated the applicants' right to have their case heard, due to its failure to provide legible or signed copies of domestic court decisions despite the applicants' diligent efforts to obtain them. It also found a violation of the right to a fair trial with respect to due process because the MSCA's review hearing was conducted by only two judges, contrary to the Constitution of Malawi and the applicable Practice Directions requiring a larger, uneven-numbered bench. However, the Court found no violation of the right to defence, and no violation of the right to be tried within a reasonable time, given the absence of a complete record substantiating the cause of delays. It also found no violation of the right to property, since the applicants had not established a valid legal entitlement to the land and had been given a fair opportunity to litigate their claim domestically.

The Court held its 82nd ordinary session from 31 August to 25 September 2026 and, on 24 September 2026, delivered the six decisions above. The recording of the decisions' delivery is accessible via the AfCHPR's You Tube Channel.

Docket

06/07/2026 — Brahim Ben Mohamed Belghith v. Republic of Tunisia: request for provisional measures dismissed.

The applicant, a Tunisian lawyer residing in France, challenges Tunisia's withdrawal of its Article 34(6) Declaration, deposited in 2017, which had allowed individuals and eligible NGOs to bring cases directly before the African Court. On 7 March 2025, Tunisia deposited, with the African Union Commission, an instrument withdrawing the said Declaration. The African Court had held (*Ghannouchi and Others v. Tunisia*) that this withdrawal had no bearing on pending cases and new cases filed before 8 March 2026, which is the day on which the withdrawal took effect, being a period of one year after its deposit. This application having been filed on 7 July 2025 is thus not affected by the withdrawal of the Declaration.

The applicant alleges that the withdrawal of the Declaration constitutes a violation of a number of human rights protected by the African Charter, including the right to have one's case heard, the right to participate freely in the public affairs of one's country, and the right to information. After the expiry of the one-year period, he alleges, it will deprive Tunisians of the right to be heard before the African Court, which constitutes irreparable harm, in light of the continuing human rights violations in Tunisia as well as Tunisia's failure to comply with the Court's previous rulings and orders. The applicant alleges that the situation of extreme gravity and urgency justifies the issuance of provisional measures.

The Court found that it could not examine the provisional measures requested without discussing the merits of the main application. As such, granting the measures requested would amount to prejudging the merits of the case. The Court, therefore, dismissed the applicant's request for provisional measures.

06/07/2026 — Saif Eddine Makhlouf v. Republic of Tunisia: request for provisional measures dismissed.

The applicant alleges the violation of his rights during proceedings before the national courts. Acting as a Member of the Assembly of the Representatives of the People and as legal counsel, the applicant went to Tunis-Carthage International Airport to assist a woman who was prevented from travelling. A confrontation with airport staff and security union members led to parallel criminal and military proceedings.

The applicant was convicted by the Tunis District Court and the Permanent Military Court of Tunis in 2022. Following several appeals, the Military Court of Appeal ultimately convicted him of insulting a public official by words and threats, sentencing him to one month's imprisonment and a two-year ban from legal practice. He served eight months in prison. The applicant subsequently fled to Algeria, where he was convicted of unlawful entry and sought asylum under UNHCR (UN High Commissioner for Refugees) protection. Despite preliminary approval by the United Kingdom for family reunification, he was surrendered by Algeria to Tunisia on 18 January 2025.

The applicant asked the Court to return him to UNHCR custody and allow him to depart to his country of asylum to join his family, arguing that his continued detention and resulting loss of liberty, freedom of movement and residence, and professional reputation constitute irreparable harm. The Court dismissed this request for failure to prove irreparable harm and given that it could not be granted without prejudging the merits of the main application.

01/07/2026 — Nourredine Bhiri v. Republic of Tunisia: Tunisia ordered to provide adequate medical care; provisional measures concerning access to justice dismissed.

The applicant is a Tunisian lawyer and politician, former Minister of Justice and head of the parliamentary bloc of the Ennahda Movement. He is serving a ten-year prison sentence for attempting to overthrow the government. He alleges violations of his rights in different criminal proceedings. He faced criminal charges primarily within two distinct proceedings: the first arose from the publication of a social media post, for which he was convicted of committing acts of violence with the intent to overthrow the government; the second concerned issuing, during his tenure as Minister of Justice, Tunisian nationality and travel documents to a Syrian national allegedly classified as a terrorist. He contends in particular that the evidence was misrepresented and that his subsequent complaints against the judicial officers involved have not been properly processed, risking his right of appeal.

The applicant requested provisional measures concerning access to adequate medical care in prison and access to justice. The Court ordered Tunisia to provide adequate medical care, should the applicant not be released, and to ensure his family had appropriate access to information concerning the medical care provided to him. The Court found a plausible risk of irreparable harm to his health—that could not be remedied by the awarding of reparations—given that he is sixty-seven years old and in poor health. Regarding access to justice, the Court found that the alleged harm constituted a hypothetical risk of a general nature, insufficient to establish extreme gravity, urgency and irreparable harm. The requested access to justice measures would prejudice the merits of the case, and the alleged harm could be addressed through other reparation measures if the violations were later established.

2. European Court of Human Rights (ECHR)

Decided cases

23/09/2026 — Request for interim measures rejected for 25 French nationals detained in Iraq

The Court rejected the request for interim measures lodged by 25 French nationals detained in Iraq. The applicants, all adults, left France to join the ranks of the so-called “Islamic State”. They were subsequently detained in various detention centres in north-eastern Syria before being transferred, between 2025 and 2026, to a prison in Baghdad, Iraq, where they are currently being held for trial. They are being prosecuted for offences falling within the jurisdiction of the Iraqi courts.

On 17 September 2026, they lodged a request for interim measures with the Court under Rule 39 of the Rules of Court. They primarily sought their repatriation or the execution of warrants for their arrest or search issued by the French judicial authorities. In the alternative, they asked that the French Government take the requisite steps to ensure that they are not sentenced to death and that they receive a fair trial, in particular by requesting the necessary guarantees from the Iraqi authorities.

The Court rejected the request for interim measures, on the grounds that it fell outside the scope of Article 39 of the Rules of Court because France has no jurisdiction, within the meaning of Article 1 of the Convention, over the applicants.

23/09/2026 — Grand Chamber ruling *Kuijt v. the Netherlands* concerning deliberation practice at Supreme Court of the Netherlands: application inadmissible

The [case](#) concerns Mrs Kuijt's complaint about the practice at the Supreme Court of the Netherlands by which judges of the Criminal Law Division who do not form part of the formation to which a case has been assigned may participate in the deliberations. This is allowed in the interest of ensuring the uniform interpretation and application of the law. Such Supreme Court judges are called "reservisten". A Grand Chamber hearing on the admissibility and merits of the case was held on 21 January 2026.

The Court declared the application inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies as a legal avenue had been available to the applicant at national level to raise her complaint but she had not used it. It would have been important to give the Supreme Court the opportunity to assess and respond to her criticisms of a well-known and long-standing internal practice that was intended to serve the purpose of ensuring the uniform application of the law. The Court underlined that the serious concerns underlying the applicant's complaint would merit careful examination by the Supreme Court. The webcast of the delivery of the Grand Chamber ruling is [available here](#).

8/09/2026 — Judgment *A.A. v. the Netherlands*: No violation of the Convention in refusing residence permits for children born from polygamy in Yemen

The Court [found](#), in particular, that the assessment of the Dutch authorities had struck a fair balance between the interests of the applicant and those of the State. It underlined the close connection between immigration policy and considerations of public order and reiterated that, in establishing an immigration policy taking into consideration family ties, a State cannot be required to give recognition to polygamous marriages which are in conflict with their own legal order.

3/09/2026 — Judgment *A.S. v. Latvia*: no shortcomings in authorities' response to allegations of forced labour and servitude

The case concerned the applicant's allegations that she had been subjected to servitude or, alternatively, to forced or compulsory labour while working on a dairy farm. The operator of the farm was acquitted of charges of human trafficking in 2022. The Court [found](#) that the applicant's complaint had been taken seriously by the national authorities and that there were no significant flaws undermining the proceedings' ability to establish the facts or identify those responsible.

1/09/2026 — Judgment *Brunell and McArdle v. the Netherlands*: Overturning an acquittal without hearing the decisive witness, despite doubts about his credibility, violated fair-trial rights

The case concerned the criminal proceedings against Mr Brunell and Mr McArdle for charges of manslaughter and unlawfully disposing of a body. After first being acquitted of manslaughter, they were convicted on appeal without the Court of Appeal directly hearing the witness who had incriminated them. The ECHR [found](#) that this was incompatible with the principle of immediacy, requiring courts to use original, primary evidence, and undermined the fairness of the proceedings as a whole.

25/08/2026 — Grand Chamber Judgment in *Kavala v. Türkiye (no. 2)*: Türkiye must release Mr Kavala immediately and eliminate the consequences of his conviction

The case concerned Mr Kavala's continued deprivation of liberty since 18 October 2017, following allegations relating to the Gezi Park events and the attempted coup d'état of 15 July 2016. The Court [found](#) several violations of the European Convention, noting the existence of a flagrant denial of justice. The Court also emphasised that the case illustrated a systemic problem marked by the detention and prosecution of political opponents, human-rights defenders and journalists on the basis of criminal offences, the scope of which was interpreted extensively. The case illustrated structural shortcomings which affected the guarantees of independence and impartiality of the judiciary in Türkiye.

16/07/2026 — Judgment *S.T. v. the Czech Republic* concerning the death of a Roma man following the use of the prone position by the police

The case concerned the applicant's complaints about the use of force against her brother, a Roma man who died in 2021 following a police intervention, and the investigation into the actions of the police officers involved. The Court [found](#) that the authorities had failed to protect the life of the applicant's brother and to effectively

investigate the use of force and potential discriminatory motives behind the police intervention.

09/07/2026 — Judgment in *Jesus Pinhal v. Portugal*: No violation of the Convention in case ; need for fair balance between combating crime and right not to be tried twice for the same offence

The case concerned the proceedings initiated against the applicant, who had been a member and Vice-Chairman of the Banco Comercial Português bank, by the Lisbon public prosecutor's office, the Securities Market Commission and the Portuguese central bank, for various criminal and administrative offences. The ECHR [found](#) that there was a connection in substance and in time between the three sets of proceedings in question; however, they had formed part of an integrated system intended to punish various distinct aspects of the impugned acts of reporting false information. They had therefore not amounted to duplication of proceedings.

07/07/2026 — Judgment *Grande Oriente d'Italia v. Italy*: Lack of sufficient safeguards in respect of a search and seizure measure ordered by Parliamentary Commission of Inquiry on combating the Mafia

The applicant, Grande Oriente d'Italia, a Masonic association founded in 1805 with a large number of members, coordinates the activities of numerous lodges throughout Italy. The case concerned a search—ordered by a parliamentary commission of inquiry investigating the infiltration of mafia-type criminal organisations into Masonic lodges—of the applicant's premises, and the subsequent seizure of numerous paper and digital documents; in particular, lists containing the names and personal data of more than six thousand individuals. Having pointed out the discretion enjoyed by the States in the area of parliamentary autonomy, the Court [found](#), however, that the interference with the applicant association's right to respect for its home had not been accompanied by sufficient safeguards against abuse and arbitrariness.

07/07/2026 — Judgment *Al Nashiri v. Lithuania*: Human rights violations against Lithuania for its involvement in CIA secret detention programme

The case concerned a Saudi Arabian national of Yemeni descent who is currently detained in Guantánamo Bay. He is facing capital charges before a United States military commission on suspicion of, among other things, the bombing of the US Navy ship USS Cole in 2000. He was captured during the so-called "War on Terror" launched by President Bush in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks.

The Court found that Mr Al-Nashiri had been held for more than five months at a secret CIA facility in Lithuania. The Lithuanian authorities had facilitated his transfer despite a real risk of a flagrant denial of justice and the death penalty in the USA. He was also held in incommunicado detention and solitary confinement and denied contact with his family. Given this, the Court [found](#) several violations of the European Convention. The Court indicated that the Lithuanian Government should seek assurances from the US authorities that Mr Al-Nashiri would not be subjected to the death penalty.

2/07/2026 — Judgment in two cases concerning the refusal by the Polish authorities to recognise a legal parent child relationship established abroad

In both cases, same sex couples living in the United Kingdom in civil partnerships asked to have their respective child's birth certificate registered in Poland. The Polish authorities refused in both cases, referring to public policy grounds. One of the children had acquired Polish citizenship at birth while in the other case, the child had a British mother whose partner was Polish. The European Court [found](#) that the refusal of authorities to recognise a legal parent-child relationship established abroad failed to take account of the child's best interests. The other complaints were declared inadmissible or did not breach Convention.

2/07/2026 — Judgment *Ubeda and Others v. Italy*: Authorities' inadequate response to allegations of domestic violence

The case concerned a mother's complaint to the Italian police alleging domestic violence by the father of her children and former cohabitant. She and her children were placed in a shelter, where they remained for over three years. The Court [found](#) that the investigation was neither prompt nor effective, that sexist and stereotyped remarks had further victimised the mother, and that the authorities' prolonged placement of the applicants in a shelter and inaction on custody issues breached the European Convention.

23/06/2026 — Judgment of *Taleski and Others v. North Macedonia* concerning the annulment of presidential pardons

The case concerned a legislative intervention, the 2016 Pardon Act, which permitted the annulment of presidential pardons that had been granted to the applicants six weeks earlier and which, at the time, had been considered to be final and irrevocable. As a consequence, the pardons were annulled and the applicants, who were public officials, were prosecuted for abuse of official position and authority and various electoral offences.

The case also concerned the fairness of those criminal proceedings. The Court [found](#) that the annulment of presidential pardons was justified. The Court held that the need to hold public officials to account and prevent them from being placed above the law outweighed the need to safeguard legal certainty. The gravity of the situation and ensuing political crisis justified exceptional legislation targeting a small group of individuals who would otherwise have benefited from unlawful pardons, with the aim of restoring the rule of law.

23/06/2026 — Judgment *Ottlakán v. Hungary*: compensation remedy for cramped conditions of detention was not effective

The case concerned the applicant's inability to access compensation awarded for cramped conditions of detention, in *Domján proceedings*—a remedy introduced in 2017 to address inadequate conditions of detention in Hungary. Under the 2021 Execution of Punishments Act, such compensation is set aside in a holding account (administered by the prison) until the prisoner's release. The Court [found](#) that, given the absence of a genuine prospect of release, making payment conditional on the applicant's release breached the principle of promptness required for an effective remedy under the European Convention.

11/06/2026 — Judgment *Christian Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses v. Italy*: inability to enter into an agreement with the State amounted to discrimination

The applicant was a duly registered religious association of Jehovah's Witnesses in Italy. It had been unable to enter into an agreement with the Italian State on the basis of a provision of the Italian Constitution. The Court [found](#) that this inability, resulting in the association's exclusion from the funding system for religious denominations, amounted to discrimination. The Court found that the Italian Government had provided no arguments showing that the grounds they had relied on—i.e., the applicant association's position on blood transfusions, blood donation and not voting in elections—breached the domestic legal order and justified the difference in treatment.

Docket

Forthcoming delivery of advisory opinion in response to a request from the Supreme court of Ukraine

The Court will deliver an advisory opinion at a public hearing on Tuesday 29 September 2026. The request concerns proceedings pending before the Supreme

Court of Ukraine concerning a challenge by a company to a tax fine. The delivery will be broadcast live on the European Court's [YouTube](#) channel.

22 September 2026 — Hearing in *Ukrainian Helsinki Human Rights Union on behalf of ten Ukrainian children v. Russia*

The case concerns ten Ukrainian children who were living in childcare institutions in Crimea in 2014 when Russia asserted jurisdiction over the peninsula. According to the association acting on their behalf, Russian nationality was imposed on the children, and they were put up for adoption and may have been adopted.

The webcast of the [hearing](#) is available [here](#).

***Miladze v. Georgia* referred to the Grand Chamber**

On **21 September 2026**, the Court has [accepted the](#) referral to the Grand Chamber of the case *Miladze v. Georgia*. The case concerns the applicant's administrative conviction for a video he had posted on TikTok criticising the new transport policies in Tbilisi and alleging misconduct by public officials. The video had gone viral. I

n its Chamber judgment of 19 May 2026, the Court had unanimously found that there had been no violation of Article 10 (freedom of expression) of the European Convention. The case was referred to the Grand Chamber at Mr Miladze's request.

Within three months of delivery of a Chamber judgment, the parties may request the referral of the case to the Grand Chamber. A panel of judges decides whether or not the case should be referred to the Grand Chamber for fresh examination (Rule 25 of the Rules of Court).

On 3 September 2026, an [update](#) on the Court's processing of applications against Russia was released

Since 16 September 2022, the European Court of Human Rights has dealt with a substantial number of pending cases against the Russian Federation after it ceased to be a party to the European Convention on Human Rights. These fall into two main categories:

conflict-related cases, concerning Russia's military action against neighbouring States (Georgia and Ukraine), its exercise of control over territories outside its internationally recognised borders and measures affecting the human rights of persons in those areas. The Court dealt with three inter-State cases against Russia in 2024-2025 and approximately 5,700 individual applications are currently pending before the Court.

The Court indicated that the examination of these conflict-related cases continues to be a priority for the Court and that the Court's Registry has set up a Conflicts Unit to ensure that they can be processed speedily and efficiently.

—*individual cases concerning matters arising within Russia*, including the treatment of political opposition figures and democratic activists, repressive legislation, restrictions on freedom of expression and online speech, conditions of detention, immigration, freedom of movement and of assembly and personal-data protection. Sixty cases of marked importance, covering over 600 applications, have been decided by the Court.

In *Lebedeva and Others v. Russia*, the Court unanimously decided to strike out 879 applications as they concerned issues that had already been sufficiently addressed, while emphasising that this did not release Russia from its international responsibility for serious violations of the European Convention. The decision is final; however, the Court retains the power to restore an application to its list if it considers that the circumstances justify doing so.

NOTIFICATIONS

Notification of a case is a stage in the Court's proceedings when a Government is informed that an application against it is pending and that the Court is requesting more information.

10/07/2026 — Notification to the French Government of case brought by Nicolas Sarkozy

The case concerns the use of transcripts of conversations between Nicolas Sarkozy and his lawyer, recorded while their telephones were being tapped in the “telephone tapping case”.

6/07/2026 — Notification to the Russian Government of Yahidne village case concerning Ukrainian civilians held by Russian troops in school basement

The case concerns 111 Ukrainian civilians who were captured and held in a school basement by Russian soldiers during the full-scale invasion of Ukraine in March 2022. The applicants in the case allege that the school was in effect a military base, that they were used as human shields, and that they were kept in cramped and inhuman and degrading conditions for almost a month, resulting in the deaths of eleven people.

29/05/2026 — [Notification](#) to Italian Government of two cases brought by alleged victims of former Libyan chief of police

The applications concern the Italian authorities' alleged failure to enforce an International Criminal Court arrest warrant against Osama Elmasry Njeem, former chief of the Libyan paramilitary police, who is accused of crimes against humanity. Mr Njeem was arrested in Italy in January 2025 but was repatriated to Libya shortly afterwards. The applicants in the case, nationals of South Sudan and the Ivory Coast, allege that they were victims of torture and ill-treatment when detained in prisons under Mr Njeem's control.

PROVISIONAL LIST OF FORTHCOMING HEARINGS

2 December 2026

Grand Chamber hearing — [Ahmad v. Denmark and Makki v. Denmark](#)

These cases concern the seclusion of patients detained in psychiatric hospitals.

16 December 2026

Grand Chamber hearing — [Macagnino and Marzo v. Italy and Cavallotti and Others v. Italy](#)

The cases concern confiscations of assets, known as “preventive confiscations” in Italian law, which are measures taken in respect of individuals who, on account of their behaviour and lifestyle and on the basis of factual evidence, may be regarded as habitually living, even in part, on the proceeds of crime (on grounds of “ordinary dangerousness”), and in respect of individuals suspected, inter alia, of membership of a mafia-type organisation (on grounds of “special dangerousness”).

Institutional updates

A Court for All

On **3 July 2026**, the Court launched its “A Court for All project”, which will enable anyone interested to visit the Human Rights Building on the first Friday afternoon of every month, starting in September 2026. More [here](#).

On **4 September 2026**, the Court welcomed some 90 visitors, who discovered the Human Rights Building and learned more about the Court's history, its functioning, and the role it plays in protecting human rights across Europe. More [here](#).

Meeting with representatives with United Nations Treaty bodies

On **30 June 2026**, the Court held a meeting with representatives of United Nations human rights treaty bodies. Judges and representatives exchanged views on human rights issues and jurisprudential developments, including possible avenues for closer engagement and greater coherence in human rights protection. More [here](#).

Meeting between Government Agents and Registrars

On **29 June 2026**, the Court hosted a meeting between the Registrars and the Government Agents aimed at further advancing institutional dialogue and cooperation. The President of the Court, Mattias Guyomar, focused his opening remarks on third party interventions. The Registrar of the Court, Marialena Tsirli, provided a brief overview of the Court's activity over the past six months. More [here](#).

In the context of the European Court of Human Rights, a Government Agent is the person appointed by a Contracting State to represent that State in proceedings before the Court. Under Rule 35 of the [Rules of Court](#), "the Contracting Parties shall be represented by Agents, who may have the assistance of advocates or advisers."

Handbook on European law relating to asylum, borders and immigration

In June 2026, the Court, the Council of Europe, and the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA), published an updated handbook on European law relating to asylum, borders and immigration. The handbook reflects key legal developments since the 2020 edition and provides clear, accessible guidance on EU law and the European Convention on Human Rights, alongside other Council of Europe standards. Taking into account major changes across the European legal landscape since 2020, the handbook incorporates important case-law from the European Court of Human Rights and the Court of Justice of the EU. More [here](#).

3. Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACtHR)

Decided cases

Judgment — [Rojas Riera et al. v. Venezuela](#): Venezuela is responsible for the violations committed against Jorge Rojas Riera and ordered the closing of “El Helicoide”

On **10 June 2026**, the IACtHR notified its judgment of 23 April 2026 (Series C No. 592). In *Rojas Riera et al. v. Venezuela*, the IACtHR declared Venezuela internationally responsible for violations committed against Jorge Rojas Riera, who was unlawfully detained by agents of the intelligence services in September 2003 while participating in and providing logistical support for a peaceful demonstration. The Court found that his detention restricted his right to peaceful assembly, freedom of thought and expression, and political participation, and violated his right to personal liberty.

The Court further found that Mr. Rojas Riera was subjected to acts of torture while detained at “El Helicoide” detention facility, including beatings, threats of sexual violence, humiliations, firearms being pointed at him, and mock executions. Venezuela also failed to investigate those acts of torture. The Court found violations affecting his mother, including the suffering she endured and the impact on the life project of both the victim and his mother.

The Court ordered Venezuela to close the “El Helicoide” detention facility, finding that its continued operation is incompatible with the guarantees established in the American Convention. It noted that detention in a facility administered by an intelligence agency, combined with a lack of transparency and effective judicial oversight, creates an aggravated risk to personal integrity and judicial guarantees and, in this case, facilitated the torture and other violations suffered by Mr. Rojas Riera. The Court also ordered Venezuela to investigate and prosecute those responsible, adopt measures to prevent torture and ill-treatment, establish a registry of complaints concerning “El Helicoide”, and provide various forms of reparation.

See [Press Release](#).

Judgment — [Bravo Garvich et al. \(Dismissed Employees of the National Ports Company S.A.\) v. Peru](#): Peru is responsible for the lack of an effective judicial response to the dismissal of three workers of the National Ports Company

On **15 July 2026**, the IACtHR notified its judgment of 21 April 2026 (Series C No. 590). The Court declared Peru internationally responsible for violating the rights to judicial guarantees, judicial protection, work and personal integrity of three former ENAPU (the National Ports Company) workers, following their dismissal in February 1996.

The Court found that the domestic judicial bodies did not substantively examine their claims concerning the compatibility of the rules underlying their dismissals with the Constitution and the American Convention, and instead validated the State's actions based on the formal application of domestic law. It also noted that the proceedings before the Constitutional Court took place in a context in which its independence and impartiality had been impaired following the removal of three of its justices in 1997.

Although the three workers were subsequently included in the National Registry of Irregularly Dismissed Workers, reinstated by ENAPU between 2003 and 2004, and had their social security contributions regularised retroactively, they did not receive compensation for the wages lost between their dismissal and reinstatement. The Court therefore found that the measures adopted did not fully remedy the consequences of the violation and that Peru was responsible for violating their right to work.

The Court also found that the prolonged effects of the lack of judicial protection affected the victims' personal integrity and life project, including their career development, studies, family and housing plans, and ability to support dependents, as well as causing prolonged psychological and emotional harm.

It ordered Peru to provide various forms of reparation, including compensation for lost wages and non-pecuniary damages, psychological and/or psychiatric treatment, and legal costs and expenses.

See [Press Release](#).

Judgment — [Puracal et al. v. Nicaragua](#): Nicaragua is responsible for the arbitrary detention, cruel, inhumane and degrading treatment and illegal deportation of Jason Puracal

On **13 August 2026**, the IACtHR notified its judgment of 21 April 2026 (Series C No. 591). The Court declared Nicaragua internationally responsible for the illegal and arbitrary detention of Jason Zachary Puracal, an American citizen, and for the cruel, inhumane and degrading treatment he endured during more than 21 months of imprisonment. The Court also found violations of his rights to health, water and sanitation, as well as judicial guarantees, the presumption of innocence, honour and dignity, consular assistance and judicial protection.

Mr. Puracal was detained in 2010 during a drug trafficking investigation after police entered and searched his home and office without a valid judicial search warrant. His detention was automatically ordered under domestic law because of the nature of the charges. He was held in several prisons, including "El Chipote" and "La Modelo", in overcrowded conditions, with limited access to drinking water and inadequate medical attention. The Court also found violations arising from the illegal entry and search of his home at night in the presence of his three-year-old son, and from the way he was publicly exhibited during his detention.

The Court further found that his detention and subsequent illegal deportation to the United States affected his wife, children, sisters and mother, and had an impact on his life project, his wife, his eldest son and one of his sisters.

As reparations, the Court ordered Nicaragua, among other measures, to adapt its domestic law on automatic preventive detention to make it compatible with the American Convention and to take measures to ensure that conditions in the “La Modelo” and “El Chipote” prisons comply with international human rights law.

See [Press Release](#).

Order on monitoring compliance with judgment: Ecuador has complied with the judgment in the case of *Gattas Sahih*

On **19 August 2026**, the IACtHR announced that, by its resolution of 2 July 2026, it had found Ecuador to have complied with the judgment and ordered the case closed. In *Gattas Sahih v. Ecuador*, the Court had declared Ecuador internationally responsible for violating the right to information on consular assistance of Elías Gattas Sahih, a Lebanese citizen detained in December 2001 during a deportation procedure. The Court found that he was not informed of his right to consular assistance at the time of his detention or while deprived of liberty, preventing him from having effective access to consular legal assistance at the appropriate procedural moment.

The Court did not find Ecuador responsible for the other alleged violations. As Mr. Gattas Sahih had passed away before the case was presented to the Court, the sole reparation ordered was payment of the amount established in the judgment for reimbursement of costs and expenses to his representatives.

In its order of 2 July 2026, the Court confirmed that Ecuador had fully complied with the sole reparation ordered and therefore decided to conclude and archive the case.

See [Press Release](#).

Judgment — [Case of López de Belva et. al v. Argentina](#): Argentina is responsible for the violation of judicial guarantees in the criminal proceedings against two lawyers

On **21 August 2026**, the IACtHR notified its judgment of 15 May 2026 (Series C No. 596). The Court declared Argentina internationally responsible for violating the right to be heard by an impartial judge or tribunal, to be tried within a reasonable time, and to interrogate witnesses of Carlos Alberto López de Belva and Arturo Jorge Podestá, in criminal proceedings against them between 1991 and 2006.

The Court found that statements made by the first-instance judge constituted unjustified prejudgment and that the proceedings lasted more than eleven years, with

unjustified periods of inactivity. It also found that the applicants were denied the right to interrogate a witness during a hearing.

The Court did not find Argentina responsible for the other alleged due-process violations. As reparation, it ordered Argentina to publish and disseminate the judgment, pay compensation for non-pecuniary damage, costs and expenses, and reimburse the Court's Legal Assistance Fund for Victims.

See [Press Release](#) (Spanish).

Docket

Precautionary measures & Cases referred to the IACtHR

[The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR) investigates human rights violations and issues merits reports with recommendations. It is composed of seven independent members who serve in a personal capacity. If violations are found by the Commission and not resolved, it can refer cases to the Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACtHR). The Court delivers binding judgments on States that have accepted its jurisdiction.]

From **29 May to 24 September 2026**, the IACHR granted precautionary measures and referred to the IACtHR [the following cases](#):

- [13.159— IACHR refers 14 Indigenous Q'eqchi' Communities and others v. Guatemala concerning ancestral lands](#);
- [13.550—IACHR submits to IA Court case concerning Guatemala about failure to provide collective land titles for Maya Achi communities](#);
- [70/2026— IACHR grants precautionary measures to E.J.F.C. and her daughters C.M.F. and M.M.F. in Nicaragua: risk to life and personal integrity; one daughter reportedly missing](#);
- [13/113— IACHR submits case to IA Court over access to justice in legal action regarding pensions in Venezuela concerning retired teachers formerly employed by the Ministry of Education and Sports of Venezuela](#);
- [71/2026— IACHR grants precautionary measures to Claudia Magaly Munguía Mayorga in Nicaragua: no official information about detainee's whereabouts and reported medical conditions requiring treatment](#);
- [73/2026— IACHR grants precautionary measures to ten Nicaraguan persons in Costa Rica: risks to life and personal integrity allegedly connected to threats and transnational repression](#);
- [74/2026— IACHR grants precautionary measures to Panter Rodríguez Baró: risks to detainee's life, personal integrity and health, alleged mistreatment and inadequate medical care in Cuba](#);
- [93/26—IACHR grants precautionary measures to Pablo Sánchez, disappeared in Mexico](#);

- [95/26—IACHR takes to Inter-American Court case concerning Peru about non-payment of back wages in the judiciary;](#)
- [96/26—IACHR files case with IA Court concerning the murder of campesino leaders and a journalist in Colombia;](#)
- [99/26—IACHR takes to Inter-American Court case concerning Ecuador about a pregnant woman and her daughter;](#)
- [102/26—IACHR grants precautionary measures in favour of Beyker Ferreti Hernández, who is deprived of liberty in Nicaragua;](#)
- [109/26—IACHR submits case against Venezuela to IA Court over restrictions on freedom of expression and access to justice;](#)
- [110/26—IACHR submits case against Peru to IA Court over failure to recognize gender identity;](#)
- [112/26—IACHR grants precautionary measures in favour of Daniel Enrique Echenagucia, who is deprived of liberty in Venezuela;](#)
- [113/26—IACHR grants precautionary measures to Manuel Antonio Sánchez and Rosalba Pereira Ramírez in Venezuela;](#)
- [527/26—IACHR grants precautionary measures to five people deprived of their freedom in Venezuela;](#)
- [12/664—IACHR refers case to the Inter-American Court concerning violations in parental authority proceedings in Suriname;](#)
- [114/26—IACHR grants precautionary measures in favour of Ricardo José Mendoza Yrigoyen in Nicaragua;](#)
- [138/26—IACHR files case with IA Court over the forced disappearance of Andy Williams Garcés Suárez in Peru;](#)
- [140/26—IACHR takes to Inter-American Court case concerning Guatemala about enforced disappearance and extrajudicial killing of Caxaj Rodríguez brothers;](#)
- [141/26—IACHR files case with IA Court over the torture and death of Juan Carlos Aliaga Mera in Peru;](#)
- [143/26—IACHR takes to Inter-American Court case concerning El Salvador about the arbitrary dismissal of a Supreme Court magistrate;](#)
- [144/26—IACHR files case with IA Court over the extrajudicial execution of Victor Emmanuel Torres Leyva in Mexico;](#)
- [146/26—IACHR grants precautionary measures to Indigenous boy E.G.G.F. in Colombia;](#)
- [147/26—IACHR takes to Inter-American Court case concerning Ecuador about torture of adolescent by Navy officers;](#)
- [148/26—IACHR grants precautionary measures to Ángel Jesús Véliz and Yasmany Porra, who are deprived of their freedom in Cuba;](#)
- [149/26—IACHR grants precautionary measures in favour of Elmer Concepción Romero Yanes in El Salvador;](#)

- [153/26—IACHR takes to Inter-American Court case concerning Peru about injuries caused to an individual by police officers and lack of access to justice;](#)
- [154/26—IACHR files case with IA Court over arbitrary detention and torture of Navy lieutenant Gustavo Carrero in Venezuela;](#)
- [155/26—IACHR takes to Inter-American Court case concerning Guatemala about disappearances and torture of students during armed conflict;](#)
- [157/26—IACHR takes to Inter-American Court case concerning Colombia about murder of presidential candidate Carlos Pizarro Leongómez;](#)
- [158/26—IACHR grants precautionary measures to Rosa Morales Rincón in Colombia;](#)
- [159/26—IACHR grants precautionary measures in favour of Rodrigo Antonio López Estrada and Jesús Antonio Pacheco Oviedo in Colombia;](#)
- [161/26—IACHR grants precautionary measures in favour of three individuals who are deprived of liberty in Venezuela;](#)
- [164/26—IACHR submits case to IA Court over the lack of judicial review of the dismissal of a public employee during Argentina's dictatorship;](#)
- [165/26—IACHR takes to Inter-American Court case concerning Argentina about child custody and allegations of sexual abuse of a child;](#)
- [167/26—IACHR grants precautionary measures to Santos Ariel Rodríguez Lagos in Nicaragua;](#)
- [168/26—IACHR grants precautionary measures in favour of Isaías Castro Ruiz in Nicaragua;](#)
- [169/26—IACHR submits case to IA Court over due process violations in international return proceedings in Paraguay;](#)
- [170/26—IACHR grants precautionary measures in favour of court bailiff Daysi Amelia Castillo Álvarez in Nicaragua;](#)
- [173/26—IACHR takes to Inter-American Court case concerning Venezuela about arrest, torture, and extrajudicial killing of opposition leader;](#)
- [182/26—IACHR grants precautionary measures to five people deprived of their freedom in Venezuela;](#)
- [183/26—IACHR grants precautionary measures in favour of Brittany Holberg on death row in the United States;](#)
- [184/26—IACHR takes to Inter-American Court case concerning Guatemala about failure to provide collective land titles for Maya Achi communities; and](#)
- [185/26—IACHR submits case to IA Court over access to justice in legal action regarding pensions in Venezuela.](#)

IACtHR Sessions

-On 25 June 2026, the IACtHR held its **191st Regular Session** See — [Press Release](#).

-On 10 July 2026, the IACtHR held its **192nd Regular Session** — See [Press Release](#).

-On 2 September 2026, the IACtHR held its **193rd Regular Session** — See [Press Release](#) (Spanish).

Institutional updates

The IACtHR announces call for applications for the Internship and Professional Visits Program for the first two periods of 2027 — See [Press Release](#).

Inter-American Commission on Human Rights

- 04/06/2026 — The IACHR calls on States to protect Indigenous women, girls, and adolescents from forced displacement — See [Press Release](#).
- 19/06/2026 — The IACHR stresses fundamental right to seek and be granted asylum — See [Press Release](#).
- 01/07/2026 — The IACHR calls on States to guarantee the rights of LGBTI individuals to freedom of expression and participation in public life — See [Press Release](#).
- 31/07/2026 — The IACHR recalls Inter-American Standards on the Territorial Rights of Women of African Descent — See [Press Release](#).
- 28/08/2026 — The IACHR urges States to step up efforts to identify disappeared persons — See [Press Release](#).
- 18/09/2026 — The IACHR urges the United States to refrain from applying the death penalty set for 30 September 2026 against Christa Pike, beneficiary of precautionary measures — IACHR Resolution No. of 11 December 2020 — See [Press Release](#).

Between 3-7 August, the Commission held its 196th Period of Sessions: [webpage](#). The 197th Period of Sessions will be held from 26 October to 6 November 2026 ([webpage](#)). The IACHR announced Ex Officio Hearing and Dialogue with Civil Society for the 197th Period of Sessions in Panama ([press release](#)).

Publication of Friendly Settlement in case concerning girl suffering from “butterfly skin” disease

On **17 July 2026**, the IACHR published a friendly settlement agreement on timely access to medical care in Colombia. The case concerned Jessica Liliana Ramírez Gaviria, a girl with dystrophic epidermolysis bullosa, a disease also known as “butterfly skin.” The applicants alleged that Colombia failed to provide Jessica with timely access

to essential treatments, medicines, and supplies. They alleged that these circumstances, compounded by administrative barriers and the absence of effective remedies to safeguard her rights, had amounted to institutional violence through neglect and caused serious harm to her health.

The parties signed a friendly settlement agreement in which Colombia recognised its international responsibility for violating Jessica Liliana Ramírez Gaviria's rights to life, personal integrity, judicial guarantees, the rights of children and adolescents, judicial protection, and health, as well as the right to personal integrity of her family members.

Colombia undertook comprehensive reparations, including a public acknowledgment of responsibility, a commemorative mural, a specialised rehabilitation plan for rare diseases, and financial compensation. It also committed to strengthening care for rare diseases through national guidelines, specialised health centres, policy reviews, technical assistance, and awareness campaigns.

See [Press Release](#).

IV. OTHER INSTITUTIONS

1. International Organization for Mediation (IOMed)

Iran, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Libya sign the Convention on the IOMed

On **22 June, 14 July, 25 July, and 10 September 2026** respectively, Iran, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Libya signed the Convention on the IOMed.

See Press Releases for [Iran](#), [Kazakhstan](#), [Kyrgyzstan](#), and [Libya](#).

Sierra Leone accedes to the Convention on the IOMed

On **25 July 2026**, it was reported that Sierra Leone deposited its Instrument of Accession to the Convention on the IOMed on 25 June 2026, thus officially becoming a Contracting State of the IOMed as of 25 July 2026.

See [Press Release](#).

2. UNCITRAL Working Group III: Investor-State Dispute Settlement Reform

UNCITRAL Working Group III held its [10th intersessional meeting](#) from **7 to 9 September 2026** in Ninh Binh, Viet Nam. The intersessional meeting focused on the topics of the standing mechanisms, i.e., the permanent tribunal and the permanent appellate tribunal, and the assessment of damages and compensation. The [meeting outcomes](#) will contribute to the final stages of its ongoing work on ISDS reform.

UNCITRAL Working Group III is programmed to hold its 55th session from **12 to 16 October 2026** in Vienna.

According to its [provisional agenda](#), at its fifty-fifth session, the Working Group is expected to continue its deliberations on (i) remaining draft provisions 10, 11 *bis*, and 12-22 on procedural and cross-cutting issues as contained in document [A/CN.9/WG.III/WP.267](#); and (ii) the draft guidelines on the calculation of damages and compensation in document [A/CN.9/WG.III/WP.255](#).

3. Multilateral International Investment Tribunal

On **25 August 2026**, Singapore Law Minister Edwin Tong announced that Singapore would be putting forward its bid to host the proposed Multilateral Investment Tribunal (MIT) that is being considered at UNCITRAL Working Group III, as a part of investor-State dispute settlement (ISDS) reforms. The proposal for the MIT stems from inconsistencies across ISDS proceedings; issues of independence, impartiality, and diversity of arbitrators; and concerns about inefficiency and costs in ISDS processes.

The announcement, which was made during Singapore Convention Week, was accompanied by a Law Ministry update, stating that Singapore would be prepared to enable an assistance fund for developing and least developed countries to access the MIT's functions. If the bid were successful, the MIT would become part of the existing system of ISDS institutions in Singapore, including branches of the PCA and ICSID.

See [The Straits Times](#) report and [Singapore Ministry of Law](#) announcement.

4. Special Tribunal for the Crime of Aggression against Ukraine & Claims Commission for Ukraine

Special Tribunal for the Crime of Aggression against Ukraine

[Information and updates on the Special Tribunal for the Crime of Aggression against Ukraine are available on the Council of Europe's dedicated webpage: <https://www.coe.int/en/web/special-tribunal-ukraine/frequently-asked-questions>.]

On **18 June 2026**, the European Council welcomed the EU's ratification of the Claims Commission Convention and progress on the Special Tribunal and called for sustained efforts to operationalise both bodies within the Council of Europe framework.

See [European Council Press Release](#).

On **3 July 2026**, the Netherlands reaffirmed its willingness to host the Special Tribunal not only during the preparatory phase but also during its operational phase.

See [Delegation of the European Union to the Council of Europe](#).

On **13 July 2026**, the EU reported that work was continuing towards swift entry into force of the Enlarged Partial Agreement (EPA) governing the Tribunal's Management Committee and highlighted the Netherlands' hosting offer. Separately, an EU-Ukraine statement called for continued efforts to operationalise both the Tribunal and Claims Commission.

[Delegation of the European Union to the Council of Europe](#).

On **1 September 2026**, at the Bled Strategic Forum, Council of Europe Secretary General Alain Berset again identified the future Claims Commission and Special Tribunal as core accountability mechanisms necessary for a durable peace in Ukraine.

See [Council of Europe Press Release](#).

International Claims Commission for Ukraine

[For further information and updates on the Register of Damage for Ukraine, please refer to its official webpage: <https://www.rd4u.coe.int/en/>.]

On **5 June 2026**, the Register of Damage's Conference of Participants met in Strasbourg, reviewed progress and elected a new Bureau. The Register is the first

component of the compensation mechanism on which the future Claims Commission will build.

See [Council of Europe Press Release](#).

On **15 June 2026**, Albania signed the Convention Establishing an International Claims Commission for Ukraine, further expanding participation in the treaty.

See [Council of Europe News](#).

From **22 to 23 June 2026**, the Commission's Preparatory Committee held its first meeting in The Hague. Representatives of 39 states plus the EU participated, with 12 additional states as observers. It elected its Chair/Vice-Chair, adopted rules of procedure and a work programme, and began work on draft rules and procedures for the Commission.

See [Council of Europe Press Release](#).

On **23 June 2026**, Sweden ratified the Convention Establishing an International Claims Commission for Ukraine.

See [Council of Europe News](#).

On **7 July 2026**, Lithuania ratified the Convention Establishing an International Claims Commission for Ukraine.

See [Council of Europe News](#).

During **August 2026**, the Register of Damage progressively opened further categories including Ukrainian state public expenditures, damage to property of legal entities and of the State of Ukraine, loss of gainful employment and business property in occupied territories.

See Council of Europe Press Release on [Claims Categories B4 and B5](#), [damaged or destroyed immovable property](#), [category of claims A3.4](#), and [C3.2](#).

On **21 August 2026**, the Council of Europe updated that the Convention Establishing an International Claims Commission for Ukraine had 40 signatories (39 states+ EU) and had been ratified by seven states plus the EU. It still required 25 ratifications plus sufficient financial commitments to enter into force. On the Special Tribunal, 36 states

plus the EU had expressed their intention to join its Enlarged Partial Agreement, while the EU-funded advance team was continuing preparatory work.

See [Council of Europe Press Release](#).

On **4 September 2026**, the Register of Damage opened further claims categories aimed at protecting and preserving Ukraine's cultural heritage for damage, destruction or loss of objects or buildings of cultural value.

See [Council of Europe Press Release](#).

On **15 September 2026**, the Netherlands, the anticipated future host country of the Commission (in The Hague), formally ratified the Convention Establishing an International Claims Commission for Ukraine.

See [Council of Europe Press Release](#).

* * * * *