



Lawyering TTIP

Issue 5

April 2019



ALMA MATER STUDIORUM
UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA
DIPARTIMENTO DI SCIENZE GIURIDICHE
CENTRO INTERNAZIONALE DI RICERCHE SUL DIRITTO EUROPEO

KING'S
College
LONDON

UNIVERSITÉ DE
RENNES 1



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



Contents

1. Welcome Message by LAWTTIP coordinator

2. Past Activities

- **III LAWTTIP Joint Conference**
- **2019 UNIBO TTIPills Lectures Series**
- **2019 KCL TTIPills Lectures Series**
- **II LAWTTIP IODE Roundtable**

3. Future Activities

- **2nd LAWTTIP Young Researchers Workshop**
- **LAWTTIP Final Expert Meeting**

4. Major developments in the EU Common Commercial Policy

- **AG Bot on the Investment Court System set in CETA**
- **The Commission publishes its Annual Report on EU trade defence**
- **The EU moves forward efforts at UNCITRAL on multilateral reform of ISDS**
- **Discontinuing steps on the opening of trade negotiations between the EU and the US**
- **EU-Japan Economic Partnership Agreement enters into force**

5. Relevant publications

- **New publications (January - April 2019)**

6. News

- **Summer Course on WTO and EU Trade Law**
- **ESIL Workshop: “Challenges to the Governance of the Global Economy: Dispute Settlement in the WTO and in International Investment Law”**

1. Welcome Message by LAWTTIP coordinator

Dear reader,

Welcome to the fifth issue of the Jean Monnet Network LAWTTIP Newsletter. Published twice a year, this Newsletter aims to present the research and training activities carried out by the LAWTTIP Network members, as well as their planned future events.

The Newsletter also includes insights and comments on major legal and judicial developments in the field of the EU Common Commercial Policy, as well as a selection of relevant publications and events promoted by other institutions.

Warm Regards,

Federico Casolari

2. Past Activities

III LAWTTIP Joint Conference

London,
21-22 March 2018

The **Centre of European Law** of King's College London, in collaboration with the International Research Centre on European Law (CIRDE) of the University of Bologna and IODE - Institut de l'Ouest: Droit et Europe of the University of Rennes 1, hosted the **III LAWTTIP Joint Conference** on “**EU Law, Trade Agreements, and Dispute Resolution Mechanisms: Contemporary Challenges**”. It mainly focused on the rule of law and its relationship with the principle of autonomy of EU law as well as the way it is upheld by the other international courts and tribunals. Moreover, the underlying theme of the conference will be dialogue among international and regional institutions as a tool to overcome fragmentation and implement the rule of law in the international economic relations of the EU. Among the others, on the first day, the Network had the pleasure to have the President of the ECJ, **Koen Lenaerts**, giving his Keynote Speech on the interaction among mutual trust, principle of autonomy of EU law and rule of law in the perspective of the ECJ. He retraced the ECJ's jurisprudence with regard to the application of



the rule of law by underlining its strict connection with the principle of mutual trust among Member States.

The second day was dedicated to the **dialogue among international and regional institutions** as a tool to overcome fragmentation and implement the rule of law in the international economic relations of the EU. In particular, it was examined the role of the ECJ in EU external relations, and also explore, on a comparative basis, dispute resolution systems in international trade law, including multilateral and bilateral treaties. The conference closed on 22 March with a short **intra-EU moot** to give a practical twist to the conference, allowing attendees to get a flavour of the difficulties investment tribunals are facing when dealing with intra-EU issues in the Brexit scenario.

The executive summary and the recordings of the Conference will be soon published within the LAWTTIP webpage.

2019 UNIBO TTIPills Lectures Series

Bologna,
11 March – 15 April 2019

Under the coordination of Prof. Federico Casolari – academic responsible of the LAWTTIP Network – the **International Research Centre on European Law (CIRDE)** of the University of Bologna hosted a series of TTIPills Lectures on “**The constitutional dimension of the EU external action: recent trends and future perspectives**”. The first lesson, delivered by Prof. Paul James Cardwell (University of Strathclyde Glasgow), focused on the implications of **Brexit** on the external relations of the EU. The second lecture



was given by Prof. Christophe Hillion (Universities of Oslo and Leiden) who talked on the integration of the **EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy** into the Community method. In the third lecture, Prof. Peter Van Elsuwege (University of Ghent) dealt with the conclusion of **association agreements** with third countries under Article 217 TFEU. The fourth lecture was delivered by Prof. Panos Koutrakos (City University London) who focused on the **principle of autonomy** of EU law in external relations. The fifth lecture, on the **role of the European Union** within

the international context, was given by Prof. Ramses A. Wessel (University of Twente). Finally, Prof. Isabelle Bosse-Platière talked on the **requirement of consistency of EU external action**. Such a series of lectures was the occasion to discuss on the constitutional dimension of the EU external action in order to increase public awareness on the major trends and future perspectives in this field.

2019 KCL TTIPills Lectures Series

London,
25 February – 20 March 2019

On 25 February 2019, the KCL organised a [talk](#) on “**Brexit Reflections: where do we stand?**” given by **Ian Forrester QC**, Judge at the General Court of the European Union. In the chair Professor Anand Menon, Director of The UK in a Changing Europe and Professor of European Politics and Foreign Affairs, King's College London. Moreover, as part of the TTIPills on the issues of investments, the KCL hosted a [lecture](#) on “**The Treatment of Sovereign Investors in International Investment Agreements**”, given by **Dini Sejko**, Researcher at the Institute for Emerging Market Studies of the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology.

II LAWTTIP IODE Roundtable

Rennes,
25 April 2019

The IODE - Institut de l'Ouest: Droit et Europe of the University of Rennes 1 hosted the II LAWTTIP IODE Roundtable on “Les accords de libre-échange de l'Union européenne, quels enjeux pour l'agriculture?”. The [discussion](#) focused on the **impact for the agricultural sector of the EU's new generation of FTAs**. Speakers included not only outstanding academics such as Daniel Gadbinu (Professor Emeritus of the University of Rennes 1), but also representatives of institutions, including André Sergent (President of the Chambre D'Agriculture de Bretagne) and Lionel Mesnildre (European Commission, DG Agriculture).

3. Future Activities

2nd LAWTTIP Young Researchers Workshop

Rennes,
4-7 June 2019

In the framework of the LAWTTIP Jean Monnet Network, the **Institut de l'Ouest: Droit et Europe (IODE) of the University of Rennes 1**, in collaboration with the Centre of European Law of King's College London and the International Research Centre on European Law of the University of Bologna, is hosting the [III LAWTTIP Young Researchers Workshop](#) in Rennes from **4th to 7th of June 2019**. The Workshop will take place at Rennes' Faculty of Law and Political Science.

This four-day workshop will consist of a training school aiming to help young researchers and doctoral students to write and published a paper. The event will start with an opening lecture

and close with a concluding lecture, given by distinguished scholars. **Two main lines of research** could be followed to this end. The first one would be twofold. It should, on the one hand, serve to identify the **legal means** by which the EU NGFTAs are articulated with other legal instruments of international law. It should, on the other hand, consider whether the NGFTAs are actually relevant instruments for the promotion of the rule of law in the international legal order. The second line of research should be much more inward looking. In other words, it should be directed to the analysis of the internal – constitutional, institutional and substantial – effects of the **implementation** of EU NGFTAs on the EU legal order. Again, this line of research would be twofold. It could, firstly, be focused on the effectiveness of the external action’s consistency requirement with the internal policies of the Union, at least with their external aspects, as prescribed by Art. 21(3) TFEU. This could include the study of the impact of EU NGFTAs on fundamental principles of the EU legal order, such as for instance the equality of treatment / non-discrimination principle. Secondly, it might also serve as a good opportunity to review the autonomy concern that they create in light of the Opinion 1/17 procedure. The programme will be soon available on the LAWTTIP website.

LAWTTIP Final Expert Meeting

Brussels,
July 2019

The **Final Expert Meeting** of the LAWTTIP Network will gather together key staff members of the three partners, Members of the European Parliament and of the European Commission as well as stakeholders and representatives of the civil society. It will be the occasion to summarise the main scientific and practical results of the network and to identify future challenges for the negotiation and implementation of the free trade agreements concluded by the European Union.

Further information will be soon published in the LAWTTIP website.

4. Major developments in the EU Common Commercial Policy

AG Bot on the Investment Court System set in CETA

On 29 January 2019, **Advocate General Bot** delivered his [Opinion](#) on the compatibility of the mechanism for the settlement of disputes between investors and States provided for by the free trade agreement between the EU and Canada with EU law.

The AG’s opinion sparks from the request for an **opinion (C-1/17)** of the European Court of Justice pursuant to Article 218(11) TFEU filed by Belgium on 7 September 2017 regarding the compatibility with EU law of the Investment Court System (“ICS”) provided for by the [Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement between the EU and Canada](#) (“CETA”). Specifically, Belgium expressed reservations as regards to the effects of that mechanism on

the **autonomy of EU law**, the general principle of equal treatment, the requirement that EU law is effective, and the right of access to an independent and impartial tribunal. In the opinion of AG Bot, “autonomy” of the EU legal order **cannot be understood as autarchy**. Indeed, the creation of a common set of rules and standards to regulate the EU relations with third countries calls for the creation of an independent system of protection for investors, both in the EU and on the territory of the Union’s trade partners. This conclusion is also supported by the absence of direct effect of CETA, which excludes that national courts may enforce the safeguards included therein. The AG also draws a comparison – and underlines



the differences – between the ICS and the system of investment arbitration, found incompatible by the ECJ in the **Achmea judgement** (C-284/16): whilst the Court in *Achmea* was safeguarding the essential principles of mutual trust and loyal cooperation which govern the relationship between the Member States, the ICS does not impinge in such principles. AG Bot further observes that the ICS would not be able to interpret and apply EU law, it would be unable to order the annulment of EU law measures considered in violation of CETA, and it would be

prohibited from ruling on the division of powers between the EU and its Member States. Thus, **its structure and functioning safeguard the autonomy of EU law**. Of particular relevance is the observation that the law applicable by the ICS consists of the provisions of CETA, applied in the light of international law. On those instances where the ICS would be requested to apply EU law, it would be bound by the decisions of the ECJ.

The AG also concludes that **the ICS does not undermine either the application of EU law or the role of national courts to start preliminary references procedures**: on the one hand, its jurisdiction does not limit the substantive rights enjoyed by investors in the EU; on the other, the role of national courts “to hear and determine actions brought with a view to ensuring the observance of such rights as are afforded by internal EU law” remains untouched.

Finally, for AG Bot, the ICS affords **investors with the right of access to an independent and impartial tribunal** as provided under Article 47 of the European Charter of Fundamental Rights. Not only the ICS is only an alternative method of dispute resolution relating to the application of the free trade agreement – which complements the remedies offered by the contracting parties – but also it includes procedural safeguards essential to ensuring the right of access to an independent and impartial tribunal, such as the remuneration of the judges, the rules for their appointment and possible removal, and the specific rules on ethics applicable to them.

The Commission publishes its Annual Report on EU trade defence

On 28 April 2019 the Commission released its [annual report on trade defence](#). Trade defence instruments (anti-dumping, anti-subsidy, safeguards) are particularly important for EU trade, as they shield European industry from the harmful effects of dumped or subsidized imports. The Commission has put in place in the last few years a new defence policy, based on the **principles of transparency, engagement with third countries, and effectiveness**.

The reports highlights that at the end of 2018 the EU had 93 definitive anti-dumping measures and 12 countervailing measures in force. The total number of trade defence instrument measures in force in other countries affecting EU exports, amounted instead to 174 in 2018 (as compared to 162 in 2017). According to the report, this trend is expected to continue over the next years. As for the investigative work of the Commission of situations regarding the need of adoption of trade defence measures, that remained at a high level, reaching nearly that of 2017. The work consisted mainly of new investigations under new sets of trade defence investigation rules, as well as of a still significant number of reviews. At the end of 2018, 45 investigations were ongoing, as well as six refund investigations covering 99 refund requests. According to the report, trade defence measures kept busy also the judicial organs of the EU; the General Court and the Court of Justice rendered 26 judgments in the area, while 15 new cases – against the 20 for 2017 – were filed.

The EU moves forward efforts at UNCITRAL on multilateral reform of ISDS

After the adoption of the negotiating directives for the multilateral investment court (MIC) by the Council in March 2018, the EU is continuing to negotiate the establishment of the court at the multilateral level. On 22 March 2019, the EU Commission held a meeting with stakeholders on the reform of investor-State dispute settlement (ISDS). Furthermore, on 18 January 2019, the Commission submitted to the in UNCITRAL Working Group III two proposals that have been discussed at the beginning of April.

The [first EU paper](#) sets out the EU's proposal of establishing a **permanent multilateral investment court** with an appeal mechanism and full-time adjudicators. The EU views this as the only reform option that can effectively respond to all the concerns identified in this UN process as it would enhance the predictability and consistency of decisions and ensure their correctness, eliminate the ethical concerns of the current system, and effectively address the problems of excessive costs and duration. The [second paper](#) makes proposals for an **effective work plan** so that the Working Group develops concrete solutions and text proposals to be adopted by the UNCITRAL Commission and ultimately the UN General Assembly. The EU papers are a contribution to a multilateral discussion on ISDS reform with broad and inclusive participation of all countries and stakeholders.



The report of the 37th Session held from 1 to 5 April 2019 in New York is available on the [UNCITRAL website](#).

Discontinuing steps on the opening of trade negotiations between the EU and the US

On 18 January 2019, the **European Commission** adopted two negotiating **directives** for its trade talks with the United States: one on conformity assessment and one on the elimination of tariffs for industrial goods. The negotiating directives submitted by the Commission to the Council are aimed at implementing the 25 July Joint Statement and cover two potential agreements with the US. The first one should be strictly focused on the removal



of tariffs on industrial goods, excluding agricultural products, while the second agreement would help address the objective of removing non-tariff barriers, by making it easier for companies to prove their products meet technical requirements on both sides of the Atlantic.

Following the European Commission proposals, the **International Trade Committee**, in a report adopted by 21 votes to 17 and one abstention, voted in favour of a resolution calling for new talks between the EU and the US to start. The MEPs nevertheless noted that the conclusion of a trade agreement based on the current negotiating mandate can only be successful under specific **conditions**. In particular, they urged that the US lift tariffs on aluminium and steel; a comprehensive

consultation process with civil society and a sustainability impact assessment are carried out; the EU insists on including cars and car tariffs in the talks, and on excluding agriculture; more clarity on how rules of origin (which lock in how much of the value of a product must be created locally for trade preferences) are handled during the talks.

On 14 March 2019, the European Parliament **rejected the draft resolution** recommending the opening of EU-US trade talks by 223 votes against 198, with 37 abstentions. In its resolution, the Parliament pointed out that the mentioned negotiations shall not start before the US complies with some of the conditions indicated in the resolution of the international trade committee. Albeit the Parliament resolution is not binding to the process, it carries significant political importance and seeks to influence the mandate. It is now up to EU countries to approve the negotiating mandates.

EU-Japan Economic Partnership Agreement enters into force

On 1 February 2019, the Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA) between the EU and Japan entered into force. The EPA, which represents the outcome of longstanding negotiations started in 2013, addresses several aspects of the commercial relations between Japan and the EU, by for instance: removing customs duties – tariffs on more than 90% of the EU's exports to Japan; safeguarding the geographical indications of numerous EU exports; reducing many non-tariff measures thus facilitating the access of EU companies to the highly regulated Japanese markets, such as the automotive sector; opening the services

sectors; removing a number of access barriers to the market of public procurements in Japan. The deal also includes a comprehensive chapter on trade and sustainable development and sets the highest standards of labour, safety, environmental and consumer protection.

On the same day, a large part of another agreement – the **Strategic Partnership Agreement** between the European Union and Japan – also started apply on a provisional basis. This Agreement, which was signed in July of last year together with the EPA, is the first-ever bilateral framework agreement between the EU and Japan and strengthens the overall partnership by providing an overarching framework for enhanced political and sectoral cooperation and joint actions on issues of common interest, including on regional and global challenges. The Agreement will enter into force once it has been ratified by all EU Member States. On the parallel issue of **investment protection**, negotiations with Japan continue on standards and investment protection dispute resolution to reach convergence in the investment protection negotiations as soon as possible, in light of their shared commitment to a stable and secure investment environment in Europe and Japan.

5. Relevant publications

New publications (January - April 2019)

Monographs, collective works and book chapters

Stegmann P. T., *Responsibility of the EU and the Member States under EU International Investment Protection Agreements. Between Traditional Rules, Proceduralisation and Federalisation*, Springer, 2019.

Journal articles

Acconci P. “L’inclusione del “right to regulate” negli accordi internazionali in materia di investimenti. Considerazioni in margine alla posizione dell’Unione europea”, in *Studi sull’Integrazione Europea*, Vol. 14, Issue 1, 2019, pp. 89-106.

Calamita M. R., “Il nuovo "doppio binario" della politica commerciale dell’Unione europea”, in *Diritto Pubblico e Comparato Europeo*, Vol. 20, Issue 4, 2018, pp. 855-874.

Contartese C., Andenas M., “Court of Justice EU autonomy and investor-state dispute settlement under *inter se* agreements between EU Member States: *Achmea*”, in *Common Market Law Review*, Vol. 56, Issue 1, 2019, pp. 157–191.

Goetz-Charlier A., “Mediating Investor-State Disputes in Free Trade Agreements: An Evaluation of the EU’s Proposal”, in *European Foreign Affairs Review*, Vol. 24, Issue 1, 2019, pp. 81-100.

Harrison J., Barbu M., Campling L., Richardson B., Smith A., “Governing Labour Standards through Free Trade Agreements: Limits of the European Union’s Trade and Sustainable Development Chapters”, in *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol.57, Issue 2, 2019, pp. 260-277.

Kikarea E., “Brexit and Preferential Trade Agreements: Issues of Termination and Survival Clauses”, in *Legal Issues of Economic Integration*, Vol. 46, Issue 1, 2019, pp. 53–75.

Koutrakos P., “The Autonomy of EU law and International Investment Arbitration”, in *Nordic Journal of International Law*, Vol. 88, Issue 1, 2019, pp. 41-64.

Melillo M., “Informal Dispute Resolution in Preferential Trade Agreements”, in *Journal of World Trade*, Vol.53, Issue 1, 2019, pp. 95–127.

Pohl J., “Intra-EU Investment Arbitration after the Achmea Case: Legal Autonomy Bounded by Mutual Trust?”, in *European Constitutional Law Review*, Vol. 14, Issue 4, 2018, pp. 767-791.

Zankl M. W., “The Effects of CETA on the Continuous Implementation of the Precautionary Principle within the European Union”, in *Global Trade and Customs Journal*, Vol. 14, Issue 4, 2019, pp. 179–198.

On-line journal articles

Croissant G., “CJEU Opinion 1/17 – AG Bot Concludes that CETA’s Investment Court System is Compatible with EU Law”, in *Kluwer Arbitration Blog*, 29 January 2019, available at <http://arbitrationblog.kluwerarbitration.com/2019/01/29/cjeu-opinion-117-ag-bot-concludes-that-cetas-investment-court-system-is-compatible-with-eu-law/>.

Declève Q., Van Damme I., “Opinion 1/17 on CETA: Advocate General Bot Finds Investment Court System in CETA compatible with EU law”, in *International Litigation Blog*, 31 January 2019, available at <http://international-litigation-blog.com/opinion-1-17-ag-bot/>.

Declève Q., “ISDS Reform, Intra-EU BITs and CETA: New and Upcoming Developments”, in *International Litigation Blog*, 22 January 2019, available at <http://international-litigation-blog.com/isds-reform-intra-eu-bits-ceta-new-and-upcoming-developments/>

Draye M., Hay E., “The Future of ISDS: Can’t See the Wood or the Trees”, in *Kluwer Arbitration Blog*, 28 February 2019, available at <http://arbitrationblog.kluwerarbitration.com/2019/02/28/the-future-of-isds-cant-see-the-wood-or-the-trees-2/>.

Kim W. J., “Lack of Certification of the WTO Schedules of the United Kingdom: A Way for Frictionless Trade under a No-deal Brexit Scenario?”, in *Blog of the European Journal of International Law*, 7 March 2019, available at <https://www.ejiltalk.org/lack-of-certification-of-the-wto-schedules-of-the-united-kingdom-a-way-for-frictionless-trade-under-a-no-deal-brexit-scenario/>.

Knoll-Tudor I., “The European and Singapore International Commercial Courts: Several Movements, a Single Symphony”, in *Kluwer Arbitration Blog*, 6 March 2019, available at <http://arbitrationblog.kluwerarbitration.com/2019/03/06/the-european-and-singapore-international-commercial-courts-several-movements-a-single-symphony/>.

Pantaleo L., “Secondo l’avvocato generale Bot, il meccanismo di risoluzione delle controversie in materia di investimenti istituito dal CETA è compatibile con il diritto dell’Unione”, in *Il Diritto dell’Unione Europea – Osservatorio europeo*, March 2018, available at http://www.dirittounioneuropea.eu/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1170&catid=77&Itemid=172&lang=it.

Roes T., “Facultative Mixity: Blessing Disguised?”, in *Leiden Law Blog*, 5 March 2019, available at <https://leidenlawblog.nl/articles/facultative-mixity-blessing-disguised>

Romanchyshyna I., “The Post-TTIP Transatlantic Cooperation on Trade: Stepping up Conformity Assessment”, in *Blog of the European Journal of International Law*, 25 February 2019, available at <https://www.ejiltalk.org/the-post-ttip-transatlantic-cooperation-on-trade-stepping-up-conformity-assessment/>

Schepel H., “A Parallel Universe: Advocate General Bot in Opinion 1/17”, in *European Law Blog*, 7 February 2019, available at <http://europeanlawblog.eu/2019/02/07/a-parallel-universe-advocate-general-bot-in-opinion-1-17/>

Singh J. S., “Analyzing Features of Investment Court System under CETA and EUVIPA: Discussing Improvement in the System and Clarity to Clauses”, in *Kluwer Arbitration Blog*, 8 February 2019, available at <http://arbitrationblog.kluwerarbitration.com/2019/02/08/analyzing-features-of-investment-court-system-under-ceta-and-euvipa-discussing-improvement-in-the-system-and-clarity-to-clauses/>.

Szilárd G. -S., “AG Bot in Opinion 1/17. The autonomy of the EU legal order v. the reasons why the CETA ICS might be needed”, in *European Law Blog*, 6 February 2019, available at <http://europeanlawblog.eu/2019/02/06/ag-bot-in-opinion-1-17-the-autonomy-of-the-eu-legal-order-v-the-reasons-why-the-ceta-ics-might-be-needed/>

Papers and studies

Furculiță C., *Fork-in-the-Road Clauses in the New EU FTAs: Addressing Conflicts of Jurisdictions with the WTO Dispute Settlement Mechanism*, CLEER PAPERS 2019/1 available at https://www.asser.nl/media/5268/cleer19-01_web.pdf

6. News

Summer Course on WTO and EU Trade Law

Trier,
8 – 12 July 2019

The **Academy of European Law** organises a [summer course](#) on WTO and EU Trade Law that will provide participants with comprehensive knowledge of the fundamentals of WTO and EU trade law as well as EU investment law. In particular, it will focus – among the others – on the key features of substantive WTO law and investment law, the reform of EU trade defence instruments and the new EU methodology for dumping calculation, the assessment of the key existing and forthcoming EU free trade agreements and the impact of the CJEU's Opinion 2/15 and the practical challenges and legal issues deriving from Brexit in the field of trade. The course will focus on case-studies, applying instruments and concepts learned during the presentations to trade law practice. Participants in the summer course, that is open to lawyers, in-house counsel, EU officials, civil servants and other legal practitioners, will also have the opportunity to visit the **Court of Justice** of the EU in Luxembourg. [Here](#) the programme of the Summer Course.

ESIL Workshop: “Challenges to the Governance of the Global Economy: Dispute Settlement in the WTO and in International Investment Law”

Athens,
12 September 2019

The **ESIL Interest Group on International Economic Law** organises a Workshop on “Challenges to the Governance of the Global Economy: Dispute Settlement in the WTO and International Investment Law”, as a side-event to the ESIL 2019 Annual Conference in Athens. The Workshop will take place on September 12, 2019. The workshop will address two different topics. The first one on the current crisis of the WTO Appellate Body and the need for reform of the **WTO dispute settlement mechanism**. The second one will be devoted to the Investor-state dispute settlement, including the intra-EU investment dispute settlement mechanisms, and the **efforts of reform** currently underway at UNCITRAL with particular attention to the establishment of a Multilateral Investment Court. The programme will be soon available on the ESIL [website](#).



Editorial Committee

F. Casolari, Associate Professor of European Union Law, University of Bologna

S. Villani, Postdoctoral researcher, University of Bologna

Jean Monnet Network LAWTTIP

Based on a consortium among the **International Research Centre on European Law of the University of Bologna**, the **Centre of European Law of the King's College London** and the **Institut de l'Ouest Droit et Europe of the University of Rennes 1**, the Jean Monnet Network **LAWTTIP – Legal Ambiguities withstanding TTIP** intends to promote a large-scale legal reflection of both the existing EU Free Trade Agreements of new generation and the ongoing negotiations on the Transatlantic Trade Investment Partnership (TTIP).

Website: <http://www.lawttip.eu>

Email: info@lawttip.eu

Twitter: https://twitter.com/jmn_lawttip

