

---

Postgraduate Certificate in International Energy Law

## Energy Arbitration and Mediation

---

Arbitration is a consensual dispute-resolution mechanism in which the parties agree to submit their disagreement to one or more neutral decision-makers, known as arbitrators, whose award is binding and enforceable under international law. In the context of the energy sector, arbitration frequently arises from long-term contracts for the supply, transportation, and processing of oil, gas, electricity, and renewable resources. A typical example involves a state-owned oil company and a multinational contractor disagreeing over the interpretation of a production-sharing agreement; the parties may invoke the arbitration clause in the contract and refer the dispute to a specialized tribunal such as the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID) or the London Court of International Arbitration (LCIA).

Mediation differs from arbitration in that the mediator does not render a binding decision. Instead, the mediator facilitates communication, helps clarify the issues, and assists the parties in reaching a mutually acceptable settlement. In energy disputes, mediation is often employed to preserve commercial relationships and avoid the public exposure that can accompany arbitration. For instance, when a renewable-energy developer and a host government disagree over the granting of a feed-in tariff, a mediator may guide the parties toward a compromise that adjusts the tariff while maintaining the project's financial viability.

Force Majeure refers to an event beyond the control of the contracting parties that prevents or substantially impedes performance. Typical force-majeure events in energy contracts include natural disasters, civil unrest, and governmental actions such as export bans. The clause usually requires the affected party to notify the other party promptly and to take reasonable steps to mitigate the impact. In arbitration, the interpretation of what qualifies as force majeure can be contentious; a tribunal may examine the precise language of the clause, the foreseeability of the event, and whether the party could have mitigated the damage. A notable case involved a gas pipeline operator that claimed force majeure after a hurricane disrupted deliveries; the tribunal held that the operator had failed to activate alternative routing options, thereby limiting the force-majeure relief.

Force Majeure Clause is a contractual provision that defines the scope, conditions, and consequences of invoking force majeure. It often distinguishes between "act of God" events and "governmental actions." The drafting of this clause is critical in energy contracts because it can determine the allocation of risk for interruptions caused by geopolitical events, such as sanctions or export restrictions. An example of a well-crafted clause includes a list of specific events, a notice requirement, and a duty to mitigate, whereas a vague clause may lead to protracted arbitration over whether a pandemic qualifies as force majeure.

Litigation Risk in energy disputes is the risk that a party will be forced into court proceedings, which can be costly, time-consuming, and damaging to reputation. Arbitration and mediation are preferred because they

reduce litigation risk by providing specialized forums, confidentiality, and enforceable awards. However, parties must still consider the risk of parallel litigation, where a court may retain jurisdiction over certain ancillary matters, such as injunctions or preliminary relief, even when the main dispute is arbitrated.

Governing Law designates the legal system that will be applied to interpret the contract. Energy contracts often specify a neutral jurisdiction, such as English law or New York law, to provide predictability. The choice of governing law influences the substantive rights of the parties, the interpretation of clauses such as force majeure, and the availability of certain remedies. For example, under English law, a party may be entitled to “termination for breach” if the other party fails to cure a material breach within a reasonable period, whereas under some civil-law jurisdictions, termination may be more restricted.

Arbitration Clause is a contractual provision that obligates the parties to resolve disputes through arbitration rather than litigation. The clause typically identifies the seat of arbitration, the applicable rules (e.G., ICC Rules, UNCITRAL Rules), the number of arbitrators, and the language of the proceedings. A well-drafted arbitration clause also addresses issues such as the confidentiality of the proceedings, the method of appointing arbitrators, and the scope of the award. A poorly drafted clause may lead to procedural disputes, such as challenges to jurisdiction or the validity of the arbitration agreement itself.

Seat of Arbitration is the legal jurisdiction where the arbitration is seated, which determines the procedural law that governs the arbitration, including the powers of the arbitral tribunal and the supervisory role of the courts. The seat is distinct from the venue, which refers to the physical location where hearings may be held. Selecting a seat with a supportive legal framework, such as the United Kingdom or Singapore, can enhance the enforceability of the award and provide efficient court assistance for interim measures.

Arbitral Tribunal consists of one or more arbitrators appointed to hear the dispute. In energy arbitration, tribunals often comprise experts with technical knowledge of the energy industry, as well as legal professionals experienced in international commercial law. The tribunal’s authority includes determining the facts, applying the governing law, and issuing a final and binding award. The composition of the tribunal is significant because the parties may prefer arbitrators who understand complex concepts such as “take-or-pay” obligations or “liquidated damages” calculations.

Take-or-Pay Clause is a contractual provision common in natural-gas and oil supply agreements that obligates the buyer to pay for a specified quantity of product, regardless of whether the product is taken. This clause protects the seller’s revenue stream and is frequently a source of dispute when market conditions change. In arbitration, the tribunal may be asked to interpret the scope of the clause, determine whether the buyer is liable for payments on unserved volumes, and calculate the appropriate amount, often requiring sophisticated demand-forecasting analysis.

Liquidated Damages are pre-agreed amounts stipulated in a contract to compensate for breach when actual damages are difficult to quantify. In energy contracts, liquidated damages may be triggered by delays in project completion, failure to meet production targets, or non-delivery of electricity. The enforceability of

liquidated damages depends on whether the amount is deemed a genuine pre-estimate of loss rather than a penalty. Arbitrators assess this by comparing the stipulated amount with the actual loss incurred, taking into account market price fluctuations and the cost of alternative supplies.

Confidentiality is a critical consideration in energy arbitration because parties often wish to keep commercial sensitivities, pricing data, and strategic information out of the public domain. Confidentiality may be built into the arbitration agreement, the rules of the chosen arbitral institution, or the award itself. In mediation, confidentiality is typically a core principle, ensuring that statements made during the process cannot be used as evidence in subsequent proceedings. Breaches of confidentiality can undermine trust and may give rise to separate claims for damages.

Interim Measures are temporary orders issued by an arbitral tribunal or a court to preserve the status quo, protect assets, or prevent irreparable harm while the arbitration proceeds. In the energy sector, interim measures may include injunctions to stop the shut-down of a power plant, orders to maintain supply of gas to critical customers, or the preservation of offshore assets pending award. The ability to obtain interim relief depends on the procedural law of the seat of arbitration and the willingness of the local courts to enforce such orders.

Recognition and Enforcement of arbitral awards is governed by the 1958 New York Convention, to which more than 160 states are parties. The Convention requires courts to recognize and enforce foreign awards unless one of the limited grounds for refusal applies, such as public policy or a violation of due process. In energy disputes, the ease of enforcement is a key factor when selecting the seat of arbitration. For example, awards issued in Singapore are often readily enforced in the United States, the United Kingdom, and many Asian jurisdictions, providing parties with confidence that the award will be effective.

Public Policy is a narrow ground for refusing enforcement of an arbitral award. In energy arbitration, public policy objections may arise when a tribunal's award conflicts with a state's sovereign rights over natural resources or environmental protection statutes. However, most courts interpret public policy narrowly to preserve the pro-arbitration stance of the New York Convention. A case in point involved an award that ordered the transfer of oil revenues to a foreign investor; the host state attempted to block enforcement on public policy grounds, but the court upheld the award, finding that the clause did not contravene fundamental public policy.

Arbitration Agreement is the contractual or separate agreement that creates the arbitration relationship. It must satisfy the requirements of the law governing the agreement, typically showing the parties' consent, the scope of disputes covered, and the procedural parameters. In the energy sector, arbitration agreements may be embedded in master agreements, joint-venture contracts, or separate "letter of intent" documents. The validity of the arbitration agreement can be challenged on grounds such as lack of consent, incapacity, or fraud, and such challenges are often decided by the courts of the seat of arbitration.

Jurisdictional Challenge (or "Kompetenzkompetenz") refers to a dispute over whether the arbitral tribunal

has the authority to hear the case. In energy arbitration, jurisdictional challenges frequently arise when a party claims that the dispute falls outside the scope of the arbitration clause or that the clause is invalid. The tribunal's competence to determine its own jurisdiction is a recognized principle, but courts of the seat may be called upon to intervene if the challenge is raised before the tribunal has acted.

Procedural Rules are the set of guidelines that govern the conduct of arbitration, including the filing of statements of claim, the exchange of documents, the scheduling of hearings, and the issuance of awards. Major procedural regimes include the ICC Rules of Arbitration, the UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules, and the SIAC Rules. Energy arbitrations often require bespoke procedural orders to address technical complexities, such as the appointment of expert witnesses, the use of site visits to offshore platforms, and the handling of large volumes of data.

Expert Witness is an individual with specialized knowledge who provides opinion evidence on technical matters. In energy arbitrations, experts may be petroleum engineers, geologists, financial analysts, or environmental consultants. Their testimony can be crucial in quantifying damages, assessing compliance with performance standards, or interpreting industry-specific terms such as "capacity factor" or "heat rate." Parties typically exchange expert reports early in the proceedings, and the tribunal may order joint expert reports to narrow the issues.

Capacity Factor is a performance metric that measures the actual output of a power plant relative to its maximum possible output over a given period. It is commonly used in contracts for renewable-energy projects to assess whether a plant is meeting its obligations. Disputes may arise when a plant's capacity factor falls below the stipulated threshold, leading to claims for liquidated damages or termination. Arbitrators will examine the plant's operational data, weather conditions, and maintenance records to determine whether the shortfall is due to the plant's performance or external factors.

Heat Rate is a measure of the efficiency of a power-generating unit, expressed as the amount of fuel energy required to produce one unit of electricity. In gas-fired power contracts, the heat rate may be a contractual benchmark; deviations can trigger compensation mechanisms. Arbitration may involve complex calculations to compare actual heat rates with contractual targets, taking into account fuel quality, ambient temperature, and plant age. Expert testimony is essential for accurate assessment.

Supply-Side Risk encompasses the uncertainties associated with the production and delivery of energy commodities. These risks include geological uncertainties, production shortfalls, and interruptions caused by force majeure. Contracts often allocate supply-side risk through clauses such as "take-or-pay," "minimum delivery obligations," and "price adjustment mechanisms." In arbitration, parties dispute the extent to which the supplier is liable for under-performance and the appropriate remedies.

Demand-Side Risk refers to uncertainties on the buyer's side, such as fluctuations in consumption, regulatory changes, or the inability to secure financing. Buyers may seek to limit demand-side risk through "capacity-purchase agreements," "off-take clauses," and "price caps." Disagreements may arise when a

buyer claims that market conditions justify non-performance, while the seller argues that the contractual obligations remain unchanged. Arbitration provides a forum to balance these competing risk allocations.

Price Adjustment Mechanism is a contractual provision that allows the price of the energy commodity to be adjusted in response to changes in market conditions, exchange rates, or regulatory frameworks. Common mechanisms include "indexation" to a recognized price benchmark (e.G., WTI for oil), "formula-based" adjustments, or "escalation clauses." The design of a price adjustment mechanism is critical to ensure fairness and to avoid disputes. Arbitrators often scrutinize the formula, the data sources, and the methodology used to compute adjustments.

Indexation links the price of a contract to an external reference, such as a commodity price index, a currency exchange rate, or an inflation index. In energy contracts, indexation is frequently used to reflect the volatility of oil, gas, or electricity markets. The parties must specify the index, the frequency of adjustment, and the rounding rules. Disputes may arise over the choice of index (e.G., Spot versus futures) or over the timing of adjustments. Arbitration decisions may require the tribunal to interpret the contract language and to apply the relevant market data.

Currency Clause determines the currency in which payments are to be made and may also provide for currency conversion mechanisms. In cross-border energy transactions, currency risk is a major concern. Parties may include "hedging" provisions or "currency reset" clauses that allow for adjustments if exchange rates move beyond a defined threshold. Arbitration may involve assessing whether the currency clause was triggered and calculating the appropriate conversion amount, often requiring financial expert analysis.

Funding Clause addresses the financing arrangements for a project, specifying the obligations of the parties to secure and maintain funding. It may include "step-in rights," whereby a lender can take over the project if the sponsor defaults. Funding clauses are a source of dispute when investors claim that the sponsor failed to provide the agreed-upon capital, or when lenders argue that the sponsor's breach jeopardizes the project's viability. Mediators can facilitate negotiations to restructure financing, while arbitrators may interpret the clause's enforceability.

Step-In Rights give a lender the ability to assume control of a project's operations in the event of a default. This right is often triggered by a breach of financial covenants. In energy projects, step-in rights can be critical for protecting the lender's investment and for ensuring continuity of supply. Disputes may focus on whether a default occurred, whether the step-in was exercised properly, and the scope of the lender's authority. Arbitration awards may order the lender to take possession of assets or to provide financial remedies.

Termination Clause outlines the conditions under which a contract may be terminated by either party. Termination may be "for cause," such as material breach, or "for convenience," where one party may end the agreement without fault. Energy contracts often contain detailed termination provisions due to the high capital intensity of projects. Arbitrators assess whether the termination was lawful, whether notice periods

were complied with, and whether any damages are payable. In mediation, parties may negotiate a settlement that includes an amicable termination and a release of claims.

Material Breach is a substantial violation of a contractual obligation that justifies termination. Determining what constitutes a material breach involves evaluating the significance of the breach, its impact on the contract's purpose, and the possibility of cure. In the energy sector, a material breach might be the failure to deliver a specified volume of gas, the non-payment of a take-or-pay amount, or the unauthorized shutdown of a power plant. Arbitration provides a forum to objectively assess the breach and to award appropriate remedies.

Remedies are the legal solutions available to a party whose rights have been infringed. In energy arbitration, common remedies include monetary damages, specific performance, injunctions, and restitution. Monetary damages may be calculated on a "loss-of-benefit" basis, "cost-of-performance" basis, or based on "liquidated damages" provisions. Specific performance, though less common, may be ordered to compel the delivery of energy where monetary compensation is deemed inadequate. Mediators aim to craft creative remedies that preserve commercial relationships, such as schedule adjustments or profit-sharing arrangements.

Loss-of-Benefit Remedy compensates the injured party for the profit it would have earned had the contract been performed. This approach requires the tribunal to estimate the expected market price, the volume of energy that would have been supplied, and the associated costs. Because it involves speculative elements, parties often dispute the assumptions used. Arbitrators must balance the need for fairness with the certainty of the evidence presented.

Cost-of-Performance Remedy requires the breaching party to pay the cost of performing the contract, often used when performance is still possible but the breaching party has refused to do so. In energy contracts, this may involve the cost of procuring substitute supplies at higher market prices. The tribunal will assess whether the cost is reasonable, whether the injured party mitigated the loss, and whether any penalties apply.

Specific Performance is an equitable remedy that orders the breaching party to fulfill its contractual obligations. In the context of energy supply, specific performance may be ordered to compel the delivery of gas or electricity where the alternative sources are scarce or where the breach would cause severe economic disruption. Courts are often reluctant to grant specific performance for complex, ongoing obligations, preferring monetary compensation, but arbitration tribunals may issue such orders when the contract explicitly provides for it.

Injunction is a court order that restrains a party from taking a specific action or compels it to act. In energy disputes, injunctions are frequently sought to prevent the shutdown of critical infrastructure, to stop the export of oil from a contested field, or to preserve the status quo during arbitration. The availability of injunctive relief depends on the jurisdiction of the seat and the urgency of the situation. The tribunal may

issue an interim injunction if the risk of irreparable harm is demonstrated.

Confidential Settlement is an agreement reached by the parties that includes a confidentiality provision covering the terms, the fact of settlement, and any related documents. In energy mediation, confidentiality is essential to protect commercially sensitive information, such as pricing strategies, cost structures, and future project plans. A confidential settlement may also include non-disparagement clauses and provisions for future cooperation. Mediators often draft settlement agreements that balance the need for closure with the parties' desire for privacy.

Good Faith Negotiation is an implied duty that requires parties to engage sincerely in discussions to resolve disputes. In many jurisdictions, good-faith negotiation is a prerequisite for invoking certain contractual dispute-resolution mechanisms, such as "escalation" clauses that require the parties to attempt settlement before proceeding to arbitration. Mediators rely on the parties' willingness to negotiate in good faith to facilitate a constructive dialogue. Arbitrators may assess whether a party acted in good faith when considering challenges to procedural steps.

Escalation Clause obliges the parties to first attempt to resolve a dispute through internal senior-level discussions before moving to external mechanisms like arbitration. The clause typically defines a hierarchy of officials, timeframes for responses, and the method of communication. In energy contracts, escalation clauses are common to prevent premature litigation and to preserve long-term relationships. Failure to follow the escalation procedure can be a ground for challenging the arbitrability of a dispute.

Arbitration Institution administers the arbitration process, providing rules, logistical support, and sometimes a panel of arbitrators. Prominent institutions for energy disputes include the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), the London Court of International Arbitration (LCIA), the Singapore International Arbitration Centre (SIAC), and the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID). Institutions differ in their procedural frameworks, fees, and experience with energy cases. Selecting an institution with a strong track record in energy arbitration can streamline the process and enhance the quality of the award.

Ad Hoc Arbitration is conducted without the assistance of an institution, relying solely on the parties' agreement and the applicable procedural rules, such as the UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules. Ad hoc arbitration offers flexibility and may reduce costs, but it also requires the parties to manage administrative matters themselves. In complex energy disputes, parties often prefer institution-administered arbitration for the institutional support and the reputation that can aid enforcement.

Arbitration Costs encompass the fees of arbitrators, the administrative charges of the institution, legal counsel, expert witness fees, and expenses for hearings. Energy arbitrations can be expensive due to the technical complexity, the need for expert testimony, and the often international nature of the proceedings. Cost-allocation provisions in the arbitration agreement may specify that each party bears its own costs, or that the losing party must reimburse the winner's expenses. Mediators can help parties agree on

cost-sharing arrangements as part of a settlement.

Cost-Award is a separate award that determines the allocation of arbitration costs, including attorney fees and expert fees. In energy arbitration, the tribunal may issue a cost-award after determining liability for the substantive dispute. The cost-award may be based on the “loser-pays” principle, but many tribunals apply a discretionary approach, considering the conduct of the parties, the complexity of the case, and the relative resources of the parties.

Arbitrator Independence is a fundamental principle that requires arbitrators to be free from any bias or conflict of interest. In energy arbitration, potential conflicts may arise from prior engagements with the parties, ownership of shares in energy companies, or previous service as counsel. The parties must disclose any relationships that could affect independence, and the tribunal may recuse itself if a conflict is identified. Institutional rules often provide detailed guidelines on independence and impartiality.

Arbitrator Impartiality complements independence and requires the arbitrator to act without favoritism toward either party. Impartiality is assessed both at the time of appointment and throughout the proceedings. In energy disputes, the perception of impartiality is especially important because the outcomes can affect national energy security and large financial interests. Challenges to impartiality can be raised before the tribunal or before the courts of the seat.

Challenge of Arbitrator is a procedural device that allows a party to request the removal of an arbitrator on grounds such as lack of independence, bias, or failure to disclose a conflict. The challenge must be made promptly, usually within a specified period after the grounds become known. In energy arbitration, challenges may be strategic, aiming to influence the composition of the tribunal. The tribunal or the seat court will decide on the merits of the challenge.

Procedural Fairness (or “due process”) requires that the parties have a reasonable opportunity to present their case, to be heard, and to obtain a fair and unbiased decision. In energy arbitration, procedural fairness may be contested when a party alleges that the tribunal denied it the opportunity to submit evidence, that the hearing schedule was unreasonably short, or that the award was issued without adequate reasoning. Tribunals must ensure transparent procedures to uphold fairness.

Award Reasoning is the written explanation accompanying the arbitral award, setting out the factual findings, the legal analysis, and the basis for the award. Detailed reasoning is essential for enforceability, as courts may refuse to enforce an award that lacks sufficient justification. In energy arbitration, the reasoning often includes technical calculations, market analyses, and references to expert reports. Parties may challenge an award on the ground that the reasoning is insufficient or contradictory.

Annexure refers to supplemental documents attached to the award, such as expert reports, calculations, or evidentiary exhibits. Annexures are commonly used in energy arbitration to provide detailed technical data that supports the tribunal’s conclusions. The annexure becomes part of the award and is enforceable under the same principles as the main award.

Set-Aside is a court action that seeks to invalidate an arbitral award on limited grounds, such as procedural irregularities, lack of jurisdiction, or violation of public policy. In the energy sector, parties may attempt to set aside an award if they believe the tribunal exceeded its authority or failed to respect the parties' agreement. Courts of the seat are usually the only forum for set-aside actions, and the threshold for success is high to preserve the finality of arbitration.

Appeal in arbitration is generally limited, as most arbitral awards are final and binding. However, some jurisdictions allow a narrow right of appeal on questions of law, or the parties may agree to a "limited appeal" provision. In the energy context, appeal rights are seldom exercised because of the costs and time involved, and parties typically focus on enforcement rather than appeal.

Enforcement Procedure involves filing the arbitral award with a national court and invoking the New York Convention. The plaintiff must provide a certified copy of the award, the arbitration agreement, and evidence of the award's finality. In energy disputes, enforcement may be complicated by sovereign immunity claims, especially when a state is a party. Courts may require additional documentation, such as proof that the award does not contravene domestic law on natural-resource ownership.

Sovereign Immunity shields a state from being sued in foreign courts without its consent. In energy arbitration, sovereign immunity can affect enforcement when a state is the losing party. Many investment treaties waive immunity for disputes arising under the treaty, allowing awards to be enforced against state assets. However, the distinction between sovereign and commercial assets can be contentious, and courts may limit enforcement to commercial assets while protecting sovereign assets.

Commercial Asset is property used in the commercial activities of a state, such as oil rigs, pipelines, and power plants. International law often permits the enforcement of arbitral awards against commercial assets, even when sovereign immunity is asserted. In practice, determining whether a particular asset is commercial can be complex, requiring analysis of the asset's function, ownership, and the state's activities.

Natural-Resource Ownership is a principle that the state retains ownership over natural resources, such as oil and gas reserves, even when they are exploited by private entities. This principle can limit the enforcement of awards that order the transfer of resource ownership. Arbitration tribunals may issue awards that require the state to pay compensation for expropriation, rather than ordering the transfer of the resources themselves.

Expropriation is the taking of private property by the state for public purpose, usually accompanied by compensation. In energy contracts, expropriation claims arise when a government nationalizes a project or revokes a licence. Investment treaties often provide protection against unlawful expropriation, and arbitration may be used to assess the adequacy of compensation. The remedy typically involves a monetary award rather than the return of the asset.

Stabilisation Clause is a contractual provision that seeks to protect the investor from changes in the legal or regulatory framework that would adversely affect the project. The clause may freeze the applicable law at

the time of contract signing or require the state to compensate the investor for any detrimental regulatory change. In arbitration, the tribunal must interpret the scope of the stabilisation clause, determine whether a regulatory change triggered the clause, and calculate the appropriate compensation.

Regulatory Change refers to amendments to laws, regulations, or policies that affect the operation of an energy project. Examples include changes in environmental standards, tax regimes, or licensing requirements. Disputes often arise when a party argues that a regulatory change constitutes a breach of a stabilisation clause, while the other party contends that the change is a legitimate exercise of sovereign authority. Arbitration provides a neutral forum to balance contractual expectations with the state's regulatory prerogatives.

Environmental Compliance is the obligation to adhere to environmental laws and standards. Energy contracts increasingly contain environmental compliance clauses that require parties to obtain permits, conduct impact assessments, and meet emission limits. Failure to comply can lead to termination, penalties, or claims for damages. In arbitration, the tribunal may need to evaluate the validity of environmental permits, the adequacy of mitigation measures, and the impact of non-compliance on the contract.

Performance Bond is a security instrument issued by a bank or insurer to guarantee the performance of contractual obligations. In large-scale energy projects, performance bonds are used to protect the project owner against the contractor's failure to complete the work. Disputes may arise over the conditions for invoking the bond, the amount to be released, and the timing of payment. Arbitration may be used to interpret the bond terms and to determine the entitlement of the claimant.

Parent Company Guarantee is a promise by a parent corporation to fulfill the obligations of its subsidiary. In energy projects, a parent company guarantee can provide additional security for lenders and contractors. The enforceability of such guarantees depends on the language of the guarantee, the governing law, and the existence of any limitations. Arbitration may be invoked to resolve disputes over the scope of the guarantee, especially when the parent company claims it is not liable for certain breaches.

Joint Venture Agreement (JVA) is a contract that establishes a partnership between two or more parties to develop, own, and operate an energy project. The JVA typically specifies each party's capital contribution, profit-sharing arrangement, management structure, and dispute-resolution mechanism. Disagreements may arise over decision-making, cost overruns, or the allocation of output. The JVA's arbitration clause will govern the resolution of these disputes, and mediators may be engaged to preserve the partnership.

Shareholder Agreement outlines the rights and obligations of shareholders in a company that owns an energy asset. The agreement may contain provisions on voting rights, dividend distribution, transfer restrictions, and dispute resolution. In cases where shareholders dispute the management of the company, arbitration may be used to interpret the agreement and to award remedies, such as buy-out rights or damages.

Project Finance is a financing structure where the repayment is based on the cash flows generated by the

project itself, rather than on the balance sheets of the sponsors. Project finance is common in large-scale energy projects, such as offshore wind farms or LNG terminals. The financing documents typically include loan agreements, security documents, and inter-creditor arrangements, each containing dispute-resolution clauses. Arbitration provides a consistent forum for resolving disputes that may involve multiple lenders and sponsors.

Inter-Creditor Agreement governs the relationship among lenders to a single project, addressing priority of payment, collateral enforcement, and dispute resolution. In energy financing, inter-creditor agreements often contain "pari passu" clauses that require lenders to share collateral equally. Disputes may arise when one lender attempts to enforce its security against the project assets, and other lenders claim that the enforcement breaches the inter-creditor agreement. Arbitration can adjudicate these complex multi-party disputes.

Security Package comprises the collateral and guarantees that lenders require to secure a loan. In energy projects, security may include mortgages over land, assignments of contracts, and pledges of shares. The security package is often subject to multiple layers of priority, and the enforcement of security can be contested in arbitration. For example, a lender may seek to enforce a mortgage over an offshore platform, while the project company argues that the platform is a sovereign asset exempt from enforcement.

Offshore Platform is a structure used for the extraction of oil and gas beneath the seabed. The platform is a critical asset in many energy contracts, and its ownership, operation, and transfer are frequently the subject of dispute. Arbitration may address issues such as the allocation of operational risk, the calculation of damages for platform downtime, and the enforcement of security interests over the platform.

Pipeline is a conduit for transporting oil, gas, or refined products. Pipelines are often the subject of long-term transportation agreements that include provisions for capacity, tariffs, and maintenance. Disputes can arise over capacity allocation, tariff adjustments, or force-majeure events that affect the pipeline's operation. Arbitration provides a venue for technical experts to assess flow rates, maintenance logs, and market conditions.

Capacity Allocation determines how much of a pipeline's capacity each shipper may use. In energy contracts, capacity allocation clauses may be "first-come, first-served," "pro-rata," or based on "firm" versus "interruptible" capacity. Disagreements over allocation can lead to arbitration, where the tribunal may need to interpret the allocation formula, examine the pipeline operator's scheduling practices, and award damages for denied capacity.

Tariff is the price charged for the use of a pipeline or transmission system. Tariffs are often regulated by a national authority and may be subject to periodic adjustments. Energy contracts may include "tariff protection" clauses that lock in rates for a certain period or provide for compensation if tariffs increase. Arbitration may be required to determine whether a tariff change constitutes a breach of the contract and to calculate the appropriate compensation.

Regulatory Authority is the government body responsible for overseeing the energy sector, including licensing, pricing, and compliance. In many jurisdictions, the regulatory authority has the power to set tariffs, approve projects, and enforce environmental standards. Disputes between parties and the regulatory authority may be resolved through administrative appeal, but arbitration can be used when the contract provides for it, especially in cases involving private-party rights.

Licensing is the process by which a state grants permission to develop, explore, or produce energy resources. Licences may be exclusive or non-exclusive, and they often contain conditions relating to performance, environmental protection, and revenue sharing. Breach of licensing conditions can trigger penalties, suspension, or revocation. Arbitration may be invoked when a party alleges that a licensing decision was arbitrary or that the state has violated the terms of a licence.

Revenue-Sharing Agreement (RSA) outlines how the proceeds from the extraction of natural resources are divided between the state and the private operator. RSAs typically specify a royalty rate, profit-oil split, and sometimes a sliding scale based on production levels. Disputes may arise over the calculation of taxable profit, the allocation of costs, or the interpretation of the sliding-scale provisions. Arbitration can resolve these technical issues, often relying on expert testimony.

Royalty is a payment made by the operator to the state for the right to extract resources. Royalty rates can be fixed, variable, or linked to market prices. Disagreements over royalty calculations may involve questions of whether certain expenses are deductible, how to value production, and whether the operator complied with reporting obligations. Arbitration provides a neutral forum to interpret the royalty clause and to award any arrears.

Profit-Oil Split defines how the profit from oil production is divided between the state and the contractor after deducting costs. The split may be expressed as a percentage or as a tiered structure that changes with the level of production. In arbitration, the tribunal may be required to determine the appropriate cost deductions, the timing of profit calculation, and the applicability of any "bonus" provisions.

Cost Recovery allows the contractor to recover its investment and operating costs before profit sharing occurs. The extent of cost recovery is often a point of contention, especially when the state seeks to limit recoverable costs. Arbitration may involve detailed accounting analysis, the classification of expenditures, and the application of the cost-recovery ceiling.

Production Sharing Contract (PSC) is a type of agreement in which the state retains ownership of the resource, while the contractor receives a share of the production as compensation. PSCs contain detailed provisions on cost recovery, profit sharing, and the allocation of risk. Disputes commonly arise over the interpretation of "cost recovery ceiling," "taxes and royalties," and "termination rights." Arbitration is frequently used to resolve PSC disputes because of the technical and financial complexity involved.