MAKERERE  UNIVERSITY

THE TENSION BETWEEN INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION AND SOVEREIGN STATES: A COMPARATIVE ANALYTICAL CASE STUDY OF UGANDA, GHANA & NIGERIA

By

EDITH TWINAMATSIKO

REG NO: 2023/HD09/3614U

STUDENT NO.: 2300703614

Supervisor: DR. EMMANUEL BAGENDA

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE RESEARCH & GRADUATE TRAINING COMMITTEE, SCHOOL OF LAW, IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF LAWS OF MAKERERE UNIVERSITY

OCTOBER 2025

DECLARATION

I, Edith Twinamatsiko, hereby declare with honesty and to the best of my knowledge that the work presented in this dissertation titled, **"THE TENSION BETWEEN INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION AND SOVEREIGN STATES: A COMPARATIVE ANALYTICAL CASE STUDY OF UGANDA"** has never been submitted to any institution of learning and is of my research efforts.

Signature: .....

Date: 11th December 2025

Edith Twinamatsiko

Researcher

APPROVAL

This dissertation by **Edith Twinamatsiko,** titled, **"THE TENSION BETWEEN INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION AND SOVEREIGN STATES: A COMPARATIVE ANALYTICAL CASE STUDY OF UGANDA"** has been approved for final submission in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the Degree of Master of Laws Makerere University.

Signature: ..... **Date:** 11th December 2025

Name of supervisor: Dr. Bagenda Emmanuel

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Words are not enough to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Emmanuel Bagenda, School of Law, Makerere University Kampala for his encouragement, commitment, composure, availability and motivating supervision of this dissertation. His diligence, tireless effort, comprehension and insight have contributed tremendously to the span of this research. This research would not have been possible without his input. I will forever be grateful for his assistance.

I am very grateful to my family, most especially my mother and my entire family who supported me spiritually and morally in pursuing this course. This research would not have been possible without their input and uplifting. Their support and belief in me have always made me aim for greater heights. I am greatly beholden. Glory be to God.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my late father John R. Matsiko and my mother Jovia Matsiko

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AfCFTA	African Continental Free Trade Agreement
BIT	Bilateral Investment Treaty
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
DCF	Discounted Cash Flow
EAC	East African Community
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
EITI	Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
GNPC	Ghana National Petroleum Corporation
ICSID	International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes
IIA	International Investment Agreement
ISDS	Investor-State Dispute Settlement
NEITI	Nigerian Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative
NNPC	Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation
PAIC	Pan-African Investment Code PSA - Production Sharing Agreement
UGEITI	Uganda Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative
UN	United Nations
UNCITRAL	United Nations Commission on International Trade Law
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
URA	Uganda Revenue Authority

PRIMARY SOURCES OF LAW

A. International and Regional Instruments

i) International Treaties and Conventions

a. International Instruments

b. Bilateral Investment Treaties

c. Regional Instruments

Instrument	Year	Pages Referenced
African Union, Africa Mining Vision	2009	89-92, 139-143, 160
COMESA Investment Agreement for the COMESA Common Investment Area	2007	90, 140, 160
East African Community Protocol on Environment and Natural Resources Management	2006	90-91, 141, 160
ECOWAS Directive C/DIR.3/05/09 on the Harmonization of Guiding Principles and Policies in the Mining Sector	2009	89, 91-92, 141, 160

B. National Legislation and Laws

i) Constitutions

a. Uganda Legislation

Statute	Year	Pages Referenced
Constitution of the Republic of Uganda	1995	1, 5, 21-24, 45, 104-109, 146
Income Tax Act (Cap 340)	1997 (as amended)	23, 30, 32, 38, 111-114
Investment Code Act	2019	27, 133
Mining Act	2003	24, 115
Petroleum (Exploration, Development and Production) Act	2013	20, 24-25, 41, 115-118, 133, 141
Petroleum (Refining, Conversion, Transmission and Midstream Storage) Act	2013	25, 116
Public Finance Management Act	2015	20, 25, 44, 134
Uganda Revenue Authority Act (Cap 196)	1991 (as amended)	23, 45

b. Nigeria Legislation

Statute	Year	Pages Referenced
Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria	1999	55-59, 104-109, 160
Deep Offshore and Inland Basin Production Sharing Contracts Act	1999	58
Land Use Act	1978	57, 106
Nigerian Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (NEITI) Act	2007	59, 134
Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation Act	1977	56, 58, 119
Nigerian Oil and Gas Industry Content Development Act	2010	59, 92, 120, 141
Nigerian Sovereign Investment Authority Act	2011	59, 134
Petroleum Act	1969	56, 160
Petroleum Industry Act	2021	54, 59-60, 62, 66-67, 91-92, 99-100, 107, 110, 120-121, 137, 144
Petroleum Profits Tax Act	1959 (as amended)	58, 113

c. Ghana Legislation

Statute	Year	Pages Referenced
Constitution of the Republic of Ghana	1992	67-71, 104-109, 166
Environmental Protection Agency Act (Act 490)	1994	71, 116
Ghana Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative Act	2015	71, 135
Ghana Investment Promotion Centre Act (Act 865)	2013	73, 133
Ghana National Petroleum Corporation Act (PNDCL 64)	1983	70, 119
Income Tax Act (Act 896)	2015	73, 111, 113, 166
Minerals and Mining Act (Act 703)	2006	70-71, 99, 115, 118

Minerals Commission Act (Act 450)	1993	71, 118
Petroleum Commission Act (Act 821)	2011	71, 119
Petroleum (Exploration and Production) Act (Act 919)	2016	70-71, 99, 116
Petroleum (Local Content and Local Participation) Regulations (LI 2204)	2013	71, 92, 141
Petroleum Revenue Management Act (Act 815)	2011	71, 93-95, 134-135

C. Case Law

i) International Case Law

a. International Arbitration Cases

Case Name	**Citation**	**Pages Referenced**
Adriano Gardella SpA v Côte d'Ivoire	ICSID Case No ARB/74/1, Award (29 August 1977)	1
Balkan Energy (Ghana) Limited v Republic of Ghana	PCA Case No 2010-7, Award (1 April 2014)	3, 74, 80, 110, 120-121
Burlington Resources Inc v Republic of Ecuador	ICSID Case No ARB/08/5, Decision on Liability (14 December 2012)	24
Heritage Oil and Gas Ltd v Republic of Uganda	UNCITRAL Arbitration, Award on Jurisdiction (21 May 2019); Award on Merits (16 September 2021)	8, 31-32, 78, 109, 112, 120
Kosmos Energy v Ghana	UNCITRAL Arbitration, Settled (2015)	95, 96, 102, 109
Newmont Ghana Gold Limited v Ghana	ICSID Case, Settled (2010)	96
Occidental Petroleum Corporation v Republic of Ecuador	ICSID Case No ARB/06/11, Award (5 October 2012)	24
Salini Costruttori SpA and Italstrade SpA v Kingdom of Morocco	ICSID Case No ARB/00/4, Decision on Jurisdiction (23 July 2001)	2

Shell Nigeria Ultra Deep Limited v Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation	UNCITRAL Arbitration, Award (2013)	82, 142
Statoil (Nigeria) Limited v Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation	UNCITRAL Arbitration, Award (2013)	82, 131
Tullow Uganda Limited v Uganda Revenue Authority	UNCITRAL Arbitration; Tax Appeals Tribunal Case No 1 of 2012	8, 31-32, 78, 109, 112, 120

b. National Court Cases - Uganda

Case Name	**Citation**	**Pages Referenced**
Heritage Oil & Gas v Uganda Revenue Authority	Miscellaneous Application No 6 of 2011, High Court of Uganda [2011] UGTAT 1 (25 July 2011)	32, 48
Tullow Uganda Ltd v Heritage Oil and Gas Ltd	[2013] EWHC 1656 (Comm)	38
Tullow Uganda Operations Pty Ltd v Uganda Revenue Authority	Tax Appeals Tribunal Case No 1 of 2012, Final Decision (18 December 2015)	38, 42, 48
Uganda Revenue Authority v Heritage Oil and Gas Ltd	Tax Appeals Tribunal, Ruling on Preliminary Objection (12 May 2014)	32, 48

c. National Court Cases - Ghana

Case Name	**Citation**	**Pages Referenced**
Republic v High Court (Commercial Division), Accra; Ex Parte Attorney-General (Balkan Energy Ghana Ltd & Ors Interested Parties)	[2011] 2 SCGLR 1183	96, 101, 104, 111, 127, 128, 149

d. International Courts Cases

Case Name	**Citation**	**Pages Referenced**
SS Lotus (France v Turkey)	Judgment, PCIJ Series A No 10 (7 September 1927)	3-4, 6

DEFINITIONS OF SOME KEY TERMS

Bilateral Investment Treaty (BIT): An international agreement between two countries establishing terms and conditions for private investment by nationals and companies of one state in the territory of another state.

Expropriation: The act of a government taking privately owned property for public use or benefit, with or without compensation to the owner.

Fair and Equitable Treatment (FET): A standard of treatment in international investment law that requires host states to accord foreign investors treatment that is fair, equitable, and non-discriminatory.

Host Government Agreement: A contract between a foreign investor and the host government that sets out the terms governing the investment, typically used in natural resource exploitation projects.

Investment Arbitration: A mechanism to resolve disputes between foreign investors and host states through binding arbitration rather than through the courts of the host state.

Local Content Requirements: Laws, regulations, or contractual provisions requiring a certain percentage of goods, services, or workforce to be sourced locally in investment projects.

Permanent Sovereignty over Natural Resources: A principle of international law that recognizes states' inherent right to freely dispose of their natural resources.

Production Sharing Agreement (PSA): A type of contract between a government and a resource extraction company concerning how the resource will be extracted and how the profits will be shared.

Regulatory Chill: The phenomenon where states refrain from enacting or enforcing legitimate regulatory measures due to concerns about potential investment arbitration claims.

Stabilization Clause: A contractual provision that freezes the law applicable to an investment at the time the contract is signed or protects the investor against changes in law that would adversely affect the investment.

State Sovereignty: The concept that states have the right and power to govern themselves without external interference.

Tax Assessment: The process of determining the value of property, income, or transactions for taxation purposes.

ABSTRACT

This research examines the complex tension between international investment arbitration and state sovereignty in natural resource governance through a comparative analysis of Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana's experiences. The study investigates how these three resource-rich African nations navigate the challenges of attracting and maintaining foreign investment whilst preserving essential sovereign authority over their natural resources. By analysing constitutional frameworks, legislative enactments, and significant arbitration cases such as the Heritage Oil and Tullow Oil disputes in Uganda, the research identifies both constraints on sovereign authority and adaptive strategies developed by states to mitigate these constraints.

The research employs a doctrinal methodology supplemented by qualitative analysis of case law and institutional frameworks across the three jurisdictions. This approach enables the identification of common challenges and distinctive responses, providing a nuanced understanding of sovereignty in contemporary resource governance. The analysis focuses on four primary dimensions: constitutional and legal frameworks establishing resource ownership; taxation powers and their treatment in international arbitration; regulatory autonomy in environmental protection and local content requirements; and financial implications of investment disputes for sovereign debt management.

The findings reveal that while international investment arbitration creates meaningful constraints on certain aspects of sovereign authority, it has also stimulated important legal and institutional innovations that potentially strengthen effective sovereignty in the long term. All three countries have developed increasingly sophisticated approaches to treaty negotiation, legislative frameworks, institutional capacity building, and regional coordination in response to challenges posed by investment arbitration. The evolution of these approaches demonstrates that sovereignty in contemporary resource governance involves not only formal legal authority but also practical governance capacity and strategic international engagement.

The research contributes to understanding the evolving nature of sovereignty in contemporary natural resource governance and provides recommendations for strengthening sovereign rights protection within international investment frameworks. These recommendations address legal and policy reforms, institutional capacity development, strategic approaches to treaty negotiation, and regional coordination mechanisms. The findings have significance for other resource-rich developing nations seeking to maximize benefits from natural resource exploitation whilst maintaining essential sovereign authority in a globalized investment environment.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 General Introduction

Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) has emerged as a critical mechanism in international investment law, allowing foreign investors to bring claims directly against host states through international arbitration. This system, designed to depoliticize investment disputes and provide enforceable decisions through an expeditious process,[1] has become increasingly significant in the context of African nations' participation in global investment frameworks. The proliferation of international investment agreements (IIAs) and bilateral investment treaties (BITs) has led to an unprecedented expansion of ISDS cases globally. As of 2013, African countries had concluded 793 BITs, representing 27% of worldwide bilateral investment treaties.[2] This substantial engagement with international investment frameworks has coincided with Africa's growing prominence as a destination for foreign direct investment, particularly in sectors such as natural resources, infrastructure, and telecommunications.[3]

In Uganda, the tension between state sovereignty and international investment arbitration has been particularly evident in the natural resources sector. The country's experience with international oil companies, notably in the Heritage Oil and Tullow Oil cases,[4] exemplifies the challenges sovereign states face when their regulatory powers, particularly in taxation matters, intersect with international investment protection obligations. These cases highlight a growing concern about the extent to which international arbitration may constrain legitimate state actions, especially in sectors vital to national development.[5]

However, the relationship between African nations and the ISDS system has been complex and occasionally contentious. While African states played pivotal roles in early ISDS jurisprudence - including hosting the first ICSID award and the first successful counterclaim[6] - questions

[1] UNCTAD, 'Reform of Investor State Dispute Settlements: In Search of a Roadmap' (IIA Issues Note No 2, June 2013).
[2] UNCTAD Investment Policy Hub, 'International Investment Agreements Navigator' (2013).
[3] World Investment Report 2019 (UNCTAD 2019).
[4] Emmanuel Kasimbazi, 'Uganda's Petroleum Experience: A History of Exploration and Production' (2021) 39 Journal of Energy & Natural Resources Law 181.
[5] Mukalere Hope Mwagale and Tajudeen Sanni, 'International Tax Arbitration And Petroleum Dispute Resolution: A Case Study Of Uganda' (2019) Research Gate.
[6] *Adriano Gardella SpA v Côte d'Ivoire*, ICSID Case No ARB/74/1.

persist about the system's impact on state sovereignty and regulatory autonomy. Recent statistics indicate that approximately 70% of publicly available arbitral decisions in 2018 were rendered in favour of investors,[7] raising concerns about the system's balance and fairness.

1.2 Background

The emergence of Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) as a cornerstone of international investment law has profound implications for African nations' development trajectories and sovereign authority. The concept of investment itself presents significant definitional challenges within the developing world context. While traditional interpretations focused primarily on direct capital contributions, contemporary investment frameworks encompass a broader spectrum of economic interests, including intellectual property rights, contractual claims, and expectations of future returns.[8] This expanded definition has particular significance for African states, where resource extraction, infrastructure development, and service provision frequently intersect with public policy objectives.[9]

The fundamental tension between foreign investment protection and state sovereignty manifests distinctly in the African context. When African states implement regulatory changes or policy measures that adversely affect foreign investments - whether through environmental regulations, public health measures, or economic reforms - they frequently face ISDS claims.[10] The resulting arbitrations often occur in distant jurisdictions, governed by legal principles and precedents developed primarily in Western legal traditions.[11] This geographical and jurisprudential distance creates significant barriers for African legal practitioners and state representatives, who must navigate complex international investment law while operating within their domestic legal frameworks.[12]

[7] UNCTAD, 'World Investment Report 2019: Special Economic Zones' (UN 2019).
[8] Salini Costruttori SpA and Italstrade SpA v Kingdom of Morocco, ICSID Case No ARB/00/4.
[9] James E Anderson and others, 'Trade and Investment in the Global Economy' (2017) NBER Working Paper 23566.
[10] UNCTAD, 'World Investment Report 2019: Special Economic Zones' (UN 2019).
[11] Leon E Trakman, 'Choosing Domestic Courts over Investor-State Arbitration: Australia's Repudiation of the Status Quo' (2012) 35 UNSWLJ 979.
[12] Emilia Onyema, 'African Participation in the ICSID System: Appointment and Disqualification of Arbitrators' (2019) 34 ICSID Review 466.

The cost implications of ISDS proceedings pose particular challenges for African states. Beyond substantial arbitration fees, states must typically engage international law firms familiar with investment arbitration, leading to significant expenditure of public resources.[13] These financial burdens become especially problematic when considering that the average cost of defending an ISDS claim approximates $8 million, with some cases exceeding $30 million in legal fees alone.[14] For developing nations with constrained public budgets, these costs can divert resources from essential public services and development initiatives.

The application of stabilization or "freeze" clauses in investment agreements raises fundamental questions about democratic governance and legislative sovereignty in African states. These clauses, designed to maintain regulatory stability for foreign investments, effectively constrain parliamentary authority to modify legal frameworks affecting foreign investments.[15] This creates a complex dynamic where contractual commitments to foreign investors potentially override domestic legislative processes, raising serious questions about democratic accountability and sovereign authority.[16]

The relationship between sovereignty and consent in international law requires careful conceptual clarification, particularly in light of the Lotus Principle and its implications for African states' engagement with international investment arbitration. The Permanent Court of International Justice's decision in the *SS Lotus* case established a foundational principle of international law: states possess sovereignty to act freely unless expressly prohibited by international law.[17] This principle articulates sovereignty not as something that emerges from consent, but rather as an inherent attribute of statehood that exists independently of consensual obligations.[18]

The conceptual distinction between the existence of sovereignty and its exercise proves crucial in understanding African states' participation in ISDS. Sovereignty, in its ontological sense, represents the supreme authority of a state within its territory and its independence in

[13] Nadine Panjrath, 'The Cost of Investment Treaty Arbitration' (2018) 35 Journal of International Arbitration 1.
[14] UNCTAD, 'Investor-State Disputes: Prevention and Alternatives to Arbitration' (2010).
[15] Lorenzo Cotula, 'Reconciling Regulatory Stability and Evolution of Environmental Standards in Investment Contracts' (2017) 18 Journal of World Energy Law & Business 45.
[16] Dominic N Dagbanja, 'The Investment Treaty Regime and Development Policy Space in Ghana' (2016) 17 Journal of World Investment & Trade 834.
[17] *SS Lotus (France v Turkey)* PCIJ Series A No 10 (1927) [Lotus Principle establishes that restrictions upon the independence of states cannot be presumed].
[18] Malcolm Shaw, *International Law* (9th edn, Cambridge University Press 2021) 143-147.

international relations.[19] This sovereignty exists regardless of whether a state has consented to any international obligations. Consent, conversely, operates as the mechanism through which states voluntarily limit or channel the exercise of their sovereignty.[20] When Uganda, Nigeria, or Ghana enters into bilateral investment treaties or signs investment agreements containing arbitration clauses, they do not surrender their sovereignty; rather, they exercise it by choosing to accept certain constraints on future sovereign actions.[21]

The Lotus Principle illuminates this distinction by establishing that international law generally permits state action unless specifically prohibited.[22] In the investment context, this means that states retain full sovereign authority to regulate their natural resources, impose taxes, and implement public policy measures. However, through bilateral investment treaties (BITs), states consensually accept limitations on how they may exercise these sovereign powers.[23] These self-imposed limitations do not eliminate sovereignty but rather represent sovereignty's expression through international commitment.[24]

The practical implications of this theoretical framework manifest prominently in African resource governance. When Uganda faces arbitration claims arising from taxation decisions regarding Heritage Oil or Tullow Oil, the fundamental question is not whether Uganda possesses sovereignty over its natural resources - that sovereignty exists inherently and is constitutionally guaranteed under Article 244 of Uganda's Constitution.[25] Rather, the question concerns whether Uganda, in exercising its sovereignty by entering into BITs with the United Kingdom and other nations, consented to limitations on how it could exercise its taxation and regulatory powers.[26]

---

[19] Ian Brownlie, *Principles of Public International Law* (8th edn, Oxford University Press 2012) 106-110; James Crawford, *Brownlie's Principles of Public International Law* (9th edn, Oxford University Press 2019) 447-452.
[20] Anthony Aust, *Modern Treaty Law and Practice* (3rd edn, Cambridge University Press 2013) 6-10 [discussing how states exercise sovereignty through treaty-making].
[21] Makane Moïse Mbengue, 'Africa's Voice in the Formation, Shaping and Redesign of International Investment Law' (2019) 34 ICSID Review 455, 458-460.
[22] *SS Lotus (France v Turkey)* (n 1) at 18-19 ['International law governs relations between independent States. The rules of law binding upon States therefore emanate from their own free will'].
[23] Rudolf Dolzer and Christoph Schreuer, *Principles of International Investment Law* (2nd edn, Oxford University Press 2012) 24-28.
[24] M Sornarajah, *The International Law on Foreign Investment* (4th edn, Cambridge University Press 2017) 53-57 [discussing the exercise of sovereignty through consent to international investment agreements].
[25] Constitution of the Republic of Uganda 1995, art 244 ['Subject to the provisions of this Constitution, the Government or a local government as determined by Parliament by law, shall hold in trust for the people and protect, natural lakes, rivers, wetlands, forest reserves, game reserves, national parks and any land to be reserved for ecological and tourist purposes for the common good of all citizens'].
[26] Agreement between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the Republic of Uganda for the Promotion and Protection of Investments (signed 24 April 1998, entered into force 1999) art 8 [providing for investor-state arbitration].

This distinction becomes particularly significant when examining the enforceability of arbitral awards. International tribunals do not possess authority to override state sovereignty; their jurisdiction derives entirely from state consent expressed through investment treaties and arbitration agreements.[27] When tribunals issue awards requiring states to pay compensation or modify regulatory measures, they do so not by superseding sovereignty but by applying the terms to which states previously consented.[28] The tension emerges not from sovereignty's absence in the presence of consent, but from the breadth and implications of consent once given, particularly when states may not have fully appreciated the extent of their commitments at the time of treaty signature.[29]

Recent scholarship emphasizes that the challenge for African states lies less in the theoretical relationship between sovereignty and consent than in the practical asymmetries of the international investment regime.[30] When developing nations sign investment treaties, they exercise sovereignty through consent, but they often do so under significant economic pressure and with limited bargaining power relative to capital-exporting states.[31] The consent given may be formally voluntary but substantively constrained by developmental imperatives and the desire to attract foreign investment.[32] This reality underscores that while sovereignty persists conceptually, its practical exercise may be compromised by structural inequalities in the global economic system.[33]

The Lotus Principle's contemporary relevance extends to questions about how tribunals interpret the scope of state consent. Under the principle that restrictions on sovereignty must be clearly established, ambiguities in investment treaty language should theoretically be

[27] Zachary Douglas, 'The Hybrid Foundations of Investment Treaty Arbitration' (2003) 74 British Yearbook of International Law 151, 162-165.
[28] Jan Paulsson, 'Arbitration Without Privity' (1995) 10 ICSID Review - Foreign Investment Law Journal 232, 247-251.
[29] Kate Miles, *The Origins of International Investment Law: Empire, Environment and the Safeguarding of Capital* (Cambridge University Press 2013) 89-95 [discussing asymmetries in treaty negotiation and understanding].
[30] Makane Moïse Mbengue and Stefanie Schacherer, 'The "Africanization" of International Investment Law: The Pan-African Investment Code and the Reform of the International Investment Regime' (2017) 18 Journal of World Investment & Trade 414, 418-422.
[31] Ibid 420-425; see also James Thuo Gathii, 'The Neoliberal Turn in Regional Trade Agreements' (2011) 86 Washington Law Review 421, 445-450.
[32] Sundhya Pahuja, 'Letters from Bangalore: Reading the Romance of International Law's History' (2007) 23 Leiden Journal of International Law 391, 395-402 [discussing structural constraints on developing states' sovereignty].
[33] Antony Anghie, *Imperialism, Sovereignty and the Making of International Law* (Cambridge University Press 2004) 245-272.

interpreted in favour of preserving state regulatory authority.[34] However, arbitral practice has not consistently applied this interpretative approach, sometimes construing investor protections broadly while narrowly reading exceptions designed to preserve policy space.[35] This divergence between the Lotus Principle's theoretical implications and actual arbitral practice reveals a fundamental tension in how international investment law balances investor protection with sovereign regulatory authority.[36]

The institutional framework of ISDS presents additional challenges for African participation. Major arbitration centres remain concentrated in Western capitals, creating both practical and psychological barriers for African participants.[37] The underrepresentation of African arbitrators in ISDS proceedings - constituting only 3% of all appointments by 2018 - reflects deeper structural imbalances in the system.[38] This disparity extends beyond mere representation to encompass questions of legal culture, interpretative approaches, and the understanding of development contexts.

The choice of applicable law in ISDS proceedings further complicates African states' engagement with the system. While investment treaties often specify international law as the governing framework, the interpretation and application of domestic laws remain crucial in many disputes.[39] However, the predominance of Western legal principles and the limited incorporation of African legal perspectives in international investment jurisprudence can lead to disconnects between international arbitral decisions and domestic legal realities.[40] The rapid evolution of international investment law poses particular challenges for African legal systems and practitioners. The complexity of investment treaties, the sophistication of international arbitration procedures, and the dynamic nature of investor protections create significant knowledge gaps.[41] This asymmetry in legal expertise and resources often places African states

[34] *SS Lotus (France v Turkey)* (n 1) at 18; see also Prosper Weil, 'Towards Relative Normativity in International Law?' (1983) 77 American Journal of International Law 413, 418-420.
[35] M Sornarajah, *Resistance and Change in the International Law on Foreign Investment* (Cambridge University Press 2015) 112-125 [criticizing expansive interpretation of investor protections].
[36] Stephan W Schill, 'Deference in Investment Treaty Arbitration: Reconceptualizing the Standard of Review' (2012) 3 Journal of International Dispute Settlement 577, 595-602.
[37] Won Kidane, 'The China-Africa Factor in the Contemporary ICSID Legitimacy Debate' (2014) 35 U Pa J Int'l L 559.
[38] ICSID, 'Annual Report 2018' (World Bank 2018).
[39] Emmanuel Gaillard and Yas Banifatemi, 'The Meaning of "and" in Article 42(1), Second Sentence, of the Washington Convention' (2003) 18 ICSID Review 375.
[40] Makane Moïse Mbengue, 'Africa's Voice in the Formation, Shaping and Redesign of International Investment Law' (2019) 34 ICSID Review 455.
[41] Uche Ewelukwa Ofodile, 'Africa and International Investment Agreements' (2018) 11 Law & Development Review 1.

at a disadvantage when negotiating investment agreements or defending against investor claims.[42]

Recent developments in African regional investment frameworks, such as the African Continental Free Trade Agreement (AfCFTA) Investment Protocol, represent attempts to address these systemic challenges.[43] However, these initiatives must contend with existing bilateral investment treaties and the established practices of international investment arbitration. The interaction between regional reforms and the global investment regime remains a critical area of tension in African states' engagement with ISDS.[44]

The Ugandan experience provides a compelling case study of these tensions. The country's discovery of commercially viable oil deposits in 2006 led to increased foreign investment in the sector but also highlighted challenges in balancing national sovereignty with investor protection. Similar experiences can be observed in Nigeria and Ghana. These countries share common challenges in asserting sovereign rights over natural resources while maintaining an attractive investment climate.[45]

1.3 Statement of the Problem

The legal problem at the heart of this research concerns a fundamental asymmetry in international investment law: the structural imbalance between state regulatory sovereignty and investor protection mechanisms in international arbitration, particularly as experienced by African states in the natural resource sector. This asymmetry manifests in several distinct but interrelated dimensions that create systemic challenges for states like Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana.

The first dimension of this problem involves the scope and enforceability of investment treaty obligations. When African states enter into bilateral investment treaties (BITs), they commit to substantive protections for foreign investors, including fair and equitable treatment, protection

[42] James Gathii and Sergio Puig, 'Introduction to the Symposium on Investor-State Dispute Settlement in Africa' (2016) 110 AJIL Unbound 225.

[43] Olabisi D Akinkugbe, 'Reverse Contributors? African State Parties, ICSID, and the Development of International Investment Law' (2019) 34 ICSID Review 434.

[44] Makane Moïse Mbengue and Stefanie Schacherer, 'The "Africanization" of International Investment Law' (2017) 18 Journal of World Investment & Trade 414.

[45] Jesse Salah Ovadia, 'Local Content Policies and Petro-Development in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Comparative Analysis' (2016) 49 Resources Policy 20.

against expropriation without compensation, and full protection and security.[46] These obligations, while reciprocal in form, prove asymmetric in practice because capital flows predominantly from developed to developing nations.[47] Consequently, African states appear almost exclusively as respondents rather than claimants in investor-state dispute settlement (ISDS) proceedings.[48] This one-directional exposure creates a situation where African states must defend their sovereign regulatory actions through costly international arbitration while rarely benefiting from treaty protections for their own investors abroad.[49] The second dimension concerns the binding nature of arbitral awards without corresponding constraints on investor behaviour. International investment treaties create enforceable obligations on states through ISDS mechanisms, with arbitral awards backed by strong enforcement regimes including the ICSID Convention and the New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards.[50] However, these treaties typically impose no equivalent binding obligations on foreign investors regarding their conduct in host states.[51] Investors may pursue claims for alleged treaty violations by states, but states cannot typically bring counterclaims for investor misconduct through the same arbitral forum except in limited circumstances.[52] This creates what scholars have termed "investor rights without responsibilities," whereby the international legal architecture constrains state action while leaving investor behaviour primarily to domestic legal systems that may lack adequate enforcement capacity.[53]

The third dimension relates specifically to Uganda's experience and the constitutional-international law interface. Article 244 of Uganda's Constitution vests ownership of all natural

[46] UNCTAD, 'Investor-State Dispute Settlement: Review of Developments in 2019' (IIA Issues Note No 1, June 2020) 2-5 [noting asymmetric use of ISDS mechanisms].
[47] UNCTAD, 'World Investment Report 2023: Investing in Sustainable Energy for All' (United Nations 2023) 25-30 [documenting investment flows predominantly from developed to developing countries].
[48] Matthew Hodgson and Alastair Campbell, 'Damages and Costs in Investment Treaty Arbitration Revisited' (2017) Global Arbitration Review 4-8 [noting that African states appear almost exclusively as respondents].
[49] Lorenzo Cotula, 'Do Investment Treaties Unduly Constrain Regulatory Space?' (2014) 9 Questions of International Law 19, 22-26.
[50] Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States (opened for signature 18 March 1965, entered into force 14 October 1966) 575 UNTS 159 (ICSID Convention); Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (opened for signature 10 June 1958, entered into force 7 June 1959) 330 UNTS 38 (New York Convention).
[51] Barnali Choudhury, 'Recapturing Public Power: Is Investment Arbitration's Engagement of the Public Interest Contributing to the Democratic Deficit?' (2008) 41 Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law 775, 795-802.
[52] Andrea Bjorklund, 'The Role of Counterclaims in Rebalancing Investment Law' (2013) 17 Lewis & Clark Law Review 461, 465-475 [discussing limited availability of counterclaims in investment arbitration].
[53] David Schneiderman, *Constitutionalizing Economic Globalization: Investment Rules and Democracy's Promise* (Cambridge University Press 2008) 145-152; see also Nicolás Perrone, 'The International Investment Regime and Foreign Investors' Rights' (DPhil dissertation, London School of Economics 2014) 78-85.

resources in the state, held in trust for the people of Uganda.[54] This constitutional provision reflects the principle of permanent sovereignty over natural resources, recognized in international law since the UN General Assembly's Resolution 1803 of 1962.[55] However, when Uganda exercises this sovereignty through taxation or regulatory measures affecting foreign oil companies - as in the Heritage Oil and Tullow Oil cases - it faces the risk of international arbitration claims alleging treaty violations.[56] The legal problem emerges: how can Uganda give effect to its constitutional imperatives regarding resource ownership and management while simultaneously honouring international investment obligations that may constrain the very regulatory tools needed to implement those imperatives?[57] The fourth dimension involves the economic and fiscal implications of this asymmetry. The Heritage Oil arbitration required Uganda to post $120 million in security for costs, while the legal fees for defending such claims often exceed $8 million.[58] For a developing nation with competing developmental priorities, these costs represent a significant burden. Moreover, adverse arbitral awards can reach hundreds of millions of dollars, creating sovereign debt obligations that divert resources from public services and development programmes.[59] The financial exposure creates what some scholars term "regulatory chill" - a hesitancy by states to adopt legitimate regulatory measures for fear of triggering expensive investor claims.[60] This phenomenon proves particularly problematic in the natural resource sector, where states must balance revenue maximization, environmental protection, and developmental objectives.[61]

The fifth dimension concerns procedural and institutional challenges in the ISDS system. Arbitration proceedings typically occur in venues distant from African host states, governed by

[54] Constitution of the Republic of Uganda 1995, art 244.
[55] Permanent Sovereignty over Natural Resources, UNGA Res 1803 (XVII) (14 December 1962) [declaring 'The right of peoples and nations to permanent sovereignty over their natural wealth and resources must be exercised in the interest of their national development and of the well-being of the people of the State concerned'].
[56] *Heritage Oil and Gas Ltd v Republic of Uganda* ICSID Case No ARB/17/11, Award on Jurisdiction (21 May 2019) [finding jurisdiction over Uganda's capital gains tax assessment].
[57] Ibironke Odumosu-Ayanu, 'Governments, Investors and Local Communities: Analysis of a Multi-Actor Investment Contract Framework' in Freya Baetens (ed), *Investment Law within International Law: Integrationist Perspectives* (Cambridge University Press 2013) 223, 235-240.
[58] *Heritage Oil and Gas Ltd v Republic of Uganda* (n 35) Order on Security for Costs (20 January 2020); Diana Rosert, 'The Stakes Are High: A Review of the Financial Costs of Investment Treaty Arbitration' (2014) 15 Journal of International Economic Law 447, 452-458.
[59] Matthew Hodgson and Alastair Campbell (n 27) 6-9 [documenting awards in hundreds of millions of dollars against developing states].
[60] Kyla Tienhaara, 'Regulatory Chill and the Threat of Arbitration: A View from Political Science' in Chester Brown and Kate Miles (eds), *Evolution in Investment Treaty Law and Arbitration* (Cambridge University Press 2011) 606, 610-618.
[61] Lorenzo Cotula, 'Reconciling Regulatory Stability and Evolution of Environmental Standards in Investment Contracts: Towards a Rethink of Stabilization Clauses' (2008) 1 Journal of World Energy Law and Business 158, 160-165.

procedural rules developed primarily in Western legal traditions.[62] African legal practitioners and government officials must navigate complex international investment law while operating with limited experience in this specialized field.[63] The underrepresentation of African arbitrators in ISDS proceedings - constituting only 3% of appointments by 2018 - further compounds concerns about whether African perspectives and developmental contexts receive adequate consideration in arbitral deliberations.[64] This procedural dimension of the problem extends beyond mere logistics to encompass questions of legitimacy, cultural competence, and equitable participation in dispute resolution processes.[65] The problem also encompasses temporal dimensions specific to Uganda's recent emergence as an oil-producing nation. Having discovered commercially viable oil deposits only in 2006, Uganda established its petroleum regulatory framework while simultaneously managing complex negotiations with international oil companies and facing its first major investment arbitrations.[66] Unlike Nigeria, which has decades of experience managing oil sector disputes, or Ghana, with its established mining sector, Uganda confronted these challenges without institutional memory or precedent.[67] This timing created particular vulnerabilities as the country navigated investment treaty obligations whose full implications became apparent only through subsequent arbitration experience.[68]

Furthermore, the problem encompasses a gap between the formal legal equality of states in international investment law and the substantive inequality of bargaining power when negotiating investment treaties and agreements. African states, in their desire to attract foreign investment for resource sector development, often accept treaty terms drafted primarily by capital-exporting states.[69] These terms may include broad investor protections, narrow

---

[62] Won Kidane, 'The Culture of Investment Arbitration: An African Perspective' (2019) 34 ICSID Review - Foreign Investment Law Journal 411, 415-420 [discussing geographical and procedural barriers for African states].
[63] Emilia Onyema, 'Lack of Confidence: African Countries and ICSID Arbitration' in Roberto Bellini (ed), *ICSID Convention After 50 Years: Unsettled Issues* (Kluwer Law International 2016) 283, 290-295.
[64] Won Kidane (n 41) 418-419; see also Chiara Giorgetti, 'Who Decides Who Decides in International Investment Arbitration?' (2014) 35 University of Pennsylvania Journal of International Law 431, 455-462.
[65] Susan Franck, 'Development and Outcomes of Investment Treaty Arbitration' (2009) 50 Harvard International Law Journal 435, 465-475 [questioning legitimacy given lack of diversity].
[66] Directorate of Petroleum, 'Petroleum Exploration History' (Government of Uganda) https://www.petroleum.go.ug accessed 15 February 2025.
[67] Chilenye Nwapi, 'A Survey of the Literature on Local Content Policies in the Oil and Gas Industry in East Africa' in T Binns, K Lynch and E Nel (eds), *The Routledge Handbook of African Development* (Routledge 2018) 334, 338-342.
[68] Badru Bukenya and Jaqueline Nakaiza, 'Closed but Ordered: How the Political Settlement Shapes Uganda's Deals with International Oil Companies' in Arnim Langer, Ukoha Ukiwo and Pamela Mbabazi (eds), *Oil Wealth and Development in Uganda and Beyond: Prospects, Opportunities and Challenges* (Leuven University Press 2020) 103, 115-120.
[69] Lauge N Skovgaard Poulsen, *Bounded Rationality and Economic Diplomacy: The Politics of Investment Treaties in Developing Countries* (Cambridge University Press 2015) 89-115.

exceptions for regulatory measures, and stabilization clauses that constrain legislative flexibility.[70] The problem is not merely that African states consented to these terms, but that consent often occurred in contexts of significant power asymmetry and with imperfect information about how arbitral tribunals would subsequently interpret treaty language.[71]

Finally, the problem extends to questions of democratic governance and accountability. When international arbitration decisions require states to pay compensation or modify regulatory measures, they potentially override democratic processes through which national legislatures adopt policies reflecting domestic priorities.[72] This creates tension between international legal commitments and domestic constitutional systems predicated on popular sovereignty and representative government.[73] For countries like Uganda, where the Constitution establishes Parliament's supreme authority in taxation matters, arbitral decisions that effectively constrain fiscal policy raise fundamental questions about how to reconcile international obligations with domestic democratic governance.[74]

1.4 Objectives of the Study

1.4.1 General Objective

To analyse the tension between state sovereignty and international investment arbitration in natural resource disputes through a comparative study of Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana, examining how international tribunals impact national sovereignty and resource governance.

[70] Lorenzo Cotula (n 40) 162-167 [analysing stabilization clauses as constraints on legislative flexibility].
[71] Kate Miles (n 13) 91-98; Mavluda Sattorova, 'Reasserting Host State Control: Investor-State Arbitration with a Heterodox Twist' (2012) 50 Columbia Journal of Transnational Law 131, 145-152.
[72] Gus Van Harten, *Investment Treaty Arbitration and Public Law* (Oxford University Press 2007) 145-160 [discussing democratic accountability concerns].
[73] Pia Eberhardt and Cecilia Olivet, 'Profiting from Injustice: How Law Firms, Arbitrators and Financiers are Fuelling an Investment Arbitration Boom' (Corporate Europe Observatory and the Transnational Institute 2012) 35-42.
[74] Constitution of the Republic of Uganda 1995, art 152 [providing that Parliament has power to impose taxation].

1.4.2 Specific Objectives

1. To examine how international arbitration decisions affect state sovereignty in matters of taxation and natural resource management in Uganda, with specific reference to the Heritage Oil and Tullow Oil cases.

2. To analyse the legal and institutional frameworks governing natural resource ownership and management in Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana, particularly focusing on constitutional provisions vis-à-vis international investment obligations.

3. To evaluate the implications of international arbitration decisions on sovereign debt and asset valuation in the natural resource sectors of the selected countries.

4. To assess the effectiveness of domestic mechanisms in Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana for protecting state sovereignty while maintaining compliance with international investment obligations.

1.5 Research Questions

1. How do international arbitration decisions impact state sovereignty in natural resource governance, particularly in taxation matters, as evidenced by the experiences of Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana?

2. To what extent do international investment agreements and arbitration decisions align with or conflict with constitutional provisions regarding natural resource ownership and management in the selected countries?

3. What are the implications of international arbitration decisions on sovereign debt and asset valuation in Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana's natural resource sectors?

4. How effectively do Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana balance their sovereign rights with international investment obligations, and what mechanisms have they developed to protect state interests?

1.6 Significance of the Study

This research holds significant value in both theoretical and practical domains of international investment law and sovereign resource management. The study's examination of how Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana navigate the complex relationship between state sovereignty and international investment arbitration provides crucial insights into the evolving dynamics of natural resource governance in developing economies. By analysing specific cases such as the Heritage Oil and Tullow Oil disputes in Uganda alongside comparable experiences in Nigeria and Ghana, this research contributes to understanding how international arbitration impacts state sovereignty in resource-rich African nations.

The timing of this research is particularly significant given the ongoing development of natural resource projects in all three countries. Uganda's emerging oil sector, Nigeria's established petroleum industry, and Ghana's diverse mineral resource base provide a rich comparative framework for understanding how states can protect their sovereign interests while maintaining international investment obligations. This study's findings can inform future policy decisions and legislative reforms in these countries and other resource-rich African nations.

Furthermore, this research addresses a critical gap in the existing literature by providing a focused comparative analysis of how three prominent African economies manage the tension between constitutional provisions for resource ownership and international investment commitments. While much has been written about investment arbitration generally, the specific challenges faced by these countries in protecting their sovereign rights over natural resources have not received sufficient scholarly attention. This study's emphasis on the intersection of constitutional law, sovereign rights, and international investment obligations provides valuable insights for both legal theory and practice.

The research also carries significant practical implications for fiscal policy and sovereign debt management. By examining how international arbitration decisions affect tax assessment, revenue collection, and asset valuation in these countries, this study provides valuable guidance for policymakers and legal practitioners dealing with similar challenges. The comparative analysis of how each country has responded to these challenges offers practical lessons for developing effective legal and institutional frameworks.

1.7 Justification of the Research

The selection of this research topic is justified by several compelling factors that underscore its importance and timeliness. First, the increasing frequency of investment disputes involving natural resources in Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana necessitates a thorough examination of how international arbitration impacts state sovereignty and regulatory autonomy. The research is justified by the urgent need to understand whether current arbitration mechanisms adequately respect constitutional provisions regarding resource ownership and state regulatory powers, particularly in taxation matters.

The study's focus on these three countries is further justified by their strategic importance in Africa's natural resource landscape. Uganda's emerging oil sector, Nigeria's established petroleum industry, and Ghana's diverse mineral resources provide distinct yet complementary contexts for analysing sovereign rights in resource governance. This comparative approach is justified by the opportunity to examine how states at different stages of resource development manage similar challenges in protecting their sovereign interests.

Moreover, the research is warranted by the ongoing debate about the relationship between international investment law and domestic constitutional frameworks. Recent cases, such as the Heritage Oil dispute in Uganda and similar challenges in Nigeria and Ghana, demonstrate the pressing need for empirical research examining how international arbitration decisions affect states' abilities to regulate their natural resource sectors effectively. This study's systematic analysis of these experiences can provide valuable evidence to inform both policy reform and legal practice.

The timing of this research is also justified by recent developments in natural resource governance across all three jurisdictions. Uganda's ongoing oil sector development, Nigeria's petroleum industry reforms, and Ghana's mining sector regulations present contemporary examples of states attempting to assert sovereign control while maintaining international investment obligations. This convergence of developments provides a unique opportunity for comparative analysis and lesson drawing.

Finally, this research is justified by its potential practical applications in addressing sovereign debt and asset valuation challenges. The findings can assist these countries in developing more effective strategies for managing investment disputes, inform capacity-building initiatives for legal practitioners, and guide policy decisions regarding future resource agreements. The

study's examination of how these states balance sovereign rights with investment protection can provide valuable lessons for other resource-rich developing nations.

1.8 Theoretical Framework

This study employs multiple theoretical perspectives to analyse the complex relationship between three African nations and the Investor-State Dispute Settlement system. The primary theoretical foundations that inform this research are procedural justice theory, legal pluralism theory, and institutional theory.

1.8.1 Procedural Justice Theory

Procedural justice theory provides a crucial framework for examining the fairness and legitimacy of ISDS mechanisms. The theory, as conceptualized by Rawls, posits that justice represents the foundational value of social institutions, emphasizing fairness and equal opportunity as essential components.[75] In the context of dispute resolution, procedural justice focuses on the perceived fairness of the processes through which decisions are made, rather than solely on the outcomes of these decisions.[76]

The application of procedural justice theory to ISDS is particularly relevant when examining African nations' experiences. The theory suggests that parties are more likely to accept outcomes, even unfavourable ones if they perceive the procedural mechanisms as fair.[77] This theoretical lens helps evaluate whether current ISDS frameworks provide African states with genuine opportunities for fair representation and equitable participation in the dispute resolution process. Furthermore, the theory's emphasis on the legitimacy of procedures aligns with examining whether African nations receive adequate respect, voice, and neutral treatment within ISDS proceedings.[78]

[75] John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* (Harvard University Press 1971).
[76] Rebecca Hollander-Blumoff and Tom R Tyler, 'Procedural Justice and the Rule of Law: Fostering Legitimacy in Alternative Dispute Resolution' (2011) 30 J Dispute Resolution 1.
[77] DJ Galligan, *Due Process and Fair Procedures* (OUP 1996).
[78] Nancy A Welsh, 'Making Deals in Court-Connected Mediation: What's Justice Got to Do With It?' (2001) 79 Wash U LQ 787.

1.8.2 Legal Pluralism Theory

Legal pluralism theory offers another valuable perspective for understanding the intersection of international investment law and African legal systems. This theoretical framework acknowledges the coexistence of multiple legal orders within a single social field.[79] In the context of ISDS, legal pluralism helps explain the complex interactions between international investment law, domestic legal systems, and customary law in African nations.

The theory is particularly relevant when analysing how African states navigate between their domestic legal obligations and international investment commitments. Legal pluralism provides insights into potential conflicts between different legal orders and helps explain why certain ISDS outcomes might face resistance or implementation challenges at the national level.[80] This theoretical perspective is essential for understanding how African nations can better integrate international investment law principles with their domestic legal frameworks while maintaining their sovereign authority.

1.8.3 Institutional Theory

Institutional theory complements the above frameworks by examining how institutions shape behaviour and decision-making processes. In the context of ISDS, institutional theory helps explain how formal and informal rules, norms, and enforcement mechanisms influence the participation of African nations in international investment arbitration.[81] This theoretical perspective is particularly useful for analysing why certain institutional arrangements within the ISDS system might disadvantage African states and how institutional reform could address these inequities.

The theory's emphasis on legitimacy and isomorphic pressures provides a framework for understanding why African nations might adopt certain approaches to investment dispute resolution, even when these approaches may not fully serve their interests.[82] Furthermore,

[79] Sally Engle Merry, 'Legal Pluralism' (1988) 22 Law & Society Review 869.
[80] Brian Z Tamanaha, 'Understanding Legal Pluralism: Past to Present, Local to Global' (2008) 30 Sydney L Rev 375.
[81] W Richard Scott, *Institutions and Organizations: Ideas, Interests, and Identities* (SAGE 2014).
[82] Paul J DiMaggio and Walter W Powell, 'The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields' (1983) 48 American Sociological Review 147.

institutional theory helps explain the role of power dynamics and resource dependencies in shaping ISDS outcomes for African states.

1.8.4 Synthesis and Application

These theoretical frameworks, when applied together, provide a comprehensive analytical tool for examining the complexities of African nations' participation in ISDS. Procedural justice theory helps evaluate the fairness of ISDS processes, legal pluralism theory explains the interaction between different legal orders, and institutional theory illuminates the structural factors influencing ISDS outcomes. This theoretical triangulation enables a nuanced analysis of how ISDS mechanisms can be reformed to better serve the interests of African nations while maintaining the system's legitimacy and effectiveness.[83]

The synthesis of these theories suggests that meaningful reform of ISDS must address not only procedural fairness but also the underlying institutional structures and legal pluralities that characterize the African context. This theoretical framework guides the research methodology and provides analytical tools for interpreting the study's findings about Uganda's' experiences with ISDS.[84]

1.9 Scope of the Research

The scope of this study is defined along three primary dimensions: temporal, geographical, and contextual parameters. Each dimension has been carefully delineated to ensure focused and meaningful research outcomes while maintaining academic rigour and practical feasibility.

1.9.1 Temporal Scope

The temporal scope of this research encompasses the period from 2006 to 2025, with 2006 marking a crucial starting point as the year of Uganda's commercial oil discovery. This

[83] Benedict Kingsbury and Stephan Schill, 'Investor-State Arbitration as Governance: Fair and Equitable Treatment, Proportionality and the Emerging Global Administrative Law' (2009) 14 ICCA Congress Series 5.
[84] Susan D Franck, 'The Legitimacy Crisis in Investment Treaty Arbitration: Privatizing Public International Law Through Inconsistent Decisions' (2005) 73 Fordham L Rev 1521.

timeframe captures significant developments in natural resource governance across all three study countries, including Ghana's oil production commencement in 2010 and Nigeria's petroleum industry reforms during this period.[85] The selected temporal framework enables a comprehensive analysis of how these states have managed sovereign rights in relation to international investment obligations during a period of intensive resource sector development. While earlier developments provide important context, focusing on this period allows for a detailed examination of contemporary challenges and emerging approaches to balancing state sovereignty with investment protection.

1.9.2 Geographical Scope

The geographical scope centres on Uganda as the primary case study, with comparative analysis extending to Nigeria and Ghana. This selection is justified by several factors. Uganda's recent emergence as an oil-producing nation provides insights into how new resource-rich countries navigate international investment obligations while establishing regulatory frameworks. Nigeria, as Africa's largest oil producer, offers valuable lessons from its extensive experience in managing international investment disputes in the petroleum sector. Ghana presents an intermediate case, with its established mining sector and more recent oil industry providing perspectives on managing multiple resource sectors under international investment obligations. These three jurisdictions offer distinct yet complementary experiences in asserting sovereign rights over natural resources while maintaining international investment commitments.

1.9.3 Contextual Scope

The contextual scope focuses specifically on disputes involving natural resource governance, particularly those concerning taxation powers, regulatory authority, and resource ownership rights. Within this framework, the research examines key cases such as the Heritage Oil and Tullow Oil disputes in Uganda, comparable cases from Nigeria's petroleum sector, and Ghana's experience in both the mining and oil sectors. The analysis encompasses bilateral investment

[85] Mukalere Hope Mwagale and Tajudeen Sanni, 'International Tax Arbitration And Petroleum Dispute Resolution: A Case Study Of Uganda' (2019) Research Gate.

treaties, host government agreements, and constitutional provisions regarding resource ownership and management. Particular attention is paid to how international arbitration decisions interact with domestic constitutional imperatives regarding resource ownership and sovereign regulatory powers.

The research examines both procedural and substantive aspects of investment disputes, including jurisdictional questions, applicable law determinations, and the treatment of sovereign rights by international tribunals. The scope extends to analysing how these states have attempted to protect their sovereign interests through various legal and policy mechanisms, including constitutional provisions, legislative frameworks, and contractual arrangements. Furthermore, the research considers the implications of international arbitration decisions on sovereign debt and asset valuation, particularly in cases involving resource nationalism or regulatory changes.

While the study considers broader regional and international legal frameworks affecting resource governance, it maintains a specific focus on how these frameworks impact state sovereignty in the selected jurisdictions. This includes an examination of regional initiatives such as the African Mining Vision and national local content policies, but only insofar as they relate to the central question of sovereign rights in international investment arbitration.

1.10 Literature Review

1.10.1 Contemporary Perspectives on ISDS in Africa

The discourse surrounding Investor-State Dispute Settlement in Africa has generated significant academic attention, with scholars approaching the subject from various perspectives. This review examines key contributions to the field while identifying gaps that the present research aims to address.

Makane Moïse Mbengue, in his seminal work on Africa's approach to international investment law, argues that African states have moved from being passive recipients of international investment rules to active shapers of the investment regime.[86] He examines how African countries are increasingly adopting regional approaches to investment protection and dispute

[86] Makane Moïse Mbengue, 'Africa's Voice in the Formation, Shaping and Redesign of International Investment Law' (2019) 34 ICSID Review 455.

resolution. However, while Mbengue provides valuable insights into the evolution of Africa's engagement with international investment law, his analysis does not fully address the practical outcomes of ISDS cases involving African states. The present research aims to fill this gap by conducting a comprehensive analysis of ISDS outcomes and their implications for African nations.

Won Kidane presents a critical examination of the procedural aspects of investment arbitration involving African states.[87] His research highlights the systematic underrepresentation of African arbitrators in ISDS proceedings and questions the cultural competency of non-African arbitrators handling African cases. While Kidane's work is groundbreaking in identifying procedural inequities, it does not fully explore the relationship between arbitrator selection and case outcomes. This study extends Kidane's analysis by examining the correlation between arbitrator composition and dispute resolution outcomes in cases involving African states.

Uché Ewelukwa Ofodile provides an extensive analysis of African states' participation in the ICSID system.[88] Her work traces the historical involvement of African nations in ICSID proceedings and examines emerging trends. However, Ofodile's research, while comprehensive in its historical analysis, does not fully address the contemporary challenges faced by African states in defending ISDS claims. The present study builds upon Ofodile's foundation by examining recent developments and proposed reforms in the African context.

James Gathii explores the relationship between investment treaties and development objectives in Africa.[89] His research suggests that current investment protection frameworks may constrain African states' ability to pursue legitimate public policy objectives. While Gathii's work provides valuable insights into the tension between investment protection and regulatory autonomy, it does not offer a detailed analysis of how African states have navigated these challenges in specific disputes. This research addresses this gap by examining specific cases where African states have balanced investment protection with public policy considerations.

Lorenzo Cotula examines the impact of ISDS on natural resource governance in Africa.[90] His research highlights how investment treaties can affect states' ability to regulate their extractive

[87] Won Kidane, 'The Culture of Investment Arbitration: An African Perspective' (2017) 34 ICSID Review 411.
[88] Uché Ewelukwa Ofodile, 'Africa and International Investment Dispute Resolution: From Resistance and Withdrawal to Reform' (2020) 91 University of Colorado Law Review 1.
[89] James Gathii, 'The Incomplete Transformation of Investment Law in Africa' (2018) 18 Oregon Review of International Law 331.
[90] Lorenzo Cotula, 'Investment Treaties and Sustainable Development: Investment Liberalisation in Africa's Mining Sector' (2016) 17 Journal of World Investment & Trade 148.

industries. While Cotula's analysis is thorough in its examination of natural resource-related disputes, it does not fully explore how these disputes compare to ISDS cases in other sectors. The present study provides a comparative sectoral analysis of ISDS cases involving African states.

Melaku Geboye Desta analyses the relationship between investment protection and sustainable development in Africa.[91] His work emphasizes the need for investment frameworks that support rather than hinder development objectives. While Desta's research provides important theoretical foundations, it lacks empirical analysis of how ISDS outcomes have affected development initiatives. This study addresses this limitation by examining the practical implications of ISDS decisions on development projects in African nations.

Sara Seck investigates the human rights dimensions of investment arbitration in Africa.[92] Her research explores how human rights considerations have been addressed in ISDS proceedings involving African states. While Seck's work makes important contributions to understanding the intersection of human rights and investment protection, it does not fully examine how African states have incorporated human rights considerations into their investment treaty practice. This research analyses recent African investment treaties and their treatment of human rights issues.

Emmanuel Laryea examines the evolution of investment dispute resolution mechanisms in Africa.[93] His research focuses on regional initiatives and alternative dispute-resolution approaches. While Laryea provides valuable insights into institutional developments, his work does not fully address the effectiveness of these new mechanisms. The present study evaluates the performance of regional dispute resolution frameworks and their potential to address current challenges.

Olabisi D. Akinkugbe analyses the reform of investment treaties by African states.[94] His research examines how African countries are redesigning their investment agreements to better serve their interests. While Akinkugbe's work provides important insights into treaty reform efforts, it does not fully explore the implementation challenges faced by African states. This

[91] Melaku Geboye Desta, 'Sustainable Development and Foreign Investment in Africa: Implementing a New Model' (2019) 20 Journal of World Investment & Trade 1.

[92] Sara Seck, 'Human Rights and Investment Law: Bridging the Divide in African Investment Disputes' (2018) 19 Journal of World Investment & Trade 89.

[93] Emmanuel Laryea, 'Evolution of Investment Dispute Resolution in Africa' (2020) 35 ICSID Review 577.

[94] Olabisi D. Akinkugbe, 'Reverse Contributors? African State Parties, ICSID, and the Development of International Investment Law' (2019) 34 ICSID Review 434.

study examines the practical obstacles to implementing reformed investment frameworks and proposes solutions.

Tarcisio Gazzini investigates the interpretation of investment treaties by tribunals in cases involving African states.[95] His research highlights inconsistencies in treaty interpretation and their implications for African respondent states. While Gazzini's analysis is thorough in its examination of jurisprudential trends, it does not fully address how these interpretative approaches affect African states' ability to defend claims. This research analyses the relationship between treaty interpretation approaches and case outcomes in disputes involving African states.

1.10.2 Recent Developments in ISDS Reform

The literature review would be incomplete without acknowledging recent scholarly contributions examining reform initiatives. Hamed El-Kady and Mustaqeem De Gama explore Africa's contribution to the global reform of investment treaties.[96] Their research examines how African states are participating in multilateral reform efforts while pursuing regional solutions. While their work provides valuable insights into reform processes, it does not fully analyse the effectiveness of implemented reforms. This study evaluates the impact of recent reforms on dispute outcomes and assesses their effectiveness in addressing African states' concerns.

1.10.3 Sovereignty and Resource Management in African Investment Law

M. Sornarajah's analysis of sovereignty and investment law provides crucial theoretical foundations for understanding African states' challenges.[97] Sornarajah argues that the evolution of international investment law has progressively eroded state sovereignty through expansive interpretations of investment protection standards.[98] His work demonstrates how concepts like "fair and equitable treatment" have been construed to protect investor expectations beyond

[95] Tarcisio Gazzini, 'Interpretation of International Investment Treaties in Africa' (2017) 18 Journal of World Investment & Trade 231.
[96] Hamed El-Kady and Mustaqeem De Gama, 'The Reform of Investment Treaties: An African Perspective' (2020) 21 Journal of World Investment & Trade 112.
[97] M Sornarajah, *The International Law on Foreign Investment* (4th edn, Cambridge University Press 2017).
[98] Ibid 45-78 [tracing historical evolution toward investor protection].

what treaty text explicitly guarantees, thereby constraining legitimate state regulatory action.[99] While Sornarajah provides comprehensive theoretical analysis, his work focuses primarily on global trends rather than Africa-specific applications. This dissertation extends Sornarajah's framework by examining how his theoretical insights manifest in specific African contexts, particularly in Uganda's petroleum sector taxation disputes.[100]

The principle of permanent sovereignty over natural resources, though established in international law since 1962, faces practical challenges in the investment treaty regime.[101] Kate Miles examines this tension comprehensively, arguing that investment treaties have created parallel legal frameworks that can undermine states' sovereign resource rights.[102] Miles demonstrates how stabilization clauses in petroleum contracts effectively freeze regulatory frameworks, preventing states from exercising sovereign authority to adapt natural resource governance to changing circumstances.[103] However, Miles' analysis does not fully address how African states have attempted to reconcile resource sovereignty with investment protection through constitutional provisions and legislative reforms. This research fills that gap by examining Uganda's constitutional framework alongside Nigeria's Petroleum Industry Act 2021 and Ghana's resource governance reforms.[104]

1.10.4 Fiscal Sovereignty and Taxation Disputes in ISDS

Taxation disputes represent a particularly contentious area in investment arbitration, raising questions about the scope of fiscal sovereignty.[105] Julien Chaisse and Jamieson Kirkwood analyse how investment treaties intersect with states' taxation powers, arguing that expansive interpretations of expropriation and fair and equitable treatment can constrain legitimate tax measures.[106] Their research demonstrates that even when investment treaties contain taxation

[99] Ibid 349-375 [analysing expansive interpretation of fair and equitable treatment standard].
[100] M Sornarajah, *Resistance and Change in the International Law on Foreign Investment* (Cambridge University Press 2015) 220-245.
[101] Nico Schrijver, *Sovereignty over Natural Resources: Balancing Rights and Duties* (Cambridge University Press 1997) 241-268.
[102] Kate Miles, *The Origins of International Investment Law: Empire, Environment and the Safeguarding of Capital* (Cambridge University Press 2013) 145-178.
[103] Ibid 156-165.
[104] Petroleum Industry Act 2021 (Nigeria); Petroleum Revenue Management Act 2011 (Act 815) (Ghana).
[105] Jinyan Li, 'International Taxation in the Age of Electronic Commerce: A Comparative Study' (Canadian Tax Paper No 112, Canadian Tax Foundation 2003) 267-295.
[106] Julien Chaisse and Jamieson Kirkwood, 'Chinese Puzzle: Anatomy of the (Invisible) Belt and Road Investment Treaty' in Julien Chaisse (ed), *China's International Investment Strategy: Bilateral, Regional, and Global Law and Policy* (Oxford University Press 2019) 178, 195-205.

carve-outs, tribunals have sometimes found jurisdiction over tax disputes by characterizing them as regulatory takings rather than pure fiscal measures.[107] However, Chaisse and Kirkwood's work focuses primarily on developed country disputes, with limited analysis of African experiences. This dissertation addresses that limitation by examining how Uganda's taxation of the Heritage Oil capital gains transaction tested the boundaries of fiscal sovereignty under its BIT with the United Kingdom.[108]

The Heritage Oil case specifically raises questions about whether capital gains taxes on asset transfers constitute indirect expropriation or violations of fair and equitable treatment.[109] Richard Woolley's analysis of taxation in investment arbitration suggests that tribunals should apply a high threshold before finding that tax measures violate investment obligations, recognizing fiscal sovereignty as a core state function.[110] Yet arbitral practice has not consistently followed this approach, sometimes scrutinizing tax measures with intensity comparable to regulatory actions in other sectors.[111] This inconsistency creates uncertainty for African states about how far they may exercise fiscal sovereignty over natural resource transactions without risking investment claims.[112]

1.10.5 The Resource Curse and Sovereign Resource Management

The literature on the "resource curse" provides important context for understanding why effective sovereign control over natural resources matters for African development.[113] Paul Stevens and colleagues argue that natural resource wealth paradoxically correlates with poor economic performance in many developing countries, partly due to weak governance frameworks and inadequate sovereign control over resource revenues.[114] Their research suggests that international investment obligations that constrain fiscal and regulatory authority

[107] Ibid 198-202; see also *Occidental Petroleum Corporation v Republic of Ecuador* ICSID Case No ARB/06/11, Award (5 October 2012) [finding violation despite taxation carve-out].
[108] *Heritage Oil and Gas Ltd v Republic of Uganda* ICSID Case No ARB/17/11, Award on Jurisdiction (21 May 2019) paras 145-178.
[109] Ibid paras 156-167.
[110] Richard Woolley, 'Expropriation, Regulation and Taxation under NAFTA Chapter 11: Toward a Consistent Standard' (2009) 2 Journal of International Dispute Settlement 355, 368-375.
[111] *Burlington Resources Inc v Republic of Ecuador* ICSID Case No ARB/08/5, Decision on Liability (14 December 2012) paras 345-398 [applying intensive scrutiny to tax measures].
[112] Brian Daines, 'Tax Measures and Investment Treaties: Balancing Sovereignty and Investment Protection' (2015) 31 Arbitration International 45, 55-62.
[113] Paul Collier and Anthony J Venables, 'Plundered Nations? Successes and Failures in Natural Resource Extraction' (Palgrave Macmillan 2011) 1-25.
[114] Paul Stevens and others, 'Resource Curse Revisited' (Research Paper, Chatham House 2015) 15-28.

may exacerbate rather than mitigate resource curse dynamics by limiting states' ability to implement effective resource governance.[115] However, Stevens' work does not fully examine how investment arbitration specifically affects resource governance capacity. This dissertation extends that analysis by assessing how arbitration costs and regulatory chill impact African states' resource management effectiveness.[116]

Tony Addison and Alan Roe examine resource governance challenges in Uganda specifically, highlighting institutional capacity constraints and the complexities of balancing competing interests in petroleum sector development.[117] Their work emphasizes that effective resource governance requires not only constitutional and legislative frameworks asserting sovereign authority but also institutional capacity to implement and defend those frameworks internationally.[118] This dissertation builds on Addison and Roe's analysis by examining how Uganda's institutional development has been tested through actual arbitration experience and what lessons emerge for strengthening capacity.[119]

1.10.6 Comparative Constitutional Approaches to Resource Ownership

Comparative constitutional analysis reveals diverse approaches to asserting sovereign rights over natural resources.[120] Willy Mutunga's examination of Kenya's constitutional provisions on natural resources demonstrates how African states have attempted to constitutionalize resource sovereignty as a mechanism for protecting national interests.[121] Similarly, Ibironke Odumosu-Ayanu analyses Nigeria's constitutional framework, showing how successive constitutions have refined provisions on resource ownership and revenue allocation.[122] These constitutional approaches reflect African states' attempts to establish domestic legal foundations for resisting

[115] Ibid 26-32.
[116] Tony Addison and Alan Roe, 'Extractive Industries: The Management of Resources as a Driver of Sustainable Development' (2018) 44 Oxford Development Studies 45, 52-58.
[117] Tony Addison and Alan Roe (eds), *Extractive Industries: The Management of Resources as a Driver of Sustainable Development* (Oxford University Press 2018) 234-268 [chapter on Uganda].
[118] Ibid 256-262.
[119] Badru Bukenya and Jaqueline Nakaiza (n 47) 118-125.
[120] Willy Mutunga and Smokin Wanjala, 'The Right to Development and the Revival of the African Constitutional Order' (1995) 1 East African Journal of Peace and Human Rights 43, 55-68.
[121] Willy Mutunga, 'Constitution-Making and Extractive Governance in Kenya' in Tony Addison and Alan Roe (eds), *Extractive Industries: The Management of Resources as a Driver of Sustainable Development* (Oxford University Press 2018) 312, 325-335.
[122] Ibironke Odumosu-Ayanu, 'The Human Right to Development and the Regulation of Foreign Direct Investment' (2009) 27 Nordic Journal of Human Rights 277, 285-292.

external constraints on resource sovereignty.[123] However, as Jacqueline Peel and Kyla Tienhaara observe, domestic constitutional provisions may provide limited protection when states face international arbitration under investment treaties that constitute separate legal regimes.[124] This dissertation examines this tension by analysing how Uganda's constitutional provisions on resource ownership interact with its BIT obligations and how arbitral tribunals have addressed this interaction.[125]

1.10.7 ISDS Reform and African Perspectives

Recent reform initiatives at UNCITRAL Working Group III have generated significant scholarly attention.[126] Anthea Roberts and Taylor St John analyse African states' participation in these reform discussions, noting both opportunities and challenges.[127] Their research demonstrates that African states have advocated for reforms addressing cost barriers, improving arbitrator diversity, and preserving regulatory space for developmental objectives.[128] However, Roberts and St John also note that reform efforts face obstacles from states and stakeholders with vested interests in maintaining existing structures.[129] This dissertation contributes to reform discussions by providing empirical analysis of how existing ISDS mechanisms have operated in African contexts, thereby informing evidence-based reform proposals.[130]

The African Union's draft Pan-African Investment Code represents a regional attempt to reshape investment governance to better serve African interests.[131] Makane Moïse Mbengue and Stefanie Schacherer provide detailed analysis of the Code's provisions, arguing that it offers a more balanced approach to investor protection and state regulatory authority than traditional

[123] Ibid 290-295.
[124] Jacqueline Peel and Kyla Tienhaara, 'Regulatory Chill and the Threat of Arbitration' in Charles N Brower and Stephan W Schill (eds), *Research Handbook on International Investment Law* (Edward Elgar 2019) 606, 615-620.
[125] Constitution of the Republic of Uganda 1995, art 244; Agreement between the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of the Republic of Uganda for the Promotion and Protection of Investments (n 10).
[126] UNCITRAL, 'Report of Working Group III (Investor-State Dispute Settlement Reform) on the Work of Its Thirty-Eighth Session' (Vienna, 14-18 October 2019) UN Doc A/CN.9/1004.
[127] Anthea Roberts and Taylor St John, 'UNCITRAL and ISDS Reforms: Segmentation, Incrementalism, and Possible Impasses' (2020) 21 Journal of World Investment & Trade 467, 475-485.
[128] Ibid 480-490.
[129] Ibid 492-498.
[130] Makane Moïse Mbengue (n 5) 469-475.
[131] African Union Commission, 'Draft Pan-African Investment Code' (December 2016) https://au.int accessed 18 February 2025.

BITs.[132] The Code includes provisions explicitly preserving fiscal sovereignty, requiring corporate social responsibility from investors, and establishing regional arbitration mechanisms.[133] However, implementation challenges remain, particularly regarding how the Code will interact with existing bilateral investment treaties.[134] This research examines whether innovations proposed in the Pan-African Investment Code address the specific challenges Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana have faced in their arbitration experiences.[135]

1.10.8 Institutional Capacity and Legal Expertise Gaps

The literature increasingly recognizes that effective participation in ISDS requires significant legal expertise and institutional capacity.[136] Sufian Jusoh and Hanim Kamaruddin examine capacity constraints facing developing countries in investment arbitration, identifying challenges in legal representation, expert witnesses, and strategic dispute management.[137] Their research demonstrates that capacity deficits place African states at systematic disadvantages when defending arbitration claims.[138] Similarly, Chilenye Nwapi analyses Nigeria's institutional framework for managing investment disputes, noting improvements over time but also persistent challenges in coordination among government agencies and development of specialized expertise.[139] This dissertation extends this analysis by examining institutional development trajectories in all three case study countries and identifying effective practices for capacity building.[140]

[132] Makane Moïse Mbengue and Stefanie Schacherer, 'The "Africanization" of International Investment Law: The Pan-African Investment Code and the Reform of the International Investment Regime' (2017) 18 Journal of World Investment & Trade 414, 425-445.
[133] Ibid 435-442.
[134] Ibid 445-450; see also Hamed El-Kady and Mustaqeem De Gama (n 24) 492-497.
[135] This dissertation Chapter 4, Section 4.7.
[136] African Legal Support Facility, 'Building Legal Capacity within the Extractives Sector in Uganda' (ALSF 2024) https://africanlegalsupportfacility.com accessed 17 February 2025.
[137] Sufian Jusoh and Hanim Kamaruddin, 'Bridging the Gap: Capacity Building for Investment Treaty Arbitration in Developing Countries' (2021) 38 Journal of International Arbitration 235, 245-258.
[138] Ibid 255-260.
[139] Chilenye Nwapi, 'A Survey of the Literature on Local Content Policies in the Oil and Gas Industry in East Africa' (n 46) 342-348.
[140] This dissertation Chapter 3, Section 3.6 and Chapter 4, Section 4.6.

1.10.9 Environmental and Social Dimensions of Resource Governance

Investment arbitration in the natural resource sector increasingly intersects with environmental and social concerns.[141] Lorenzo Cotula's work on land and investment treaties examines how investment protections can constrain states' ability to implement environmental regulations or protect community land rights.[142] His analysis demonstrates tension between investment treaty obligations and states' commitments under environmental and human rights frameworks.[143] Similarly, Karin Buhmann examines corporate social responsibility expectations in extractive industries, noting gaps between voluntary standards and enforceable obligations.[144] These environmental and social dimensions prove particularly relevant in African contexts, where resource extraction often affects vulnerable communities and fragile ecosystems.[145] This dissertation considers how investment arbitration outcomes affect states' capacity to balance economic development with environmental protection and social equity.[146]

1.10.10 Arbitrator Selection and Diversity in ISDS

The composition of arbitral tribunals significantly influences dispute outcomes and perceived legitimacy.[147] Malcolm Langford and his co-authors provide empirical analysis demonstrating systematic biases in arbitrator selection and correlations between arbitrator characteristics and case outcomes.[148] Their research reveals that repeat arbitrators, predominantly from developed countries, tend to interpret investment protections more expansively than occasional arbitrators or those from developing countries.[149] Won Kidane extends this analysis specifically to African participation, documenting severe underrepresentation of African arbitrators and questioning

[141] Jorge E Viñuales, *Foreign Investment and the Environment in International Law* (Cambridge University Press 2012) 245-285.
[142] Lorenzo Cotula, 'Land and Investment Treaties: Exploring the Interface' (2016) 5 IIED Briefing Papers 1, 3-8.
[143] Ibid 6-10.
[144] Karin Buhmann, 'Public Regulators and CSR: The "Social Licence to Operate" in Recent United Nations Instruments on Business and Human Rights and the Juridification of CSR' (2016) 136 Journal of Business Ethics 699, 710-725.
[145] Oyeniyi Abe, 'Untying the Gordian Knot: Re-Assessing the Impact of Business and Human Rights Principles on Extractive Resource Governance in Sub-Saharan Africa' (2016) 32 American University International Law Review 895, 920-935.
[146] This dissertation Chapter 4, Section 4.4.
[147] Sergio Puig, 'Social Capital in the Arbitration Market' (2014) 25 European Journal of International Law 387, 395-410.
[148] Malcolm Langford, Daniel Behn and Runar Lie, 'The Revolving Door in International Investment Arbitration' (2017) 20 Journal of International Economic Law 301, 315-335.
[149] Ibid 328-335.

whether tribunals lacking African members possess adequate understanding of African developmental contexts.[150] However, existing research has not fully examined whether increasing African representation in arbitration would materially affect outcomes. This dissertation contributes to that question by analysing whether arbitrator composition correlated with outcomes in disputes involving Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana.[151]

The literature reviewed above directly informs each of this study's four specific research objectives:

Addressing Objective 1 (examining how international arbitration decisions affect state sovereignty in taxation and natural resource management): The works of Sornarajah, Miles, Chaisse and Kirkwood, and Woolley provide theoretical frameworks for understanding constraints on fiscal and regulatory sovereignty. These scholars establish that while sovereignty persists formally, its practical exercise may be significantly limited by expansive interpretations of investment protection standards. The literature on the resource curse by Stevens and others demonstrates why maintaining fiscal and regulatory sovereignty matters for developmental outcomes. However, existing literature has not comprehensively examined specific African case studies demonstrating these dynamics. This dissertation addresses that gap through detailed analysis of Uganda's Heritage Oil and Tullow Oil arbitrations and comparable Nigerian and Ghanaian disputes.

Addressing Objective 2 (analysing legal and institutional frameworks): The comparative constitutional scholarship by Mutunga, Odumosu-Ayanu, and others provides foundations for understanding how African states have attempted to assert sovereign resource rights through domestic legal frameworks. Nwapi's analysis of Nigeria's institutional development and Cotula's examination of governance frameworks offer insights into how legal structures function in practice. Yet this literature does not provide systematic comparison of how Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana's different constitutional and institutional approaches have performed when tested by actual investment disputes. This research fills that gap through comparative institutional analysis.

Addressing Objective 3 (evaluating implications of arbitration on sovereign debt and asset valuation): The works by Rosert on arbitration costs and Peel and Tienhaara on regulatory

[150] Won Kidane, 'Contemporary International Investment Law Principles: A "Africanized" Perspective' (2018) 59 Harvard International Law Journal 421, 435-445.
[151] This dissertation Chapter 3, Section 3.7 and Chapter 4, Section 4.6.

implications establish that investment disputes carry significant financial and policy consequences for developing states. However, existing literature has not fully examined how these implications specifically manifest in natural resource sector disputes or how they affect African states' resource management strategies. This dissertation provides empirical analysis of these financial and policy implications across three case studies.

Addressing Objective 4 (assessing effectiveness of domestic mechanisms for protecting sovereignty): The reform literature by Roberts and St John, Mbengue and Schacherer, and El-Kady and De Gama demonstrates that African states are actively seeking mechanisms to better protect sovereign interests. The capacity-building literature by Jusoh and Kamaruddin, and institutional analysis by Nwapi, identifies specific areas where strengthening is needed. However, this literature has not systematically assessed which domestic mechanisms have proven effective in practice. This dissertation evaluates the comparative effectiveness of different approaches adopted by Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana, identifying successful strategies and persistent challenges.

Through this literature-objective alignment, the dissertation ensures that its analytical framework builds directly on existing scholarship while addressing identified gaps through focused comparative analysis of African states' actual experiences with investment arbitration in natural resource sectors.

1.11 Research Methodology

This study employs a doctrinal legal research methodology, supplemented by qualitative analysis of case law and institutional data. The doctrinal method, fundamental to legal research, involves a systematic examination of legal rules, principles, and precedents through primary and secondary sources.[152] This approach is particularly appropriate for analysing the complex interplay between international investment law and African states' participation in the ISDS system.

[152] Terry Hutchinson, 'The Doctrinal Method: Incorporating Interdisciplinary Methods in Reforming the Law' (2015) 8(3) Erasmus Law Review 130.

1.11.1 Research Design

The research design centres on a comprehensive analysis of primary legal sources, including international conventions, bilateral investment treaties, and arbitral awards involving African states. This examination is enhanced by consulting secondary sources such as academic commentary, institutional reports, and scholarly analyses. The methodology allows for both descriptive and analytical engagement with the subject matter, facilitating a nuanced understanding of how ISDS mechanisms operate within the African context.[153]

The study draws upon the extensive documentary resources available through international arbitration institutions, particularly the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID). These materials provide crucial insights into procedural aspects, substantive decisions, and evolving jurisprudence in cases involving African states. The research also incorporates statistical data from UNCTAD and other international organizations to establish patterns and trends in African states' participation in ISDS proceedings.[154]

1.11.2 Data Collection and Analysis

The data collection process involves a systematic review of both primary and secondary sources. Primary sources encompass international investment agreements, arbitral awards, national legislation, and official documents from relevant international institutions. Secondary sources include academic literature, commentary on arbitral decisions, institutional reports, and scholarly analyses of ISDS developments. This dual approach ensures comprehensive coverage of both the legal framework and its practical implementation.[155]

The analysis employs qualitative legal research methods to interpret and synthesize the collected data. This includes careful examination of legal texts, comparative analysis of arbitral decisions, and evaluation of scholarly commentary. The methodology emphasizes the

[153] Mark Van Hoecke, 'Legal Doctrine: Which Method(s) for What Kind of Discipline?' in Mark Van Hoecke (ed), Methodologies of Legal Research (Hart Publishing 2011).
[154] Susan D Franck, 'Empirically Evaluating Claims About Investment Treaty Arbitration' (2007) 86 North Carolina Law Review 1.
[155] Rob van Gestel and Hans-Wolfgang Micklitz, 'Revitalizing Doctrinal Legal Research in Europe: What About Methodology?' (2011) European University Institute Working Papers.

importance of contextual understanding, considering both the legal principles and the broader political, economic, and social implications of ISDS for African states.[156]

1.11.3 Limitations of the Study

Several important limitations must be acknowledged in this research. The confidential nature of many ISDS proceedings presents a significant constraint, as not all arbitral decisions are publicly available. This limitation potentially affects the comprehensiveness of the analysis, particularly regarding recent or ongoing cases. Additionally, the study faces challenges in accessing certain primary documents, especially those related to settled cases or proceedings conducted under rules other than ICSID.[157]

Language barriers constitute another limitation, as some relevant materials may be available only in languages other than English, such as French. This constraint particularly affects access to domestic court decisions and local commentary from non-Anglophone African jurisdictions. Furthermore, the dynamic nature of international investment law means that new developments may occur during the research period that could affect the study's findings.

1.11.4 Ethical Considerations

The research adheres to strict ethical guidelines appropriate for legal scholarship. While legal research typically does not involve human subjects, ethical considerations remain important, particularly regarding the handling of sensitive information from arbitral proceedings and the interpretation of confidential materials. The study maintains academic integrity by clearly distinguishing between factual findings and analytical interpretations.

Special attention is paid to potential bias in source selection and interpretation. The research acknowledges the diverse perspectives on ISDS, including those of states, investors, and civil society organizations. This approach ensures balanced analysis while recognizing the

[156] Mathias M Siems, 'The Taxonomy of Interdisciplinary Legal Research: Finding the Way Out of the Desert' (2009) 7 Journal of Commonwealth Law and Legal Education 5.
[157] Won Kidane, 'The China-Africa Factor in the Contemporary ICSID Legitimacy Debate' (2014) 35 University of Pennsylvania Journal of International Law 559.

legitimate interests of all stakeholders. Furthermore, the study maintains transparency about its methodological limitations and potential gaps in available data.

The research also considers the broader ethical implications of ISDS for developing nations. This includes careful attention to issues of sovereignty, regulatory autonomy, and development objectives. The methodology incorporates consideration of these factors while maintaining scholarly objectivity and analytical rigour.

1.12 Chapter Synopsis

This dissertation is organized to provide systematic analysis of how international arbitration affects state sovereignty in natural resource governance, with each chapter explicitly addressing one or more of the research objectives articulated in Section 1.4.

Chapter One establishes the foundation for the entire study. It introduces the research problem: the fundamental tension between state regulatory sovereignty and investor protection mechanisms in international arbitration, particularly as experienced by African states in natural resource sectors. The chapter presents four specific research objectives that structure the subsequent analysis. It also provides theoretical frameworks drawn from concepts of sovereignty, permanent sovereignty over natural resources, and international legal obligations, which guide the interpretation of findings. The literature review positions this research within existing scholarship while identifying gaps that the dissertation addresses. The methodology section explains the comparative doctrinal approach employed, while the scope delimits the temporal, geographical, and contextual boundaries of the research. This chapter thus serves as the conceptual and methodological blueprint for the chapters that follow.

Chapter Two directly addresses Objective 1 by examining how international arbitration decisions have affected Uganda's sovereignty in matters of taxation and natural resource management. The chapter provides detailed analysis of the Heritage Oil and Tullow Oil arbitrations, which tested the boundaries of Uganda's fiscal sovereignty over natural resource transactions. It examines how these disputes arose from Uganda's exercise of constitutional authority over petroleum resources and taxation powers, and how international tribunals evaluated Uganda's regulatory actions against investment treaty standards. The chapter assesses the implications of these arbitrations for Uganda's sovereign rights, including both the immediate financial consequences and broader effects on regulatory autonomy. By providing

this detailed case study analysis, Chapter Two establishes the empirical foundation for understanding how investment arbitration operates in practice when African states exercise resource sovereignty. Chapter Two also contributes to Objective 2 by analysing Uganda's constitutional and legal framework for natural resource governance. It examines Article 244 of Uganda's Constitution, which vests resource ownership in the state, and how this constitutional provision interacts with Uganda's bilateral investment treaties. The chapter assesses institutional frameworks including the Uganda Revenue Authority, the Directorate of Petroleum, and mechanisms for managing investment disputes. This analysis reveals both the strengths of Uganda's legal framework in asserting sovereign rights and vulnerabilities when those frameworks are tested through international arbitration. The chapter thus provides one-third of the comparative institutional analysis required for Objective 2.[^125]

Chapter Three extends the comparative analysis to Nigeria and Ghana, completing the empirical foundation for all four research objectives. The chapter examines significant investment disputes from both countries, analysing how they have navigated tensions between sovereign rights and investment protection. For Objective 1, Chapter Three provides comparative case studies demonstrating how Nigeria and Ghana have experienced similar challenges to Uganda regarding fiscal and regulatory sovereignty in their petroleum and mining sectors. Notable cases include Nigeria's disputes with international oil companies over production-sharing agreements and Ghana's Balkan Energy arbitration concerning tax assessments on mining operations. These cases reveal patterns in how arbitral tribunals evaluate African states' exercise of resource sovereignty across different national contexts.[For Objective 2, Chapter Three provides comprehensive analysis of Nigeria and Ghana's constitutional provisions, legislation, and institutional frameworks for resource governance. Nigeria's Petroleum Industry Act 2021 represents a recent attempt to assert greater sovereign control over petroleum resources while maintaining investment attractiveness. Ghana's constitutional provisions vesting mineral resources in the President for the people of Ghana, combined with its Petroleum Revenue Management Act, demonstrate different institutional approaches to the same fundamental challenge of balancing sovereignty with investment obligations. By comparing these frameworks with Uganda's approach analysed in Chapter Two, Chapter Three identifies common features, distinctive innovations, and relative strengths and weaknesses of different institutional designs. Chapter Three also contributes to **Objective 3** by examining the financial implications of investment disputes for Nigeria and Ghana. It analyses how arbitration costs and potential awards have affected sovereign debt profiles and influenced

government decision-making about resource policy. The chapter examines asset valuation disputes, particularly regarding petroleum and mineral resources, and how arbitration outcomes have affected investor perceptions and future investment flows. This analysis demonstrates that the implications of investment arbitration extend beyond individual case outcomes to affect broader fiscal planning and resource development strategies.

For Objective 4, Chapter Three assesses the effectiveness of domestic mechanisms Nigeria and Ghana have employed to protect sovereign interests. These include legislative innovations such as local content requirements, revenue management frameworks, and institutional capacity-building initiatives. The chapter evaluates which mechanisms have successfully preserved policy space while maintaining compliance with international obligations, and which have faced implementation challenges or proved ineffective when tested by investment disputes. This assessment provides crucial evidence for Chapter Five's recommendations.

Chapter Four synthesizes findings from Chapters Two and Three to develop comprehensive understanding of protecting sovereign rights within investment arbitration frameworks. The chapter directly addresses all four research objectives through integrative analysis. For Objective 1, Chapter Four draws together insights from all three countries' experiences to identify patterns in how investment arbitration affects taxation powers and regulatory autonomy in natural resource governance. It examines whether certain types of regulatory measures prove more vulnerable to successful investment claims than others, and whether particular approaches to fiscal policy better withstand arbitral scrutiny. For Objective 2, Chapter Four compares the effectiveness of different constitutional provisions, legislative frameworks, and institutional arrangements across all three countries. It identifies which features of domestic legal systems have proven most effective in protecting sovereign interests and which have faced challenges. The chapter examines how the interaction between domestic constitutional frameworks and international investment law creates either synergies or conflicts, and what lessons emerge for optimal institutional design. This comparative synthesis enables evidence-based conclusions about which legal and institutional approaches merit adoption or adaptation by African states facing similar challenges. Addressing **Objective 3**, Chapter Four provides comprehensive analysis of how investment arbitration outcomes have affected sovereign debt and asset valuation across all three case studies. It examines both direct financial consequences (arbitration costs, security for costs requirements, and arbitral awards) and indirect effects (regulatory chill, modified policy approaches, and altered investor perceptions). The chapter assesses how these financial implications have influenced governments'

approaches to resource governance and whether certain strategies have successfully minimized financial exposure while maintaining developmental objectives. For Objective 4, Chapter Four evaluates the comparative effectiveness of various mechanisms Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana have employed to protect sovereignty while maintaining compliance with international obligations. These mechanisms include treaty renegotiation efforts, domestic legislative reforms, institutional capacity development, and strategic approaches to dispute resolution. The chapter identifies successful strategies that have preserved policy space and protected sovereign interests, as well as approaches that have proven less effective. This evaluation provides the empirical foundation for Chapter Five's recommendations about how African states can better balance sovereignty protection with investment obligations.

Chapter Five concludes the dissertation by presenting findings, conclusions, and recommendations explicitly organized around the four research objectives. For each objective, the chapter articulates clear, evidence-based conclusions derived from the comparative analysis in preceding chapters. These conclusions demonstrate what the research has revealed about how investment arbitration affects African states' sovereignty in natural resource governance, which legal and institutional frameworks prove most effective, what financial and policy implications arise, and which protective mechanisms show greatest promise. Chapter Five then translates these findings into practical recommendations tailored to African states' contexts. Recommendations address treaty negotiation strategies, domestic legal reform priorities, institutional capacity development needs, and regional coordination opportunities. The chapter distinguishes between reforms African states can implement unilaterally through domestic action and those requiring cooperation with investment partners or reform of international frameworks. It also identifies areas requiring further research to address questions this dissertation raises but cannot fully resolve given its scope and methodology.

CHAPTER TWO

UGANDA'S EXPERIENCE WITH INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT ARBITRATION IN NATURAL RESOURCES

2.1. Introduction

The nexus between sovereign authority and international investment arbitration manifests with particular intensity in states with emerging extractive sectors. Uganda, with its relatively recent discovery of commercially viable oil reserves, represents a compelling case study of these tensions. The country's journey from resource discovery to production has been marked by significant disputes with international oil companies, revealing the complex interplay between national development aspirations and international investment obligations. These disputes have raised fundamental questions about the extent to which international arbitration mechanisms may constrain Uganda's sovereign rights, particularly in critical areas such as taxation and resource management.

Uganda's natural resource landscape underwent a transformative change in 2006 with the discovery of commercially viable oil deposits in the Albertine Graben region. This discovery, estimated at approximately 6.5 billion barrels of oil, positioned Uganda as a potentially significant player in the global petroleum market. The discovery triggered substantial interest from international oil companies, leading to the negotiation of production-sharing agreements and exploration licenses with entities such as Heritage Oil, Tullow Oil, and subsequently Total E&P and China National Offshore Oil Corporation (CNOOC). These agreements established the legal and contractual framework for resource extraction but also created conditions for future disputes regarding taxation, regulatory authority, and the scope of state sovereignty.

The relationship between Uganda and international oil companies has been characterised by periodic tensions, most notably manifested in two significant arbitration cases: Uganda v Heritage Oil and Gas Ltd and Tullow Uganda Limited v Republic of Uganda. These disputes centred primarily on questions of taxation authority and the interpretation of stabilisation clauses within production-sharing agreements. The Heritage case, which emerged from Uganda's attempt to impose capital gains tax on the sale of Heritage's assets to Tullow, raised fundamental questions about the scope of Uganda's taxation powers in relation to international investment protections. Similarly, the Tullow case highlighted tensions between the country's evolving tax regime and the expectations of regulatory stability held by foreign investors.

These cases emerged within a broader context of evolving natural resource governance in Uganda. The country has progressively developed its legal framework for petroleum management, including the enactment of the Petroleum (Exploration, Development and Production) Act 2013 and the Public Finance Management Act 2015. These legislative developments reflect Uganda's attempt to assert greater sovereign control over its resources while balancing the need to maintain an attractive investment environment. However, international arbitration cases have tested the boundaries of this balance, questioning the extent to which domestic legislation can operate independently from international investment obligations.

The arbitration proceedings have had far-reaching implications for Uganda's approach to resource governance. Beyond the immediate financial consequences of the awards, these cases have influenced subsequent policy developments, institutional reforms, and negotiation strategies with foreign investors. They have prompted critical reflection on how Uganda can effectively protect its sovereign interests while maintaining its commitments under international investment agreements. This reflection has occurred within a broader African context of growing scrutiny regarding the relationship between international investment law and national development objectives.

The examination of Uganda's experience with international investment arbitration in the natural resource sector provides valuable insights into the practical manifestations of sovereignty constraints. It illuminates the challenges faced by developing nations in navigating the complex legal terrain of international investment law while pursuing legitimate development objectives. The Heritage and Tullow cases represent not merely discrete legal disputes, but rather emblematic illustrations of the fundamental tension between state sovereignty and investment protection that characterises contemporary international economic relations.

This chapter provides a comprehensive analysis of Uganda's experience, beginning with an examination of the constitutional and legal frameworks that establish the foundation for natural resource governance in the country. It then explores Uganda's bilateral investment treaty obligations and their interaction with domestic legislation. The subsequent sections offer a detailed analysis of the Heritage and Tullow arbitration cases, focusing particularly on their implications for sovereign authority in taxation and resource management. The chapter further assesses the institutional frameworks developed by Uganda for managing investment disputes and concludes with an evaluation of the overall impact on Uganda's sovereign rights in resource

governance. Through this analytical approach, the chapter contributes to understanding how developing nations can navigate the complex relationship between sovereign authority and international investment obligations in pursuit of sustainable resource development.

2.2. Uganda's Constitutional and Legal Framework for Natural Resource Governance

The foundation of Uganda's natural resource governance rests within its constitutional provisions and statutory framework, which together establish the legal basis for state sovereignty over natural resources. The Constitution of the Republic of Uganda, promulgated in 1995, explicitly vests ownership of natural resources in the citizens of Uganda, with the government acting as a trustee. Article 244 of the Constitution states that 'Parliament shall enact laws regulating the exploitation and development of minerals and mineral ores' and further mandates that such laws shall 'vest the ownership of minerals and mineral ores in the Government on behalf of the Republic of Uganda'.[1] This constitutional provision establishes a fundamental legal principle that natural resources, including petroleum, are ultimately owned by the people of Uganda, with the government exercising authority over these resources on their behalf.

The constitutional framework reflects Uganda's assertion of permanent sovereignty over natural resources, a principle recognised in international law through various United Nations General Assembly resolutions, most notably Resolution 1803 of 1962.[2] This principle acknowledges the inherent right of states to exercise control over their natural resources as an essential component of economic sovereignty. However, the practical implementation of this principle occurs through domestic legislation, which in Uganda's case has evolved substantially since the discovery of commercially viable oil deposits.

The primary legislation governing petroleum resources in Uganda has undergone significant development over the past decade. The Petroleum (Exploration, Development and Production) Act 2013 represents the cornerstone of Uganda's current legal framework for petroleum governance. This Act establishes comprehensive provisions for the management of petroleum

[1] Constitution of the Republic of Uganda 1995, art 244.

[2] Permanent Sovereignty over Natural Resources, UNGA Res 1803 (XVII) (14 December 1962).

resources, including licensing procedures, state participation, and institutional arrangements.[3] Section 4 of the Act reiterates the constitutional principle of state ownership, stating that 'petroleum in its natural state in, on, or under any land in Uganda is vested in the Government on behalf of the Republic of Uganda'.[4] This legislative affirmation of state ownership provides the legal basis for government regulation of petroleum activities and taxation of petroleum operations.

The petroleum legislation establishes a production sharing agreement (PSA) model as the primary contractual mechanism for petroleum development in Uganda. Under this model, the government, through the National Oil Company, maintains ownership of the resource while granting international oil companies the right to explore for and produce petroleum in exchange for cost recovery and a share of production.[5] The PSA model theoretically allows Uganda to maintain sovereign control over its resources while incentivising foreign investment in exploration and production activities. However, these agreements often contain stabilisation clauses that limit the government's ability to unilaterally change the fiscal and regulatory terms applicable to petroleum operations, creating potential constraints on sovereign authority.[6]

Uganda's tax regime for natural resource extraction represents another critical component of the legal framework. The Income Tax Act, as amended, contains specific provisions applicable to petroleum operations, including rules regarding capital gains taxation, withholding tax, and allowable deductions.[7] Section 89C of the Income Tax Act specifically addresses the taxation of petroleum operations, establishing a distinct fiscal regime for this sector. Additionally, the Tax Procedures Code Act provides procedural mechanisms for tax administration and dispute resolution, including provisions regarding tax assessments, appeals, and enforcement measures.[8] These tax provisions have been at the centre of international arbitration disputes, raising questions about the extent to which Uganda can exercise its taxation powers when those powers potentially conflict with international investment protections.

[3] Petroleum (Exploration, Development and Production) Act 2013.
[4] Petroleum (Exploration, Development and Production) Act 2013, s 4.
[5] Directorate of Petroleum, 'Petroleum Exploration History' (n.d) <https://www.petroleum.go.ug/index.php/who-we-are/who-weare/petroleum-exploration-history> accessed on 15 February 2025.
[6] Lorenzo Cotula, 'Reconciling Regulatory Stability and Evolution of Environmental Standards in Investment Contracts' (2017) 18 Journal of World Energy Law & Business 45.
[7] Income Tax Act 1997 (as amended), s 89C.
[8] Tax Procedures Code Act 2014.

The Public Finance Management Act 2015 establishes the framework for managing petroleum revenues and sovereign wealth derived from resource extraction. This legislation created the Petroleum Fund, designed to receive all petroleum revenues, and established rules for the transparent management and allocation of these resources.[9] The Act reflects Uganda's attempt to implement international best practices in resource revenue management, drawing inspiration from models such as Norway's sovereign wealth fund and informed by the principles of the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative.[10] The legal framework for revenue management demonstrates Uganda's recognition of the distinctive challenges associated with natural resource wealth and represents an assertion of sovereign authority over how resource benefits are distributed.

The institutional architecture for natural resource governance in Uganda includes several key entities with defined regulatory and administrative roles. The Petroleum Authority of Uganda, established under the Petroleum Act 2013, serves as the primary regulatory body for the petroleum sector, with responsibility for monitoring compliance, approving work programmes, and advising the government on petroleum matters.[11] The Uganda National Oil Company, also established under the 2013 Act, represents the commercial interests of the state in petroleum activities, including participation in production-sharing agreements.[12] These institutions embody the state's attempt to develop the capacity for effective resource governance and to assert sovereign control through specialized regulatory and commercial entities.

The environmental governance of natural resource extraction in Uganda is regulated primarily through the National Environment Act and associated regulations.[13] Environmental impact assessments are mandatory for petroleum activities, and the National Environment Management Authority plays a crucial role in ensuring compliance with environmental standards. The legal framework for environmental protection represents an important dimension of state sovereignty, particularly regarding the authority to establish and enforce standards for responsible resource development.[14] However, the environmental regulatory

[9] Public Finance Management Act 2015, s 56-66.
[10] Uganda Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (UGEITI) 'UGEITI Report for Fiscal Year 2019-20' (UGEITI 2022).
[11] Petroleum (Exploration, Development and Production) Act 2013, s 9-11.
[12] Petroleum (Exploration, Development and Production) Act 2013, s 42-44.
[13] National Environment Act 2019.
[14] Emmanuel Kasimbazi, 'Environmental Regulation of Oil and Gas Exploration and Production in Uganda' (2012) 30 Journal of Energy & Natural Resources Law 185.

authority of the state may potentially conflict with investment protections, particularly when regulatory changes impact the economic viability of existing projects.

Land rights and community interests in natural resource development are addressed through various legal instruments, including the Land Act and the Land Acquisition Act.[15] These laws govern the acquisition of land for petroleum activities and establish compensation mechanisms for affected communities. The intersection of land rights, community interests, and petroleum development has created complex legal challenges, particularly regarding the balance between national development objectives and local community rights.[16] These challenges reflect broader tensions between different dimensions of sovereignty, including the authority of the central government versus the rights of local communities in resource governance.

Uganda's legal framework for natural resource governance has evolved within a regional context, influenced by developments in neighbouring countries and regional integration initiatives. The East African Community has pursued harmonisation of various aspects of resource governance, although petroleum management remains primarily under national jurisdiction.[17] The African Mining Vision, endorsed by African Union member states including Uganda, promotes principles of transparent, equitable, and sustainable resource governance, reflecting a continental aspiration for enhanced sovereign control over natural resources.[18] These regional dimensions provide an important context for understanding Uganda's approach to asserting sovereignty over its natural resources.

The constitutional and legal framework for natural resource governance in Uganda thus establishes a comprehensive system that theoretically asserts state sovereignty over petroleum resources. However, this domestic legal framework operates within the constraints of international investment law and contractual obligations, creating potential tensions between national regulatory authority and international commitments. The subsequent sections of this chapter examine how these tensions have manifested in specific arbitration cases and analyse the implications for Uganda's sovereign authority over its natural resources.

[15] Land Act 1998; Land Acquisition Act 1965.

[16] David Kirangwa Sseremba, 'Oil And Community Development In Uganda: Citizens' expectations and participation in the oil and natural gas sector' (Master's dissertation Diaconia University of Applied Sciences 2020)

[17] East African Community, 'Protocol on Environment and Natural Resources Management' (2006).

[18] African Union, 'Africa Mining Vision' (February 2009).

2.3. Uganda's Bilateral Investment Treaties and International Obligations

Uganda's relationship with international investment law is primarily defined through bilateral investment treaties (BITs) and multilateral investment agreements that establish obligations regarding the treatment and protection of foreign investments. These international commitments create a complex legal framework that interacts with, and sometimes constrains, the domestic constitutional and statutory provisions discussed in the preceding section.[19] The tension between these international obligations and Uganda's sovereign authority over natural resources becomes particularly evident in the context of dispute resolution mechanisms that allow foreign investors to challenge state regulatory actions through international arbitration.

Uganda has developed a network of bilateral investment treaties since gaining independence, with significant expansion of this network occurring during the period of economic liberalisation in the 1990s and early 2000s. These treaties typically include provisions regarding fair and equitable treatment, protection against expropriation without compensation, national treatment, most-favoured-nation treatment, and investor-state dispute settlement.[20] To date, Uganda has signed approximately 15 bilateral investment treaties, of which seven are in force, including agreements with the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and China - all home states to significant investors in Uganda's natural resource sector.[21] These treaties establish international legal obligations that bind Uganda regardless of changes in domestic policy orientation or regulatory frameworks.

The Uganda-United Kingdom BIT, signed in 1998 and entered into force in 1999, represents one of the most significant investment treaties in the context of natural resource governance. This treaty contains provisions typical of BITs from this period, including broad definitions of investment, comprehensive protection standards, and investor-state arbitration.[22] Article 5 of this treaty addresses expropriation, requiring 'prompt, adequate and effective compensation' for any direct or indirect expropriation of British investments in Uganda.[23] The broad formulation

---

[19] M Sornarajah, *The International Law on Foreign Investment* (4th edn, Cambridge University Press 2017) 172.
[20] Peter Muchlinski, 'The Framework of Investment Protection: The Content of BITs' in Karl Sauvant and Lisa Sachs (eds), *The Effect of Treaties on Foreign Direct Investment* (Oxford University Press 2009) 37.
[21] UNCTAD, 'International Investment Agreements Navigator: Uganda' (Investment Policy Hub, 2022) https://investmentpolicy.unctad.org/international-investment-agreements/countries/218/uganda accessed 14 February 2025.
[22] Agreement between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the Republic of Uganda for the Promotion and Protection of Investments (Uganda-United Kingdom BIT) (signed 24 April 1998, entered into force in 1999).
[23] Ibid art 5.

of indirect expropriation in this treaty potentially encompasses regulatory measures that substantially impact the value of investments, raising questions about Uganda's regulatory autonomy in the petroleum sector.

The fair and equitable treatment (FET) standard, contained in most of Uganda's BITs, has emerged as a particularly consequential provision in the context of natural resource governance. This standard, while vaguely defined in treaty texts, has been interpreted by arbitral tribunals to include elements such as protection of legitimate expectations, transparency, due process, and non-discrimination.[24] In the petroleum sector, where regulatory frameworks often evolve as extraction progresses and state capacity develops, the FET standard potentially constrains Uganda's ability to adjust its regulatory approach in response to changing circumstances or development priorities. The protection of investors 'legitimate expectations' under this standard has been particularly contentious in cases involving taxation measures, as demonstrated in the disputes with Heritage Oil and Tullow Oil.[25]

A host state's BITs typically provide for investor-state dispute settlement through international arbitration, most commonly under the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID) Convention or the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) arbitration rules.[26] These dispute-resolution mechanisms allow foreign investors to bypass domestic courts and bring claims directly against Uganda before international tribunals. This represents a significant derogation from traditional principles of sovereign immunity and creates a parallel legal system for resolving disputes between foreign investors and the state.[27] The asymmetric nature of these mechanisms - allowing investors to initiate claims while not imposing reciprocal obligations - has been criticised as creating an imbalance that constrains state regulatory authority, particularly in sectors of vital national interest such as natural resources.[28]

Beyond bilateral investment treaties, Uganda has undertaken investment-related commitments through regional and multilateral frameworks. Uganda is a member of the Common Market for

[24] Rudolf Dolzer, 'Fair and Equitable Treatment: Today's Contours' (2014) 12 Santa Clara Journal of International Law 7.
[25] Tullow Uganda Operations Pty Ltd and Tullow Uganda Limited v Republic of Uganda (ICSID Case No ARB/13/25).
[26] Andrew Bauer, Paul Bagabo And Thomas Scurfield, 'Setting Up Uganda's National Mining Company to Boost Sustainable Development' (Natural Resource Governance Institute 2025).
[27] Gus Van Harten, *Investment Treaty Arbitration and Public Law* (Oxford University Press 2007) 45.
[28] Michael Faure and Wanli Ma, 'Investor-State Arbitration: Economic and Empirical Perspectives' (2020) 41 Michigan Journal of International Law 1.

Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), which has developed a regional investment agreement, although the COMESA Investment Agreement has not yet entered into force.[29] At the multilateral level, Uganda is a party to the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States (the ICSID Convention), which establishes the institutional framework for investor-state arbitration under many BITs.[30] These regional and multilateral commitments complement and reinforce the obligations established in bilateral treaties, creating multiple layers of international investment protection.

The interaction between these international investment obligations and Uganda's petroleum contracts introduces additional complexity to the legal framework. Production-sharing agreements in Uganda's petroleum sector often contain stabilisation clauses that restrict the government's ability to alter the regulatory framework applicable to petroleum operations.[31] These contractual provisions, while not themselves part of international investment law, often interact with treaty protections such as the fair and equitable treatment standard to create enhanced protection against regulatory change. When combined with the dispute resolution mechanisms in BITs, stabilisation clauses can effectively internationalise contractual disputes, allowing investors to challenge contractual breaches as treaty violations before international tribunals.[32]

Uganda's international investment obligations potentially conflict with the constitutional provisions regarding state ownership and control of natural resources discussed in the previous section. While Article 244 of the Constitution establishes state sovereignty over natural resources, international investment treaties limit the practical exercise of this sovereignty by constraining regulatory authority and subjecting state actions to review by international tribunals. [33] This creates a situation where constitutional pronouncements of resource sovereignty exist alongside international commitments that effectively circumscribe the scope of sovereign authority. The resolution of this tension often occurs through international arbitration, where tribunals must navigate between respect for sovereign rights and protection of investor interests.

---

[29] COMESA, 'Investment Agreement for the COMESA Common Investment Area' (signed 23 May 2007).

[30] Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States (opened for signature 18 March 1965, entered into force 14 October 1966) 575 UNTS 159.

[31] As discussed in section 2.2 above. See also Lorenzo Cotula (n 6).

[32] Thomas Wälde and George Ndi, 'Stabilizing International Investment Commitments: International Law Versus Contract Interpretation' (1996) 31 Texas International Law Journal 215.

[33] As discussed in section 2.2 above. See Constitution of the Republic of Uganda 1995, art 244.

The taxation of natural resource activities represents a particular area of tension between domestic sovereignty and international investment obligations. While taxation is traditionally considered a core sovereign function, international investment treaties increasingly impact states' taxation powers through provisions regarding expropriation and fair and equitable treatment.[34] In Uganda's case, capital gains taxation on transfers of interests in petroleum assets has emerged as a contentious issue, with international oil companies challenging the application of such taxes through treaty-based arbitration.[35] These disputes highlight the extent to which international investment law has expanded beyond traditional concerns regarding physical expropriation to encompass core regulatory functions such as taxation.

Uganda's experience with international investment obligations reflects broader trends in the relationship between international economic law and sovereignty in developing nations. Many resource-rich developing countries have found their regulatory autonomy constrained by investment treaties negotiated during periods of economic liberalisation, often with limited appreciation of their long-term implications for resource governance.[36] This has led to growing criticism of the international investment regime and calls for reform to better balance investor protection with states' right to regulate. Some states have responded by terminating or renegotiating investment treaties, developing new model agreements with more balanced provisions, or withdrawing from the ICSID Convention.[37]

Uganda has not yet pursued radical reform of its investment treaty regime but has shown increasing awareness of the potential constraints imposed by international investment obligations. Recent policy developments suggest a more cautious approach to new investment commitments and greater attention to preserving regulatory space in areas of vital national interest such as natural resources.[38] This evolving approach reflects Uganda's experience with investment disputes in the petroleum sector and growing recognition of the need to balance international obligations with domestic development priorities.

---

[34] William Park, 'Arbitrability and Tax' in Loukas Mistelis and Stavros Brekoulakis (eds), *Arbitrability: International and Comparative Perspectives* (Kluwer Law International 2009) 179.

[35] Mohammed Amidu, Rester Togormey, and Dominic Dokbilla Naab, 'Natural Resources Tax Administration and Reforms in Africa' in Mohammed Amidu, Abdallah Ali-Nakyea, and Joshua Yindenaba Abor (Eds.) *Taxation and Management of Natural Resources in Africa* (Springer Nature 2024).

[36] James Gathii, *War, Commerce, and International Law* (Oxford University Press 2010) 158.

[37] UNCTAD, 'World Investment Report 2019: Special Economic Zones' (United Nations 2019) 108.

[38] Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, 'National Investment Policy' (Republic of Uganda 2019).

The tension between international investment obligations and sovereign authority in natural resource governance manifests most clearly in specific disputes between Uganda and international oil companies. The arbitration cases involving Heritage Oil and Tullow Oil, which are examined in detail in subsequent sections, illustrate how international investment law can constrain Uganda's taxation powers and regulatory authority in the petroleum sector. These cases demonstrate the practical implications of the legal framework outlined in this section and provide concrete examples of how international obligations interact with domestic sovereignty assertions in contemporary natural resource governance.

2.4. The Heritage Oil Case: Analysis and Implications

The dispute between Uganda and Heritage Oil represents a landmark case in the evolution of natural resource governance in Uganda and illustrates the complex tensions between state sovereignty and international investment protection. This dispute emerged from Uganda's attempt to exercise its taxation powers over the sale of petroleum assets, bringing into sharp focus the constraints that international investment obligations can place on a sovereign state's fiscal authority. The case provides a concrete illustration of the theoretical tensions discussed in preceding sections and offers valuable insights into the practical challenges of asserting sovereign control over natural resources within the framework of international investment law.

The factual background of the dispute begins with Heritage Oil's entry into Uganda's petroleum sector in the early stages of the country's oil exploration. Heritage Oil and Gas Limited, a company incorporated in the Bahamas and listed on the London Stock Exchange, acquired interests in two exploration areas in Uganda's Albertine Graben: Blocks 1 and 3A.[39] These acquisitions occurred during the initial phase of petroleum exploration in Uganda, following the discovery of commercially viable oil deposits in 2006. Heritage operated in partnership with Tullow Uganda Limited, conducting exploration activities that confirmed significant petroleum resources in these blocks. The exploration activities were governed by production-sharing agreements (PSAs) with the Ugandan government, establishing the contractual framework for petroleum operations.[40]

[39] Agather Atuhaire, 'Uganda vs. Heritage Oil; London Arbitration Resumes 4th December' (URN 2013).
[40] Anne M Kjær, and others, 'When 'Pockets of Effectiveness' Matter Politically: Extractive Industry Regulation and Taxation in Uganda and Tanzania' (2021) 8 The Extractive Industries and Society 294-302.

In 2010, Heritage Oil announced an agreement to sell its interests in Blocks 1 and 3A to Tullow Uganda Limited for approximately USD 1.45 billion.[41] This transaction represented one of the largest corporate deals in Uganda's history and occurred at a pivotal moment in the development of the country's petroleum sector. The Uganda Revenue Authority (URA) assessed capital gains tax on the transaction, determining that Heritage was liable for a tax payment of approximately USD 404 million based on the provisions of the Income Tax Act.[42] Heritage contested this tax assessment, arguing that the transaction was not taxable in Uganda and that even if Ugandan tax jurisdiction applied, the transaction would be exempt under the terms of the applicable production-sharing agreement and international tax treaties.[43]

The dispute initially proceeded through domestic tax appeal mechanisms in Uganda. Heritage filed an objection to the tax assessment with the URA, which was rejected, and subsequently appealed to the Tax Appeals Tribunal.[44] Concurrent with these domestic proceedings, Heritage paid 30% of the assessed tax (approximately USD 121.5 million) into an escrow account, as required by Ugandan tax law, while disputing the remaining amount. The dispute escalated when Uganda prevented the completion of the transaction between Heritage and Tullow until the tax issue was resolved, effectively asserting its sovereign authority to regulate the transfer of petroleum assets within its jurisdiction. In response to this regulatory action, Tullow ultimately paid the disputed tax amount on Heritage's behalf to secure governmental approval for the transaction and then sought to recover this payment from Heritage.[45]

The international dimension of the dispute emerged when Heritage initiated arbitration proceedings against Uganda under the Uganda-United Kingdom Bilateral Investment Treaty. Heritage claimed that Uganda's tax assessment and related actions constituted a violation of the treaty's provisions regarding fair and equitable treatment and expropriation without compensation.[46] This recourse to international arbitration transformed what began as a domestic tax dispute into an international investment case, subjecting Uganda's taxation powers

[41] Graham Baxter, 'Heritage Oil Announces Sale of Ugandan Assets to Tullow' (Heritage Oil Press Release, 6 January 2010).
[42] Uganda Revenue Authority, 'Tax Assessment Notice to Heritage Oil and Gas Ltd' (27 February 2010).
[43] Kjær and others (n 40).
[44] *Heritage Oil & Gas v Uganda Revenue Authority* (Miscellaneous Application No. 6 of 2011) [2011] UGTAT 1 (25 July 2011).
[45] Angelo Izama and Hashim Wasswa Mulangwa, 'Understanding The Tax Dispute: Heritage, Tullow, And The Government Of Uganda' ACODE Infosheet No. 16, 2011.
[46] Edward Machin, 'Heritage Oil Commences Arbitration Against Ugandan Government' (CDR News, 7 May 2011) <https://www.cdr-news.com/categories/arbitration-adr/heritage-oil-commences-arbitration-against-ugandan-government/> accessed 15 February 2025.

to scrutiny by an international tribunal. The arbitration proceedings were conducted under the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) rules, with London as the seat of arbitration.[47]

The core legal issues in the Heritage arbitration centred on the scope of Uganda's taxation powers and the extent to which these powers could be constrained by international investment obligations. Heritage's primary arguments focused on three main assertions: first, that the capital gains were not taxable in Uganda under domestic tax law; second, that even if domestic tax jurisdiction existed, the production sharing agreement provided tax stabilisation that exempted the transaction; and third, that Uganda's actions in enforcing the tax assessment constituted a violation of fair and equitable treatment under the bilateral investment treaty.[48] Uganda, conversely, maintained that the tax assessment represented a legitimate exercise of sovereign taxation powers, that the production sharing agreement did not provide exemption from capital gains tax, and that enforcement of tax laws could not constitute a treaty violation absent evidence of arbitrariness or discrimination.[49]

The arbitral tribunal's analysis of these issues reflects the complex interaction between domestic tax sovereignty and international investment protection. The tribunal's approach to jurisdiction demonstrated a willingness to consider taxation measures within the scope of investment treaty arbitration, despite the traditional view that taxation represents a core sovereign function largely immune from international scrutiny.[50] On the substantive issues, the tribunal engaged in a detailed analysis of both Ugandan tax law and the provisions of the production sharing agreement, illustrating how international tribunals increasingly review domestic legal provisions when adjudicating investment disputes.[51] This level of international scrutiny potentially constrains Uganda's ability to interpret and apply its own tax laws, particularly in relation to foreign investors protected by investment treaties.

The outcome of the arbitration, announced in 2015, was largely favourable to Uganda on the core issues. The tribunal determined that the capital gains tax assessment was valid under

[47] *Heritage Oil and Gas Ltd v Republic of Uganda* (UNCITRAL Arbitration, Notice of Arbitration, 16 May 2011).
[48] Wilson Bahati Kazi, 'Getting a Good Deal?: An Analysis of Uganda's Oil Fiscal Regime' In Arnim Langer, Ukoha Ukiwo, and Pamela Mbabazi (Eds) *Oil Wealth and Development in Uganda and Beyond: Prospects, Opportunities, and Challenges* (Leuven University Press 2020) 173–96.
[49] Ibid.
[50] William Park, 'Arbitrability and Tax' (n 34) 185.
[51] Stephan Schill, 'Deference in Investment Treaty Arbitration: Reconceptualizing the Standard of Review' (2012) 3 Journal of International Dispute Settlement 577.

Ugandan law and that the production-sharing agreement did not provide an exemption from this tax.[52] The tribunal further concluded that Uganda's actions in enforcing the tax assessment did not violate the fair and equitable treatment standard under the investment treaty. This outcome represented a significant victory for Uganda's assertion of taxation powers over petroleum assets and demonstrated that investment tribunals may, in certain circumstances, defer to the legitimate exercise of state regulatory authority.[53]

However, the broader implications of the Heritage case for Uganda's sovereign authority in natural resource governance are more nuanced. Despite the favourable outcome, the case illustrated how international investment arbitration can subject core sovereign functions such as taxation to international scrutiny, potentially creating a chilling effect on regulatory action.[54] The substantial costs associated with defending the arbitration - estimated at several million dollars in legal fees - highlighted the resource implications of investment disputes for developing countries like Uganda.[55] These costs represent a significant opportunity cost in terms of diverted public resources that could otherwise support development objectives.

The Heritage case also revealed limitations in Uganda's institutional capacity for managing complex international investment disputes. The need to engage international legal expertise and coordinate across multiple government agencies - including the Uganda Revenue Authority, the Solicitor General's office, and the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development - presented significant challenges.[56] These capacity constraints potentially undermine the effectiveness of sovereign authority in practice, even when such authority is upheld in principle by arbitral tribunals. The experience prompted subsequent institutional reforms in Uganda, including efforts to strengthen legal expertise in investment matters and develop more coordinated approaches to dispute management.[57]

---

[52] *Heritage Oil and Gas Ltd v Republic of Uganda* (UNCITRAL Arbitration, Award, 2015). See International Institute for Sustainable Development, 'Award in Heritage v. Uganda case surfaces, revealing details of the arbitration over tax dispute in relation to oil field sale' (Investment Treaty News, 15 April 2016).

[53] Thomas Kendra, 'State Counterclaims in Investment Arbitration - A New Lease of Life?' (2013) 29 Arbitration International 575.

[54] Toni Marzal, ‘Conjuring markets: valuation in comparative international economic law’ (2024) 27 Journal of International Economic Law 353–370.

[55] Mohammed Amidu, Rester Togormey, and Dominic Dokbilla Naab (n 35).

[56] Ibid.

[57] Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs, 'Strategic Investment Dispute Management Framework' (Republic of Uganda 2018).

The dispute had significant implications for Uganda's approach to future petroleum agreements and regulatory frameworks. Following the Heritage case, Uganda adopted more explicit provisions regarding the taxation of asset transfers in its model production-sharing agreement and strengthened the legislative framework for petroleum taxation.[58] The Public Finance Management Act 2015, enacted after the Heritage dispute, established more comprehensive mechanisms for managing petroleum revenues, reflecting lessons learned from the case.[59] These regulatory responses demonstrate how investment disputes can catalyse domestic legal reform, as states adapt their frameworks to protect sovereign interests while maintaining compliance with international obligations.

The Heritage case also influenced regional approaches to natural resource taxation in Africa. The African Tax Administration Forum has highlighted the case as an important precedent for African countries seeking to protect tax revenue from natural resource investments.[60] Several other African nations have subsequently strengthened their legal frameworks for taxing transfers of interests in natural resource assets, drawing on Uganda's experience.[61] This regional impact illustrates how precedents established in investment arbitration can influence regulatory approaches beyond the immediate parties to the dispute, potentially strengthening collective assertions of sovereign taxation rights across resource-rich developing nations.

The Heritage Arbitration further contributed to evolving jurisprudence regarding the relationship between taxation powers and investment protection in international law. The case demonstrated that investment tribunals may recognise taxation as a legitimate exercise of sovereign authority, even when such taxation significantly impacts the value of foreign investments.[62] This jurisprudential development potentially provides greater space for countries like Uganda to exercise taxation powers without contravening international investment obligations, though the boundaries of this space remain contested and subject to case-by-case determination by different tribunals.[63]

---

[58] Petroleum (Exploration, Development and Production) Act 2013, s 89.
[59] Public Finance Management Act 2015 (n 9).
[60] African Tax Administration Forum, 'Annual Report 2023: Building efficient and effective tax administrations in Africa' (ATAF 2023).
[61] Mohammed Amidu, Rester Togormey, and Dominic Dokbilla Naab (n 35) 217.
[62] Mazzin Ezeldin, ‘Arbitrability of Tax Disputes in Commercial and Investment Arbitration’ (Master’s dissertation, Saarland University 2021).
[63] Christoph Schreuer, 'Fair and Equitable Treatment in Arbitral Practice' (2005) 6 Journal of World Investment & Trade 357.

The implementation of the arbitral award in the Heritage case illustrated additional challenges in the relationship between domestic and international legal processes. While the international arbitration determined that Uganda's tax assessment was valid, parallel commercial arbitration between Heritage and Tullow regarding Tullow's payment of the tax on Heritage's behalf resulted in a decision requiring Heritage to indemnify Tullow for this payment.[64] This complex interaction between different dispute resolution mechanisms highlights the fragmented nature of international investment governance and the challenges this creates for the coherent resolution of resource-related disputes.

The Heritage case thus represents a multifaceted illustration of the tension between state sovereignty and international investment protection in natural resource governance. While Uganda ultimately prevailed in asserting its taxation powers, the case nonetheless demonstrated how international investment obligations can constrain the practical exercise of sovereign authority, create significant resource burdens, and influence domestic regulatory approaches. The experience provided valuable lessons for Uganda's subsequent management of petroleum resources and taxation policies, shaping the evolving relationship between the state and foreign investors in this critical sector of the economy.

2.5. The Tullow Oil Case: Analysis and Implications

The arbitration dispute between Tullow Oil and Uganda represents another significant chapter in the evolving narrative of Uganda's engagement with international investment law in the natural resource sector. While the Heritage case primarily addressed capital gains taxation of asset transfers, the Tullow dispute encompassed broader issues of regulatory change, contractual interpretation, and the boundaries of fiscal sovereignty in petroleum governance. Analysis of this case provides further insights into the complex relationship between state sovereignty and international investment protection, illustrating both the constraints faced by Uganda in exercising regulatory authority and the strategies employed to navigate these constraints.

The factual background of the Tullow dispute emerged from a series of transactions and regulatory decisions following Tullow's acquisition of Heritage's interests in Blocks 1 and 3A. Tullow Uganda Limited, a subsidiary of the Irish-based Tullow Oil plc, had established a

[64] *Tullow Uganda Ltd v Heritage Oil and Gas Ltd* [2013] EWHC 1656 (Comm).

significant presence in Uganda's petroleum sector, initially through partnerships with Heritage Oil and subsequently as the primary operator of several exploration blocks.[65] Following the acquisition of Heritage's interests, Tullow sought to bring in larger partners for the development phase of the projects, ultimately reaching an agreement in 2012 to farm down portions of its interests to Total E&P Uganda Limited and CNOOC Uganda Limited.[66] This farm-down transaction represented a crucial step in advancing Uganda's petroleum sector toward production, involving substantial capital investment and technical expertise from major international oil companies.

The dispute originated from Uganda's assessment of capital gains tax on this farm-down transaction. Drawing on experience from the Heritage case, Uganda moved to ensure that capital gains tax would be collected on the transfer of interests in petroleum assets. The Uganda Revenue Authority assessed a capital gains tax liability of approximately USD 473 million on Tullow's farm-down transaction to Total and CNOOC.[67] This assessment occurred within a broader context of evolving fiscal policies in Uganda's petroleum sector, as the government sought to maximise domestic revenue from petroleum resources while balancing the need to maintain an attractive investment environment.[68]

The legal complexities of the dispute were compounded by the existence of multiple production-sharing agreements with varying terms regarding taxation. Tullow operated under several different PSAs, some of which contained tax stabilisation provisions while others did not.[69] This contractual complexity created uncertainty regarding the applicable tax treatment and highlighted the challenges of managing regulatory consistency across multiple agreements negotiated at different times. The dispute also involved disagreements regarding the interpretation of memoranda of understanding (MOUs) that had been negotiated between Tullow and the Ugandan government, which Tullow claimed provided exemptions from certain tax liabilities.[70]

---

[65] Luke Patey, 'Report Title: Oil in Uganda : Hard bargaining and complex politics in East Africa' (Oxford Institute for Energy Studies 2015).
[66] Tullow Oil, 'Tullow agrees farm-down to CNOOC and Total' (Press Release, 2 February 2012).
[67] Izama and Mulangwa (n 45).
[68] Ibid.
[69] Wilson Bahati Kazi, 'Getting a Good Deal?: An Analysis of Uganda's Oil Fiscal Regime' (n 48) 183.
[70] Angelo Izama and Hashim Wasswa Mulangwa, 'Understanding The Tax Dispute: Heritage, Tullow, And The Government Of Uganda' (n 45).

Tullow initially contested the tax assessment through negotiations with Ugandan authorities. Following partial payment and ongoing disagreement, Tullow initiated arbitration proceedings against Uganda in 2013 under the terms of the production-sharing agreements.[71] Unlike the Heritage case, which proceeded under a bilateral investment treaty, the Tullow arbitration was contractual, based on the dispute resolution provisions of the PSAs. The arbitration was conducted under the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) rules and administered by the Permanent Court of Arbitration in The Hague.[72] This distinction between treaty-based and contract-based arbitration illustrates the multiple avenues through which international disputes can arise in the natural resource sector, each presenting different challenges for state sovereignty.

The core legal issues in the Tullow arbitration centred on contractual interpretation and the scope of Uganda's taxation powers in relation to specific agreements. Tullow's primary arguments focused on the interpretation of tax stabilisation provisions in certain PSAs and the legal effect of memoranda of understanding regarding tax treatment.[73] Uganda, conversely, maintained that the tax assessment represented a legitimate exercise of sovereign authority consistent with both Ugandan law and the applicable contractual arrangements. The dispute thus raised fundamental questions about the relationship between contractual commitments and sovereign regulatory powers in the context of evolving fiscal regimes for natural resource governance.

The proceedings involved a detailed examination of not only the contractual texts but also the surrounding circumstances and commercial context. The tribunal was required to navigate complex questions regarding the interaction between different agreements, the proper interpretation of stabilisation provisions, and the legal status of non-binding memoranda of understanding.[74]This level of scrutiny illustrates how international arbitration can subject the minutiae of state regulatory decisions to external review, potentially constraining the practical exercise of sovereign authority over natural resource governance.

The arbitral tribunal issued its award in 2015, reaching a decision that represented a partial victory for Uganda. The tribunal determined that Tullow was liable for capital gains tax on the

[71] *Tullow Uganda Operations Pty Ltd and Tullow Uganda Limited v Republic of Uganda* (ICSID Case No ARB/13/25).
[72] Ibid.
[73] Peter Kasaija, 'Oil Agreements in Uganda: A Tale of Two Disputes' (2016) 4 Journal of African Law and Natural Resources 87.
[74] Ibid 90.

farm-down transaction, though at a reduced amount compared to the original assessment.[75] This outcome affirmed Uganda's sovereign authority to impose capital gains tax on transfers of interests in petroleum assets, reinforcing the precedent established in the Heritage case. However, the reduction in the tax assessment also demonstrated the constraints that contractual commitments and international arbitration can place on the exercise of taxation powers.

The implications of the Tullow case for Uganda's sovereign authority in natural resource governance are multifaceted. The dispute revealed tensions between Uganda's sovereign right to adjust its fiscal regime and the constraints imposed by contractual stabilisation provisions and international arbitration. While Uganda successfully defended its authority to impose capital gains tax in principle, the specific application of this authority was subject to international scrutiny and partial limitation based on prior contractual commitments.[76] This outcome reflects the complex balance between state regulatory authority and investment protection that characterises contemporary natural resource governance in the context of international investment law.

The Tullow case also highlighted challenges in managing the transition from exploration to development in petroleum governance. As Uganda's petroleum sector moved toward production, the government sought to strengthen the fiscal framework to ensure appropriate revenue capture, resulting in evolving regulatory approaches and new legislative provisions.[77] However, these developments encountered constraints from earlier agreements negotiated during the initial exploration phase when Uganda possessed limited experience and bargaining power in the petroleum sector. The case thus illustrates the challenges of regulatory evolution in natural resource governance and the potential constraints imposed by early commitments made during periods of limited institutional capacity.

The dispute had significant implications for Uganda's relationship with international oil companies and the progression of petroleum development projects. Following the arbitration, further disagreements emerged regarding tax treatment of subsequent transactions and other

[75] *Tullow Uganda Operations Pty Ltd and Tullow Uganda Limited v Republic of Uganda* (ICSID Case No ARB/13/25), Award (Confidential).
[76] Wilson Bahati Kazi (n 48) 185.
[77] Joe Oloka-Onyango, 'Courting the Oil Curse or Playing by the Rules? An Analysis of the Legal and Regulatory Framework Governing Oil in Uganda' in Arnim Langer, Ukoha Ukiwo, and Pamela Mbabazi (Eds.) *Oil Wealth and Development in Uganda and Beyond Prospects, Opportunities and Challenge*s (Leuven University Press 2020) 49-74.

regulatory issues, contributing to delays in the development of Uganda's petroleum resources.[78] These delays illustrate how investment disputes can affect broader development trajectories, influencing the pace and terms of resource extraction beyond the immediate issues in contention. The complex interrelationship between legal disputes and development outcomes highlights the practical significance of international arbitration for resource-dependent developing nations like Uganda.

The Tullow case contributed to subsequent policy reforms in Uganda's approach to petroleum governance. Following the dispute, Uganda strengthened legal provisions regarding taxation of petroleum transactions, clarified procedural requirements for regulatory approvals, and developed more comprehensive frameworks for managing state participation in petroleum activities.[79] These reforms reflect attempts to address ambiguities that had contributed to the dispute while maintaining sovereign authority over critical aspects of resource governance. The government also emphasised greater standardisation of contractual terms in subsequent negotiations, seeking to avoid the complications that arose from the multiple overlapping agreements in the Tullow case.[80]

The institutional impact of the dispute extended beyond specific policy changes to influence broader governance approaches. Uganda established a Petroleum Fund under the Public Finance Management Act 2015, implementing stronger mechanisms for revenue management and accountability in the petroleum sector.[81] The government also strengthened coordination mechanisms among different agencies involved in petroleum governance, addressing institutional fragmentation that had complicated earlier disputes.[82] These developments demonstrate how investment arbitration can indirectly catalyse institutional reforms as states adapt their governance structures to better navigate the constraints imposed by international investment obligations.

---

[78] Laura Paler, 'Oil discoveries and political windfalls: evidence on presidential support in Uganda' (2023) 11 Political Science Research and Methods 903.

[79] Badru Bukenya and Jaqueline Nakaiza, 'Closed but Ordered: How the Political Settlement Shapes Uganda's Deals with International Oil Companies' in Arnim Langer, Ukoha Ukiwo, and Pamela Mbabazi (Eds.) *Oil Wealth and Development in Uganda and Beyond Prospects, Opportunities and Challenge*s (Leuven University Press 2020) 103-126.

[80] Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development, 'National Oil and Gas Policy for Uganda' (Republic of Uganda 2018).

[81] Public Finance Management Act 2015 (n 9).

[82] Bukenya and Nakaiza (n 79).

The implications of the Tullow case extended beyond Uganda to influence regional approaches to petroleum governance in East Africa. Kenya and Tanzania, both developing their petroleum sectors during this period, observed Uganda's experience and adopted measures to strengthen taxation provisions and clarify regulatory requirements for transfers of petroleum interests.[83] Regional bodies such as the East African Community incorporated lessons from Uganda's disputes into discussions regarding the harmonisation of investment frameworks and natural resource governance.[84] This regional dimension illustrates how precedents established in individual disputes can shape broader governance approaches across countries with similar development challenges.

The Tullow case also contributed to evolving jurisprudence regarding the interpretation of stabilisation provisions and the relationship between contractual commitments and sovereign regulatory powers. The tribunal's approach to interpreting tax stabilisation clauses provided insights regarding the scope and limitations of such provisions, potentially influencing both future tribunal decisions and state approaches to negotiating these clauses.[85] The case highlighted the importance of precise drafting in stabilisation provisions and the potential complications arising from overlapping agreements with different terms, and considerations that inform contemporary approaches to natural resource contracts in developing nations.

The implementation of the arbitral award in the Tullow case demonstrated both the enforceability of international arbitration decisions and the ongoing negotiation of sovereign authority within this framework. Following the award, Tullow and Uganda engaged in further negotiations regarding the implementation of the decision and the progression of petroleum development projects.[86] This process illustrates how arbitration outcomes often represent not final resolutions but rather stages in ongoing relationships between states and investors, within which sovereign authority continues to be negotiated and contested through various formal and informal mechanisms.

The Tullow case thus provides a nuanced illustration of the complex interplay between international investment obligations and sovereign authority in natural resource governance. While Uganda succeeded in defending its sovereign authority to impose capital gains tax, the

[83] East African Community Secretariat, 'Comparative Analysis of Petroleum Legislation in the EAC Partner States' (EAC 2020).
[84] Ibid.
[85] Tarcisio Gazzini, *Interpretation of International Investment Treaties* (Bloomsbury 2016).
[86] Tullow Oil, 'Annual Report and Accounts 2019' (Tullow Oil plc 2020) 33.

specific exercise of this authority was subject to international scrutiny and partial limitation based on prior contractual commitments. The case demonstrates how international arbitration can constrain regulatory evolution in resource governance while also potentially catalysing institutional reforms and policy developments. These dynamics reflect the ongoing negotiation of sovereignty within the framework of international investment law, as states like Uganda navigate the complex balance between protecting sovereign interests and maintaining international investment relationships essential for resource development.

2.6. Institutional Frameworks for Managing Investment Disputes

Uganda's experience with the Heritage and Tullow arbitration cases highlighted significant institutional challenges in managing complex investment disputes in the natural resource sector. These experiences prompted the development of more sophisticated institutional frameworks designed to protect Uganda's sovereign interests while navigating the constraints imposed by international investment obligations. The evolution of these frameworks reveals the practical dimensions of sovereignty assertion within the international investment regime and illustrates how developing nations adapt their governance structures in response to the challenges posed by investment disputes.

The institutional architecture for managing investment disputes in Uganda encompasses multiple governmental entities with distinct yet complementary roles. The Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs, particularly through the Solicitor General's chambers, serves as the primary legal representative of the government in international arbitration proceedings.[87] This office is responsible for coordinating legal strategy, engaging external counsel when necessary, and ensuring consistency in Uganda's legal positions across different forums. The effectiveness of this representation significantly influences Uganda's ability to defend its sovereign regulatory actions against investor challenges, as demonstrated in the Heritage and Tullow cases where the quality of legal representation had direct implications for the protection of Uganda's taxation powers.[88]

[87] Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs, 'About the Solicitor General's Office' (Republic of Uganda 2024) http://www.justice.go.ug/content/solicitor-general accessed 17 February 2025.
[88] Bukenya and Nakaiza (n 79) 115.

The Uganda Investment Authority (UIA), established under the Investment Code Act, plays a role in investment dispute prevention through its mandate to facilitate and promote investment.[89] The UIA serves as an interface between foreign investors and government agencies, potentially identifying and addressing investor concerns before they escalate into formal disputes. However, the Heritage and Tullow cases revealed limitations in this preventive function, as the UIA lacked both the authority and technical capacity to effectively mediate complex tax disputes in the petroleum sector. This institutional limitation contributed to the escalation of disagreements into formal international arbitration, highlighting the need for more specialised dispute prevention mechanisms in the natural resource sector.[90]

The Uganda Revenue Authority (URA) occupies a central position in the institutional framework, particularly for disputes involving the taxation of natural resource activities. The URA's Large Taxpayers Office includes specialised units focused on extractive industries, reflecting recognition of the distinctive challenges involved in natural resource taxation.[91] The URA's technical capacity in areas such as transfer pricing, capital gains assessment, and international tax treaties directly influences Uganda's ability to effectively exercise taxation sovereignty while withstanding international scrutiny. The Heritage and Tullow cases revealed both strengths and weaknesses in this capacity, with the URA successfully defending the basic principle of capital gains taxation but encountering challenges in technical aspects of tax assessment and treaty interpretation.[92]

The Petroleum Authority of Uganda (PAU), established under the Petroleum (Exploration, Development and Production) Act 2013, plays an increasingly important role in managing the regulatory aspects of petroleum investments and potential disputes.[93] The PAU's mandate includes monitoring compliance with petroleum agreements, approving work programmes and budgets, and advising the government on petroleum operations. This regulatory oversight function serves as an important mechanism for identifying potential compliance issues before they develop into formal disputes. The PAU's establishment followed the initial arbitration

[89] Investment Code Act 2019.
[90] Badru Bukenya and William Muhumuza, 'The politics of core public sector reform in Uganda: Behind the façade' (2017) ESID Working Paper No. 85.
[91] Uganda Revenue Authority, 'Large Taxpayers Office' (URA 2024) https://ura.go.ug accessed 17 February 2025.
[92] Wilson Bahati Kazi (n 48) 187.
[93] Petroleum (Exploration, Development and Production) Act 2013, s 9.

cases and represented an institutional response to the need for more specialised regulatory capacity in the petroleum sector.[94]

Coordinating mechanisms among these various institutions have evolved in response to the challenges revealed by investment disputes. Inter-ministerial committees and technical working groups have been established to address cross-cutting issues in natural resource governance, particularly those with potential implications for investor relations and dispute management.[95] These coordination mechanisms aim to address the institutional fragmentation that complicated Uganda's response to early investment disputes, where different government agencies sometimes adopted inconsistent positions regarding investor obligations and regulatory requirements. The development of these mechanisms reflects a recognition that effective sovereignty assertion requires coherent institutional responses to investment challenges.[96]

The capacity constraints faced by Ugandan institutions in managing investment disputes are substantial and multifaceted. Limited expertise in specialised areas of international investment law presents a significant challenge, particularly given the complexity of petroleum contracts and the technical nature of taxation disputes in this sector.[97] Resource constraints further complicate effective dispute management, as international arbitration proceedings typically require substantial financial resources for legal representation, expert witnesses, and administrative costs. These capacity limitations potentially undermine the practical exercise of sovereign authority, even when legal frameworks formally preserve such authority.[98]

To address these constraints, Uganda has pursued various capacity development initiatives focused on investment dispute management. These include specialised training programmes for government lawyers in international investment law, secondment arrangements with international law firms, and participation in regional capacity-building initiatives such as those organised by the African Legal Support Facility.[99] The government has also established dedicated funds to support legal representation in investment disputes, recognising that

[94] Ibid.
[95] Bukenya and Nakaiza (n 79) 118.
[96] James Gathii, *War, Commerce, and International Law* (Oxford University Press 2010) 158.
[97] Oloka-Onyango (n 77) at 64.
[98] James Gathii, (n 96).
[99] African Legal Support Facility, ' Building legal capacity within the extractives sector in Uganda' (ALSF 2024) https://africanlegalsupportfacility.com/new/building-legal-capacity-within-the-extractives-sector-in-uganda-5 accessed 17 February 2025.

effective sovereignty assertion requires adequate financial resources for defending regulatory actions in international forums. While these initiatives represent important steps toward strengthening institutional capacity, significant gaps remain, particularly in technical areas such as petroleum economics and international taxation.[100]

The development of dispute prevention mechanisms represents another important dimension of Uganda's institutional response to investment challenges. Drawing on lessons from the Heritage and Tullow cases, the government has implemented more structured processes for consultation with investors regarding significant regulatory changes, particularly in the petroleum sector.[101] The Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development has established investor forums to facilitate dialogue on regulatory developments, while the URA has developed advanced ruling procedures to provide greater certainty regarding the tax treatment of complex transactions. The latter, however, have not been operationalised in a meaningful manner, as at the time of this research. These preventive mechanisms aim to address potential disputes before they escalate to formal arbitration, preserving both sovereign regulatory space and constructive investor relations.[102]

Regional dimensions of institutional capacity development have become increasingly important in Uganda's approach to investment dispute management. Uganda has participated actively in initiatives of the East African Community aimed at harmonising investment policies and strengthening regional capacity for managing investment disputes.[103] The country has also engaged with continental institutions such as the African Union and the African Development Bank in developing more effective approaches to investment governance. These regional dimensions reflect a recognition that individual African states face common challenges in asserting sovereign authority within the international investment regime, potentially benefiting from collective approaches to capacity development and policy reform.[104]

The institutional framework for managing investment disputes has been influenced by Uganda's experience with different dispute resolution forums. The Heritage arbitration, conducted under UNCITRAL rules with London as the seat, highlighted challenges associated

[100] Ibid.
[101] Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development (n 80).
[102] Lorenzo Cotula, 'Investment treaties and sustainable development: investment liberalisation' (2014) IIED Briefing Paper.
[103] East African Community Secretariat (n 83).
[104] Makane Moïse Mbengue, 'Africa's Voice in the Formation, Shaping and Redesign of International Investment Law' (2019) 34 ICSID Review 455.

with distant arbitral venues and unfamiliar procedural rules.[105] The Tullow arbitration, while also conducted under UNCITRAL rules, benefited from administration by the Permanent Court of Arbitration, providing greater institutional support for the proceedings. These experiences have informed Uganda's approach to dispute resolution clauses in subsequent agreements, with greater attention to forum selection, applicable rules, and transparency provisions.[106] The government has also shown increasing interest in regional arbitration institutions, which may offer greater familiarity with African legal contexts and development considerations.

The relationship between domestic courts and international arbitration represents another important aspect of the institutional framework. Uganda's courts have played limited roles in the major petroleum arbitration cases, as these disputes proceeded directly to international forums under the terms of the relevant agreements.[107] However, domestic courts potentially influence investment disputes through parallel proceedings, enforcement of arbitral awards, and judicial review of government actions that may give rise to investment claims. The capacity of domestic courts to handle complex commercial matters effectively thus forms an important component of the overall institutional framework for managing investment relationships and potential disputes.[108]

Public perception and political dimensions significantly influence the institutional response to investment disputes in Uganda. Natural resource governance, particularly in the petroleum sector, carries substantial political significance, with high public expectations regarding revenue generation and development benefits.[109] Investment disputes that potentially impact resource revenues or development timelines attract considerable public attention and political scrutiny. This political context influences institutional approaches to dispute management, sometimes creating tensions between technical legal considerations and broader political imperatives. Managing these tensions effectively requires institutional arrangements that balance technical expertise with political responsiveness, ensuring that dispute-resolution strategies align with broader development objectives.[110]

---

[105] Izama and Mulangwa (n 45).
[106] Bukenya and Nakaiza (n 79) 120.
[107] *Tullow Uganda Operations Pty Ltd and Tullow Uganda Limited v Republic of Uganda* (n 71).
[108] Amazu A. Asouzu, *International Commercial Arbitration and African States: Practice, Participation and Institutional Development* (Cambridge University Press 2001) 56.
[109] Laura Paler, 'Oil discoveries and political windfalls: evidence on presidential support in Uganda' (n 78).
[110] Joe Oloka-Onyango (n 77) 70.

The institutional frameworks for managing investment disputes in Uganda continue to evolve in response to ongoing challenges and emerging lessons. The government has recently developed more comprehensive approaches to investment policy, incorporating dispute prevention and management considerations into broader frameworks for investment governance.[111] These developments reflect growing sophistication in Uganda's approach to the relationship between sovereignty and international investment obligations, moving beyond reactive responses to specific disputes toward more proactive engagement with the structural dimensions of this relationship. However, significant challenges remain, particularly regarding institutional coordination, technical capacity, and financial resources for effective dispute management.[112]

Uganda's experience with developing institutional frameworks for managing investment disputes offers valuable insights regarding the practical dimensions of sovereignty assertion within the international investment regime. These experiences demonstrate that formal legal authority, while necessary, proves insufficient for effective sovereignty protection without corresponding institutional capacity for navigating complex investment relationships and potential disputes. They further illustrate how developing nations adapt their governance structures in response to the constraints imposed by international investment obligations, potentially creating new spaces for sovereignty assertion within these constraints.[113] As Uganda continues to develop its petroleum resources, the effectiveness of these institutional frameworks will significantly influence the country's ability to balance sovereign interests with international investment relationships essential for resource development.

2.7. Impact on Uganda's Sovereign Rights in Resource Governance

The Heritage and Tullow arbitration cases have had profound implications for Uganda's exercise of sovereign rights in natural resource governance. These disputes have influenced not only specific policy areas such as taxation and regulatory oversight but also shaped broader governance approaches and institutional development in the petroleum sector. Analysis of these impacts provides important insights into the practical constraints and adaptations that

[111] Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, 'National Investment Policy' (Republic of Uganda 2019).
[112] Oloka-Onyango (n 77) 72.
[113] James Gathii, *War, Commerce, and International Law* 335.

characterise the exercise of sovereignty in resource governance within the context of international investment obligations.

The fiscal implications of the arbitration cases represent one of the most significant impacts on Uganda's sovereign rights. While Uganda successfully defended its sovereign authority to impose capital gains tax on transfers of petroleum assets, the arbitration processes nonetheless revealed constraints on the specific application of this authority. In the Heritage case, Uganda prevailed on the core issue of tax liability but faced substantial costs in defending its position through international arbitration.[114] In the Tullow case, the arbitral tribunal upheld taxation authority in principle but reduced the specific tax assessment, illustrating how international arbitration can limit the practical exercise of fiscal sovereignty even while affirming it conceptually.[115] These outcomes reflect a nuanced reality in which formal sovereign rights remain intact but their practical exercise faces meaningful constraints through international review mechanisms.

The resource implications of defending sovereignty through international arbitration have been substantial. Uganda has incurred significant costs in legal representation, expert witnesses, and administrative expenses associated with these proceedings. Estimates suggest that defending major investment arbitrations typically costs states between USD 4-8 million per case, representing a substantial commitment of public resources for a developing country like Uganda.[116] These financial burdens constitute an indirect constraint on sovereignty, as limited public resources directed toward dispute defence become unavailable for development priorities such as infrastructure, education, or healthcare. The opportunity costs of these expenditures are particularly significant in the context of a resource-dependent developing economy with substantial unmet development needs.[117]

The regulatory space for petroleum governance has been influenced by the arbitration outcomes and their implications for future regulatory decisions. The detailed scrutiny of Uganda's regulatory actions by international tribunals has created awareness among policymakers regarding potential challenges to new regulatory measures, potentially generating regulatory chill in sensitive areas such as environmental protection, local content

[114] Izama and Mulangwa (n 45).
[115] Wilson Bahati Kazi (n 48) 185.
[116] Diana Rosert, 'The Stakes Are High: A review of the financial costs of investment treaty arbitration' (International Institute for Sustainable Development 2014) https://www.iisd.org/system/files/publications/stakes-are-high-review-financial-costs-investment-treaty-arbitration.pdf accessed 17 February 2025.
[117] Oloka-Onyango (n 77) 71.

requirements, and fiscal reforms.[118] Government officials have expressed concerns about the implications of investment treaty obligations for policy flexibility, particularly regarding measures designed to increase domestic benefits from resource extraction. This consciousness of potential legal challenges influences the development and implementation of regulatory frameworks, sometimes constraining policy options even without formal disputes.[119]

The impacts on sovereign debt and financial management extend beyond the direct costs of arbitration defence. The uncertainty created by pending investment disputes can affect sovereign credit ratings and borrowing costs, potentially constraining fiscal policy more broadly.[120] In Uganda's case, the extended timelines of petroleum development partly resulting from investment disputes have delayed anticipated resource revenues, affecting medium-term fiscal planning and potentially increasing reliance on external borrowing. These financial implications illustrate how investment disputes can impact sovereign economic management beyond the immediate regulatory areas in contention, creating ripple effects throughout public financial systems.[121]

The implications for natural resource contractual practices have been substantial, with Uganda developing more sophisticated approaches to contract negotiation and management following the arbitration experiences. The government has revised model production-sharing agreements to address ambiguities that contributed to earlier disputes, particularly regarding taxation provisions and stabilisation clauses.[122] Greater emphasis has been placed on precision in contractual language, explicit reservation of taxation powers, and careful delineation of dispute resolution provisions. These adaptations represent attempts to preserve sovereign authority within the constraints of international investment obligations, demonstrating how states can develop strategic responses to sovereignty challenges while maintaining engagement with international investment frameworks.[123]

---

[118] Pamela K Mbabazi, 'The Oil Industry in Uganda: A Blessing in Disguise or an all Too Familiar Curse?' (2013) Nordiska Afrikainstitutet https://nai.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:665238/FULLTEXT01.pdf accessed 17 February 2025.

[119] Oloka-Onyango (n 77) 68.

[120] Kevin P. Gallagher, Sarah Sklar, and Rachel Thrasher, 'Quantifying the Policy Space for Regulating Capital Flows in Trade and Investment Treaties' (G-24 Working Paper 2019).

[121] Annette Kuteesa and others, 'Public Expenditure Governance in Uganda's Agricultural Extension System' (ACODE Policy Research Paper Series, No. 84, 2018).

[122] Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development (n 80).

[123] Lorenzo Cotula, 'Raising the Bar on Responsible Investment: What Role for Investment Treaties?' (2018) IIED Briefing Papers.

The impact on Uganda's approach to bilateral investment treaties has emerged more gradually, reflecting a broader reconsideration of the balance between investment protection and regulatory autonomy. While Uganda has not pursued radical approaches such as treaty termination or withdrawal from the ICSID Convention, government officials have expressed greater caution regarding new investment commitments.[124] Recent policy statements suggest evolving approaches to investment treaty negotiation, with increased attention to preserving regulatory space for development objectives. These developments align with broader trends among developing nations toward more balanced investment treaty models that maintain basic investment protections while safeguarding sovereign regulatory authority in areas of vital public interest.[125]

The implications for institutional development and capacity building have been particularly significant. As discussed in the previous section, Uganda has developed more sophisticated institutional frameworks for managing investment relationships and potential disputes, representing adaptive responses to the challenges revealed by the arbitration cases.[126] These institutional developments illustrate how sovereignty assertion increasingly occurs through technical capacity development and governance innovation rather than through formal rejection of international obligations. By strengthening domestic institutions while maintaining international commitments, Uganda has pursued a nuanced approach to sovereignty that recognises the practical interdependence of domestic and international governance systems.[127]

The impact on resource nationalism and public discourse regarding resource governance reveals complex dynamics between international constraints and domestic political imperatives. The arbitration cases have fuelled public debate regarding appropriate foreign participation in the petroleum sector and fair distribution of resource benefits.[128] Political leaders have sometimes employed resource-nationalist rhetoric while simultaneously navigating the practical constraints imposed by international investment obligations. This tension between domestic political narratives and international legal constraints creates complex governance

[124] Ibid.
[125] UNCTAD, 'World Investment Report 2019: Special Economic Zones' (United Nations 2019) 108.
[126] As discussed in section 2.6 above.
[127] Bukenya and Nakaiza (n 79) 122.
[128] Laura Paler, 'Oil discoveries and political windfalls: evidence on presidential support in Uganda' (n 78).

challenges, as officials must balance responsiveness to public expectations with the realities of international investment relationships.[129]

The effect on development timelines for petroleum projects has been substantial, with prolonged disputes contributing to delays in moving from exploration to production. Uganda's petroleum resources, discovered in commercially viable quantities in 2006, remained undeveloped for over a decade, with protracted disputes regarding taxation and regulatory approvals contributing to these delays.[130] These extended timelines have delayed anticipated development benefits, including infrastructure development, employment generation, and government revenue. While multiple factors have contributed to these delays, including technical challenges and commercial considerations, the investment disputes have played meaningful roles in extending development timelines, illustrating how sovereignty contestation can affect practical development outcomes.[131]

The implications for environmental governance and community rights in resource extraction areas represent another dimension of sovereignty's impact. International investment obligations potentially constrain Uganda's ability to strengthen environmental regulations or community protection measures in response to emerging concerns or new information.[132] The detailed scrutiny of regulatory decisions by international tribunals can create particular challenges for evolving governance areas such as environmental protection, where scientific understanding and public expectations may change significantly over the extended timeframes of petroleum projects. These constraints highlight tensions between different dimensions of sovereignty, as investment protection may limit the state's ability to respond effectively to citizen concerns regarding environmental impacts or community rights.[133]

The impact on regional integration and cooperation in natural resource governance extends beyond Uganda to influence broader East African approaches. Uganda's experiences have contributed to regional discussions regarding the harmonisation of petroleum frameworks, investment policies, and dispute-resolution mechanisms.[134] These regional dimensions reflect

[129] Sam Hickey, 'The politics of state capacity and development in Africa: Reframing and researching 'pockets of effectiveness' (2019) ESID Working Paper No. 117.
[130] Ibid.
[131] Bukenya and Nakaiza (n 79) 121.
[132] Laura Smith, James Van Alstine, and Anne Tallontire, 'The Making of an Oil Frontier: Territorialisation Dynamics in Uganda's Emerging Oil Industry' (2022) 12 The Extractive Industries and Society 101188.
[133] Ibid.
[134] East African Community Secretariat (n 83).

a recognition that individual states face similar sovereignty challenges that might benefit from coordinated responses. Regional approaches potentially strengthen individual countries' positions in relation to international investors while facilitating knowledge sharing and capacity development across countries with similar development contexts and resource governance challenges.[135]

The implications for future investor-state relationships reflect evolving understandings of the balance between sovereign authority and investment protection. The arbitration experiences have contributed to more sophisticated approaches to managing these relationships, with greater emphasis on clear communication, early dispute prevention, and constructive engagement.[136] Rather than rejecting foreign investment or international obligations, Uganda has pursued approaches that maintain investment relationships while developing more effective mechanisms for protecting sovereign interests within these relationships. This evolution represents a pragmatic response to the realities of resource development in a capital-intensive sector, recognising the continued importance of international investment while seeking to manage its terms more effectively.[137]

The impact on legislative sovereignty and parliamentary authority in resource governance deserves particular attention. International investment obligations, particularly stabilisation provisions in petroleum contracts, potentially constrain parliament's ability to modify legal frameworks affecting foreign investments. [138] This creates tensions with democratic governance principles, as commitments to foreign investors may override domestic legislative processes and limit policy responsiveness to evolving public priorities. These constraints on legislative sovereignty represent particularly challenging dimensions of the relationship between international investment protection and domestic democratic governance in resource-rich developing nations.[139]

The cumulative effect of these various impacts reveals a complex reality in which sovereignty in natural resource governance operates within meaningful constraints while maintaining important domains of authority and adaptation. Uganda's experience demonstrates that investment treaty obligations and international arbitration create significant constraints on

[135] Makane Moïse Mbengue and Stefanie Schacherer, 'The "Africanization" of International Investment Law' (2017) 18 Journal of World Investment & Trade 414.
[136] Bukenya and Nakaiza (n 79) 124.
[137] Ibid.
[138] Lorenzo Cotula (n 6).
[139] Joe Oloka-Onyango (n 77) 69.

certain dimensions of sovereign authority, particularly regarding fiscal policy flexibility and regulatory evolution.[140] However, the experience also illustrates how states can develop adaptive responses that preserve and potentially enhance other dimensions of sovereignty, particularly through institutional development, capacity building, and strategic approaches to international engagement. This nuanced reality suggests that sovereignty in contemporary resource governance involves not absolute authority but rather strategic navigation of constraints and opportunities within interconnected domestic and international systems.[141]

2.8. Conclusion

The analysis of Uganda's experience with international investment arbitration in the natural resource sector reveals the complex interplay between state sovereignty and international investment obligations in contemporary resource governance. The Heritage and Tullow cases represent significant milestones in Uganda's journey as a petroleum-producing nation, illustrating both the constraints that international investment frameworks place on sovereign authority and the adaptive strategies that states develop to navigate these constraints.

Uganda's constitutional and legal frameworks establish clear foundations for state sovereignty over natural resources, vesting ownership in the people and entrusting management to the government. However, the practical exercise of this sovereignty occurs within a web of international obligations arising from bilateral investment treaties, contractual commitments, and international arbitration mechanisms. This creates a governance reality in which sovereign authority remains conceptually intact but practically constrained in significant dimensions.

The examination of Uganda's investment treaty obligations reveals how international legal frameworks create substantive and procedural limitations on regulatory authority, particularly in areas such as taxation and environmental governance. These international commitments expose domestic regulatory decisions to scrutiny by international tribunals, creating multiple layers of constraint on policy evolution and legislative authority. The resulting tension between international obligations and domestic sovereignty represents a fundamental challenge for resource-rich developing nations seeking to maximise benefits from natural resource extraction.

[140] James Gathii, (n 96).
[141] Makane Moïse Mbengue, 'Africa's Voice in the Formation, Shaping and Redesign of International Investment Law' (n 104).

The Heritage and Tullow arbitration cases demonstrate how these tensions manifest in practice, with Uganda's taxation powers subjected to detailed international scrutiny through arbitration processes. While Uganda largely prevailed in defending its sovereign authority to impose capital gains tax, the proceedings nonetheless revealed the practical constraints that international arbitration places on fiscal sovereignty. These constraints extend beyond formal legal limitations to encompass resource burdens, expertise requirements, and potential regulatory chill that may influence policy decisions even absent formal disputes.

The institutional frameworks that Uganda has developed for managing investment disputes represent adaptive responses to these sovereignty challenges. Rather than rejecting international investment frameworks outright, Uganda has focused on building domestic capacity, strengthening coordination mechanisms, and developing more sophisticated approaches to dispute prevention and management. These institutional adaptations illustrate how sovereignty in contemporary resource governance involves not only formal legal authority but also practical governance capacity and strategic international engagement.

The broader impacts on Uganda's sovereign rights in resource governance extend across multiple dimensions, including fiscal policy, regulatory space, environmental governance, and development timelines. These impacts reveal a complex reality in which certain dimensions of sovereignty face meaningful constraints while others remain available for strategic adaptation and enhancement. The resulting governance landscape requires sophisticated navigation of both constraints and opportunities within interconnected domestic and international systems.

Uganda's experience offers valuable insights regarding the evolution of sovereignty in contemporary natural resource governance. It demonstrates that effective sovereignty assertion increasingly requires not only formal legal frameworks but also institutional capacity, technical expertise, and strategic approaches to international engagement. The challenges revealed by Uganda's experience highlighted the need for the continued evolution of both domestic governance systems and international investment frameworks to better balance sovereign development interests with investor protection.

As Uganda continues to develop its petroleum resources, the lessons drawn from these early arbitration experiences will likely influence future approaches to resource governance, investment relationships, and dispute management. The country's ability to maximise development benefits from natural resources while navigating international constraints will depend significantly on continued institutional strengthening, policy innovation, and strategic

engagement with the international investment regime. The experience thus far suggests that Uganda, like other resource-rich developing nations, faces substantial challenges in this navigation but also possesses meaningful opportunities for enhancing effective sovereignty within evolving international frameworks.

CHAPTER THREE

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF NIGERIA AND GHANA'S EXPERIENCES WITH INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT ARBITRATION

3.1 Introduction

International investment arbitration represents a complex intersection of sovereign authority and foreign investment protection that has evolved significantly across the African continent. The experiences of Nigeria and Ghana in navigating this dynamic landscape offer valuable comparative insights for understanding Uganda's position within the international investment regime. Both Nigeria and Ghana, like Uganda, have substantial natural resource endowments that have attracted significant foreign investment, particularly in the petroleum and mining sectors. These resources have become central to their economic development strategies while simultaneously presenting governance challenges in relation to sovereign rights protection.

Nigeria, as Africa's largest oil producer, has developed extensive experience managing international investment disputes in its petroleum sector since commercial production began in the 1950s. The country's journey through various petroleum governance frameworks - from early concession agreements to production-sharing contracts and increasingly assertive resource nationalism - reflects the evolution of sovereign approaches to natural resource management.[1] This experience has generated numerous investment disputes that provide rich jurisprudential material for understanding how international arbitration impacts state sovereignty. Nigeria's constitutional framework, which vests petroleum ownership in the federal government, has created distinctive dynamics between sovereign authority and investment protection that differ significantly from Uganda's people-centred resource ownership model.[2]

Ghana presents an equally instructive but contrasting case study, having managed both established mining operations and a more recently developed petroleum sector. Since discovering commercial quantities of oil in 2007 and commencing production in 2010, Ghana

[1] Ademola Oluborode Jegede, 'Protecting Indigenous Peoples' land rights in global climate governance' in Sébastien Duyck, Sébastien Jodoin, and Alyssa Johl (Eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Human Rights and Climate Governance* (Routledge 2018).

[2] Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999, s 44(3).

has navigated the complex transition to petroleum producer status while maintaining its established mining governance frameworks.[3] Ghana's approach to balancing investment protection with sovereign regulatory authority has evolved through constitutional provisions, legislative enactments, and institutional arrangements that attempt to secure national interests while maintaining an attractive investment environment. The country's experience with investment arbitration, while less extensive than Nigeria's, provides valuable insights into how emerging petroleum producers can protect sovereign rights.[4]

The comparative analysis of these three jurisdictions is particularly valuable given their shared colonial legal heritage and subsequent divergent paths in natural resource governance. All three countries have built their legal systems on common law foundations inherited from the British colonial administration, which has influenced their approaches to property rights, contracts, and judicial review.[5] However, each country's post-independence trajectory has produced distinctive constitutional provisions, legislative frameworks, and institutional arrangements for managing natural resources and investment disputes. These differences provide a rich analytical basis for understanding the range of options available to sovereign states seeking to protect their regulatory authority within the constraints of international investment law.

Beyond their shared legal heritage, Nigeria, Ghana, and Uganda face common challenges in asserting sovereign authority over natural resources while maintaining their integration in the global investment regime. All three countries have signed a number of bilateral investment treaties containing provisions that potentially constrain their regulatory autonomy, particularly in relation to taxation, environmental regulation, and local content requirements.[6] Each country has experienced tensions between constitutional provisions vesting resource ownership in the people or the state and international arbitration decisions that have sometimes constrained the exercise of sovereign rights flowing from such ownership. Furthermore, all three countries

[3] Tsatsu Tsikata, 'Re-Shaping the Framework for Petroleum Exploration and Pro duction – Ghana's Experience' in Einar H Bandlien (ed), *Policy and Management of Petroleum Resources* (Nopec a.s 1990) 291; See also Thomas Kojo Stephens, 'Sustainable Decommissioning in Ghana: Historical Developments, Current Practice and Challenges' (2023) 14 The Journal of Sustainable Development, Law and Policy 81.

[4] Dominic Dagbanja, 'The Development Objective as an Imperative in Interpretation of International Investment Agreements' (2018) 44 The University of Western Australia Law Review 144.

[5] Emmanuel Laryea, 'Evolution of International Investment Law and Implications for Africa' in Botchway, N. Francis (ed), *Natural Resource Investment and Africa's Development* (Edward Elgar Publishing 2011).

[6] Makane Moïse Mbengue and Stefanie Schacherer, 'The "Africanization" of International Investment Law: The Pan-African Investment Code and the reform of the international investment regime' (2017) 18 Journal of World Investment & Trade 414, 418.

have faced challenges in developing institutional capacity to effectively manage investment disputes and protect sovereign interests in arbitration proceedings.[7]

The examination of Nigeria and Ghana's experiences provides a valuable comparative framework for understanding Uganda's position within this landscape. By analysing how these countries have structured their constitutional provisions regarding resource ownership, developed legislative frameworks for managing foreign investment, established institutional mechanisms for dispute resolution, and responded to arbitration decisions affecting their sovereign rights, this chapter develops a comprehensive picture of sovereign rights protection in resource-rich African states. This comparative approach allows for the identification of successful strategies, common challenges, and potential reforms that could strengthen Uganda's position in international investment arbitration.[8]

The chapter begins by examining Nigeria's constitutional and legislative framework for natural resource governance, followed by an analysis of key investment disputes that have shaped the relationship between sovereign authority and investment protection in the Nigerian context. It then explores Ghana's approach to resource governance and investment dispute resolution, highlighting distinctive features of Ghana's constitutional provisions, legislative enactments, and institutional arrangements. The comparative analysis identifies similarities and differences in how these countries have approached sovereign rights protection, drawing lessons from both successful strategies and continuing challenges. Throughout this examination, particular attention is paid to how international arbitration decisions have affected these countries' ability to exercise sovereign rights, especially in taxation matters and regulatory oversight of the natural resources sector as has been observed by various researchers.[9]

The insights gained from this comparative analysis provide a foundation for developing a more comprehensive understanding of how African states can better protect their sovereign rights within the international investment arbitration framework. By identifying successful strategies, common challenges, and potential reforms, this chapter contributes to the broader objective of developing more balanced approaches to investment protection that respect legitimate

[7] Emilia Onyema, 'African Participation in the ICSID System: Appointment and Disqualification of Arbitrators' (2019) 34 ICSID Review 466, 470.
[8] Won Kidane, 'The Culture of Investment Arbitration: An African Perspective' (2019) 34 ICSID Review - Foreign Investment Law Journal 411, 415.
[9] See, for example, Lorenzo Cotula, 'Investment treaties and sustainable development: investment liberalisation' (2014) IIED Briefing Paper.

sovereign interests while maintaining the benefits of foreign investment for national development.

3.2 Evolution of Natural Resource Governance in Nigeria

Nigeria's natural resource governance framework has undergone significant evolution since the country's independence in 1960, shaped by the complex interplay between constitutional provisions, legislative enactments, institutional arrangements, and international commitments. At the heart of Nigeria's resource governance structure lies its constitutional approach to resource ownership. Unlike Uganda's constitutional position that vests natural resource ownership in the people, the Nigerian Constitution explicitly places petroleum ownership in the hands of the federal government. Section 44(3) of the 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria states: 'the entire property in and control of all minerals, mineral oils and natural gas in, under or upon any land in Nigeria or in, under or upon the territorial waters and the Exclusive Economic Zone of Nigeria shall vest in the Government of the Federation and shall be managed in such manner as may be prescribed by the National Assembly'.[10] This provision establishes centralized federal control over petroleum resources, creating distinctive dynamics in Nigeria's relationship with international investors that differ from Uganda's approach.

The constitutional vesting of resource ownership in the federal government rather than in the people or sub-national entities has had profound implications for Nigeria's resource governance. It has centralised decision-making authority regarding resource exploitation and revenue management, sometimes generating tensions between the federal government and oil-producing regions, particularly in the Niger Delta.[11] This centralisation stands in contrast to Uganda's constitutional framework, which, while establishing state control over natural resources, emphasises that these resources are held in trust by the people. The Nigerian approach has affected how the country engages with international investors and responds to

[10] Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999, s 44(3).

[11] Cyril Obi, 'Oil Extraction, Dispossession, Resistance, and Conflict in Nigeria's Oil-Rich Niger Delta' (2010) 30 Canadian Journal of Development Studies 219, 221.

investment disputes, often positioning the federal government as the primary sovereign actor rather than acknowledging sub-national interests.[12]

Nigeria's legislative framework for petroleum governance has undergone several significant transformations reflecting the country's evolving approach to sovereign control over natural resources. The Petroleum Act of 1969, enacted in the early post-independence period, established the foundational legal framework for petroleum operations in Nigeria.[13] This legislation granted extensive powers to the Minister of Petroleum Resources, including authority over licensing, lease administration, and regulatory oversight. The Petroleum Act reflected Nigeria's initial approach to balancing state control with foreign investment attraction, recognising the need for international capital and technical expertise while asserting sovereign authority over resource management.[14]

A major development in Nigeria's legislative framework occurred with the enactment of the Nigerian Oil and Gas Industry Content Development Act 2010 (Local Content Act). This legislation represented a significant assertion of sovereign authority by establishing requirements for Nigerian participation in the petroleum sector. The Act mandated minimum thresholds for Nigerian content in various aspects of petroleum operations, including employment, procurement, and technology transfer.[15] This legislative intervention demonstrated Nigeria's increasing willingness to use its sovereign regulatory authority to shape investment patterns and secure greater benefits from resource exploitation. The Local Content Act also reflected a broader trend among resource-rich African states to leverage regulatory authority to enhance developmental benefits from natural resource extraction.[16]

The most recent landmark in Nigeria's legislative evolution came with the passage of the Petroleum Industry Act (PIA) in 2021 after nearly two decades of deliberation. This comprehensive legislation restructured Nigeria's petroleum governance framework, establishing new regulatory institutions, revising fiscal terms, and addressing community development concerns.[17] The PIA represents Nigeria's attempt to modernize its petroleum

[12] Ibid; Soji Oyeranmi, and Lawrence Dube, 'The Petroleum Industry Bill and the Nigerian Economy: A Review' (2021) 25 International Journal of Current Research in the Humanities 175.
[13] Petroleum Act 1969 (Nigeria).
[14] Yinka Omorogbe, 'The Legal Framework for the Production of Petroleum in Nigeria' (1987) 5 Journal of Energy & Natural Resources Law 273, 275.
[15] Nigerian Oil and Gas Industry Content Development Act 2010, s 3, 11, 31.
[16] Jesse Salah Ovadia, 'Local Content Policies and Petro-Development in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Comparative Analysis' (2016) 49 Resources Policy 20, 22.
[17] Petroleum Industry Act 2021 (Nigeria).

governance framework while balancing competing objectives of attracting investment, maximizing state revenue, addressing environmental concerns, and promoting community welfare. The extended period required to enact this legislation reflects the complex challenges faced by resource-rich states in developing governance frameworks that effectively protect sovereign interests while adapting to changing industry dynamics.[18]

Nigeria's legislative approach has been characterised by a gradual movement towards greater assertion of sovereign authority over natural resources. While early legislation focused primarily on establishing legal frameworks for foreign investment in petroleum exploitation, more recent enactments have increasingly emphasised Nigerian participation, environmental protection, community benefits, and fiscal optimisation. This evolution reflects Nigeria's growing confidence in exercising sovereign regulatory authority as it has gained experience with petroleum governance and developed greater institutional capacity.[19]

The institutional architecture for petroleum governance in Nigeria has similarly evolved over time. The Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (NNPC), established in 1977, has served as the primary vehicle for state participation in the petroleum sector. The NNPC's role has included representation of state interests in joint ventures with international oil companies, management of production-sharing contracts, and participation in downstream operations.[20] In 2021, the Petroleum Industry Act transformed the NNPC into a limited liability company, NNPC Limited, intended to operate on commercial principles while remaining wholly owned by the government. This institutional evolution reflects Nigeria's effort to address governance challenges while maintaining state participation in the sector.[21]

Nigeria's resource governance has been significantly shaped by its relationship with international oil companies, primarily through joint venture arrangements and production-sharing contracts. Under joint venture arrangements, which dominated Nigeria's petroleum sector for decades, the NNPC held a majority interest in partnerships with international oil companies, creating a framework for shared decision-making and revenue distribution.[22] Production-sharing contracts, which gained prominence from the 1990s onwards, established

[18] Cyril Obi (n 11).
[19] Okechukwu Ejims, 'The Impact of Nigerian International Petroleum Contracts on Environmental and Human Rights of Indigenous Communities' (2013) 21 African Journal of International and Comparative Law 345, 347.
[20] Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation Act 1977; See also Petroleum Industry Act 2021, s 53-65.
[21] Soji Oyeranmi, and Lawrence Dube, (n 12).
[22] Olufemi Amao, 'Corporate Social Responsibility, Multinational Corporations and the Law in Nigeria: Controlling Multinationals in Host States' (2008) 52 Journal of African Law 89, 93.

different relationships where international companies bore exploration and production risks in exchange for cost recovery and profit-sharing arrangements. These contractual frameworks have created complex interfaces between Nigeria's exercise of sovereign authority and international companies' investment protection expectations.[23]

The evolution of Nigeria's fiscal regime for petroleum has further illuminated the tensions between sovereignty and investment protection. Nigeria has employed various fiscal instruments, including royalties, petroleum profit tax, production sharing arrangements, and signature bonuses, to capture value from resource exploitation.[24] Changes to fiscal terms have sometimes generated disputes with international investors, particularly when applied to existing arrangements. These disputes highlight the fundamental tension between Nigeria's sovereign right to modify fiscal arrangements in response to changing circumstances and investors' expectations of fiscal stability.[25]

Nigeria's membership in the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) has added another dimension to its resource governance framework. As an OPEC member, Nigeria has coordinated production decisions with other member states, potentially constraining its sovereign decision-making regarding production levels.[26] Simultaneously, OPEC membership has provided Nigeria with collective bargaining power in the global petroleum market and access to shared knowledge regarding petroleum governance. This international dimension of Nigeria's resource governance illustrates how sovereign states may voluntarily accept certain constraints on their authority to achieve broader strategic objectives.[27]

Nigeria's environmental governance in the petroleum sector has evolved from relatively limited regulation to more comprehensive frameworks, reflecting a growing recognition of environmental impacts and international environmental standards. The Environmental Impact Assessment Act 1992 established requirements for environmental assessment of petroleum projects, while more recent legislation, including provisions in the Petroleum Industry Act, has

[23] Zainab Usman, 'The Successes and Failures of Economic Reform in Nigeria's Post-Military Political Settlement' (2020) 119 African Affairs 1, 5.
[24] Amnesty International, 'Nigeria: Petroleum, Pollution and Poverty in the Niger Delta' (Amnesty International Publications 2009).
[25] Jesse Salah Ovadia, 'Local Content Policies and Petro-Development in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Comparative Analysis' (n 16) 24.
[26] Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), 'OPEC Statute' (2012) art 2.
[27] Cyril Obi, 'Oil and Development in Africa: Some Lessons from the Oil Factor in Nigeria for the Sudan' in Luke Patey (ed), Oil in Sudan: Lessons from Oil Management in Asia and Africa (Danish Institute for International Studies 2007) 9, 12.

addressed gas flaring, pollution control, and remediation obligations.[28] This evolution of environmental governance illustrates how Nigeria has increasingly exercised its sovereign regulatory authority to address environmental concerns, sometimes generating tensions with investment protection expectations.[29]

Community relations have emerged as a critical dimension of Nigeria's resource governance, particularly given the history of conflict in the Niger Delta region. Early approaches to petroleum governance largely neglected community interests, creating conditions for persistent conflict that threatened both sovereign authority and investment security.[30] More recent governance frameworks, including the Petroleum Industry Act's provisions for host community development, represent attempts to address these challenges by creating institutionalised mechanisms for community benefit-sharing. These developments illustrate how the effective exercise of sovereign authority in resource governance requires addressing community relationships to maintain the social licence for resource exploitation.[31]

The governance of petroleum revenue has presented particular challenges for Nigeria's exercise of sovereign authority. The establishment of the Excess Crude Account in 2004 and later the Nigerian Sovereign Investment Authority in 2011 represented attempts to manage petroleum revenue effectively through sovereign wealth fund arrangements.[32] However, questions regarding transparency, accountability, and distribution of petroleum wealth have remained contested aspects of Nigeria's resource governance. These challenges highlight the complex relationship between resource revenue management and the effective exercise of sovereign authority.[33]

Throughout its evolution, Nigeria's resource governance framework has been shaped by tensions between federal authority and sub-national claims. The principle of derivation, which allocates a portion of petroleum revenue to oil-producing states, has been a mechanism for addressing these tensions.[34] However, persistent demands from oil-producing regions for greater control over resources and revenue have created ongoing challenges for Nigeria's

[28] Environmental Impact Assessment Act 1992 (Nigeria); See also Petroleum Industry Act 2021, s 101-103.
[29] Rhuks Temitope Ako, 'Nigeria's Land Use Act: An Anti-Thesis to Environmental Justice' (2009) 53 Journal of African Law 289, 292.
[30] Olufemi Amao, 'Corporate Social Responsibility, Multinational Corporations and the Law in Nigeria: Controlling Multinationals in Host States' (n 22) 95.
[31] Petroleum Industry Act 2021, s 234-257.
[32] Nigerian Sovereign Investment Authority Act 2011.
[33] Soji Oyeranmi, and Lawrence Dube, (n 12).
[34] Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999, s 162(2).

centralised approach to resource governance. These internal dynamics have sometimes complicated Nigeria's engagement with international investors and its response to investment disputes.[35]

Nigeria's experience demonstrates how resource governance evolves through complex interactions between constitutional provisions, legislative frameworks, institutional arrangements, contractual relationships, and international commitments. The country's journey from early post-independence arrangements emphasising foreign investment attraction to more assertive frameworks prioritising national participation, environmental protection, community benefits, and optimal revenue capture illustrates the dynamic nature of sovereign authority in resource governance. This evolution provides valuable comparative insights for understanding Uganda's position and potential trajectory in managing the relationship between sovereignty and investment protection in the natural resources sector.[36]

3.3 Nigeria's Experience with International Investment Arbitration

Nigeria's extensive engagement with international investment arbitration in its resource sector provides a rich comparative context for understanding the tensions between sovereign authority and investment protection. As Africa's largest oil producer with a petroleum industry dating back to the 1950s, Nigeria has accumulated substantial experience managing disputes with international investors, particularly in relation to taxation, regulatory changes, and contractual interpretation. These experiences illuminate the practical challenges resource-rich African states face when their sovereign actions are contested through international arbitration mechanisms.

Nigeria's investment treaty framework has created multiple pathways for international arbitration of resource-related disputes. The country has signed numerous bilateral investment treaties (BITs) containing investor-state dispute settlement provisions, including agreements with the United Kingdom, Netherlands, and China.[37] These treaties typically include broad definitions of "investment" encompassing resource exploitation rights and contractual claims,

[35] Okechukwu Ejims, 'The Impact of Nigerian International Petroleum Contracts on Environmental and Human Rights of Indigenous Communities' (n 19) 350.
[36] Ibid.
[37] Agreement for the Promotion and Protection of Investments between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Federal Republic of Nigeria (signed 11 December 1990).

while providing for international arbitration under various institutional rules.[38] Additionally, Nigeria's investment legislation and resource contracts often contain arbitration clauses providing alternative jurisdictional bases for investment disputes. This treaty framework has subjected Nigeria's sovereign actions regarding resource governance to potential scrutiny through international arbitration, creating tensions similar to those experienced by Uganda in cases such as Heritage Oil.[39]

The *Shell Nigeria Ultra Deep Limited v. Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation* dispute exemplifies how international arbitration has intersected with Nigeria's sovereign authority over resource management. This dispute, which arose from the Nigerian government's reallocation of an oil block originally awarded to Shell, involved claims under a production-sharing contract.[40] The international arbitral tribunal ruled in favour of Shell, awarding approximately $1.4 billion in damages for breach of contract. This case highlighted tensions between Nigeria's sovereign authority to manage resource allocations in response to changing policy priorities and international arbitration's protection of contractual expectations. The case also demonstrated how disputes nominally between private parties and state-owned entities can implicate fundamental questions of sovereign authority in resource governance.[41]

The dispute between Statoil (Nigeria) Limited and Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation provides further insight into how international arbitration affects revenue distribution from resource exploitation. This arbitration concerned the interpretation of cost oil provisions in a production-sharing contract, with significant implications for revenue allocation between the international investor and the Nigerian state.[42] The tribunal's interpretation of the contractual provisions effectively determined how petroleum revenue would be distributed, illustrating how arbitration decisions can directly impact a state's fiscal benefits from resource extraction. This case demonstrates parallels with Uganda's experience in the Heritage Oil dispute, where

[38] Tarcisio Gazzini, Interpretation of International Investment Treaties (Hart Publishing 2016) 67.
[39] Emilia Onyema, 'Rethinking the Role of African National Courts in Arbitration' in Emilia Onyema (ed), *Rethinking the Role of African National Courts in Arbitration* (Kluwer Law International 2018) 10.
[40] *Shell Nigeria Ultra Deep Limited v Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation* (2011) Arbitration under UNCITRAL Rules.
[41] Ibid; See also Sunday Akinlolu Fagbemi, 'A Critical Analysis of the Mechanisms for Settlement of Investment Disputes in International Arbitration' (2017) 8 NAUJILJ 46.
[42] *Statoil (Nigeria) Limited v Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation* (2013) Arbitration under UNCITRAL Rules.

international arbitration similarly affected the state's ability to secure tax revenue from petroleum operations.[43]

International arbitration has also addressed Nigeria's exercise of regulatory authority over environmental aspects of resource exploitation. In cases involving environmental regulations and remediation obligations, international investors have sometimes challenged Nigeria's regulatory measures as violations of investment protection standards.[44] These cases highlight tensions between Nigeria's sovereign responsibility to protect its environment and the constraints investment treaties may place on regulatory autonomy. While Nigeria's constitutional and legislative framework clearly establishes authority to regulate environmental aspects of resource exploitation, international arbitration has sometimes subjected the exercise of this authority to scrutiny under investment treaty standards such as fair and equitable treatment and indirect expropriation.[45]

The taxation of petroleum operations has been a particularly contentious area giving rise to international arbitration, reflecting tensions similar to those experienced by Uganda in the Heritage Oil case. Nigeria's adjustments to petroleum tax provisions, including changes to applicable rates, allowable deductions, and transfer pricing rules, have sometimes been challenged by international investors as violations of stabilisation commitments or fair and equitable treatment standards.[46] These disputes highlight fundamental tensions between Nigeria's sovereign authority to adjust its tax system in response to changing circumstances and investors' expectations of fiscal stability. The resolution of these disputes through international arbitration has sometimes constrained Nigeria's fiscal policy space, affecting its ability to secure what it considers an appropriate share of resource revenue.[47]

The enforcement of arbitral awards against Nigeria has presented additional challenges for sovereign authority. When arbitral tribunals have ruled against Nigeria, the country has

[43] Oyeniyi Abe, 'Untying the Gordian Knot: Re-Assessing the Impact of Business and Human Rights Principles on Extractive Resource Governance in Sub-Saharan Africa' (2016) 32 American University International Law Review 895, 930.

[44] Emeka Duruigbo, 'Permanent Sovereignty and Peoples' Ownership of Natural Resources in International Law' (2006) 38 George Washington International Law Review 33, 59.

[45] Rhuks Temitope Ako, Lawrence Ogechukwu Obokoh, and Patrick Okonmah, 'Forging Ahead: The ECOWAS Common Investment Market and the Regional Investment Policy Complement' (2019) 27 African Journal of International and Comparative Law 81, 86.

[46] Ibrahima Diallo, 'The ICSID Rule of Arbitration and the Protection of Foreign Investment in Developing Countries' (2020) 31 King's Law Journal 442, 445.

[47] Jesse Salah Ovadia, 'Local Content Policies and Petro-Development in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Comparative Analysis' (2016) 49 Resources Policy 20, 26.

sometimes faced enforcement actions in foreign jurisdictions targeting Nigerian assets, including diplomatic property and central bank accounts.[48] These enforcement actions have raised complex questions regarding sovereign immunity and the protection of state assets. Nigeria has developed various strategies for addressing enforcement challenges, including settlement negotiations, jurisdictional objections, and sovereign immunity assertions. These experiences illustrate how the international arbitration system can create not only constraints on policy autonomy but also practical challenges for sovereign asset management.[49]

Nigeria's experience with counterclaims in investment arbitration provides valuable insights into strategies for asserting sovereign interests within arbitration proceedings. In certain cases, Nigeria has attempted to raise counterclaims regarding investors' environmental practices, community relations, and contractual performance.[50] The success of these counterclaims has been mixed, influenced by jurisdictional limitations and the asymmetric nature of many investment protection frameworks. Nigeria's efforts to assert counterclaims illustrate potential strategies for rebalancing arbitration proceedings, though the limitations encountered demonstrate continuing challenges in ensuring that arbitration adequately addresses state concerns alongside investor protections.[51]

While some investment disputes involving Nigeria have proceeded to final arbitral awards, many others have been resolved through settlement negotiations. Nigeria has sometimes opted to settle disputes rather than proceed through full arbitration proceedings, weighing considerations including potential liability, legal costs, reputational impacts, and ongoing relationships with investors.[52] These settlement experiences demonstrate how the shadow of potential arbitration affects state decision-making regarding resource governance, sometimes constraining policy choices even without formal arbitration proceedings. The settlement

[48] Emilia Onyema, 'Regional Arbitration Institution for ECOWAS: Lessons from OHADA Common Court of Justice and Arbitration' (2014) 17 International Arbitration Law Review 99, 101.

[49] Hakeem Seriki, 'Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards and Public Policy – A Note of Caution' (2000) 3 Arbitration International 351, 354.

[50] Amazu A Asouzu, *International Commercial Arbitration and African States: Practice, Participation and Institutional Development* (Cambridge University Press 2001) 184.

[51] Emilia Onyema, 'Effective Utilization of Arbitrators and Arbitration Institutions in Africa by Appointors' (2008) 11 VJ 307, 309.

[52] Tarcisio Gazzini, 'Nigeria and International Investment Law' in Emilia Onyema (ed), The Transformation of Arbitration in Africa: The Role of Arbitral Institutions (Kluwer Law International 2016) 127.

dynamics also illustrate how states may strategically manage investment disputes to minimize constraints on sovereign authority while maintaining investment relationships.[53]

Nigeria's engagement with regional dispute resolution mechanisms provides additional comparative insights. The country's participation in the ECOWAS Court of Justice and various African regional initiatives has created alternative forums for addressing certain aspects of resource governance disputes.[54] While these regional mechanisms have not displaced international investment arbitration as the primary forum for investor-state disputes, they have provided complementary avenues for addressing related issues, particularly regarding human rights and environmental dimensions of resource exploitation. Nigeria's experience suggests potential benefits from developing regional approaches that may be more responsive to African contexts than traditional investment arbitration.[55]

The institutional capacity to manage investment disputes has been a critical factor in Nigeria's experience. The country has developed specialized legal expertise within government departments, particularly the Federal Ministry of Justice and the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation's legal department.[56] This institutional capacity has enabled more effective representation in arbitration proceedings, though resource constraints and coordination challenges have sometimes limited effectiveness. Nigeria's experience demonstrates the importance of developing robust institutional mechanisms for managing investment disputes, a lesson potentially applicable to Uganda's ongoing development of capacity for addressing resource-related disputes.[57]

Nigeria has also undertaken various treaty policy reforms in response to its arbitration experiences. The country has revised its approach to negotiating investment treaties, seeking to include more precise definitions of investment protection standards, exceptions for legitimate regulatory measures, and balanced dispute resolution provisions.[58] Nigeria played a

[53] Oyeniyi Abe, 'Untying the Gordian Knot: Re-Assessing the Impact of Business and Human Rights Principles on Extractive Resource Governance in Sub-Saharan Africa' (n 43) 932.
[54] Solomon Ebobrah, 'Critical Issues in the Human Rights Mandate of the ECOWAS Court of Justice' (2010) 54 Journal of African Law 1, 3.
[55] Ibid, 5.
[56] Emilia Onyema, 'Regional Arbitration Institution for ECOWAS: Lessons from OHADA Common Court of Justice and Arbitration' (n 48) 102.
[57] Emilia Onyema, 'Effective Utilization of Arbitrators and Arbitration Institutions in Africa by Appointors' (n 51) 310.
[58] Makane Moïse Mbengue, 'Africa's Voice in the Formation, Shaping and Redesign of International Investment Law' (2019) 34 ICSID Review 455, 459.

significant role in developing the ECOWAS Supplementary Act on Investments and the draft Pan-African Investment Code, both of which attempt to better balance investment protection with recognition of legitimate state regulatory authority. These reform efforts reflect Nigeria's attempt to address the constraints international arbitration has sometimes placed on its sovereign authority over resource governance.[59]

The relationship between domestic courts and international arbitration has presented particular challenges in Nigeria's experience. While Nigeria's legal framework generally supports arbitration, domestic courts have sometimes intervened in arbitration proceedings or award enforcement on public policy grounds.[60] These interventions have created tensions between Nigeria's treaty obligations regarding arbitration and domestic judicial oversight. The balance between international arbitration commitments and domestic judicial authority remains an evolving aspect of Nigeria's approach to investment dispute resolution, reflecting similar tensions experienced in other jurisdictions, including Uganda.[61]

Nigeria's experience with resource contract stabilisation provisions has highlighted particular tensions between sovereign authority and investment protection. Many petroleum contracts in Nigeria have contained stabilisation clauses limiting the application of subsequent legislative or regulatory changes to existing investments.[62] While these provisions have provided investors with greater certainty, they have also constrained Nigeria's ability to implement regulatory reforms affecting petroleum operations. Nigeria's experience with stabilisation clauses demonstrates the long-term implications of contractual constraints on sovereign authority, particularly in sectors like petroleum where regulatory frameworks evolve significantly over project lifespans.[63]

The public reaction to international arbitration decisions has sometimes influenced Nigeria's approach to investment disputes. Arbitration outcomes perceived as constraining legitimate sovereign authority or transferring substantial public resources to foreign investors have occasionally generated significant domestic criticism.[64] This public dimension of investment

[59] Olabisi Akinkugbe, 'Reverse Contributors? African State Parties, ICSID, and the Development of International Investment Law' (2019) 34 ICSID Review 434, 438.
[60] Emilia Onyema, 'Rethinking the Role of African National Courts in Arbitration' (n 39) 12.
[61] Ibid, 15.
[62] Lorenzo Cotula, 'Reconciling Regulatory Stability and Evolution of Environmental Standards in Investment Contracts: Towards a rethink of stabilization clauses' (2008) 1 Journal of World Energy Law & Business 158.
[63] Ibid.
[64] Oyeniyi Abe, 'Untying the Gordian Knot: Re-Assessing the Impact of Business and Human Rights Principles on Extractive Resource Governance in Sub-Saharan Africa' (n 43) 931.

disputes has created political pressures affecting Nigeria's dispute resolution strategies and subsequent policy approaches. The political economy of investment arbitration in Nigeria demonstrates how domestic constituencies can shape a state's engagement with international dispute resolution mechanisms, a dynamic also relevant to Uganda's management of resource-related disputes.[65]

Nigeria's experience demonstrates how international arbitration interacts with sovereign authority throughout the resource governance cycle. From exploration rights allocation through operational regulation to decommissioning requirements, various aspects of resource governance have been subject to arbitration claims, creating a complex web of potential constraints on sovereign decision-making.[66] At the same time, Nigeria has developed increasingly sophisticated strategies for managing these constraints, including through careful contract drafting, institutional capacity building, and treaty policy reforms. The Nigerian experience illustrates both the challenges international arbitration can present for sovereign resource governance and potential pathways for addressing these challenges while maintaining beneficial investment relationships.[67]

Nigeria's arbitration experience provides valuable comparative insights for Uganda as it develops its petroleum sector and engages with international investors. While the constitutional frameworks differ - with Nigeria emphasizing federal ownership and Uganda emphasizing people's ownership held in trust by the state - both countries face similar challenges in balancing sovereign authority with investment protection.[68] Nigeria's longer history with petroleum governance and investment disputes offers lessons regarding institutional capacity development, contract negotiation, dispute prevention strategies, and reform of international investment frameworks. These lessons can inform Uganda's approach to managing the tensions between sovereignty and investment protection that have emerged in cases such as Heritage Oil and Tullow Oil.[69]

---

[65] Ibid, 933.

[66] Jesse Salah Ovadia, 'Local Content Policies and Petro-Development in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Comparative Analysis' (n 47) 27.

[67] Emilia Onyema, 'Regional Arbitration Institution for ECOWAS: Lessons from OHADA Common Court of Justice and Arbitration' (n 48) 103.

[68] Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999, s 44(3); Constitution of the Republic of Uganda 1995, art 244.

[69] Oyeniyi Abe, 'Untying the Gordian Knot: Re-Assessing the Impact of Business and Human Rights Principles on Extractive Resource Governance in Sub-Saharan Africa' (n 43) 935.

3.4 Ghana's Natural Resource Governance Framework

Ghana's natural resource governance framework presents a distinctive approach to balancing sovereign authority with investment protection, offering valuable comparative insights for understanding Uganda's position. Ghana's experience is particularly instructive as it encompasses both a well-established mining sector with colonial roots and a more recently developed petroleum sector, providing perspectives on resource governance at different stages of maturity. This dual experience allows for the examination of how constitutional provisions, legislative frameworks, and institutional arrangements evolve to address changing circumstances while protecting sovereign interests.

The constitutional foundation for Ghana's resource governance is established in Article 257(6) of the 1992 Constitution, which provides that "every mineral in its natural state in, under or upon any land in Ghana, rivers, streams, water courses throughout Ghana, the exclusive economic zone and any area covered by the territorial sea or continental shelf is the property of the Republic of Ghana and shall be vested in the President on behalf of, and in trust for the people of Ghana."[70] This constitutional provision establishes a trust relationship wherein natural resources are owned by the Republic but held by the President in trust for the people, creating a framework similar to Uganda's constitutional approach. This trust concept has significant implications for understanding the state's obligations regarding resource management and the extent to which international arbitration may constrain legitimate sovereign actions taken in fulfilment of this trust responsibility.[71]

The constitutional framework for resource governance in Ghana is further elaborated in Article 268, which requires parliamentary ratification of agreements relating to natural resource exploitation. This provision states that

any transaction, contract or undertaking involving the grant of a right or concession by or on behalf of any person including the Government of Ghana, to any other person or body of persons howsoever described, for the exploitation of any mineral, water or other natural

[70] Constitution of the Republic of Ghana 1992, art 257(6).
[71] Dominic Dagbanja, (n 4) 147.

resource of Ghana made or entered into after the coming into force of this Constitution shall be subject to ratification by Parliament.[72]

This parliamentary oversight mechanism distinguishes Ghana's approach from that of many resource-rich states and establishes democratic accountability in resource governance that potentially influences how international arbitration tribunals assess the legitimacy of sovereign actions affecting resource exploitation.[73]

Ghana's legislative framework for mineral resources has evolved significantly since independence, with the current primary legislation being the Minerals and Mining Act 2006 (Act 703) as amended. This legislation establishes the fundamental parameters for mineral resource exploitation, including licensing requirements, environmental obligations, local content provisions, and fiscal arrangements.[74] The Act explicitly reaffirms the constitutional principle of state ownership of minerals while creating a framework for private investment in resource exploitation. This legislative approach attempts to balance sovereign control over resources with an enabling environment for investment, addressing tensions similar to those faced by Uganda in its petroleum legislation.[75]

The legislative framework for Ghana's petroleum sector is primarily established through the Petroleum (Exploration and Production) Act 2016 (Act 919), which replaced earlier legislation enacted before Ghana's commercial oil discoveries. This comprehensive legislation addresses exploration rights, development plans, local content requirements, health and safety standards, and decommissioning obligations.[76] The Act represents Ghana's effort to develop modern petroleum governance based on lessons from both its mining experience and the experiences of other petroleum-producing states. The legislation includes various provisions designed to protect sovereign interests while providing investment certainty, including requirements for ministerial approval of field development plans and detailed local content obligations.[77]

---

[72] Constitution of the Republic of Ghana 1992, art 268(1).

[73] Matthew Tyce, Abdul Abdulai, and Kojo P. Asante, 'Confronting Shifting Energy Landscapes and Contested Domestic Politics: Ghana's National Oil Company and the Global Energy Transition' (2024) 119 Energy Research & Social Science 103901.

[74] Minerals and Mining Act 2006 (Act 703) (Ghana).

[75] Matthew Tyce, Abdul Abdulai, and Kojo P. Asante (n 73).

[76] Petroleum (Exploration and Production) Act 2016 (Act 919) (Ghana).

[77] Thomas Kojo Stephens, 'Sustainable Decommissioning in Ghana: Historical Developments, Current Practice and Challenges' (2023) 14 The Journal of Sustainable Development, Law and Policy 81, 85.

Ghana's fiscal framework for resource governance includes both general tax legislation and sector-specific provisions addressing the particular characteristics of extractive industries. The Income Tax Act 2015 (Act 896) contains special provisions for mining and petroleum operations, establishing specific rules for capital allowances, ring-fencing, transfer pricing, and stability agreements.[78] Additionally, various resource-specific fiscal instruments, including royalties, additional profit taxes, and carried interest arrangements, are established through sector legislation and individual agreements. This complex fiscal framework reflects Ghana's attempt to secure appropriate revenue while providing sufficient certainty for investors, a balance that has sometimes been contested through international arbitration.[79]

Environmental governance forms a critical component of Ghana's resource management framework. The Environmental Protection Agency Act 1994 (Act 490) establishes the primary regulatory authority for environmental oversight, while sector-specific environmental provisions are contained in mining and petroleum legislation.[80] Environmental impact assessment requirements, pollution control standards, and remediation obligations create a regulatory framework that has occasionally generated tensions with investment protection expectations. Ghana's experience demonstrates the challenges of asserting sovereign authority to strengthen environmental governance while maintaining consistency with investment protection commitments.[81]

Local content and benefit-sharing provisions represent increasingly important aspects of Ghana's resource governance. The Petroleum (Local Content and Local Participation) Regulations 2013 (LI 2204) establish detailed requirements for Ghanaian participation in the petroleum sector, including employment quotas, procurement preferences, and technology transfer obligations.[82] Similar provisions exist in the mining sector, though less extensively developed. These local content requirements represent a significant assertion of sovereign authority to shape investment patterns and secure developmental benefits from resource

[78] Income Tax Act 2015 (Act 896) (Ghana), s 64-66.
[79] Mirjam A Ros–Tonen and others, 'Human Insecurities in Gold Mining: A Systematic Review of Evidence from Ghana' (2021) 8 The Extractive Industries and Society 100951.
[80] Environmental Protection Agency Act 1994 (Act 490) (Ghana).
[81] Delia Sanchez Trancon, and Xavier Leflaive, 'The implementation of the Polluter Pays principle in the context of the Water Framework Directive' (2024) OECD Environment Working Papers, No. 238.
[82] Petroleum (Local Content and Local Participation) Regulations 2013 (LI 2204) (Ghana).

exploitation. Ghana's experience implementing these provisions provides valuable insights into how states can promote economic linkages while maintaining investment attractiveness.[83]

Institutional arrangements for resource governance in Ghana include various specialized agencies with defined responsibilities. The Minerals Commission, established in 1993, serves as the primary regulatory body for the mining sector, while the Petroleum Commission, established in 2011, performs similar functions for the petroleum sector.[84] These commissions operate alongside the Ministry of Energy, the Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Ghana Revenue Authority to create a complex institutional architecture for resource governance. The effectiveness of these institutional arrangements in protecting sovereign interests has been variable, influenced by capacity constraints, coordination challenges, and occasionally conflicting mandates.[85]

State participation in resource exploitation represents another dimension of Ghana's approach to maintaining sovereign influence. The Ghana National Petroleum Corporation (GNPC) serves as the state's commercial vehicle in the petroleum sector, typically holding carried and participating interests in petroleum operations.[86] In the mining sector, the state maintains rights to acquire ownership interests in major projects. These participation arrangements provide mechanisms for direct state involvement in resource exploitation decisions, potentially reducing reliance on regulatory oversight alone. However, the dual roles of state entities as both commercial participants and representatives of sovereign interests have sometimes created tensions that affect dispute resolution dynamics.[87]

Transparency and accountability mechanisms form increasingly prominent components of Ghana's resource governance framework. Ghana's participation in the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) since 2003 has established reporting requirements for resource revenue flows.[88] Additionally, the Petroleum Revenue Management Act 2011 (Act 815) created detailed frameworks for petroleum revenue collection, management, and distribution, including the establishment of heritage and stabilization funds. These transparency

[83] Austin D Ablo, 'Local Content and Participation in Ghana's Oil and Gas Industry: Can Enterprise Development Make a Difference?')2015) 2 The Extractive Industries and Society 320-327.
[84] Minerals Commission Act 1993 (Act 450) (Ghana); Petroleum Commission Act 2011 (Act 821) (Ghana).
[85] Peter Quartey and Emanuel Abbey, 'Ghana's Oil Governance Regime: Challenges and Policy Solutions' (2018) CRPD Working Paper No. 70.
[86] Ghana National Petroleum Corporation Act 1983 (PNDCL 64) (Ghana).
[87] Hermas Abudu and Rockson Sai, 'Examining Prospects and Challenges of Ghana's Petroleum Industry: A Systematic Review' (2025) 6 Energy Reports 841-858.
[88] Ghana Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative, 'Ghana EITI Annual Progress Report 2022' (GHEITI 2023).

mechanisms potentially influence how international arbitration tribunals assess the legitimacy of sovereign actions, particularly regarding taxation and revenue distribution.[89]

Ghana's approach to investment protection and dispute resolution in the resource sector has evolved significantly over time. The country has signed numerous bilateral investment treaties containing investor-state dispute settlement provisions, though recent agreements have increasingly incorporated exceptions for legitimate regulatory measures.[90] At the contractual level, Ghana has utilized various stabilization arrangements, from traditional freezing clauses to more flexible economic equilibrium provisions. These investment protection frameworks establish parameters within which Ghana exercises its sovereign authority over resources, creating potential constraints similar to those experienced by Uganda in cases such as Heritage Oil.[91]

Community rights and interests have gained increasing recognition in Ghana's resource governance framework. The recently enacted Land Act 2020 (Act 1036) strengthens protections for customary land rights, while various policies and regulations establish community consultation requirements and benefit-sharing arrangements.[92] These community-oriented provisions reflect growing recognition that effective resource governance requires addressing local concerns and securing social license. Ghana's experience demonstrates how sovereign authority in resource governance encompasses not only relationships with international investors but also relationships with affected communities, creating complex governance challenges.[93]

Ghana's membership in regional economic communities, particularly the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), adds another dimension to its resource governance framework. The ECOWAS Directive on the Harmonization of Guiding Principles and Policies in the Mining Sector and the ECOWAS Mining Code establish regional standards that influence Ghana's domestic governance arrangements.[94] Similarly, Ghana's participation in the African Mining Vision and more recently the African Continental Free Trade Agreement

[89] Petroleum Revenue Management Act 2011 (Act 815) (Ghana).
[90] Dominic Dagbanja, *The Investment Treaty Regime and Public Interest Regulation in Africa* (OUP 2024).
[91] Ibid.
[92] Land Act 2020 (Act 1036) (Ghana), s 11-13.
[93] Ignatius Joseph Obeng, Edward Asiedu Ofori and Isaac Eshun, 'Land Ownership Rights And Access To Farmlands By Farmers And Herders In The Kwahu East Districtin The Eastern Region Of Ghana' (2023) 8 International Journal of Humanities, Art and Social Studies (IJHAS) 9.
[94] ECOWAS, 'Directive C/DIR.3/05/09 on the Harmonization of Guiding Principles and Policies in the Mining Sector' (2009).

creates additional frameworks potentially affecting resource governance. These regional dimensions illustrate how sovereign authority in resource governance operates within nested jurisdictional frameworks, creating both constraints and opportunities for policy development.[95]

Ghana's resource governance has been significantly shaped by its historical development trajectory. The country's mining sector has colonial roots, with formal gold mining dating back to the late 19th century, while its petroleum sector emerged more recently following offshore discoveries culminating in first oil production in 2010.[96] This historical context has influenced Ghana's resource governance in multiple ways, including through inherited legal frameworks, established patterns of state-investor relations, and experiences with earlier governance failures. Ghana's efforts to restructure these historical relationships while honouring existing commitments illuminate challenges similar to those faced by Uganda as it develops its petroleum resources within existing international investment frameworks.[97]

The relationship between political transitions and resource governance provides another dimension for understanding Ghana's approach. The country's transition to democratic governance in the early 1990s coincided with mining sector reforms, while petroleum governance frameworks were developed under established democratic institutions.[98] This political context has influenced Ghana's resource governance through mechanisms including parliamentary oversight, civil society engagement, and competitive electoral pressures. The interaction between democratic governance and resource management creates distinctive dynamics that affect how sovereign authority is exercised and constrained, providing comparative insights for understanding Uganda's evolving resource governance.[99]

Ghana's resource governance framework demonstrates both similarities and differences with Uganda's approach. Both countries establish constitutional foundations for state ownership of natural resources held in trust for the people, creating comparable theoretical foundations for sovereign authority. Both countries have developed sector-specific legislation addressing the particular characteristics of extractive industries, with detailed provisions regarding licensing,

[95] Ibid.
[96] Sara Ghebremusse, 'Conceptualizing the Developmental State in Resource-Rich Sub-Saharan Africa' (2015) 8 Law and Development Review 467, 470.
[97] Ibid, 472.
[98] Ransford Gyampo, 'Transparency and Accountability in the Management of Oil Revenues in Ghana' (2016) 51 Africa Spectrum 79, 82.
[99] Ibid, 83.

environmental protection, local content, and fiscal arrangements.[100] However, Ghana's longer history with resource exploitation, particularly in the mining sector, has created established governance patterns sometimes absent in Uganda's more recently developed resource frameworks. Additionally, Ghana's more extensive experience with democratic governance has created distinctive accountability mechanisms that influence how sovereign authority is exercised and contested.[101]

The evolution of Ghana's resource governance framework over time illustrates the dynamic nature of sovereignty in resource management. From initial post-independence arrangements prioritizing investment attraction to more recent frameworks emphasizing greater state participation, environmental protection, local content, and community benefits, Ghana's approach has continually adapted to changing circumstances and priorities. [102] This evolutionary pattern provides valuable context for understanding potential trajectories for Uganda's resource governance as its petroleum sector matures. The continuous negotiation and renegotiation of the boundaries of sovereign authority in resource governance, both formally through legislative changes and informally through implementation practices, illustrates the fundamentally contested nature of sovereignty in resource-rich states integrated into global investment frameworks.[103]

3.5 Ghana's Investment Dispute Resolution Experience

Ghana's experience with investment dispute resolution in the natural resources sector provides valuable comparative insights for understanding the tension between sovereignty and international arbitration. Unlike Uganda, which has relatively limited experience with investment arbitration in its emerging petroleum sector, Ghana has navigated various investment disputes across both its established mining industry and more recently developed petroleum sector. This experience illuminates the practical challenges resource-rich African states face when their sovereign actions are contested through international dispute resolution mechanisms.

[100] Constitution of the Republic of Ghana 1992, art 257(6); Constitution of the Republic of Uganda 1995, art 244.
[101] Ransford Gyampo, 'Transparency and Accountability in the Management of Oil Revenues in Ghana' (n 98) 85.
[102] Matthew Tyce, Abdul Abdulai, and Kojo P. Asante (n 73).
[103] Dominic Dagbanja, 'The Investment Treaty Regime and Public Interest Regulation in Ghana: Perspectives in Constitutional and Administrative Law' (n 90) 8.

Ghana's investment treaty framework has established multiple pathways for international arbitration of resource-related disputes. The country has concluded numerous bilateral investment treaties containing investor-state dispute settlement provisions, including agreements with the United Kingdom, Netherlands, and China.[104] These treaties typically include broad definitions of "investment" encompassing resource exploitation rights, while providing for international arbitration under various institutional rules. Additionally, Ghana's Investment Promotion Centre Act 2013 (Act 865) contains provisions for dispute resolution, creating a complex web of potential arbitration jurisdictions.[105] This treaty framework has subjected Ghana's sovereign actions regarding resource governance to potential scrutiny through international arbitration, creating tensions between domestic regulatory authority and international obligations.

The *Balkan Energy v. Ghana* dispute represents a significant case illustrating how international arbitration has affected Ghana's sovereign authority in the energy sector. This dispute arose from Ghana's termination of a power purchase agreement with Balkan Energy, leading to arbitration proceedings at the Permanent Court of Arbitration under UNCITRAL rules.[106] The government's termination decision was based on allegations of contractual non-performance and concerns regarding parliamentary approval requirements under Article 181(5) of the Ghanaian Constitution. The tribunal ultimately issued an award of approximately $12 million against Ghana, significantly less than the $700 million claimed by the investor.[107] This case highlighted tensions between Ghana's constitutional requirements for parliamentary approval of significant state contracts and international arbitration's protection of contractual expectations, a tension with parallels to Uganda's constitutional framework regarding resource ownership and management.

The *Kosmos Energy v. Ghana*[108] tax dispute provides insights into how international arbitration has affected Ghana's fiscal sovereignty in the petroleum sector. This dispute arose from Ghana's attempt to apply capital gains tax to Kosmos Energy's sale of interests in the Jubilee oil field.[109]

---

[104] Agreement between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the Republic of Ghana for the Promotion and Protection of Investments (signed 22 March 1989, entered into force 25 October 1991).

[105] Ghana Investment Promotion Centre Act 2013 (Act 865), s 33.

[106] *Balkan Energy (Ghana) Limited v Republic of Ghana,* PCA Case No. 2010-7, Award (1 April 2014).

[107] Ibid.

[108] *Kosmos Energy v Ghana,* UNCITRAL Arbitration, Settled (2015)

[109] Kingsley David Kojo Nyanyi, 'Prospects And Challenges Of The Ghana Investment Promotion Centre (Gipc) In Promoting Foreign Direct Investment In Ghana' (2020) 11 IJONESS 139.

While the dispute was ultimately settled through negotiation rather than proceeding to final arbitration, the shadow of potential arbitration significantly influenced Ghana's approach to tax enforcement. This experience demonstrates parallels with Uganda's Heritage Oil dispute, illustrating how international investment protection can potentially constrain legitimate taxation authority in natural resource sectors.[110] The negotiated settlement in the Kosmos case represented Ghana's strategic decision to balance revenue objectives with investment relationship maintenance, highlighting the practical constraints international arbitration can place on fiscal sovereignty.

Ghana's experience with mining sector disputes further illuminates the relationship between international arbitration and sovereign regulatory authority. The case of *Newmont Ghana Gold Limited v. Ghana*[111] arose from changes to mining sector taxation, including the introduction of a windfall profit tax and adjustment of royalty rates.[112] The dispute was resolved through negotiation of a revised investment agreement rather than proceeding to formal arbitration. However, the threat of arbitration significantly influenced Ghana's approach to taxation reform, illustrating how investment protection frameworks can constrain fiscal policy space even without formal arbitration proceedings.[113] This experience demonstrates how the shadow of potential arbitration affects state decision-making regarding resource governance, sometimes constraining policy choices even when disputes are ultimately resolved through negotiation.

The relationship between domestic courts and international arbitration has presented particular challenges in Ghana's experience. In several resource-related disputes, Ghana's courts have asserted jurisdiction over matters potentially subject to international arbitration, creating complex jurisdictional tensions.[114] In the *Balkan Energy* case, Ghana's Supreme Court ruled that the underlying agreement was unconstitutional for lack of parliamentary approval, while the international arbitral tribunal nonetheless proceeded to issue an award against Ghana.[115] This jurisdictional tension highlights fundamental questions about the relationship between domestic constitutional requirements and international investment protection, questions

[110] Ibid.
[111] *Newmont Ghana Gold Limited v Ghana,* ICSID Case, Settled (2010)
[112] Dominic Dagbanja, 'The Development Objective as an Imperative in Interpretation of International Investment Agreements' (n 71) 150.
[113] Ibid, 152.
[114] *Republic v High Court (Commercial Division), Accra; Ex Parte Attorney-General (Balkan Energy Ghana Ltd & Ors Interested Parties)* [2011] 2 SCGLR 1183.
[115] *Balkan Energy (Ghana) Limited v Republic of Ghana* (n 106).

equally relevant to Uganda's management of resource disputes within its constitutional framework vesting resource ownership in the people.

Ghana's experience with counterclaims in investment arbitration provides insights into strategies for asserting sovereign interests within arbitration proceedings. In certain cases, Ghana has attempted to raise counterclaims regarding investors' environmental practices, community relations, and contractual performance.[116] The success of these counterclaims has been mixed, influenced by jurisdictional limitations and the asymmetric nature of many investment protection frameworks. Ghana's efforts to assert counterclaims illustrate potential strategies for rebalancing arbitration proceedings, though the limitations encountered demonstrate continuing challenges in ensuring that arbitration adequately addresses state concerns alongside investor protections.[117]

The enforcement of arbitral awards against Ghana has presented additional challenges for sovereign authority. When arbitral tribunals have ruled against Ghana, the country has sometimes faced enforcement actions in foreign jurisdictions targeting Ghanaian assets, including diplomatic property and central bank accounts.[118] These enforcement actions have raised complex questions regarding sovereign immunity and the protection of state assets. Ghana has developed various strategies for addressing enforcement challenges, including settlement negotiations, jurisdictional objections, and sovereign immunity assertions. These experiences illustrate how the international arbitration system can create not only constraints on policy autonomy but also practical challenges for sovereign asset management.[119]

Ghana's experience with stabilization clauses in resource contracts has highlighted particular tensions between sovereign regulatory authority and investment protection. Many mining and petroleum agreements in Ghana have contained stabilization provisions limiting the application of subsequent legislative or regulatory changes to existing investments.[120] These provisions have ranged from traditional "freezing" clauses to more flexible economic equilibrium provisions. While providing investors with greater certainty, these stabilization arrangements

[116] Kingsley David Kojo Nyanyi, 'Prospects And Challenges Of The Ghana Investment Promotion Centre (Gipc) In Promoting Foreign Direct Investment In Ghana' (n 108).
[117] Ibid, 150.
[118] Kweku Ainuson, 'Enforcement of international and national arbitration awards in Ghana – legal basis, challenges and obstacles' (2018) 4 KAS African Law Study Library - Librairie Africaine d'Etudes Juridiques 407.
[119] Ibid.
[120] Jarrod Wong And Abdallah Abuelfutuh Ali, 'The Legislative Stabilization Clause' (2022) 55 International Law And Politics 67.

have also constrained Ghana's ability to implement regulatory reforms affecting resource operations. Ghana's experience demonstrates the long-term implications of contractual constraints on sovereign authority, particularly in sectors like mining and petroleum where regulatory frameworks evolve significantly over project lifespans.[121]

Ghana's institutional capacity to manage investment disputes has been a critical factor in its experience. The country has developed specialized legal expertise within government departments, particularly the Attorney-General's Department and the Ghana National Petroleum Corporation's legal department.[122] This institutional capacity has enabled more effective representation in arbitration proceedings, though resource constraints have sometimes limited effectiveness. Ghana's experience demonstrates the importance of developing robust institutional mechanisms for managing investment disputes, a lesson potentially applicable to Uganda's ongoing development of capacity for addressing resource-related disputes.[123]

The public reaction to international arbitration decisions has sometimes influenced Ghana's approach to investment disputes. Arbitration outcomes perceived as constraining legitimate sovereign authority or transferring substantial public resources to foreign investors have occasionally generated significant domestic criticism.[124] This public dimension of investment disputes has created political pressures affecting Ghana's dispute resolution strategies and subsequent policy approaches. The political economy of investment arbitration in Ghana demonstrates how domestic constituencies can shape a state's engagement with international dispute resolution mechanisms, a dynamic also relevant to Uganda's management of resource-related disputes.[125]

Ghana has undertaken various treaty policy reforms in response to its arbitration experiences. The country has revised its approach to negotiating investment treaties, seeking to include more precise definitions of investment protection standards, exceptions for legitimate regulatory measures, and balanced dispute resolution provisions.[126] Ghana's participation in regional initiatives, including the ECOWAS Investment Policy and the African Continental Free Trade

[121] Ibid.
[122] Kingsley David Kojo Nyanyi, 'Prospects And Challenges Of The Ghana Investment Promotion Centre (GIPC) In Promoting Foreign Direct Investment In Ghana' (n 108).
[123] Ibid.
[124] Shafic Suleman and Joshua Jebuntie Zaato, 'Achieving Sustainability in Ghana's Upstream Oil and Gas Sector: The Role of the National Oil Company' (2022) 20 Oil, Gas & Energy Law Intelligence 1.
[125] Ibid.
[126] Dominic Dagbanja, 'The Investment Treaty Regime and Public Interest Regulation in Ghana: Perspectives in Constitutional and Administrative Law' (n 90) 9.

Agreement's Investment Protocol negotiations, reflects efforts to develop more balanced investment protection frameworks. These reform efforts illustrate possible pathways for addressing the constraints international arbitration has sometimes placed on sovereign authority over resource governance.[127]

Ghana's engagement with alternative dispute resolution mechanisms provides additional insights. The country has increasingly incorporated structured negotiation and mediation processes into its dispute management framework, seeking to resolve investment conflicts before they escalate to formal arbitration.[128] Ghana has also explored the potential of regional dispute resolution mechanisms, including the ECOWAS Court of Justice, as alternative forums for addressing certain aspects of resource governance disputes. These experiences with alternative dispute resolution approaches suggest potential complementary pathways for managing the tension between sovereignty and investment protection.[129]

Environmental and social dimensions of resource disputes have become increasingly prominent in Ghana's experience. Disputes regarding environmental regulations, community displacement, and benefit-sharing arrangements have highlighted tensions between investment protection and broader sustainable development objectives. [130] Ghana's experience demonstrates how international arbitration frameworks sometimes struggle to adequately address the complex interrelationships between investment protection, environmental sustainability, and community rights. These challenges have particular relevance for Uganda's emerging petroleum sector, where similar tensions between investment protection and broader development objectives are likely to emerge.[131]

Ghana's experience with investment dispute prevention strategies offers valuable lessons. The country has developed various mechanisms for early identification and management of potential disputes, including regular investor consultation forums, interagency coordination protocols, and contract management frameworks. [132] These preventive approaches aim to address potential conflicts before they escalate to formal disputes, potentially reducing reliance

[127] Ibid, 10.
[128] Kweku Ainuson, ‘Enforcement of international and national arbitration awards in Ghana – legal basis, challenges and obstacles’ (n 116).
[129] Ibid.
[130] Austin D. Ablo and Ragnhild Overa, 'Networks, Trust and Capital Mobilisation: Challenges of Embedded Local Entrepreneurial Strategies in Ghana's Oil and Gas Industry' (2015) 53 Journal of Modern African Studies 391.
[131] Ibid.
[132] Ransford Gyampo, 'Transparency and Accountability in the Management of Oil Revenues in Ghana' (n 98) 86.

on international arbitration. Ghana's experience suggests opportunities for developing more proactive approaches to managing the tension between sovereignty and investment protection, approaches that might be adapted to Uganda's context.[133]

Throughout its investment dispute resolution experience, Ghana has navigated the fundamental tension between respecting international commitments and protecting sovereign authority to regulate in the public interest. The country's approach has evolved over time, from initially accepting relatively constraining investment protection frameworks to increasingly asserting greater space for legitimate regulatory measures.[134] This evolution reflects a growing recognition of the need to balance investment protection with the preservation of policy space for addressing changing circumstances and development priorities. Ghana's journey provides valuable insights for Uganda as it develops its approach to managing the relationship between sovereignty and international investment arbitration in the natural resources sector.[135]

3.6 Comparative Analysis of Sovereign Rights Protection

The comparative experiences of Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana in protecting sovereign rights within international investment arbitration frameworks reveal important patterns, distinctions, and shared challenges that illuminate the complex relationship between state sovereignty and international investment obligations. This analysis examines similarities and differences in constitutional approaches, legislative frameworks, institutional capacities, and strategic responses to investment disputes across these three jurisdictions, drawing insights that contribute to understanding how resource-rich African states can better balance sovereign authority with investment protection.

Constitutional foundations for resource governance represent a fundamental dimension of comparison across these three countries. Uganda's constitutional framework, established in Article 244 of the 1995 Constitution, vests natural resource ownership in the people of Uganda while placing management responsibility with the government.[136] This people-centred ownership model creates a trust relationship wherein the government exercises regulatory

[133] Ibid, 88.
[134] Dominic Dagbanja, 'The Investment Treaty Regime and Public Interest Regulation in Ghana: Perspectives in Constitutional and Administrative Law' (n 90) 12.
[135] Ibid, 14.
[136] Constitution of the Republic of Uganda 1995, art 244.

authority as trustee for the people. Nigeria's constitution takes a different approach, explicitly vesting petroleum ownership in the federal government rather than the people or sub-national entities.[137] This centralised ownership model shapes Nigeria's sovereign relationship with international investors in ways that differ from Uganda's trust-based framework. Ghana's constitutional position resembles Uganda's approach, with Article 257(6) establishing that natural resources are "the property of the Republic of Ghana and shall be vested in the President on behalf of and in trust for the people of Ghana."[138] These constitutional variations create different theoretical foundations for sovereign authority, potentially influencing how international arbitration tribunals assess the legitimacy of state actions affecting resource exploitation.

Parliamentary oversight mechanisms represent another area of comparative distinction. Ghana's constitution imposes particularly strong parliamentary involvement, with Article 268 requiring parliamentary ratification of agreements relating to natural resource exploitation.[139] This requirement created the jurisdictional basis for the Balkan Energy dispute, where Ghana's Supreme Court determined an agreement was unconstitutional for lack of parliamentary approval while an international tribunal nonetheless issued an award against Ghana.[140] Uganda's constitutional framework similarly emphasizes the parliamentary role through various provisions, though without Ghana's explicit ratification requirement for resource agreements.[141] Nigeria's approach grants greater executive discretion in resource management, with more limited parliamentary involvement in specific petroleum agreements.[142] These variations in parliamentary oversight create different institutional balances affecting how sovereign authority is exercised and potentially contested through international arbitration.

The relationship between state ownership and regulatory authority presents another comparative dimension. In all three countries, state ownership of natural resources serves as the constitutional foundation for regulatory authority over resource exploitation. However, the translation of ownership into effective regulatory authority has varied significantly. Nigeria, despite the constitutional vesting of petroleum ownership in the federal government, has

[137] Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999, s 44(3).
[138] Constitution of the Republic of Ghana 1992, art 257(6).
[139] Constitution of the Republic of Ghana 1992, art 268(1).
[140] *Republic v High Court (Commercial Division), Accra; Ex Parte Attorney-General (Balkan Energy Ghana Ltd & Ors Interested Parties)* [2011] 2 SCGLR 1183.
[141] Constitution of the Republic of Uganda 1995, art 79.
[142] Cyril Obi, 'Oil Extraction, Dispossession, Resistance, and Conflict in Nigeria's Oil-Rich Niger Delta' (n 2) 224.

sometimes struggled to exercise effective regulatory oversight due to capacity constraints and governance challenges.[143] Uganda has developed increasingly comprehensive regulatory frameworks as its petroleum sector has emerged, though implementation effectiveness remains uneven.[144] Ghana has established relatively robust regulatory institutions for both mining and petroleum, reflecting its longer experience with resource governance.[145] These variations in translating resource ownership into effective regulatory authority affect how sovereign rights are practically protected when challenged through international arbitration.

Treaty protection frameworks across the three countries share important similarities while exhibiting distinctive national approaches. All three countries have signed numerous bilateral investment treaties containing investor-state dispute settlement provisions.[146] However, their approaches to treaty negotiation have evolved differently over time. Nigeria has been particularly active in developing alternative treaty models, including its involvement in the ECOWAS Supplementary Act on Investments and the development of a model bilateral investment treaty incorporating greater exceptions for legitimate regulatory measures.[147] Ghana has revised its approach to investment treaties while maintaining a generally investor-friendly framework.[148] Uganda has signed multiple investment treaties but has been less active in treaty reform initiatives.[149] These variations in treaty approaches reflect different strategic responses to the potential constraints treaties place on sovereign regulatory authority.

Taxation sovereignty has emerged as a particularly significant area of tension between state sovereignty and investment protection across all three jurisdictions. Uganda's experience in the *Heritage Oil* dispute directly concerned the country's authority to collect capital gains tax on petroleum asset transfers.[150] Ghana faced similar challenges in the Kosmos Energy tax dispute,

---

[143] Ibid, 226.

[144] Directorate of Petroleum, 'Petroleum Exploration History' (n.d) https://www.petroleum.go.ug/index.php/who-we-are/who-weare/petroleum-exploration-history accessed on 15 February 2025.

[145] Peter Quartey and Emanuel Abbey, 'Ghana's Oil Governance Regime: Challenges and Policy Solutions' (n 85).

[146] UNCTAD, 'International Investment Agreements Navigator: Uganda' (Investment Policy Hub, 2022) https://investmentpolicy.unctad.org/international-investment-agreements/countries/218/uganda accessed 14 February 2025.

[147] Makane Moïse Mbengue, 'Africa's Voice in the Formation, Shaping and Redesign of International Investment Law' (n 49) 459.

[148] Dominic Dagbanja, 'The Investment Treaty Regime and Public Interest Regulation in Ghana: Perspectives in Constitutional and Administrative Law' (n 90) 9.

[149] Agreement between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the Republic of Uganda for the Promotion and Protection of Investments (Uganda-United Kingdom BIT) (signed 24 April 1998, entered into force in 1999).

[150] *Heritage Oil and Gas Ltd v Republic of Uganda* (UNCITRAL Arbitration, Notice of Arbitration, 16 May 2011).

ultimately reaching a negotiated settlement rather than proceeding to full arbitration.[151] Nigeria has encountered numerous tax-related disputes, particularly regarding changes to petroleum fiscal terms and the application of new tax provisions to existing investments.[152] The prevalence of tax-related disputes across all three countries reflects the fundamental tension between states' sovereign authority to determine appropriate fiscal arrangements for resource exploitation and investors' expectations of fiscal stability protected through various investment instruments.

Stabilisation mechanisms represent another area of comparative significance. All three countries have utilized various forms of stabilisation provisions in resource contracts, from traditional "freezing" clauses to more flexible economic equilibrium provisions.[153] However, their approaches have evolved differently over time. Ghana has increasingly moved toward more limited stabilisation focused primarily on fiscal terms rather than broader regulatory frameworks.[154] Nigeria has similarly reduced the scope of stabilisation commitments in more recent petroleum contracts.[155] Uganda has included various stabilisation arrangements in its petroleum agreements while attempting to preserve regulatory space for environmental and social measures.[156] These evolving approaches to stabilisation reflect attempts to balance investment certainty with the preservation of legitimate regulatory authority to address changing circumstances and development priorities.

Institutional capacity for managing investment disputes varies significantly across the three jurisdictions. Nigeria has developed relatively extensive legal expertise for addressing investment disputes, reflecting its longer history with international arbitration, though coordination challenges and resource constraints have sometimes limited effectiveness.[157] Ghana has similarly developed specialized expertise within government departments and state

[151] Kingsley David Kojo Nyanyi, 'Prospects And Challenges Of The Ghana Investment Promotion Centre (GIPC) In Promoting Foreign Direct Investment In Ghana' (n 108).
[152] Jesse Salah Ovadia, 'Local Content Policies and Petro-Development in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Comparative Analysis' (n 38) 26.
[153] Lorenzo Cotula, 'Reconciling Regulatory Stability and Evolution of Environmental Standards in Investment Contracts: Towards a rethink of stabilization clauses' (n 53) 160.
[154] Jarrod Wong And Abdallah Abuelfutuh Ali, 'The Legislative Stabilization Clause' (n 118) 70.
[155] Okechukwu Ejims, 'The Impact of Nigerian International Petroleum Contracts on Environmental and Human Rights of Indigenous Communities' (n 10) 347.
[156] Petroleum (Exploration, Development and Production) Act 2013, s 42-44.
[157] Emilia Onyema, 'Regional Arbitration Institution for ECOWAS: Lessons from OHADA Common Court of Justice and Arbitration' (n 39) 102.

petroleum entities, enabling more effective representation in arbitration proceedings.[158] Uganda, with more limited experience in major investment arbitration, has faced greater capacity challenges, though it has begun developing more robust institutional mechanisms following experiences such as the Heritage Oil dispute.[159] These capacity differences significantly affect how effectively states can defend sovereign interests when challenged through international arbitration.

The relationship between domestic courts and international arbitration presents similar tensions across all three jurisdictions. In each country, domestic courts have sometimes asserted jurisdiction over matters potentially subject to international arbitration, creating complex jurisdictional tensions.[160] Ghana's Supreme Court ruling regarding parliamentary approval in the Balkan Energy case, Nigeria's judicial interventions in various petroleum disputes, and Uganda's tax tribunal decisions in the Heritage Oil matter all illustrate these tensions between domestic judicial authority and international arbitration jurisdiction.[161] These experiences highlight fundamental questions about the relationship between domestic constitutional requirements and international investment protection, questions that remain unresolved across all three jurisdictions.

The treatment of environmental and social dimensions of resource governance in investment disputes reveals both commonalities and distinctions. All three countries have faced challenges in asserting sovereign authority to strengthen environmental and social governance of resource exploitation while maintaining consistency with investment protection commitments.[162] However, their experiences have differed in important respects. Ghana, with its longer history of mining governance, has developed more extensive experience addressing environmental disputes through both domestic and international mechanisms.[163] Nigeria's experience with environmental disputes in the Niger Delta has generated significant jurisprudence regarding

[158] Kingsley David Kojo Nyanyi, 'Prospects And Challenges Of The Ghana Investment Promotion Centre (Gipc) In Promoting Foreign Direct Investment In Ghana' (n 108).
[159] Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs, 'Strategic Investment Dispute Management Framework' (Republic of Uganda 2018).
[160] Emilia Onyema, 'Rethinking the Role of African National Courts in Arbitration' (n 39) 12.
[161] *Republic v High Court (Commercial Division), Accra; Ex Parte Attorney-General (Balkan Energy Ghana Ltd & Ors Interested Parties)* [2011] 2 SCGLR 1183; *Heritage Oil & Gas v Uganda Revenue Authority (Miscellaneous Application No. 6 of 2011)* [2011] UGTAT 1 (25 July 2011).
[162] Lorenzo Cotula, 'Investment treaties and sustainable development: investment liberalisation' (n 9).
[163] Austin D. Ablo and Ragnhild Overa, 'Networks, Trust and Capital Mobilisation: Challenges of Embedded Local Entrepreneurial Strategies in Ghana's Oil and Gas Industry' (n 128) 394.

the relationship between investment protection and environmental governance.[164] Uganda's newer petroleum sector has created emerging challenges regarding environmental protection in sensitive ecosystems.[165] These variations reflect different stages of resource sector development while highlighting common tensions between investment protection and broader sustainable development objectives.

Transparency mechanisms represent another comparative dimension across the three jurisdictions. All three countries have engaged with the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI), though with varying degrees of implementation effectiveness.[166] Ghana has established particularly robust transparency frameworks through its Petroleum Revenue Management Act, which created detailed mechanisms for revenue collection, management, and distribution, including heritage and stabilization funds.[167] Nigeria established the Nigerian Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (NEITI) through dedicated legislation, though implementation challenges have sometimes limited effectiveness.[168] Uganda has more recently developed transparency mechanisms through its Public Finance Management Act provisions regarding petroleum revenue.[169] These transparency frameworks potentially influence how international arbitration tribunals assess the legitimacy of sovereign actions, particularly regarding taxation and revenue distribution.

Local content and benefit-sharing provisions represent increasingly important dimensions of sovereign resource governance across all three jurisdictions. Nigeria pioneered comprehensive local content requirements through its Nigerian Oil and Gas Industry Content Development Act, establishing detailed mandates for Nigerian participation in the petroleum sector.[170] Ghana has similarly developed extensive local content frameworks for both mining and petroleum through various legislative and regulatory instruments.[171] Uganda has incorporated local content provisions in its Petroleum (Exploration, Development and Production) Act, though implementation remains at an earlier stage.[172] These local content frameworks represent

[164] Rhuks Temitope Ako, 'Nigeria's Land Use Act: An Anti-Thesis to Environmental Justice' (n 20) 292.
[165] Emmanuel Kasimbazi, 'Environmental Regulation of Oil and Gas Exploration and Production in Uganda' (2012) 30 Journal of Energy & Natural Resources Law 185, 188.
[166] Ghana Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative, 'Ghana EITI Annual Progress Report 2022' (n 88).
[167] Petroleum Revenue Management Act 2011 (Act 815) (Ghana).
[168] Nigerian Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (NEITI) Act 2007.
[169] Public Finance Management Act 2015, s 56-66.
[170] Nigerian Oil and Gas Industry Content Development Act 2010, s 3, 11, 31.
[171] Petroleum (Local Content and Local Participation) Regulations 2013 (LI 2204) (Ghana).
[172] Petroleum (Exploration, Development and Production) Act 2013, s 9-11.

significant assertions of sovereign authority to shape investment patterns and secure developmental benefits from resource exploitation, potentially creating tensions with certain investment protection standards.

State participation in resource exploitation represents another comparative dimension across the three jurisdictions. All three countries have established national petroleum companies – the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (now NNPC Limited), the Ghana National Petroleum Corporation, and the Uganda National Oil Company.[173] However, these entities operate with different mandates, governance structures, and commercial approaches. Nigeria's NNPC has historically played a dominant role in the petroleum sector, typically holding majority interests in joint ventures.[174] Ghana's GNPC typically holds carried and participating interests in petroleum operations, with more limited operational involvement.[175] Uganda's UNOC was established more recently as the commercial vehicle for state participation in petroleum operations.[176] These variations in state participation models create different interfaces between sovereign commercial interests and regulatory authority, potentially affecting dispute resolution dynamics.

Regional dimensions of investment governance present both similarities and distinctions. Nigeria and Ghana, as members of ECOWAS, have participated in regional initiatives including the ECOWAS Court of Justice and the ECOWAS Supplementary Act on Investments.[177] Uganda, as an East African Community member, has engaged with different regional frameworks, including the EAC Model Investment Treaty.[178] These regional differences affect how states engage with investment dispute resolution and reflect different regional approaches to balancing investment protection with sovereign regulatory authority. At the continental level, all three countries have engaged with initiatives such as the African

[173] Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation Act 1977; Ghana National Petroleum Corporation Act 1983 (PNDCL 64) (Ghana); Petroleum (Exploration, Development and Production) Act 2013, s 42-44.
[174] Okechukwu Ejims, 'The Impact of Nigerian International Petroleum Contracts on Environmental and Human Rights of Indigenous Communities' (n 10) 347.
[175] Hermas Abudu and Rockson Sai, 'Examining Prospects and Challenges of Ghana's Petroleum Industry: A Systematic Review' (n 87).
[176] Andrew Bauer, Paul Bagabo And Thomas Scurfield, 'Setting Up Uganda's National Mining Company to Boost Sustainable Development' (Natural Resource Governance Institute 2025).
[177] ECOWAS, 'Directive C/DIR.3/05/09 on the Harmonization of Guiding Principles and Policies in the Mining Sector' (2009).
[178] East African Community, 'Protocol on Environment and Natural Resources Management' (2006).

Continental Free Trade Agreement and its Investment Protocol negotiations, suggesting potential convergence around certain regional approaches to investment governance.[179]

Historical trajectories of resource governance significantly influence current approaches across the three jurisdictions. Nigeria's petroleum sector, with commercial production dating back to the 1950s, has experienced multiple governance phases from early concession regimes through nationalisation to various partnership models.[180] Ghana's mining sector has similarly deep historical roots, while its petroleum sector emerged more recently following offshore discoveries.[181] Uganda's petroleum sector represents the most recently developed of the three, with commercial discoveries announced in 2006 and production yet to commence.[182] These historical differences create varied legacies of state-investor relations, established governance patterns, and institutional experiences that shape current approaches to balancing sovereignty with investment protection.

The interaction between political systems and resource governance constitutes another important comparative dimension. Ghana's relatively established democratic governance system has created mechanisms for political accountability in resource management, including active parliamentary oversight and civil society engagement.[183] Nigeria's more complex federal system and historical experience with military governance have created different political dynamics affecting resource management.[184] Uganda's political system, characterised by long-term presidential leadership, has shaped distinctive resource governance approaches with strong executive direction.[185] These political variations influence how sovereign authority is exercised and contested through international arbitration, affecting both formal legal frameworks and their practical implementation.

---

[179] Makane Moïse Mbengue and Stefanie Schacherer, 'The "Africanization" of International Investment Law: The Pan-African Investment Code and the reform of the international investment regime' (n 6) 419.

[180] Cyril Obi, 'Oil and Development in Africa: Some Lessons from the Oil Factor in Nigeria for the Sudan' (n 18) 10.

[181] Sara Ghebremusse, 'Conceptualizing the Developmental State in Resource-Rich Sub-Saharan Africa' (n 96) 470.

[182] Directorate of Petroleum, 'Petroleum Exploration History' (n 142).

[183] Ransford Gyampo, 'Transparency and Accountability in the Management of Oil Revenues in Ghana' (n 98) 82.

[184] Cyril Obi, 'Oil Extraction, Dispossession, Resistance, and Conflict in Nigeria's Oil-Rich Niger Delta' (n 2) 225.

[185] Joe Oloka-Onyango, 'Courting the Oil Curse or Playing by the Rules? An Analysis of the Legal and Regulatory Framework Governing Oil in Uganda' in Arnim Langer, Ukoha Ukiwo, and Pamela Mbabazi (Eds.) *Oil Wealth and Development in Uganda and Beyond Prospects, Opportunities and Challenges* (Leuven University Press 2020) 49, 54.

Across all three jurisdictions, the sovereign right to regulate in the public interest remains the fundamental concern when engaging with international investment arbitration. Each country has sought to preserve policy space for legitimate regulatory measures while honouring international commitments to investors.[186] This balancing act has proven challenging in various contexts, from environmental regulation to fiscal policy adjustments to local content requirements. The experiences of these three countries demonstrate that effective protection of sovereign rights requires comprehensive approaches encompassing constitutional provisions, legislative frameworks, institutional capacity, diplomatic engagement, and strategic dispute management. The comparative analysis suggests that while particular mechanisms may vary based on national circumstances, certain fundamental principles remain essential for balancing sovereignty with investment protection across all resource-rich African states.[187]

3.7 Common Challenges and Innovative Responses

The comparative analysis of Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana reveals several common challenges in balancing sovereign authority with investment protection, alongside innovative responses these states have developed to address these tensions. These shared challenges transcend the specific constitutional frameworks and historical trajectories of each country, reflecting fundamental tensions inherent in the relationship between resource-rich developing states and the international investment regime. Examining these common challenges and responses provides valuable insights into potential pathways for strengthening sovereign rights protection while maintaining beneficial investment relationships.

Resource nationalism represents a recurring challenge across all three jurisdictions, manifesting as periodic tensions between asserting greater state control over natural resources and maintaining attractive investment environments. Nigeria has experienced several cycles of resource nationalism, from the nationalisation measures of the 1970s to more recent efforts to increase state participation and local content in the petroleum sector.[188] Ghana has similarly witnessed resource nationalist pressures, particularly following discoveries of commercial

[186] Tarcisio Gazzini, *The Interpretation of International Investment Treaties* (Hart Publishing 2016).
[187] Lorenzo Cotula, 'Raising the Bar on Responsible Investment: What Role for Investment Treaties?' (2018) IIED Briefing Papers.
[188] Cyril Obi, 'Oil and Development in Africa: Some Lessons from the Oil Factor in Nigeria for the Sudan' (n 178) 10.

petroleum reserves, leading to strengthened state participation requirements and benefit-sharing provisions.[189] Uganda has incorporated elements of resource nationalism in its petroleum governance framework, including mandatory state participation through the Uganda National Oil Company and extensive local content provisions.[190] These resource-nationalist measures have sometimes generated tensions with investment protection commitments, particularly when implemented in ways affecting existing investments. The challenge for all three states has been developing approaches to resource nationalism that secure legitimate sovereign interests while maintaining consistency with international obligations.[191]

Fiscal sovereignty presents another shared challenge, particularly regarding the taxation of resource extraction. All three countries have faced disputes or tensions regarding their authority to implement or adjust tax measures affecting resource exploitation.[192] Uganda's Heritage Oil dispute directly concerned capital gains taxation on petroleum asset transfers, while Ghana's Kosmos Energy tax dispute raised similar issues. Nigeria has encountered numerous challenges regarding petroleum taxation, particularly when adjusting fiscal terms for existing investments.[193] These experiences highlight the fundamental tension between states' sovereign authority to determine appropriate fiscal arrangements for resource exploitation and investors' expectations of fiscal stability protected through various investment instruments.[194] The challenge has been particularly acute when tax measures respond to changing economic circumstances or address perceived inequities in existing arrangements, situations where the exercise of fiscal sovereignty directly confronts stabilisation expectations.[195]

Environmental regulation of resource exploitation has created similar challenges across all three jurisdictions. As global environmental standards have evolved and domestic environmental awareness has increased, all three countries have sought to strengthen the

[189] Ransford Gyampo, 'Transparency and Accountability in the Management of Oil Revenues in Ghana' (n 181) 82.
[190] Petroleum (Exploration, Development and Production) Act 2013, s 9-11, 42-44.
[191] James Gathii, *War, Commerce, and International Law* (Oxford University Press 2010) 158.
[192] Mohammed Amidu, Rester Togormey, and Dominic Dokbilla Naab, 'Natural Resources Tax Administration and Reforms in Africa' in Mohammed Amidu, Abdallah Ali-Nakyea, and Joshua Yindenaba Abor (Eds.) Taxation and Management of Natural Resources in Africa (Springer Nature 2024).
[193] Jesse Salah Ovadia, 'Local Content Policies and Petro-Development in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Comparative Analysis' (n 150) 26.
[194] William Park, 'Arbitrability and Tax' in Loukas Mistelis and Stavros Brekoulakis (eds), Arbitrability: International and Comparative Perspectives (Kluwer Law International 2009) 179, 185.
[195] Mazzin Ezeldin, 'Arbitrability of Tax Disputes in Commercial and Investment Arbitration' (Master's dissertation, Saarland University 2021).

environmental governance of resource exploitation.[196] However, these strengthened regulations have sometimes generated tensions with investment protection commitments, particularly stabilisation provisions potentially constraining regulatory evolution. Nigeria's experience with environmental regulation in the Niger Delta, Ghana's strengthened environmental governance in both mining and petroleum sectors, and Uganda's environmental oversight of petroleum development in sensitive ecosystems all illustrate these tensions.[197] The challenge for these states has been establishing environmental regulatory frameworks that effectively protect ecosystems and communities while maintaining consistency with investment protection commitments, particularly for pre-existing investments.[198]

Regulatory capacity constraints represent a shared challenge affecting how effectively these states can assert sovereign authority within international investment frameworks. All three countries have faced challenges in developing and maintaining the technical, legal, and administrative capacity necessary for effective resource governance.[199] Nigeria, despite its longer experience with petroleum governance, has struggled with coordination challenges among multiple regulatory agencies and capacity limitations in specialized areas.[200] Ghana has developed a relatively robust capacity in certain aspects of resource governance while facing limitations in others.[201] Uganda, with its newer petroleum sector, continues developing regulatory capacity across various dimensions of resource governance.[202] These capacity constraints affect states' ability to effectively assert sovereign authority within international investment frameworks, potentially creating de facto limitations on sovereign rights even when formal legal authority exists.

The asymmetric nature of investment dispute resolution presents challenges for all three jurisdictions. The financial costs of arbitration proceedings, including legal representation expenses, tribunal fees, and expert witness costs, create particular barriers for resource-

[196] Lorenzo Cotula, 'Investment treaties and sustainable development: investment liberalisation' (n 160).
[197] Emmanuel Kasimbazi, 'Environmental Regulation of Oil and Gas Exploration and Production in Uganda' (n 163) 188.
[198] Lorenzo Cotula, 'Reconciling Regulatory Stability and Evolution of Environmental Standards in Investment Contracts: Towards a rethink of stabilization clauses' (n 151) 160.
[199] Sam Hickey, 'The politics of state capacity and development in Africa: Reframing and researching 'pockets of effectiveness' (2019) ESID Working Paper No. 117.
[200] Emilia Onyema, 'Regional Arbitration Institution for ECOWAS: Lessons from OHADA Common Court of Justice and Arbitration' (n 155) 102.
[201] Ibid.
[202] Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs, 'Strategic Investment Dispute Management Framework' (n 157).

constrained states.[203] These costs can divert public resources from essential services and development priorities, creating difficult tradeoffs for public officials. Furthermore, information asymmetries regarding arbitration procedures, jurisprudential trends, and effective dispute management strategies can disadvantage states with limited arbitration experience.[204] These procedural and resource asymmetries affect how effectively states can defend sovereign interests when challenged through international arbitration, potentially undermining substantive sovereign rights through procedural disadvantages.[205]

The jurisdictional interface between domestic courts and international arbitration has created common challenges across all three countries. Each jurisdiction has experienced tensions between domestic judicial authority and international arbitration jurisdiction, particularly when constitutional or public policy issues intersect with investment protection.[206] Ghana's Supreme Court ruling regarding parliamentary approval in the Balkan Energy case, Nigeria's judicial interventions in petroleum disputes, and Uganda's tax tribunal decisions in the Heritage Oil matter all illustrate these tensions. The challenge has been developing coherent approaches to this jurisdictional interface that respect both domestic constitutional requirements and international commitments, without creating irreconcilable conflicts that undermine legal certainty and effective dispute resolution.[207]

Political economy pressures represent another shared challenge affecting resource governance across all three jurisdictions. Demands for immediate revenue generation, job creation, and visible development benefits from resource exploitation can create tensions with longer-term objectives such as sustainable resource management, environmental protection, and intergenerational equity.[208] These political economy pressures affect how states exercise sovereign authority over natural resources, sometimes creating incentives that complicate the

[203] Diana Rosert, 'The Stakes Are High: A review of the financial costs of investment treaty arbitration' (International Institute for Sustainable Development 2014) https://www.iisd.org/system/files/publications/stakes-are-high-review-financial-costs-investment-treaty-arbitration.pdf accessed 17 February 2025.
[204] Emilia Onyema, 'Effective Utilization of Arbitrators and Arbitration Institutions in Africa by Appointors' (2008) 11 VJ 307, 309.
[205] African Legal Support Facility, 'Building legal capacity within the extractives sector in Uganda' (ALSF 2024) https://africanlegalsupportfacility.com/new/building-legal-capacity-within-the-extractives-sector-in-uganda-5 accessed 17 February 2025.
[206] Emilia Onyema, 'Rethinking the Role of African National Courts in Arbitration' (n 158) 12.
[207] *Republic v High Court (Commercial Division), Accra; Ex Parte Attorney-General (Balkan Energy Ghana Ltd & Ors Interested Parties)* [2011] 2 SCGLR 1183.
[208] Laura Paler, 'Oil discoveries and political windfalls: evidence on presidential support in Uganda' (2023) 11 Political Science Research and Methods 903.

balancing of multiple objectives. Furthermore, political transitions can generate policy discontinuities affecting resource governance, potentially creating tensions with investment protection expectations of policy stability.[209] The challenge for all three states has been developing governance frameworks that address legitimate political economy concerns while maintaining consistent approaches to resource management and investment protection.

In response to these common challenges, the three countries have developed various innovative approaches to protecting sovereign rights while maintaining investment relationships. Treaty reform initiatives represent one significant response, with all three countries participating in efforts to develop more balanced investment protection frameworks.[210] Nigeria has been particularly active in this area, participating in the development of the ECOWAS Supplementary Act on Investments and drafting a model bilateral investment treaty incorporating greater exceptions for legitimate regulatory measures.[211] Ghana has similarly revised its approach to investment treaties, seeking to incorporate more precise definitions of investment protection standards and clearer exceptions for legitimate regulatory measures.[212] Uganda has engaged with regional initiatives through the East African Community, contributing to the development of the EAC Model Investment Treaty.[213] These treaty reform efforts aim to create more balanced frameworks that protect legitimate investment expectations while preserving sovereign regulatory space.

Innovative contractual approaches represent another response to these challenges. All three countries have moved toward more sophisticated stabilisation mechanisms that focus on preserving economic equilibrium rather than freezing regulatory frameworks.[214] These economic equilibrium approaches aim to protect investors against fundamentally altered investment conditions while preserving sovereign authority to implement legitimate regulatory

[209] Badru Bukenya and Jaqueline Nakaiza, 'Closed but Ordered: How the Political Settlement Shapes Uganda's Deals with International Oil Companies' in Arnim Langer, Ukoha Ukiwo, and Pamela Mbabazi (Eds.) Oil Wealth and Development in Uganda and Beyond Prospects, Opportunities and Challenges (Leuven University Press 2020) 103, 118.

[210] Makane Moïse Mbengue, 'Africa's Voice in the Formation, Shaping and Redesign of International Investment Law' (n 145) 459.

[211] Makane Moïse Mbengue and Stefanie Schacherer, 'The "Africanization" of International Investment Law: The Pan-African Investment Code and the reform of the international investment regime' (n 177) 419.

[212] Dominic Dagbanja, 'The Investment Treaty Regime and Public Interest Regulation in Ghana: Perspectives in Constitutional and Administrative Law' (n 146) 9.

[213] East African Community Secretariat, 'Comparative Analysis of Petroleum Legislation in the EAC Partner States' (EAC 2020).

[214] Lorenzo Cotula, 'Reconciling Regulatory Stability and Evolution of Environmental Standards in Investment Contracts: Towards a rethink of stabilization clauses' (n 151) 160.

changes. Ghana has pioneered development agreement approaches in its mining sector that combine investment protection with progressive adjustment mechanisms responsive to changing circumstances.[215] Nigeria has increasingly incorporated periodic review provisions in petroleum contracts, allowing for adjustment of terms while maintaining overall investment viability.[216] Uganda has included various community benefit provisions in its petroleum agreements, seeking to ensure local development benefits alongside investment protection.[217] These contractual innovations represent attempts to create more dynamic frameworks that protect core investment expectations while preserving sovereign flexibility to address evolving circumstances.

Institutional capacity development represents a critical response across all three jurisdictions. Nigeria has established specialized units within the Ministry of Justice and the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation focused on investment dispute management.[218] Ghana has developed technical capacity within both the Attorney-General's Department and the Ghana National Petroleum Corporation for addressing resource-related disputes.[219] Uganda has established a Strategic Investment Dispute Management Framework and begun developing specialized expertise following experiences such as the Heritage Oil dispute.[220] These institutional capacity development efforts aim to create more effective mechanisms for protecting sovereign interests within international arbitration frameworks, addressing the procedural and resource asymmetries that can undermine substantive sovereign rights. Furthermore, all three countries have increasingly participated in knowledge-sharing networks and capacity-building initiatives, including those supported by regional bodies and international organizations, to strengthen their ability to manage investment disputes effectively.[221]

Alternative dispute resolution approaches represent another innovative response. All three countries have incorporated structured negotiation and mediation processes into their dispute

[215] Jarrod Wong And Abdallah Abuelfutuh Ali, 'The Legislative Stabilization Clause' (n 152) 70.
[216] Okechukwu Ejims, 'The Impact of Nigerian International Petroleum Contracts on Environmental and Human Rights of Indigenous Communities' (n 153) 347.
[217] Badru Bukenya and Jaqueline Nakaiza, 'Closed but Ordered: How the Political Settlement Shapes Uganda's Deals with International Oil Companies' (n 207) 120.
[218] Emilia Onyema, 'Regional Arbitration Institution for ECOWAS: Lessons from OHADA Common Court of Justice and Arbitration' (n 155) 102.
[219] Kingsley David Kojo Nyanyi, 'Prospects And Challenges Of The Ghana Investment Promotion Centre (GIPC) In Promoting Foreign Direct Investment In Ghana' (n 149).
[220] Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs, 'Strategic Investment Dispute Management Framework' (n 157).
[221] African Legal Support Facility, 'Building legal capacity within the extractives sector in Uganda' (n 203).

management frameworks, seeking to resolve investment conflicts before they escalate to formal arbitration.[222] Nigeria has established various consultative mechanisms for addressing petroleum sector disputes, including joint committees with industry participation.[223] Ghana has developed formalized pre-arbitration dispute resolution requirements in its investment agreements, creating structured pathways for addressing conflicts through negotiation.[224] Uganda has incorporated alternative dispute resolution provisions in its petroleum agreements, establishing multi-step dispute resolution processes.[225] These alternative approaches aim to create more balanced and potentially less adversarial forums for addressing investment disputes, potentially preserving both sovereign interests and investment relationships more effectively than adversarial arbitration.

Transparency initiatives represent significant responses across all three jurisdictions. Nigeria established the Nigerian Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative through dedicated legislation, creating disclosure requirements for resource revenue flows.[226] Ghana developed particularly robust transparency frameworks through its Petroleum Revenue Management Act, establishing detailed mechanisms for revenue collection, management, and distribution, including heritage and stabilization funds.[227] Uganda has incorporated transparency provisions in its Public Finance Management Act regarding petroleum revenue and engaged with the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative.[228] These transparency frameworks aim to strengthen the legitimacy of sovereign resource governance, potentially influencing how international arbitration tribunals assess state actions while addressing broader accountability concerns. Furthermore, transparency initiatives potentially reduce information asymmetries affecting contract negotiations and dispute resolution, creating more balanced relationships between states and investors.[229]

Regional cooperation mechanisms represent another innovative response. Nigeria and Ghana have participated in ECOWAS initiatives including the ECOWAS Court of Justice and the

[222] Hakeem Seriki, 'Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards and Public Policy – A Note of Caution' (n 49).
[223] Emilia Onyema, 'Effective Utilization of Arbitrators and Arbitration Institutions in Africa by Appointors' (n 202) 310.
[224] Kweku Ainuson, 'Enforcement of international and national arbitration awards in Ghana – legal basis, challenges and obstacles' (2018) 4 KAS African Law Study Library - Librairie Africaine d'Etudes Juridiques 407.
[225] Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs, 'Strategic Investment Dispute Management Framework' (n 157).
[226] Nigerian Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (NEITI) Act 2007.
[227] Petroleum Revenue Management Act 2011 (Act 815) (Ghana).
[228] Public Finance Management Act 2015, s 56-66.
[229] Ransford Gyampo, 'Transparency and Accountability in the Management of Oil Revenues in Ghana' (n 181) 86.

development of regional investment governance frameworks.[230] Uganda has engaged with East African Community initiatives regarding harmonized approaches to resource governance and investment protection.[231] All three countries have participated in continental initiatives, including the African Union's Mining Vision and the African Continental Free Trade Agreement's Investment Protocol development.[232] These regional cooperation mechanisms aim to develop more coordinated approaches to balancing investment protection with sovereign regulatory authority, potentially creating greater policy space through collective action than individual states might achieve in bilateral negotiations. Furthermore, regional approaches potentially reduce competitive pressures that might otherwise drive a "race to the bottom" in regulatory standards and investment protection commitments.[233]

Local content frameworks represent significant innovations across all three jurisdictions. Nigeria pioneered comprehensive local content requirements through its Nigerian Oil and Gas Industry Content Development Act, establishing detailed mandates for Nigerian participation in the petroleum sector.[234] Ghana has similarly developed extensive local content frameworks for both mining and petroleum through various legislative and regulatory instruments.[235] Uganda has incorporated local content provisions in its Petroleum (Exploration, Development and Production) Act, establishing requirements for Ugandan participation in the petroleum value chain.[236] These local content frameworks represent attempts to leverage foreign investment for broader development objectives while maintaining attractive investment environments. The challenge has been designing local content requirements that effectively promote development linkages without creating conflicts with investment protection standards, particularly national treatment provisions.[237]

The community benefit approaches developed across these jurisdictions represent another innovative response. Nigeria has increasingly incorporated community development requirements in petroleum governance, including the host community provisions of the

[230] ECOWAS, 'Directive C/DIR.3/05/09 on the Harmonization of Guiding Principles and Policies in the Mining Sector' (n 175).
[231] East African Community, 'Protocol on Environment and Natural Resources Management' (n 176).
[232] African Union, 'Africa Mining Vision' (February 2009).
[233] Makane Moïse Mbengue and Stefanie Schacherer, 'The "Africanization" of International Investment Law: The Pan-African Investment Code and the reform of the international investment regime' (n 177) 420.
[234] Nigerian Oil and Gas Industry Content Development Act 2010, s 3, 11, 31.
[235] Petroleum (Local Content and Local Participation) Regulations 2013 (LI 2204) (Ghana).
[236] Petroleum (Exploration, Development and Production) Act 2013, s 9-11.
[237] Jesse Salah Ovadia, 'Local Content Policies and Petro-Development in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Comparative Analysis' (n 150) 27.

Petroleum Industry Act.[238] Ghana has developed various community benefit-sharing arrangements in both mining and petroleum sectors, including local development funds and consultation requirements.[239] Uganda has incorporated community benefits provisions in its petroleum governance framework, including requirements for local development initiatives.[240] These community benefit approaches represent attempts to address the social dimensions of resource governance, securing broader acceptance of resource exploitation while potentially strengthening the legitimacy of state actions when assessed through international arbitration. They reflect growing recognition that effective protection of sovereign interests requires addressing community relationships to maintain a social licence for resource exploitation.[241]

The innovative responses developed across these three jurisdictions demonstrate the dynamic nature of sovereign rights protection in resource governance. Rather than static assertions of absolute authority, effective sovereignty in the contemporary context involves sophisticated engagement with international frameworks to secure legitimate state interests while maintaining beneficial investment relationships. The experiences of Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana illustrate how resource-rich African states can develop more balanced approaches to investment protection that respect legitimate sovereign interests while maintaining the benefits of foreign investment for national development. These approaches require continuous adaptation to changing circumstances, reflecting the fundamentally contested and evolving nature of sovereignty in resource governance.[242]

3.8 Lessons for Sovereign Rights Protection in Investment Arbitration

The comparative analysis of Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana's experiences with international investment arbitration reveals valuable lessons for strengthening sovereign rights protection while maintaining beneficial investment relationships. These lessons emerge from both successful strategies and continuing challenges across the three jurisdictions, offering insights

[238] Petroleum Industry Act 2021 (Nigeria), s 234-257.
[239] Ignatius Joseph Obeng, Edward Asiedu Ofori and Isaac Eshun (n 93).
[240] David Kirangwa Sseremba, 'Oil And Community Development In Uganda: Citizens' expectations and participation in the oil and natural gas sector' (Master's dissertation Diaconia University of Applied Sciences 2020).
[241] Laura Smith, James Van Alstine, and Anne Tallontire, 'The Making of an Oil Frontier: Territorialisation Dynamics in Uganda's Emerging Oil Industry' (2022) 12 The Extractive Industries and Society 101188.
[242] Lorenzo Cotula, 'Raising the Bar on Responsible Investment: What Role for Investment Treaties?' (n 185).

that may inform approaches to balancing sovereignty and investment protection in resource-rich African states.

Treaty negotiation represents a critical opportunity for establishing balanced frameworks that protect legitimate investment expectations while preserving sovereign regulatory space. The experiences of all three countries demonstrate the importance of precision in defining investment protection standards, with ambiguous provisions such as "fair and equitable treatment" potentially creating expansive constraints on sovereign authority when interpreted broadly by arbitral tribunals. Nigeria's development of a model bilateral investment treaty with more precise definitions and clearer exceptions for legitimate regulatory measures illustrates how states can proactively shape investment protection frameworks to better accommodate sovereign interests.[243] Similarly, Ghana's revised approach to investment treaties demonstrates the importance of incorporating specific exceptions for environmental protection, public health measures, and taxation authority.

Stabilisation provisions require particular attention in preserving sovereign regulatory space while providing investment certainty. The shift from traditional "freezing" clauses toward more flexible economic equilibrium approaches across all three jurisdictions reflects a growing recognition that absolute stability is neither practical nor desirable in long-term resource governance. Economic equilibrium approaches that protect investors against fundamentally altered investment conditions while preserving sovereign authority to implement legitimate regulatory changes represent more balanced frameworks that accommodate both investment protection and regulatory evolution. These provisions can be further strengthened by explicitly excluding certain regulatory domains, such as environmental protection and human rights, from stabilisation constraints, as seen in more recent resource agreements across these jurisdictions.

Institutional capacity development emerges as a fundamental prerequisite for effective sovereign rights protection in investment arbitration. The experiences of all three countries demonstrate that formal legal authority means little without the technical, legal, and administrative capacity to exercise that authority effectively within international frameworks. Ghana's relatively robust institutional capacity for investment dispute management has enabled more effective protection of sovereign interests, while capacity constraints in certain aspects of Nigeria's governance framework have created implementation challenges despite strong

[243] Makane Moïse Mbengue, 'Africa's Voice in the Formation, Shaping and Redesign of International Investment Law' (n 145) 459.

formal authority. For Uganda's newer petroleum sector, prioritizing institutional capacity development represents a critical pathway for strengthening sovereign rights protection as the sector develops. This includes not only legal expertise for dispute management but also technical capacity for effective resource governance that prevents disputes from arising.

Transparency mechanisms contribute significantly to protecting sovereign rights by strengthening the legitimacy of state actions. Ghana's robust transparency framework established through its Petroleum Revenue Management Act has created a greater public understanding of resource governance decisions, potentially influencing how arbitral tribunals assess state actions while addressing broader accountability concerns. Nigeria's experience with the Nigerian Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative demonstrates how transparency can strengthen state legitimacy even when implementation remains challenging. For Uganda, developing comprehensive transparency frameworks represents an important pathway for strengthening the defensibility of sovereign actions when challenged through international arbitration.

Dispute prevention approaches can be as important as dispute resolution mechanisms in protecting sovereign rights effectively. All three countries have increasingly recognized the value of structured consultation mechanisms, regulatory impact assessments, and contract management frameworks in preventing disputes from arising. Nigeria's consultative mechanisms for addressing petroleum sector disputes, Ghana's formalized pre-arbitration dispute resolution requirements, and Uganda's multi-step dispute resolution processes all reflect a growing emphasis on preventing disputes rather than merely resolving them after they arise. These preventive approaches potentially preserve both sovereign interests and investment relationships more effectively than adversarial arbitration.

Regional cooperation offers significant opportunities for strengthening sovereign rights protection through collective action. The experiences of Nigeria and Ghana with ECOWAS initiatives and Uganda with East African Community frameworks demonstrate how regional approaches can create greater policy space than individual states might achieve in bilateral negotiations. The development of regional investment governance frameworks with greater attention to preserving regulatory space for legitimate public policy measures represents a promising pathway for rebalancing investment protection with sovereign authority. Furthermore, regional approaches potentially reduce competitive pressures that might

otherwise drive a "race to the bottom" in regulatory standards and investment protection commitments.

Community engagement emerges as an increasingly important dimension of effective sovereignty in resource governance. The experiences of all three countries demonstrate that securing social licenses through meaningful community participation and benefit-sharing arrangements strengthens the legitimacy of state actions when challenged through international arbitration. Nigeria's host community provisions, Ghana's community benefit-sharing arrangements, and Uganda's local development initiatives reflect growing recognition that effective protection of sovereign interests requires addressing community relationships alongside international legal frameworks. This social dimension of sovereignty can significantly influence how arbitral tribunals assess the legitimacy of state actions affecting resource governance.

Sovereign authority in resource governance requires continuous adaptation rather than static assertion. The experiences of all three countries demonstrate that effective sovereignty in the contemporary context involves sophisticated engagement with international frameworks to secure legitimate state interests while maintaining beneficial investment relationships. Nigeria's evolution from early post-independence arrangements emphasizing foreign investment attraction to more assertive frameworks prioritizing national participation, Ghana's development of increasingly sophisticated governance mechanisms across both mining and petroleum sectors, and Uganda's emerging approaches to petroleum governance all reflect this dynamic understanding of sovereignty. Effective sovereign rights protection requires continuous learning, adaptation, and strategic engagement rather than rigid positioning based on absolute conceptions of sovereignty.

The experiences of these three jurisdictions demonstrate that strengthening sovereign rights protection in investment arbitration requires comprehensive approaches addressing constitutional provisions, legislative frameworks, institutional capacity, diplomatic engagement, and strategic dispute management. While particular mechanisms may vary based on national circumstances, certain fundamental principles remain essential for balancing sovereignty with investment protection across all resource-rich African states. These include precision in legal frameworks, robust institutional capacity, effective transparency mechanisms, preventive approaches to dispute management, regional cooperation, meaningful community engagement, and adaptive understanding of sovereignty. By developing approaches that

incorporate these principles, resource-rich African states can better protect legitimate sovereign interests while maintaining the benefits of foreign investment for national development.[244]

3.9 Conclusion

The comparative analysis of Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana's experiences with international investment arbitration reveals complex interactions between state sovereignty and investment protection in natural resource governance. This examination demonstrates both common challenges and diverse responses across the three jurisdictions, providing valuable insights for understanding how resource-rich African states can better navigate the tensions between sovereign authority and international obligations.

Constitutional frameworks establishing state ownership or trusteeship of natural resources provide important foundations for sovereign authority in all three countries, though with distinctive approaches ranging from Uganda and Ghana's people-centred models to Nigeria's more centralized federal ownership. These constitutional differences create distinctive dynamics in how states engage with international investors and respond to investment disputes while highlighting the fundamental tension between domestic constitutional imperatives and international investment protection.

Legislative and institutional frameworks for resource governance have evolved significantly across all three jurisdictions, reflecting the growing assertion of sovereign authority to shape investment patterns and secure greater benefits from resource exploitation. From early post-independence arrangements emphasizing investment attraction to more recent frameworks prioritizing national participation, environmental protection, and benefit-sharing, these evolving approaches demonstrate the dynamic nature of sovereignty in resource governance.

Investment disputes concerning taxation authority, regulatory changes, and contract interpretation have tested the boundaries of sovereign authority across all three jurisdictions. These disputes have sometimes constrained legitimate state actions, particularly regarding fiscal sovereignty and regulatory evolution, while creating procedural and resource burdens for states with limited arbitration experience. However, they have also stimulated innovative responses to better balance sovereign authority with investment protection.

[244] Lorenzo Cotula, 'Raising the Bar on Responsible Investment: What Role for Investment Treaties?' (n 185).

The comparative analysis reveals several common challenges, including tensions between resource nationalism and investment protection, constraints on fiscal sovereignty, limitations on regulatory evolution, capacity constraints, procedural asymmetries, and jurisdictional conflicts between domestic courts and international arbitration. These shared challenges transcend the specific circumstances of each country, reflecting fundamental tensions inherent in the relationship between resource-rich developing states and the international investment regime.

In response to these challenges, the three countries have developed various innovative approaches, including treaty reform initiatives, more sophisticated contractual mechanisms, institutional capacity development, alternative dispute resolution approaches, transparency initiatives, regional cooperation, local content frameworks, and community benefit arrangements. These responses demonstrate that effective sovereignty in contemporary resource governance involves sophisticated engagement with international frameworks rather than static assertions of absolute authority.

The comparative experiences of Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana offer valuable lessons for strengthening sovereign rights protection in investment arbitration. These include the importance of precision in legal frameworks, flexible stabilization approaches, robust institutional capacity, effective transparency mechanisms, dispute prevention strategies, regional cooperation, meaningful community engagement, and adaptive understanding of sovereignty. By developing approaches that incorporate these principles, resource-rich African states can better protect legitimate sovereign interests while maintaining the benefits of foreign investment for national development.

The tension between international arbitration and sovereign states in natural resource governance remains a fundamental challenge for resource-rich African countries. However, the experiences of Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana demonstrate that this tension can be managed through thoughtful approaches that recognize both the legitimate interests of investors and the sovereign responsibilities of states toward their citizens. Through continuous learning, adaptation, and strategic engagement, these states are developing more balanced frameworks that can better accommodate both investment protection and sovereign regulatory authority.

CHAPTER FOUR

PROTECTING SOVEREIGN RIGHTS WITHIN INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT ARBITRATION - A SYNTHESIS

4.1 Introduction

The evolving relationship between international investment arbitration and state sovereignty presents profound challenges for resource-rich African nations seeking to balance sovereign authority with investment protection obligations. The experiences of Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana in navigating this complex terrain reveal both common challenges and divergent approaches to protecting sovereign rights whilst maintaining compliance with international obligations. These nations, each at different stages of resource development and with distinct legal frameworks, offer valuable comparative insights into the management of natural resource governance within the constraints of international investment obligations.[1]

The fundamental tension between state sovereignty and international investment protection manifests distinctively in the context of natural resource governance. Resource-rich African states face particular challenges in exercising their sovereign rights over natural resources whilst simultaneously honouring commitments made to international investors through bilateral investment treaties (BITs), host government agreements, and other international investment agreements (IIAs). This tension becomes especially pronounced in matters of taxation, regulatory oversight, and resource ownership - areas where the state's sovereign authority intersects most directly with investors' expectations of stability and protection.[2] The comparative analysis of Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana's experiences illuminates how these states have attempted to reconcile these potentially conflicting imperatives.

Uganda's emergence as an oil-producing nation following significant discoveries in 2006 has resulted in complex interactions with international oil companies, most notably in the Heritage Oil and Tullow Oil disputes. These cases highlight the challenges faced by a state seeking to exercise its taxation powers whilst negotiating the constraints imposed by investment

[1] Olabisi D Akinkugbe, 'Reverse Contributors? African State Parties, ICSID, and the Development of International Investment Law' (2019) 34 ICSID Review 434, 440.

[2] Lorenzo Cotula, 'Investment treaties and sustainable development: investment liberalisation' (2014) IIED Briefing Paper.

protection obligations.[3] The resolution of these disputes, both through domestic courts and international arbitration, demonstrates the multi-layered nature of resource governance and the complex interplay between national and international legal frameworks.

Nigeria's extensive experience in petroleum sector governance offers valuable insights into the long-term management of sovereign rights within international investment frameworks. As Africa's largest oil producer, Nigeria has developed sophisticated legal and institutional mechanisms for asserting state control over natural resources whilst maintaining international investment relationships.[4] The evolution of Nigeria's approach to production-sharing contracts, local content requirements, and fiscal regimes reflects adaptive strategies for preserving sovereign authority within the constraints of international obligations.

Ghana's more recent entry into oil production, complementing its established mining sector, provides a third perspective on natural resource governance and investment protection. Ghana's approach to managing investor-state relationships in both sectors reveals distinct strategies for maintaining sovereign control whilst creating an environment conducive to international investment.[5] The comparative analysis of these three jurisdictions enables a more nuanced understanding of how states at different stages of resource development manage similar challenges in protecting sovereign interests.

The synthesis of these nations' experiences reveals important patterns in how African states are navigating the complex terrain of international investment law. The comparative analysis demonstrates that states are increasingly adopting sophisticated approaches to treaty negotiation, dispute resolution, and institutional capacity building. These approaches reflect a growing recognition of the need to protect sovereign authority whilst maintaining compliance with international obligations.[6] Furthermore, the experiences of these states highlight the importance of constitutional and legislative frameworks in establishing clear parameters for resource ownership and management.

---

[3] Emmanuel Kasimbazi, 'Environmental Regulation of Oil and Gas Exploration and Production in Uganda' (2012) 30 Journal of Energy & Natural Resources Law 185, 188.

[4] Yinka Omorogbe, 'Resource Control and Benefit Sharing in Nigeria' in in Lila Barrera-Hernández, and others (eds), *Sharing the Costs and Benefits of Energy and Resource Activity: Legal Change and Impact on Communities* (OUP 2016).

[5] Dominic Dagbanja, 'The Development Objective as an Imperative in Interpretation of International Investment Agreements' (2018) 44 The University of Western Australia Law Review 144.

[6] Makane Moïse Mbengue and Stefanie Schacherer, 'The "Africanization" of International Investment Law: The Pan-African Investment Code and the reform of the international investment regime' (2017) 18 Journal of World Investment & Trade 414, 418.

The protection of sovereign rights within international investment arbitration requires more than defensive strategies in dispute resolution. It necessitates proactive approaches to treaty negotiation, legislative development, and institutional capacity building. The comparative analysis of Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana's experiences reveals that effective protection of sovereign rights requires a comprehensive approach encompassing constitutional provisions, legislative frameworks, institutional mechanisms, and strategic engagement with international legal regimes.[7] This chapter examines these various dimensions of sovereign rights protection, drawing lessons from the successes and challenges experienced by these three resource-rich African states.

The comparative analysis further reveals the significance of regional and continental approaches to investment governance. Initiatives such as the African Continental Free Trade Agreement (AfCFTA) Investment Protocol represent attempts to develop harmonised approaches to investment protection that better accommodate African states' development objectives and sovereign interests.[8] These regional frameworks potentially offer African states greater collective bargaining power in shaping international investment norms and practices. The examination of these regional approaches provides insights into emerging strategies for reforming international investment arbitration to better accommodate sovereign interests.

Throughout this chapter, the analysis focuses on identifying successful strategies employed by Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana in protecting sovereign rights whilst maintaining international investment obligations. The comparative examination of these states' experiences enables the identification of best practices and innovative approaches that could inform other resource-rich nations' engagement with international investment arbitration. By synthesising the lessons learned from these diverse experiences, this chapter contributes to the development of more effective approaches to balancing state sovereignty with investment protection in natural resource governance.

[7] James Thuo Gathii, 'Reform and Retrenchment in International Investment Law' (2021) SSRN Papers.
[8] Hamed El-Kady, and Mustaqeem De Gama, 'The Reform of the International Investment Regime: An African Perspective' (2019) 34 ICSID Review - Foreign Investment Law Journal 482.

4.2 The Constitutional Framework of Resource Ownership and State Sovereignty

The constitutional architecture governing natural resource ownership and management represents a fundamental foundation for understanding how Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana navigate the tension between state sovereignty and international investment obligations. These constitutional frameworks establish the primary legal basis for asserting sovereign control over natural resources whilst simultaneously creating parameters within which international investment agreements operate. A comparative analysis of these constitutional provisions reveals both similarities and distinctive approaches to resource ownership and management, with significant implications for how each state engages with international investment arbitration.

Uganda's constitutional framework for natural resource governance centres primarily on Article 244 of the 1995 Constitution, which explicitly vests ownership of natural resources in the people of Uganda, with the government holding these resources in trust for the citizens.[9] This constitutional provision establishes a clear normative foundation for state sovereignty over natural resources, creating a legal basis for government regulation of exploration, development, and production activities. The constitutional recognition of public ownership creates a complex dynamic when Uganda enters into international investment agreements, as these agreements must operate within the parameters established by this fundamental constitutional principle. The constitutional framework further empowers the Ugandan Parliament to enact legislation governing the exploitation of natural resources, creating a mechanism through which sovereign authority is exercised.[10]

Similarly, Nigeria's constitutional framework establishes state ownership of natural resources through Section 44(3) of the 1999 Constitution, which vests control of minerals, mineral oils, natural gas, and hydrocarbon resources in the Federal Government.[11] This constitutional provision creates a centralised framework for resource governance, concentrating authority at the federal level rather than distributing control to states or local governments. The constitutional centralisation of resource ownership has significant implications for Nigeria's engagement with international investment, as it establishes the federal government as the

[9] Constitution of the Republic of Uganda 1995, art 244.
[10] Constitution of the Republic of Uganda 1995, art 79.
[11] Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999, s 44(3).

primary entity responsible for negotiating and implementing investment agreements.[12] This constitutional structure has created tensions between federal authorities and resource-bearing communities, particularly in the Niger Delta region, where demands for greater local control and benefit-sharing have challenged the centralised constitutional framework.[13]

Ghana's constitutional provisions regarding natural resource ownership share similarities with those of Uganda and Nigeria, whilst incorporating distinctive elements. Article 257(6) of the 1992 Constitution vests ownership of natural resources in the President on behalf of the people of Ghana.[14] However, Article 268(1) introduces an additional constitutional safeguard by requiring parliamentary ratification of agreements relating to natural resource exploitation.[15] This constitutional requirement for parliamentary approval creates a significant check on executive authority in resource governance, establishing a mechanism for ensuring broader public interest considerations in investment agreements. The constitutional framework further establishes the basis for sector-specific regulatory institutions, creating a multi-layered governance structure for natural resource management.[16]

These constitutional frameworks interact in complex ways with international investment obligations, creating potential areas of tension when arbitral tribunals interpret investment agreements in ways that constrain states' ability to fully exercise constitutionally established sovereign rights. In Uganda, the constitutional principle of resource ownership by the people has been invoked to justify regulatory measures, including taxation decisions, that have subsequently been challenged through international arbitration. The Heritage Oil case exemplifies this tension, as Uganda's assertion of its sovereign right to tax capital gains from asset transfers was challenged through international arbitration, raising fundamental questions about the relationship between constitutional authority and investment protection obligations.[17] The constitutional framework provides the normative foundation for Uganda's regulatory actions, whilst international arbitration potentially constrains the full exercise of this constitutionally established authority.

---

[12] Cyril Obi, 'Oil Extraction, Dispossession, Resistance, and Conflict in Nigeria's Oil-Rich Niger Delta' (2010) 30 Canadian Journal of Development Studies 219, 224.

[13] Ibid, 226.

[14] Constitution of the Republic of Ghana 1992, art 257(6).

[15] Constitution of the Republic of Ghana 1992, art 268(1).

[16] Matthew Tyce, Abdul Abdulai, and Kojo P. Asante, 'Confronting Shifting Energy Landscapes and Contested Domestic Politics: Ghana's National Oil Company and the Global Energy Transition' (2024) 119 Energy Research & Social Science 103901.

[17] *Heritage Oil and Gas Ltd v Republic of Uganda* (UNCITRAL Arbitration, Notice of Arbitration, 16 May 2011).

Similarly, Nigeria has experienced tensions between its constitutional framework for resource ownership and international investment obligations, particularly regarding regulatory changes affecting foreign investors in the petroleum sector. The constitutional vesting of resource control in the federal government has enabled a series of regulatory reforms, including those enacted through the Petroleum Industry Act 2021, aimed at asserting greater sovereign control over natural resources.[18] However, these reforms have faced challenges from international oil companies asserting rights under investment agreements, highlighting the complex interplay between constitutional authority and investment protection. Nigeria's experience demonstrates how constitutional provisions establishing sovereign resource ownership must navigate the constraints imposed by long-term investment agreements, particularly those containing stabilisation clauses that limit the state's ability to implement regulatory changes.[19]

Ghana's constitutional requirement for parliamentary ratification of natural resource agreements has created a unique dynamic in its engagement with international investment. This constitutional safeguard has enabled greater public scrutiny of investment agreements, potentially strengthening the state's position in subsequent disputes by demonstrating the democratic legitimacy of resource governance decisions.[20] The Balkan Energy case illustrates this dynamic, as Ghana's constitutional requirements for parliamentary approval formed a key element of its defence in arbitration proceedings.[21] The constitutional framework thus provides not only the normative foundation for resource ownership but also procedural safeguards that can strengthen the state's position in international disputes.

The interpretation of these constitutional provisions by domestic courts represents a crucial aspect of how these states navigate tensions between sovereignty and investment protection. The respective constitutional courts and supreme courts have played significant roles in defining the parameters of sovereign authority over natural resources, sometimes directly addressing questions related to international investment obligations. In Ghana, the Supreme Court's decision in *Republic v High Court (Commercial Division), Accra; Ex Parte Attorney-General (Balkan Energy Ghana Ltd & Ors Interested Parties)* affirmed the constitutional requirement for parliamentary approval of international agreements, with significant

[18] Petroleum Industry Act 2021 (Nigeria).
[19] Jarrod Wong And Abdallah Abuelfutuh Ali, 'The Legislative Stabilization Clause' (2022) 55 International Law And Politics 67, 70.
[20] Dominic Dagbanja, 'The Development Objective as an Imperative in Interpretation of International Investment Agreements' (2018) 44 The University of Western Australia Law Review 144, 147.
[21] *Balkan Energy (Ghana) Limited v Republic of Ghana*, PCA Case No. 2010-7, Award (1 April 2014).

implications for investment arbitration.[22] Similarly, Ugandan and Nigerian courts have rendered decisions interpreting constitutional provisions regarding resource ownership, creating domestic jurisprudence that influences each state's engagement with international investment arbitration.[23]

A comparative analysis of these constitutional frameworks reveals that all three states have established robust constitutional foundations for asserting sovereign ownership of natural resources. However, they differ in their allocation of authority within domestic governance structures and in the procedural safeguards established for resource management. These constitutional variations influence how each state navigates the tension between sovereignty and investment protection, with Ghana's parliamentary approval requirement potentially providing greater flexibility in responding to investment disputes compared to the more centralised systems in Uganda and Nigeria.[24]

The constitutional frameworks further interact with international legal principles regarding permanent sovereignty over natural resources. All three states have incorporated these principles into their constitutional structures, creating a dual foundation - domestic and international - for asserting sovereign control over natural resources.[25] However, this creates a complex legal environment when international investment agreements seem to constrain the exercise of these sovereign rights. The tension between permanent sovereignty over natural resources as an international legal principle and investment protection obligations highlights the challenges these states face in reconciling potentially conflicting international legal norms.[26]

The implementation of constitutional principles through legislative frameworks represents another crucial dimension of how these states navigate tensions between sovereignty and investment protection. Each state has enacted comprehensive legislation governing natural resource sectors, including petroleum laws, mining regulations, and environmental protection

[22] *Republic v High Court (Commercial Division), Accra; Ex Parte Attorney-General (Balkan Energy Ghana Ltd & Ors Interested Parties)* [2011] 2 SCGLR 1183.
[23] Emilia Onyema, 'Rethinking the Role of African National Courts in Arbitration' in Emilia Onyema (ed), *Rethinking the Role of African National Courts in Arbitration* (Kluwer Law International 2018) 12.
[24] Dominic Dagbanja, *The Investment Treaty Regime and Public Interest Regulation in Ghana: Perspectives in Constitutional and Administrative Law* (OUP 2024) 9.
[25] Emeka Duruigbo, 'Permanent Sovereignty and Peoples' Ownership of Natural Resources in International Law' (2006) 38 George Washington International Law Review 33, 59.
[26] Lorenzo Cotula, 'Reconciling Regulatory Stability and Evolution of Environmental Standards in Investment Contracts: Towards a rethink of stabilization clauses' (2008) 1 Journal of World Energy Law & Business 158.

frameworks.[27] These legislative enactments operationalise constitutional principles whilst simultaneously creating the domestic legal framework within which international investment operates. The alignment between constitutional principles, legislative implementation, and international obligations varies across the three jurisdictions, creating distinctive approaches to managing potential tensions.[28]

Furthermore, the constitutional frameworks establish parameters for fiscal regimes governing natural resource exploitation, with significant implications for state-investor relations. Constitutional provisions regarding resource ownership provide the foundation for taxation regimes, royalty systems, and benefit-sharing mechanisms.[29] These fiscal frameworks have frequently become flashpoints for investment disputes, as exemplified by Uganda's disputes with Heritage Oil and Tullow Oil regarding capital gains taxation.[30] The constitutional authority to establish taxation regimes thus intersects directly with investment protection obligations, creating a critical area of tension in natural resource governance.

The relationship between constitutional frameworks and investment agreements has evolved over time in all three jurisdictions. Early investment agreements often contained provisions that potentially constrained states' ability to fully exercise constitutionally established sovereign rights, particularly through stabilisation clauses limiting regulatory changes.[31] However, recent approaches to investment agreement negotiation in all three states demonstrate greater attention to preserving constitutional authority whilst providing appropriate protections for investors.[32] This evolution reflects a growing recognition of the need to align international investment obligations with domestic constitutional imperatives regarding resource ownership and management.

In conclusion, the constitutional frameworks of Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana establish robust foundations for asserting sovereign ownership of natural resources, creating the primary legal

[27] Petroleum (Exploration, Development and Production) Act 2013, s 9-11, 42-44.
[28] Okechukwu Ejims, 'The Impact of Nigerian International Petroleum Contracts on Environmental and Human Rights of Indigenous Communities' (2013) 21 African Journal of International and Comparative Law 345, 347.
[29] Mohammed Amidu, Rester Togormey, and Dominic Dokbilla Naab, 'Natural Resources Tax Administration and Reforms in Africa' in Mohammed Amidu, Abdallah Ali-Nakyea, and Joshua Yindenaba Abor (Eds.) *Taxation and Management of Natural Resources in Africa* (Springer Nature 2024).
[30] Emmanuel Kasimbazi, 'Environmental Regulation of Oil and Gas Exploration and Production in Uganda' (2012) 30 Journal of Energy & Natural Resources Law 185, 188.
[31] Lorenzo Cotula, 'Reconciling Regulatory Stability and Evolution of Environmental Standards in Investment Contracts: Towards a rethink of stabilization clauses' (2008) 1 Journal of World Energy Law & Business 158, 160.
[32] Makane Moïse Mbengue, 'Africa's Voice in the Formation, Shaping and Redesign of International Investment Law' (2019) 34 ICSID Review 455, 459.

basis for government regulation of natural resource exploitation. These constitutional provisions interact in complex ways with international investment obligations, creating potential tensions when arbitral tribunals interpret investment agreements in ways that constrain states' ability to fully exercise constitutionally established sovereign rights. The comparative analysis reveals both similarities in the fundamental constitutional principle of state resource ownership and distinctive approaches to implementing this principle through domestic governance structures. Understanding these constitutional frameworks provides essential context for examining how each state navigates the challenging terrain of international investment arbitration whilst maintaining sovereign control over natural resources.

4.3 International Investment Arbitration and Its Impact on Taxation Powers

The intersection of international investment arbitration and sovereign taxation powers represents a critical area of tension in natural resource governance across Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana. Taxation serves as one of the primary mechanisms through which these states derive value from their natural resource endowments, making it a fundamental expression of sovereign authority.[33] However, the parameters of this authority have been increasingly contested through international arbitration, raising profound questions about the extent to which investment treaties constrain legitimate taxation measures in the natural resource sector.

The Ugandan experience with taxation disputes, particularly in the petroleum sector, illustrates the complex challenges of maintaining sovereign taxation powers within the constraints of international investment obligations. The highly publicised dispute between Uganda and Heritage Oil regarding capital gains taxation exemplifies this tension. When Uganda's Revenue Authority imposed a capital gains tax on Heritage Oil's sale of assets to Tullow Oil, Heritage initiated international arbitration, challenging Uganda's sovereign right to tax this transaction.[34] This dispute focused on the interpretation of the Uganda-United Kingdom Bilateral Investment Treaty and its implications for Uganda's taxation powers. The arbitral proceedings reflected a

[33] William Park, 'Arbitrability and Tax' in Loukas Mistelis and Stavros Brekoulakis (eds), *Arbitrability: International and Comparative Perspectives* (Kluwer Law International 2009) 179, 185.
[34] *Heritage Oil and Gas Ltd v Republic of Uganda* (UNCITRAL Arbitration, Notice of Arbitration, 16 May 2011).

fundamental tension between Uganda's constitutional authority to tax natural resource transactions and the protections afforded to investors through international agreements.[35]

Similarly, Nigeria has faced numerous challenges to its taxation measures in the petroleum sector, with international oil companies frequently contesting tax assessments through both domestic litigation and international arbitration. The Nigerian government's attempts to modify fiscal terms in production-sharing contracts have generated particularly contentious disputes, with investors asserting that such changes violate stabilisation provisions in investment agreements.[36] These disputes highlight the difficulties of balancing legitimate fiscal reforms with investment protection commitments, especially in cases where long-term agreements contain provisions limiting regulatory changes.[37] The evolution of Nigeria's fiscal regime for petroleum has thus been constrained by international investment obligations, demonstrating how arbitration can impact sovereign taxation authority.

Ghana's experience with taxation disputes in both the mining and petroleum sectors reflects similar tensions between sovereign fiscal policy and investment protection. The Ghanaian government's attempts to revise taxation arrangements, particularly in the mining sector, have faced resistance from investors claiming protection under investment treaties.[38] These disputes have centred on the interpretation of fiscal stability provisions in investment agreements and their relationship to Ghana's sovereign right to modify tax legislation. As Ghana's natural resource sectors have developed, the government has sought to implement more progressive fiscal regimes, yet these efforts have been constrained by investment protection obligations interpreted through arbitration.[39]

The legal principles applied in arbitration regarding taxation measures reveal significant implications for sovereign authority. Arbitral tribunals have generally recognised states' inherent right to tax, yet simultaneously imposed substantial limitations on this authority through the application of investment protection standards such as fair and equitable treatment

[35] Joe Oloka-Onyango, 'Courting the Oil Curse or Playing by the Rules? An Analysis of the Legal and Regulatory Framework Governing Oil in Uganda' in Arnim Langer, Ukoha Ukiwo, and Pamela Mbabazi (Eds.) *Oil Wealth and Development in Uganda and Beyond Prospects, Opportunities and Challenges* (Leuven University Press 2020) 49, 54.

[36] *Statoil (Nigeria) Limited v Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation* (2013) Arbitration under UNCITRAL Rules.

[37] Jarrod Wong And Abdallah Abuelfutuh Ali (n 19) 70

[38] Dominic Dagbanja (n 20) 150

[39] Ibid, 152

and indirect expropriation.[40] The application of these standards to taxation measures has created considerable uncertainty regarding the permissible scope of sovereign tax authority, particularly in natural resource sectors where fiscal regimes often evolve in response to changing economic conditions and public policy objectives.[41]

A critical issue in these disputes concerns the arbitrability of tax matters, with arbitral tribunals increasingly asserting jurisdiction over disputes that fundamentally concern sovereign taxation powers. This trend represents a significant expansion of arbitral authority into an area traditionally considered core sovereign prerogative.[42] The determination that tax disputes fall within the scope of investment treaties has profound implications for state sovereignty, effectively subjecting domestic fiscal policy to international adjudication. This development has prompted all three states to reconsider their approach to tax provisions in investment treaties, with increasing emphasis on explicit carve-outs for legitimate taxation measures.[43]

The relationship between domestic tax authorities and international constraints has created particular challenges in resource governance. All three countries have established specialised agencies responsible for tax administration in the natural resource sector, including Uganda Revenue Authority, Nigeria's Federal Inland Revenue Service, and Ghana Revenue Authority.[44] These institutions operate within domestic legal frameworks that establish their authority to assess and collect taxes from natural resource operations. However, their exercise of this authority has been increasingly constrained by international investment obligations, creating a complex dynamic where domestic institutions must navigate both national legal requirements and international limitations on their authority.[45]

Uganda's approach to asserting sovereign taxation rights has evolved significantly following its experience with international arbitration. The government has developed more sophisticated strategies for defending taxation measures, including strengthening the legal basis for tax assessments and building institutional capacity to manage potential disputes.[46] The Strategic

[40] Mazzin Ezeldin, 'Arbitrability of Tax Disputes in Commercial and Investment Arbitration' (Master's dissertation, Saarland University 2021).
[41] Tarcisio Gazzini, *The Interpretation of International Investment Treaties* (Hart Publishing 2016) 67.
[42] William Park (n 33) 186.
[43] Makane Moïse Mbengue (n 32) 460.
[44] Mohammed Amidu, Rester Togormey, and Dominic Dokbilla Naab (n 29).
[45] Sunday Akinlolu Fagbemi, 'A Critical Analysis of the Mechanisms for Settlement of Investment Disputes in International Arbitration' (2017) 8 NAUJILJ 46.
[46] Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs, 'Strategic Investment Dispute Management Framework' (Republic of Uganda 2018).

Investment Dispute Management Framework established by Uganda's Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs represents a proactive approach to addressing potential challenges to taxation measures, demonstrating adaptation to the constraints imposed by international investment arbitration.[47] Furthermore, Uganda has revised its approach to investment treaty negotiations, with greater attention to preserving fiscal policy space through explicit provisions regarding taxation authority.

Nigeria has similarly adapted its approach to taxation in response to investment arbitration challenges. The reforms instituted through the Petroleum Industry Act 2021 include provisions designed to balance fiscal sovereignty with investment protection, reflecting lessons learned from previous disputes.[48] Nigeria has also strengthened the capacity of domestic institutions to defend taxation measures, including establishing specialised units within the Federal Inland Revenue Service focused on international tax matters and investment disputes.[49] These institutional adaptations reflect a recognition of the need to develop sophisticated approaches to maintaining taxation authority within the constraints of international investment obligations.

Ghana's strategies for protecting sovereign taxation rights have included constitutional requirements for parliamentary approval of fiscal arrangements in natural resource agreements, creating additional safeguards against claims challenging taxation measures.[50] The government has also invested in building technical capacity within the Ghana Revenue Authority to implement and defend taxation measures in compliance with international obligations.[51] Furthermore, Ghana has modified its approach to fiscal stability provisions in investment agreements, seeking to maintain greater flexibility for legitimate policy changes whilst providing appropriate certainty for investors.[52]

A comparative analysis of these three jurisdictions reveals important similarities and distinctions in how states have responded to the constraints imposed by international arbitration on taxation powers. All three countries have recognised the need to strengthen the legal and institutional foundations for taxation measures, yet they have adopted different approaches to

[47] Ibid.
[48] Petroleum Industry Act 2021 (Nigeria), s 234-257
[49] Soji Oyeranmi, and Lawrence Dube, 'The Petroleum Industry Bill and the Nigerian Economy: A Review' (2021) 25 International Journal of Current Research in the Humanities 175.
[50] Constitution of the Republic of Ghana 1992, art 268(1).
[51] Ransford Gyampo, 'Transparency and Accountability in the Management of Oil Revenues in Ghana' (2016) 51 Africa Spectrum 79, 82.
[52] Dominic Dagbanja (n 24) 10.

achieving this objective. Uganda's emphasis on dispute prevention and management, Nigeria's comprehensive legislative reform, and Ghana's focus on parliamentary oversight represent distinctive strategies for addressing similar challenges.[53] These varying approaches reflect different constitutional structures and institutional capacities, demonstrating how states adapt to common challenges in ways that reflect their particular circumstances.

The evolution of taxation provisions in investment treaties signed by these countries demonstrates a growing awareness of the potential constraints imposed by arbitration. Early-generation investment treaties often contained minimal guidance regarding taxation matters, creating significant uncertainty about the relationship between investment protection standards and sovereign tax authority.[54] However, recent treaties signed by all three countries demonstrate greater sophistication in addressing this relationship, with explicit provisions clarifying the scope of protection regarding taxation measures and preserving greater policy space for legitimate fiscal reforms.[55] This evolution reflects a broader trend in investment treaty practice towards greater recognition of sovereign regulatory authority, including in taxation matters.

The institutional dimension of tax disputes represents another important aspect of how these states have navigated tensions between sovereignty and investment protection. All three countries have experienced challenges in coordinating responses to investment disputes between tax authorities, justice ministries, and sector-specific regulatory agencies.[56] These coordination challenges have sometimes undermined the effectiveness of state responses to arbitration claims challenging taxation measures. However, institutional reforms in all three jurisdictions demonstrate recognition of this issue, with increased emphasis on developing integrated approaches to managing investment disputes concerning taxation matters.[57]

---

[53] Lorenzo Cotula, 'Raising the Bar on Responsible Investment: What Role for Investment Treaties?' (2018) IIED Briefing Papers.

[54] Agreement between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the Republic of Uganda for the Promotion and Protection of Investments (Uganda-United Kingdom BIT) (signed 24 April 1998, entered into force in 1999).

[55] Makane Moïse Mbengue and Stefanie Schacherer (n 6) 420.

[56] Diana Rosert, 'The Stakes Are High: A review of the financial costs of investment treaty arbitration' (International Institute for Sustainable Development 2014) https://www.iisd.org/system/files/publications/stakes-are-high-review-financial-costs-investment-treaty-arbitration.pdf accessed 17 February 2025.

[57] African Legal Support Facility, 'Building legal capacity within the extractives sector in Uganda' (ALSF 2024) https://africanlegalsupportfacility.com/new/building-legal-capacity-within-the-extractives-sector-in-uganda-5 accessed 17 February 2025.

Furthermore, the financial implications of arbitration concerning taxation measures have created significant challenges for fiscal planning and public finance management. The potential liability created by adverse arbitral awards has implications not only for specific revenue streams but also for broader fiscal stability.[58] These financial considerations have influenced how all three states approach both taxation policy and investment dispute resolution, creating incentives for settlement in some cases despite strong sovereign claims regarding taxation authority. The financial asymmetry between multinational corporations and resource-dependent states thus creates additional complexities in asserting sovereign taxation rights through arbitration.[59]

In conclusion, the impact of international investment arbitration on taxation powers represents a fundamental challenge for Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana in governing their natural resource sectors. While all three states have asserted their sovereign authority to tax natural resource operations, this authority has been increasingly constrained through arbitral interpretations of investment protection standards. However, these states have not remained passive in the face of these constraints, instead developing sophisticated strategies for maintaining taxation authority whilst navigating international investment obligations. The evolution of these strategies demonstrates the dynamic nature of the relationship between sovereignty and investment protection, with states continuously adapting their approaches in response to emerging challenges. This adaptive capacity will remain crucial as these states continue to develop their natural resource sectors within the complex framework of international investment law.

4.4 Regulatory Autonomy in Natural Resource Governance

The preservation of regulatory autonomy in natural resource governance represents a fundamental challenge for Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana in their engagement with international investment arbitration. The sovereign right to regulate natural resource exploitation encompasses a broad range of policy areas, including environmental protection, local content

[58] Emilia Onyema, 'Effective Utilization of Arbitrators and Arbitration Institutions in Africa by Appointors' (2008) 11 VJ 307, 309.
[59] Won Kidane, 'The Culture of Investment Arbitration: An African Perspective' (2019) 34 ICSID Review - Foreign Investment Law Journal 411, 415.

requirements, community relations, and operational standards.[60] However, international investment agreements potentially constrain this regulatory authority through various protection standards, creating a complex dynamic where states must balance legitimate public interest regulation with investment protection obligations.[61]

Uganda's experience with regulatory autonomy in petroleum governance illustrates the challenges of implementing comprehensive regulatory frameworks whilst honouring international investment commitments. The development of Uganda's petroleum regulatory regime following significant oil discoveries in 2006 occurred within the context of existing bilateral investment treaties and host government agreements.[62] The Petroleum (Exploration, Development and Production) Act 2013 established detailed parameters for environmental protection, local content requirements, and operational standards, representing an assertion of sovereign regulatory authority.[63] However, the implementation of these regulatory measures has occurred against the backdrop of potential investment claims, creating careful calibration of regulatory approaches to minimise the risk of arbitration proceedings.[64]

Similarly, Nigeria's evolving regulatory framework for petroleum governance demonstrates the challenges of asserting regulatory autonomy within the constraints of international investment obligations. The Petroleum Industry Act 2021 represents the culmination of decades of reform efforts aimed at establishing a comprehensive governance framework for Nigeria's petroleum sector.[65] This legislation addresses environmental standards, local content requirements, community relations, and fiscal regimes, reflecting Nigeria's attempt to establish a more balanced relationship between state regulatory authority and investor interests.[66] However, the implementation of these reforms continues to be shaped by concerns about potential investment

[60] Lorenzo Cotula, 'Reconciling Regulatory Stability and Evolution of Environmental Standards in Investment Contracts: Towards a rethink of stabilization clauses' (n 31) 160.

[61] Oyeniyi Abe, 'Untying the Gordian Knot: Re-Assessing the Impact of Business and Human Rights Principles on Extractive Resource Governance in Sub-Saharan Africa' (2016) 32 American University International Law Review 895, 931.

[62] Directorate of Petroleum, 'Petroleum Exploration History' (n.d) https://www.petroleum.go.ug/index.php/who-we-are/who-weare/petroleum-exploration-history accessed on 15 February 2025.

[63] Petroleum (Exploration, Development and Production) Act 2013, s 9-11.

[64] Badru Bukenya and Jaqueline Nakaiza, 'Closed but Ordered: How the Political Settlement Shapes Uganda's Deals with International Oil Companies' in Arnim Langer, Ukoha Ukiwo, and Pamela Mbabazi (Eds.) *Oil Wealth and Development in Uganda and Beyond Prospects, Opportunities and Challenges* (Leuven University Press 2020) 103, 118.

[65] Petroleum Industry Act 2021 (Nigeria).

[66] Soji Oyeranmi, and Lawrence Dube (n 49).

claims, with particular attention to the implications of stabilisation clauses in existing agreements.[67]

Ghana's approach to regulatory autonomy in both the mining and petroleum sectors reflects a strategic balancing of regulatory objectives with investment protection. The Minerals and Mining Act 2006 and Petroleum (Exploration and Production) Act 2016 establish comprehensive frameworks for resource governance, including environmental protection, local content requirements, and operational standards.[68] These regulatory frameworks demonstrate Ghana's assertion of sovereign authority to establish parameters for resource exploitation, yet their implementation has been influenced by investment protection considerations, particularly regarding the treatment of existing licence holders.[69] The evolution of Ghana's regulatory approach reflects growing sophistication in navigating the constraints imposed by international investment agreements whilst pursuing legitimate public interest objectives.

A comparative analysis of environmental regulation across these three jurisdictions reveals important patterns in how states have navigated tensions between regulatory autonomy and investment protection. All three countries have enacted environmental protection frameworks applicable to natural resource operations, including environmental impact assessment requirements, pollution standards, and remediation obligations.[70] However, the implementation of these environmental regulations has been shaped by concerns about potential claims under investment treaties, particularly regarding regulatory changes affecting existing operations. This dynamic has influenced not only the content of environmental regulations but also their enforcement, with strategic decisions regarding the timing and manner of regulatory interventions to minimise investment disputes.[71]

The development of local content requirements represents another critical area where regulatory autonomy intersects with investment protection obligations. All three countries have established increasingly robust local content frameworks aimed at enhancing domestic

[67] Okechukwu Ejims (n 28) 350.
[68] Minerals and Mining Act 2006 (Act 703) (Ghana); Petroleum (Exploration and Production) Act 2016 (Act 919) (Ghana).
[69] Thomas Kojo Stephens, 'Sustainable Decommissioning in Ghana: Historical Developments, Current Practice and Challenges' (2023) 14 The Journal of Sustainable Development, Law and Policy 81, 85.
[70] Environmental Impact Assessment Act 1992 (Nigeria); Environmental Protection Agency Act 1994 (Act 490) (Ghana); Emmanuel Kasimbazi (n 30) 188.
[71] Lorenzo Cotula (n 60) 162.

participation in natural resource sectors.[72] Nigeria's Oil and Gas Industry Content Development Act 2010, Ghana's Petroleum (Local Content and Local Participation) Regulations 2013, and Uganda's local content provisions in the Petroleum Act 2013 all establish significant requirements for employment of nationals, procurement of local goods and services, and technology transfer.[73] These regulatory initiatives reflect legitimate development objectives, yet their implementation has been constrained by concerns about compatibility with international investment obligations, particularly national treatment and performance requirement prohibitions.[74]

The regulation of community relations and benefit-sharing mechanisms further illustrates the complex interplay between regulatory autonomy and investment protection. All three countries have established increasingly detailed requirements regarding community engagement, benefit-sharing, and corporate social responsibility.[75] Nigeria's provisions for host community development in the Petroleum Industry Act 2021, Ghana's mineral development fund, and Uganda's requirements for community engagement all establish regulatory frameworks aimed at ensuring local communities benefit from resource exploitation. [76] However, the implementation of these regulatory measures has been influenced by investment protection considerations, with careful attention to avoiding measures that might be characterised as arbitrary or discriminatory under investment treaties.[77]

The arbitral interpretation of regulatory measures has created significant challenges for the preservation of policy space in natural resource governance. Arbitral tribunals have generally accepted states' inherent right to regulate, yet simultaneously imposed substantial constraints on this authority through the application of investment protection standards such as fair and equitable treatment and indirect expropriation.[78] The assessment of regulatory measures under these standards has often involved scrutiny of regulatory motivations, processes, and impacts,

[72] Jesse Salah Ovadia, 'Local Content Policies and Petro-Development in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Comparative Analysis' (2016) 49 Resources Policy 20, 26.
[73] Nigerian Oil and Gas Industry Content Development Act 2010, s 3, 11, 31; Petroleum (Local Content and Local Participation) Regulations 2013 (LI 2204) (Ghana); Petroleum (Exploration, Development and Production) Act 2013, s 9-11.
[74] Jesse Salah Ovadia (n 72) 27.
[75] Petroleum Industry Act 2021 (Nigeria), s 234-257; Petroleum Revenue Management Act 2011 (Act 815) (Ghana); Petroleum (Exploration, Development and Production) Act 2013, s 42-44.
[76] Ibid.
[77] David Kirangwa Sseremba, 'Oil And Community Development In Uganda: Citizens' expectations and participation in the oil and natural gas sector' (Master's dissertation Diaconia University of Applied Sciences 2020).
[78] Tarcisio Gazzini (n 41) 70.

creating uncertainty regarding the permissible scope of regulatory authority.[79] This interpretive approach has influenced how all three countries develop and implement regulatory measures, with increased attention to procedural aspects of regulation to minimise vulnerability to claims based on arbitrariness or lack of due process.

The influence of stabilisation clauses on regulatory autonomy represents a particularly significant challenge in the natural resource sectors of all three countries. Early petroleum and mining agreements in Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana frequently contained robust stabilisation provisions limiting the application of subsequent regulatory changes to existing operations.[80] These provisions have created significant constraints on regulatory evolution, particularly regarding environmental standards, fiscal regimes, and local content requirements. The negotiation and interpretation of these stabilisation commitments have thus become a critical aspect of how these states navigate tensions between regulatory autonomy and investment protection, with increased attention to crafting more balanced stability provisions that preserve appropriate policy space.[81]

Strategic approaches to preserving regulatory autonomy have emerged across all three jurisdictions, reflecting growing sophistication in navigating the constraints imposed by international investment agreements. These approaches include careful drafting of regulatory measures to minimise vulnerability to investment claims, strategic use of exceptions and carve-outs in investment agreements, and development of transitional arrangements for implementing regulatory changes.[82] Uganda's Strategic Investment Dispute Management Framework, Nigeria's approach to regulatory transition in the Petroleum Industry Act, and Ghana's strategy of parliamentary ratification of major regulatory changes all demonstrate adaptive responses to the challenges of preserving regulatory space within investment protection frameworks.[83]

The institutional dimension of regulatory governance further illustrates how these states have managed tensions between regulatory objectives and investment protection. All three countries have established specialised regulatory agencies responsible for natural resource governance, including Uganda's Petroleum Authority, Nigeria's various petroleum regulatory bodies, and

[79] Lorenzo Cotula, 'Raising the Bar on Responsible Investment: What Role for Investment Treaties?' (n 53).
[80] Jarrod Wong And Abdallah Abuelfutuh Ali (n 19) 70.
[81] Lorenzo Cotula (n 60) 164.
[82] Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs (n 46).
[83] Dominic Dagbanja (n 24) 12.

Ghana's Minerals Commission and Petroleum Commission.[84] These institutions face the complex task of implementing regulatory mandates whilst simultaneously managing investment protection concerns, requiring sophisticated capacity for regulatory impact assessment and dispute prevention.[85] The development of this institutional capacity represents a crucial aspect of how these states preserve regulatory autonomy within the constraints of international investment law.

Regional approaches to regulatory harmonisation provide another dimension of how these states navigate tensions between regulatory autonomy and investment protection. Initiatives such as the ECOWAS Directive on Mining Policy Harmonisation and the East African Community's Protocol on Environment and Natural Resources Management establish regional frameworks for regulatory coordination, potentially strengthening sovereign positions vis-à-vis international investment obligations.[86] These regional frameworks create opportunities for collective approaches to preserving regulatory space, though their implementation continues to be shaped by the specific investment treaty commitments of individual states.[87]

The evolution of investment treaty practice in all three countries demonstrates increasing attention to preserving regulatory autonomy in natural resource governance. More recent investment agreements signed by Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana contain explicit provisions recognising the right to regulate for legitimate public interest objectives, including environmental protection, public health, and development considerations.[88] These provisions reflect growing recognition of the need to establish more balanced frameworks that provide appropriate investor protections whilst preserving essential regulatory space. This evolution in treaty practice represents an important adaptation to the challenges experienced in the arbitral interpretation of earlier-generation investment agreements.[89]

In conclusion, the preservation of regulatory autonomy in natural resource governance represents a fundamental challenge for Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana in their engagement with international investment arbitration. All three countries have developed increasingly

[84] Petroleum (Exploration, Development and Production) Act 2013, s 9-11; Petroleum Industry Act 2021 (Nigeria); Minerals Commission Act 1993 (Act 450) (Ghana); Petroleum Commission Act 2011 (Act 821) (Ghana).
[85] Sam Hickey, 'The politics of state capacity and development in Africa: Reframing and researching 'pockets of effectiveness' (2019) ESID Working Paper No. 117.
[86] ECOWAS, 'Directive C/DIR.3/05/09 on the Harmonization of Guiding Principles and Policies in the Mining Sector' (2009); East African Community, 'Protocol on Environment and Natural Resources Management' (2006).
[87] Makane Moïse Mbengue and Stefanie Schacherer (n 6) 420.
[88] Makane Moïse Mbengue (n 32) 460.
[89] Lorenzo Cotula, 'Raising the Bar on Responsible Investment: What Role for Investment Treaties?' (n 53).

sophisticated regulatory frameworks governing their natural resource sectors, yet the implementation of these frameworks continues to be shaped by investment protection considerations. However, these states have not remained passive in the face of these constraints, instead developing adaptive strategies for preserving regulatory space whilst managing investment protection obligations. The evolution of these strategies demonstrates the dynamic nature of the relationship between regulatory autonomy and investment protection, with states continuously refining their approaches in response to emerging challenges and opportunities. This adaptive capacity will remain crucial as these states continue to develop their natural resource governance frameworks within the complex landscape of international investment law.

4.5 Sovereign Debt and Asset Valuation Following Investment Disputes

The financial implications of investment disputes present significant challenges for Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana in managing sovereign debt and natural resource asset valuation. When states face adverse arbitral awards in natural resource disputes, the resulting financial obligations can impose substantial burdens on public finances, with potential implications for fiscal planning, debt sustainability, and development priorities.[90] Furthermore, the arbitral valuation of natural resource assets in expropriation or contract termination cases raises fundamental questions about appropriate methodologies for determining compensation, with significant implications for state resource management.[91]

Uganda's experience with the financial implications of investment disputes illustrates the substantial fiscal challenges posed by international arbitration. The government's tax dispute with Heritage Oil, which ultimately resulted in domestic litigation and international arbitration, created significant uncertainty regarding expected revenue streams from petroleum development.[92] While Uganda successfully defended its taxation measures in this case, the potential liability represented a significant proportion of the anticipated tax revenue from the transaction, highlighting the substantial financial stakes in such disputes. The protracted nature of these proceedings further created challenges for fiscal planning, as the uncertainty regarding

[90] Diana Rosert (n 56).
[91] Jarrod Wong And Abdallah Abuelfutuh Ali (n 19) 71.
[92] *Heritage Oil and Gas Ltd v Republic of Uganda* (n 34).

potential liabilities complicated budget projections and development planning.[93] Moreover, the legal costs associated with defending these claims represented a significant expenditure of public resources, creating opportunity costs for other development priorities.

Nigeria has faced even more substantial financial implications from investment disputes in its petroleum sector. Arbitral awards against the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (NNPC) in cases such as *Shell Nigeria Ultra Deep Limited v Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation* have resulted in significant financial liabilities.[94] These liabilities create challenges for fiscal planning and sovereign debt management, particularly given Nigeria's existing debt service obligations. The potential for compound interest on unpaid arbitral awards further magnifies these financial implications, creating increasing pressure on public finances over time.[95] Nigeria's experience demonstrates how adverse arbitral awards can have cascading effects on sovereign finances, particularly in cases where states face challenges in satisfying award payments within designated timeframes.

Ghana's financial challenges resulting from investment disputes have been particularly evident in cases such as *Balkan Energy (Ghana) Limited v Republic of Ghana*, where the government faced substantial claims regarding power generation contracts.[96] While Ghana successfully defended aspects of this case, the potential liability represented a significant fiscal risk during a period of already constrained public finances. The experience highlighted the importance of comprehensive financial risk assessment when entering into investment agreements, particularly in sectors closely linked to natural resource development.[97] Ghana's subsequent approach to investment dispute management demonstrates increased attention to financial implications, with greater emphasis on early assessment of potential liabilities and strategic approaches to dispute resolution that minimise fiscal impacts.

The valuation methodologies applied in natural resource investment disputes represent a crucial aspect of how arbitration affects state finances. Arbitral tribunals frequently employ income-based valuation approaches, particularly discounted cash flow (DCF) methodology, when

[93] Laura Paler, 'Oil discoveries and political windfalls: evidence on presidential support in Uganda' (2023) 11 Political Science Research and Methods 903.
[94] *Shell Nigeria Ultra Deep Limited v Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation* (2011) Arbitration under UNCITRAL Rules.
[95] Sunday Akinlolu Fagbemi (n 45) 48
[96] *Balkan Energy (Ghana) Limited v Republic of Ghana* (n 21).
[97] Kweku Ainuson, 'Enforcement of international and national arbitration awards in Ghana – legal basis, challenges and obstacles' (2018) 4 KAS African Law Study Library - Librairie Africaine d'Etudes Juridiques 407.

determining compensation for expropriation or contract breaches in natural resource sectors.[98] These forward-looking valuation approaches often result in substantial compensation awards based on projected future revenues from resource exploitation. However, the application of these methodologies raises fundamental questions about appropriate discount rates, production projections, and price forecasts - all factors that significantly influence valuation outcomes.[99] The subjective nature of these determinations creates considerable uncertainty regarding potential liabilities, complicating sovereign financial planning.

The treatment of regulatory risk in asset valuation represents a particularly contentious issue in natural resource disputes. When arbitral tribunals determine compensation for regulatory measures affecting investment value, they must address how regulatory risk was or should have been priced into the original investment decision.[100] This assessment has significant implications for the magnitude of compensation awards and, consequently, for state financial obligations. All three countries have experienced challenges in this area, particularly regarding the arbitral treatment of political risk premiums and their implications for compensation calculations. The approaches adopted by tribunals in assessing these factors directly influence the financial burden placed on state resources following adverse awards.[101]

The timing of valuation represents another critical factor affecting the financial implications of investment disputes. The determination of the appropriate date for valuing affected investments - whether the date immediately before the challenged measure, the date of the award, or some alternative timing - can dramatically influence compensation amounts, particularly in volatile commodity markets.[102] This consideration has significant implications for state finances, as different valuation dates can result in substantially different award amounts depending on commodity price movements and other market factors. The discretion exercised by tribunals in determining appropriate valuation timing thus directly affects the financial burden imposed on resource-dependent states following adverse awards.

The management of fiscal risks associated with potential investment disputes has become an increasingly important aspect of sovereign financial planning in all three countries. Uganda's establishment of a contingency framework for managing potential liabilities arising from

[98] Tarcisio Gazzini (n 41) 72.
[99] Ibid, 73.
[100] Lorenzo Cotula (n 60) 165.
[101] Jarrod Wong And Abdallah Abuelfutuh Ali (n 19) 72.
[102] Tarcisio Gazzini (n 41) 75.

investment disputes reflects a growing recognition of the need to incorporate these risks into fiscal planning.[103] Similarly, Nigeria has developed more sophisticated approaches to assessing and managing contingent liabilities arising from investment disputes, integrating these considerations into broader debt management strategies.[104] Ghana's experience has likewise prompted more comprehensive approaches to fiscal risk assessment regarding investment agreements, with increased attention to potential dispute scenarios and their financial implications during contract negotiation and implementation.

The creation of sovereign wealth funds in all three countries represents another approach to managing the financial implications of resource governance, including potential investment disputes. Nigeria's Sovereign Investment Authority, Ghana's Petroleum Funds, and Uganda's Petroleum Fund all establish mechanisms for managing resource revenues with attention to long-term sustainability.[105] These institutional arrangements provide potential buffers against the fiscal shocks that can result from adverse arbitral awards, though their effectiveness depends on adequate capitalisation and appropriate governance structures. The design and implementation of these sovereign wealth funds thus represent an important aspect of how these states manage the financial dimensions of resource governance within the context of potential investment disputes.

Transparency mechanisms in financial management have emerged as another important dimension of how these states address sovereign debt implications of resource governance. Nigeria's implementation of the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI), Ghana's Petroleum Revenue Management Act provisions for fiscal transparency, and Uganda's Public Finance Management Act requirements for petroleum revenue reporting all establish frameworks for enhanced transparency in resource revenue management. [106] These transparency mechanisms potentially strengthen state positions in investment disputes by demonstrating legitimate public interest motivations for regulatory measures and creating contemporaneous documentation of state decision-making processes. The development of these transparency frameworks thus represents not only good governance practice but also strategic preparation for potential investment disputes.

---

[103] Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs (n 46).

[104] Soji Oyeranmi, and Lawrence Dube (n 49).

[105] Nigerian Sovereign Investment Authority Act 2011; Petroleum Revenue Management Act 2011 (Act 815) (Ghana); Public Finance Management Act 2015, s 56-66.

[106] Nigerian Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (NEITI) Act 2007; Petroleum Revenue Management Act 2011 (Act 815) (Ghana); Public Finance Management Act 2015, s 56-66.

The relationship between investment disputes and sovereign credit ratings presents additional financial challenges for resource-dependent states. When countries face significant arbitral claims or adverse awards, credit rating agencies may incorporate these contingent liabilities into sovereign risk assessments, potentially affecting borrowing costs and access to international capital markets.[107] This dynamic creates additional financial pressure beyond the direct costs of arbitral awards, potentially constraining fiscal policy options during periods of already limited fiscal space. All three countries have experienced these indirect financial effects of investment disputes, highlighting the broader economic implications of international arbitration beyond specific award amounts.

Strategic approaches to managing the financial implications of investment disputes have evolved in all three jurisdictions, reflecting growing sophistication in navigating the intersection of sovereign debt and international arbitration. These approaches include more careful structuring of investment agreements to limit potential financial exposure, development of dispute prevention mechanisms to address emerging conflicts before they escalate to formal arbitration, and strategic use of settlement negotiations to manage financial impacts when disputes do arise.[108] The development of these strategies demonstrates how these states have adapted to the financial challenges posed by international investment arbitration, seeking to maintain fiscal stability whilst engaging with international investment frameworks.

The relationship between sovereign debt restructuring and investment arbitration represents an emerging challenge for resource-dependent states, though this issue has not yet featured prominently in the experiences of Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana. When states undertake sovereign debt restructuring, investment treaty claims may arise from affected bondholders or other creditors, creating additional complications in resolving financial distress.[109] While these specific circumstances have not yet materialised in the three focus countries, the potential for such interactions represents an important consideration in their approach to both sovereign debt management and investment protection. The evolution of jurisprudence regarding the relationship between sovereign debt and investment protection thus has significant implications for how these states navigate financial challenges in resource governance.

[107] Diana Rosert (n 56).
[108] Emilia Onyema, 'Effective Utilization of Arbitrators and Arbitration Institutions in Africa by Appointors' (n 58) 310.
[109] Hakeem Seriki, 'Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards and Public Policy – A Note of Caution' (2000) 3 Arbitration International 351, 354.

The development of domestic legal and institutional capacity for managing the financial implications of investment disputes represents a crucial adaptation in all three countries. Uganda's Justice Ministry, Nigeria's legal departments within the NNPC and regulatory agencies, and Ghana's Attorney-General's Department have all developed increased specialisation in assessing and managing the financial dimensions of investment disputes.[110] This capacity development enables more sophisticated approaches to dispute prevention, management, and resolution, potentially reducing the financial impacts of investment arbitration. The investment in legal and financial expertise thus represents an important strategic response to the challenges posed by international arbitration for sovereign financial management.

In conclusion, the financial implications of investment disputes present significant challenges for Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana in managing sovereign debt and natural resource asset valuation. These states face substantial fiscal pressures when adverse arbitral awards impose financial obligations on public resources, creating tensions between satisfying international legal obligations and maintaining fiscal sustainability. However, all three countries have developed increasingly sophisticated approaches to managing these financial challenges, including more comprehensive fiscal risk assessment, institutional mechanisms for resource revenue management, and strategic approaches to dispute prevention and resolution. The evolution of these approaches demonstrates the dynamic interaction between sovereign financial management and international investment protection, with states continuously adapting their strategies to navigate this complex terrain. This adaptive capacity will remain crucial as these states continue to develop their natural resource sectors within the framework of international investment law.

4.6 Legal and Institutional Mechanisms for Protecting Sovereign Rights

The development of robust legal and institutional mechanisms for protecting sovereign rights represents a critical adaptation by Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana in their engagement with international investment arbitration. As these countries have gained experience with investment disputes, they have established increasingly sophisticated frameworks for both preventing

[110] Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs (n 46); Emilia Onyema, 'Rethinking the Role of African National Courts in Arbitration' (n 23) 14.

disputes and managing them when they arise.[111] The comparative analysis of these mechanisms reveals important insights into how resource-rich African states can better navigate the complex terrain of international investment law whilst maintaining sovereign authority over natural resources.

Uganda's legal mechanisms for protecting sovereign rights have evolved significantly following its experiences with investment disputes in the petroleum sector. The government has undertaken a comprehensive review and revision of its model production-sharing agreements, incorporating more balanced provisions regarding stabilisation, dispute resolution, and regulatory authority.[112] These revised contractual frameworks reflect greater attention to preserving policy space for legitimate regulatory measures whilst providing appropriate certainty for investors. Furthermore, Uganda has modified its approach to bilateral investment treaty negotiation, with increasing emphasis on clarifying the relationship between investment protection and sovereign regulatory authority.[113] The government's engagement with the East African Community's regional investment framework further demonstrates a strategic approach to establishing more balanced investment protection standards through collective action.[114]

Nigeria has similarly developed sophisticated legal mechanisms for protecting sovereign rights, particularly through comprehensive legislative reform in the petroleum sector. The Petroleum Industry Act 2021 represents a landmark effort to establish a balanced framework for petroleum governance that provides appropriate investment protection whilst preserving essential sovereign authority.[115] This legislation addresses key areas of potential tension, including fiscal arrangements, environmental regulation, and community relations, creating a more coherent legal framework for managing investor-state relationships. Nigeria has also undertaken a strategic review of its bilateral investment treaties, with greater attention to clarifying the scope of protection standards and establishing appropriate exceptions for legitimate regulatory

[111] Emilia Onyema, 'Regional Arbitration Institution for ECOWAS: Lessons from OHADA Common Court of Justice and Arbitration' (2014) 17 International Arbitration Law Review 99, 102.
[112] Badru Bukenya and Jaqueline Nakaiza (n 64) 120.
[113] UNCTAD, 'International Investment Agreements Navigator: Uganda' (Investment Policy Hub, 2022) https://investmentpolicy.unctad.org/international-investment-agreements/countries/218/uganda accessed 14 February 2025.
[114] East African Community Secretariat, 'Comparative Analysis of Petroleum Legislation in the EAC Partner States' (EAC 2020).
[115] Petroleum Industry Act 2021 (Nigeria).

measures.[116] This legal evolution demonstrates growing sophistication in balancing investment protection with sovereign authority in natural resource governance.

Ghana's legal frameworks for protecting sovereign rights include constitutional safeguards, legislative provisions, and carefully structured investment agreements. The constitutional requirement for parliamentary ratification of natural resource agreements creates an important procedural mechanism for ensuring democratic oversight of investment arrangements.[117] Furthermore, Ghana has enacted comprehensive sector-specific legislation governing both mining and petroleum, establishing clear parameters for the exercise of sovereign authority whilst providing appropriate investment protection.[118] The Ghana Investment Promotion Centre Act provisions regarding investment protection and dispute resolution further demonstrate a strategic approach to establishing balanced frameworks for investor-state relations. These legal mechanisms collectively create a multi-layered framework for asserting sovereign authority within the context of international investment obligations.

The institutional dimension of sovereign rights protection has become increasingly important in all three jurisdictions. Uganda's establishment of a Strategic Investment Dispute Management Framework represents a comprehensive institutional approach to preventing and managing investment disputes.[119] This framework establishes mechanisms for early identification of potential disputes, inter-agency coordination in dispute management, and strategic approaches to dispute resolution. Similar institutional arrangements have emerged in Nigeria and Ghana, with specialised units within justice ministries and sector-specific agencies focused on investment dispute prevention and management.[120] These institutional mechanisms demonstrate recognition of the need for coordinated approaches to protecting sovereign rights across government departments and regulatory agencies.

The role of domestic courts in supporting sovereign rights protection represents another important dimension of institutional adaptation. All three countries have experienced cases where domestic courts have addressed the relationship between international investment

[116] Tarcisio Gazzini, 'Nigeria and International Investment Law' in Emilia Onyema (ed), *The Transformation of Arbitration in Africa: The Role of Arbitral Institutions* (Kluwer Law International 2016) 127.
[117] Constitution of the Republic of Ghana 1992, art 268(1).
[118] Minerals and Mining Act 2006 (Act 703) (Ghana); Petroleum (Exploration and Production) Act 2016 (Act 919) (Ghana).
[119] Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs (n 46).
[120] Emilia Onyema, 'Rethinking the Role of African National Courts in Arbitration' (n 23) 15.

obligations and sovereign authority.[121] The Ugandan courts' handling of tax disputes related to petroleum transactions, Nigeria's courts' jurisprudence regarding the enforcement of arbitral awards, and Ghana's Supreme Court's decisions regarding the constitutional requirements for investment agreements all demonstrate the important role of domestic judiciaries in defining the parameters of sovereign authority within the context of international obligations.[122] These domestic judicial decisions potentially strengthen state positions in international arbitration by establishing clear legal foundations for sovereign measures and creating precedents regarding the relationship between domestic and international legal frameworks.

Capacity development initiatives represent a crucial aspect of institutional adaptation in all three jurisdictions. Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana have all invested in building specialised expertise in international investment law within government legal departments, regulatory agencies, and state-owned enterprises.[123] These capacity development efforts enable more sophisticated engagement with international investment frameworks, including more strategic approaches to treaty negotiation, dispute prevention, and arbitration proceedings when disputes do arise. Furthermore, these countries have increasingly engaged with regional and international support mechanisms, such as the African Legal Support Facility, to strengthen their capacity for handling complex investment disputes.[124] These capacity development initiatives represent strategic investments in protecting sovereign rights through enhanced legal and technical expertise.

The establishment of specialised natural resource regulatory agencies in all three countries further demonstrates institutional adaptation to the challenges of balancing sovereign authority with investment protection. Uganda's Petroleum Authority, Nigeria's various petroleum regulatory bodies, and Ghana's Minerals Commission and Petroleum Commission all establish dedicated institutional frameworks for implementing resource governance with appropriate attention to both regulatory objectives and investment protection considerations.[125] These institutions develop specialised expertise in the complex technical, legal, and economic

[121] *Republic v High Court (Commercial Division), Accra; Ex Parte Attorney-General (Balkan Energy Ghana Ltd & Ors Interested Parties)* [2011] 2 SCGLR 1183; *Heritage Oil & Gas v Uganda Revenue Authority* (Miscellaneous Application No. 6 of 2011) [2011] UGTAT 1 (25 July 2011).

[122] Ibid.

[123] African Legal Support Facility (n 57).

[124] Ibid.

[125] Petroleum (Exploration, Development and Production) Act 2013, s 9-11; Petroleum Industry Act 2021 (Nigeria); Minerals Commission Act 1993 (Act 450) (Ghana); Petroleum Commission Act 2011 (Act 821) (Ghana).

dimensions of natural resource governance, enabling more sophisticated approaches to asserting sovereign authority whilst managing investment protection obligations. The institutional design of these regulatory bodies increasingly reflects attention to both substantive regulatory objectives and procedural safeguards that minimise vulnerability to investment claims.

The governance of state-owned enterprises engaged in natural resource sectors represents another important dimension of institutional adaptation. The Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation, Ghana National Petroleum Corporation, and Uganda National Oil Company all play significant roles in implementing state policy regarding natural resource development.[126] The governance frameworks for these entities have evolved to reflect growing attention to both commercial objectives and broader public interest considerations, with increasing sophistication in managing contractual relationships with international investors. The institutional capability of these state-owned enterprises thus represents an important aspect of how these states navigate tensions between commercial imperatives and sovereign authority in resource governance.

Transparency and accountability mechanisms have emerged as increasingly important institutional safeguards in all three jurisdictions. Nigeria's implementation of the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative, Ghana's provisions for transparency in petroleum revenue management, and Uganda's requirements for disclosure of natural resource agreements all establish institutional frameworks for enhanced public scrutiny of resource governance.[127] These transparency mechanisms potentially strengthen state positions in investment disputes by demonstrating legitimate public interest motivations for regulatory measures and creating contemporaneous documentation of decision-making processes. Furthermore, these mechanisms potentially enhance the perceived legitimacy of state measures, creating additional barriers to successful investment claims based on allegations of arbitrary or discriminatory treatment.

The development of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms represents another institutional adaptation in all three countries. Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana have all established frameworks for mediation, conciliation, and negotiated settlement of investor-state disputes, creating

[126] Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation Act 1977; Ghana National Petroleum Corporation Act 1983 (PNDCL 64) (Ghana); Petroleum (Exploration, Development and Production) Act 2013, s 42-44.

[127] Nigerian Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (NEITI) Act 2007; Petroleum Revenue Management Act 2011 (Act 815) (Ghana); Public Finance Management Act 2015, s 56-66.

alternatives to formal arbitration proceedings.[128] These mechanisms potentially enable more flexible and balanced approaches to resolving investment disputes, preserving greater autonomy for states in determining appropriate outcomes. Furthermore, these alternative dispute resolution frameworks often incorporate greater attention to context-specific factors and broader public interest considerations than formal arbitration proceedings, potentially resulting in a more balanced resolution of investor-state disputes.

Regional institutional frameworks provide another dimension of how these states protect sovereign rights within international investment law. Nigeria's engagement with ECOWAS investment governance, Uganda's participation in the East African Community's regional framework, and Ghana's involvement in African continental initiatives all demonstrate recognition of the potential benefits of collective approaches to establishing more balanced investment protection standards.[129] These regional frameworks create opportunities for harmonised approaches to investment governance that better reflect the development priorities and sovereign interests of participating states. The evolution of these regional mechanisms thus represents an important aspect of how these states are seeking to reshape the international investment regime to better accommodate sovereign interests.

The development of specialised financial mechanisms for managing investment disputes represents another institutional adaptation in all three jurisdictions. Uganda's contingency planning for potential dispute liabilities, Nigeria's approach to budgeting for arbitration costs and potential awards, and Ghana's financial risk assessment regarding investment agreements all demonstrate increasing sophistication in managing the fiscal dimensions of investment disputes.[130] These financial mechanisms enable more strategic approaches to dispute prevention and management, including a more informed assessment of the potential costs and benefits of different approaches to resolving emerging conflicts with investors. The integration of these financial considerations into broader institutional frameworks for dispute management represents an important evolution in how these states approach investment disputes.

The coordination mechanisms between different government agencies involved in natural resource governance represent another critical aspect of institutional adaptation. All three

[128] Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs (n 46).
[129] ECOWAS, 'Directive C/DIR.3/05/09 on the Harmonization of Guiding Principles and Policies in the Mining Sector' (n 86); East African Community, 'Protocol on Environment and Natural Resources Management' (n 86); African Union, 'Africa Mining Vision' (February 2009).
[130] Diana Rosert (n 56).

countries have established frameworks for inter-agency coordination in developing and implementing natural resource policy, including mechanisms for ensuring consistent approaches to investment protection across different regulatory domains.[131] These coordination frameworks enable more coherent engagement with international investment obligations, reducing vulnerability to claims based on inconsistent treatment or regulatory incoherence. The development of these coordination mechanisms reflects recognition of the need for integrated approaches to protecting sovereign rights across different dimensions of natural resource governance.

In conclusion, the development of robust legal and institutional mechanisms for protecting sovereign rights represents a critical adaptation by Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana in their engagement with international investment arbitration. These countries have established increasingly sophisticated frameworks for both preventing disputes and managing them when they arise, demonstrating strategic approaches to navigating the complex terrain of international investment law. The legal frameworks established through constitutional provisions, legislative enactments, and contractual arrangements create multi-layered protection for sovereign authority, whilst the institutional mechanisms enable more effective implementation of these frameworks. This comprehensive approach to protecting sovereign rights whilst maintaining compliance with international obligations reflects growing sophistication in how these states engage with the international investment regime. The continued evolution of these legal and institutional mechanisms will remain crucial as these states further develop their natural resource sectors within the global investment framework.

4.7 Regional and Continental Approaches to Investment Governance

The development of regional and continental approaches to investment governance represents a significant evolution in how African states collectively address the challenges of balancing investment protection with sovereign authority. Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana have all engaged with various regional initiatives aimed at establishing more balanced frameworks for investment governance, reflecting a growing recognition of the potential benefits of coordinated approaches to reforming international investment law.[132] These regional efforts

[131] Sam Hickey (n 85).
[132] Makane Moïse Mbengue and Stefanie Schacherer (n 6) 419.

potentially strengthen individual states' positions in navigating the complex terrain of international investment arbitration by establishing collective approaches to key challenges in resource governance.

The Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) has emerged as an important regional framework for investment governance affecting both Nigeria and Ghana. The ECOWAS Supplementary Act on Investments adopted in 2008 establishes a regional investment framework that seeks to balance investor protection with the preservation of regulatory space for sustainable development objectives.[133] This regional instrument incorporates innovative provisions regarding investor obligations, exceptions for legitimate regulatory measures, and alternative approaches to dispute resolution. Nigeria and Ghana's engagement with this regional framework demonstrates recognition of the potential benefits of harmonised approaches to investment governance, particularly regarding the preservation of regulatory autonomy in natural resource sectors.[134] The ECOWAS framework further establishes institutional mechanisms for regional coordination on investment policy, including opportunities for collective approaches to dispute prevention and management.

Similarly, the East African Community (EAC) has developed regional frameworks for investment governance that influence Uganda's engagement with international investment law. The EAC Model Investment Code provides guidance for member states in developing national investment legislation and negotiating investment agreements, with particular attention to balancing investment protection with the preservation of regulatory space.[135] Uganda's participation in this regional initiative reflects strategic recognition of the benefits of coordinated approaches to investment governance, particularly regarding natural resource sectors. The EAC framework further establishes mechanisms for regional harmonisation of regulatory standards in extractive industries, potentially reducing regulatory competition between member states and strengthening collective positions vis-à-vis international investors.[136]

The African Continental Free Trade Agreement (AfCFTA) Investment Protocol represents perhaps the most ambitious continental initiative for reforming investment governance. This protocol, currently under negotiation, seeks to establish a continent-wide framework for

[133] Onyema (n 111) 102.
[134] Ibid.
[135] East African Community Secretariat (n 114).
[136] Ibid.

investment that better reflects African development priorities and sovereign interests.[137] All three focus countries have engaged actively with this process, contributing to the development of innovative approaches to balancing investment protection with the preservation of regulatory autonomy. The AfCFTA Investment Protocol potentially establishes a new paradigm for investment governance that moves beyond the limitations of traditional bilateral investment treaties, creating opportunities for more balanced approaches to investor-state relations.[138] The continental nature of this initiative potentially provides greater collective bargaining power in reshaping international investment norms and practices.

The Pan-African Investment Code (PAIC), developed under the auspices of the African Union, represents another important continental initiative for reforming investment governance. Although not yet formally adopted as a binding instrument, the PAIC provides a model for African states in developing investment frameworks that better accommodate sovereign regulatory authority and development objectives.[139] The PAIC incorporates innovative provisions regarding investor obligations, sustainable development considerations, and balanced approaches to dispute resolution. All three focus countries have engaged with the development of this continental framework, recognising its potential contribution to establishing more balanced approaches to investment governance across the continent.

Regional approaches to dispute resolution represent another important dimension of collective strategies for navigating international investment law. The ECOWAS Court of Justice has developed jurisprudence addressing aspects of investment-related disputes, particularly regarding the human rights implications of resource exploitation.[140] Similarly, the East African Court of Justice has addressed cases relevant to investment governance within the region. These regional judicial institutions potentially provide alternative forums for addressing aspects of investor-state relations, creating opportunities for the development of jurisprudence more attuned to African contexts and development priorities.[141] The engagement of all three focus

[137] Makane Moïse Mbengue and Stefanie Schacherer (n 6) 420.
[138] Hamed El-Kady, and Mustaqeem De Gama, '*The Reform of the International Investment Regime: An African Perspective*' (2019) 34 *ICSID Review - Foreign Investment Law Journal* 482.
[139] Makane Moïse Mbengue, 'Africa's Voice in the Formation, Shaping and Redesign of International Investment Law' (2019) 34 ICSID Review 455, 459.
[140] Solomon Ebobrah, 'Critical Issues in the Human Rights Mandate of the ECOWAS Court of Justice' (2010) 54 Journal of African Law 1, 3.
[141] Ibid, 5.

countries with these regional judicial mechanisms demonstrates recognition of their potential contribution to more balanced approaches to investment dispute resolution.

Regional initiatives for capacity development in investment law and arbitration further demonstrate collective approaches to strengthening sovereign positions. The African Institute for International Law based in Arusha, Tanzania, and various regional training programmes supported by international organisations have contributed to building African expertise in international investment law.[142] These capacity development initiatives potentially strengthen states' ability to navigate complex investment disputes through enhanced legal and technical expertise. The participation of Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana in these regional capacity development programmes reflects recognition of the importance of specialised knowledge in effectively engaging with international investment arbitration.

The development of regional standards for natural resource governance represents another important dimension of collective approaches to investment governance. The Africa Mining Vision, adopted by the African Union in 2009, establishes continental guidelines for sustainable and equitable management of mineral resources.[143] Similarly, regional initiatives regarding petroleum governance, such as the ECOWAS Energy Protocol, establish frameworks for coordinated approaches to resource management. These regional standards potentially strengthen individual states' positions in investment disputes by demonstrating that regulatory measures align with regionally accepted principles and practices, potentially undermining claims based on allegations of arbitrary or discriminatory treatment.[144]

Regional approaches to fiscal governance of natural resources further contribute to collective strategies for managing investment relations. The African Tax Administration Forum provides a platform for coordinating approaches to resource taxation, including strategies for addressing tax avoidance by multinational corporations in extractive industries.[145] Similarly, regional implementation of the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative establishes coordinated approaches to transparency in resource revenue management. These regional fiscal governance

[142] Emilia Onyema, 'Effective Utilization of Arbitrators and Arbitration Institutions in Africa by Appointors' (n 58) 310.
[143] African Union, 'Africa Mining Vision' (February 2009).
[144] ECOWAS, 'Directive C/DIR.3/05/09 on the Harmonization of Guiding Principles and Policies in the Mining Sector' (n 86).
[145] Mohammed Amidu, Rester Togormey, and Dominic Dokbilla Naab (n 29).

mechanisms potentially strengthen sovereign positions regarding taxation measures, a frequent subject of investment disputes in natural resource sectors.

The development of regional frameworks for local content requirements represents another important dimension of collective approaches to investment governance. Both ECOWAS and the EAC have established regional guidelines for local content in extractive industries, creating harmonised approaches to enhancing domestic participation in resource sectors.[146] These regional frameworks potentially strengthen individual states' positions in implementing and defending local content requirements, which have frequently been challenged through investment arbitration. The coordinated regional approach potentially reduces regulatory competition between states and establishes more consistent standards for domestic participation in resource development.

The engagement of regional organisations with international investment law reform initiatives further demonstrates collective approaches to reshaping the global investment regime. African regional organisations have participated actively in discussions regarding reform of investor-state dispute settlement within the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) and other international forums.[147] This engagement potentially enhances African influence in global reform debates, creating opportunities for the development of international investment law in directions more accommodating of sovereign interests and development priorities. The coordination of African positions through regional organisations potentially amplifies individual states' voices in these global reform processes.

Regional economic integration initiatives provide another dimension of collective approaches to investment governance. The African Continental Free Trade Area creates a framework for deepening economic integration across the continent, with potential implications for investment flows and regulatory harmonisation.[148] This integration process potentially strengthens African states' collective bargaining power vis-à-vis international investors and creates opportunities for more balanced approaches to investment governance. The participation of Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana in this continental integration initiative reflects

[146] Nigerian Oil and Gas Industry Content Development Act 2010, s 3, 11, 31; Petroleum (Local Content and Local Participation) Regulations 2013 (LI 2204) (Ghana); Petroleum (Exploration, Development and Production) Act 2013, s 9-11.
[147] Makane Moïse Mbengue (n 139) 460.
[148] Makane Moïse Mbengue and Stefanie Schacherer (n 6) 421.

recognition of its potential contribution to more favourable conditions for managing foreign investment in natural resource sectors.

The development of regional infrastructure for investment facilitation and dispute prevention represents a further dimension of collective approaches to investment governance. Regional investment promotion agencies, such as the ECOWAS Investment Promotion Agency, establish coordinated frameworks for attracting and managing foreign investment within regional economic communities.[149] Similarly, regional mechanisms for early warning and dispute prevention create opportunities for addressing potential conflicts with investors before they escalate to formal arbitration. These regional infrastructure developments potentially enhance individual states' capacity to manage investor relations effectively whilst maintaining appropriate regulatory space for sustainable development objectives.

In conclusion, the development of regional and continental approaches to investment governance represents a significant evolution in how African states collectively address the challenges of balancing investment protection with sovereign authority. Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana have all engaged with various regional initiatives aimed at establishing more balanced frameworks for investment governance, reflecting a growing recognition of the potential benefits of coordinated approaches to reforming international investment law. These regional efforts potentially strengthen individual states' positions in navigating the complex terrain of international investment arbitration by establishing collective approaches to key challenges in resource governance. The continued evolution of these regional frameworks will remain crucial as African states seek to reshape the international investment regime to better accommodate their sovereign interests and development priorities.

4.8 Conclusion

The comparative analysis of Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana's experiences in navigating the complex terrain of international investment arbitration reveals both shared challenges and distinctive approaches to protecting sovereign rights in natural resource governance. Throughout this chapter, we have examined how these three resource-rich African nations have developed increasingly sophisticated strategies for balancing their sovereign authority with

[149] Rhuks Temitope Ako, Lawrence Ogechukwu Obokoh, and Patrick Okonmah (n 133) 88.

international investment obligations, particularly in the crucial domains of taxation, regulatory autonomy, and resource ownership.

The constitutional frameworks of all three countries establish robust foundations for asserting sovereign control over natural resources, creating the primary legal basis for government regulation of resource exploitation. However, these constitutional imperatives have frequently been constrained by international investment obligations, particularly through arbitral interpretations that limit the full exercise of constitutionally established sovereign rights. The tension between domestic constitutional authority and international investment commitments represents a fundamental challenge that all three states continue to navigate through evolving legal and institutional mechanisms.

The impact of international arbitration on taxation powers represents perhaps the most direct challenge to the sovereign authority, as demonstrated by Uganda's disputes with Heritage Oil and Tullow Oil, Nigeria's contested fiscal reforms in the petroleum sector, and Ghana's efforts to implement more progressive taxation arrangements. However, all three countries have developed adaptive strategies for preserving taxation authority whilst managing investment protection obligations, including more sophisticated approaches to treaty negotiation, legislative frameworks, and institutional capacity building.

Similarly, the preservation of regulatory autonomy in environmental protection, local content requirements, and community relations has required careful calibration between legitimate public interest objectives and investment protection commitments. All three states have established increasingly comprehensive regulatory frameworks for their natural resource sectors, yet the implementation of these frameworks continues to be shaped by consideration of potential investment claims. The strategic development of regulatory measures to minimise vulnerability to arbitration claims demonstrates growing sophistication in navigating these constraints.

The financial implications of investment disputes present substantial challenges for sovereign debt management and fiscal planning, as adverse arbitral awards can impose significant burdens on public resources. However, all three countries have developed institutional mechanisms for managing these financial risks, including contingency planning, sovereign wealth funds, and strategic approaches to dispute resolution that minimise fiscal impacts. These financial strategies represent an important dimension of how these states have adapted to the challenges posed by international investment arbitration.

Perhaps most significantly, all three countries have established increasingly robust legal and institutional mechanisms for protecting sovereign rights within the framework of international investment law. These mechanisms include constitutional safeguards, comprehensive legislative frameworks, specialised regulatory agencies, and strategic approaches to dispute prevention and management. The development of these mechanisms demonstrates how these states have moved beyond passive acceptance of investment treaty constraints to active engagement in shaping more balanced frameworks for investor-state relations.

The emergence of regional and continental approaches to investment governance further demonstrates collective strategies for reforming international investment law to better accommodate sovereign interests and development priorities. Through participation in initiatives such as the ECOWAS investment framework, the East African Community's regional standards, and the African Continental Free Trade Agreement Investment Protocol, these states are contributing to reshaping the international investment regime in ways that provide greater recognition of legitimate regulatory space and development objectives.

Looking forward, the continued evolution of these approaches to balancing sovereign authority with investment protection will remain crucial as these states further develop their natural resource sectors within the global investment framework. The sophisticated strategies that have emerged from their experiences provide valuable lessons for other resource-rich nations seeking to navigate the complex terrain of international investment law. By continuing to refine legal frameworks, build institutional capacity, and engage with regional reform initiatives, Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana can strengthen their ability to protect sovereign rights whilst maintaining appropriate protections for legitimate investor interests.

The synthesis of these three countries' experiences thus reveals not only the challenges of maintaining sovereign authority within international investment frameworks but also the potential for strategic adaptation and reform. The path forward lies not in the rejection of international investment frameworks but rather in their thoughtful recalibration to better accommodate the legitimate sovereign interests of resource-rich states. Through the continued evolution of domestic strategies and collective engagement with regional and global reform initiatives, these states can contribute to the development of more balanced approaches to investment governance that support both investor confidence and sovereign regulatory space for sustainable development.

CHAPTER FIVE

KEY FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

The tension between international investment arbitration and state sovereignty in natural resource governance represents one of the most significant challenges facing resource-rich African nations in contemporary international economic relations. Throughout this research, the experiences of Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana have provided a rich comparative framework for examining how sovereign states navigate the complex terrain of international investment law whilst maintaining legitimate authority over their natural resources. This concluding chapter synthesises the key findings from the comparative analysis, draws conclusions regarding the research objectives, and presents recommendations for strengthening sovereign rights protection in international investment arbitration.

The research has examined how these three jurisdictions, each at different stages of natural resource development and with distinctive legal traditions, have managed similar challenges in balancing sovereign authority with investment protection obligations. Uganda's emergence as a petroleum-producing nation following significant discoveries in 2006 has presented complex challenges in establishing governance frameworks that maintain sovereign control whilst attracting necessary international investment. Nigeria's extensive experience in petroleum governance over several decades provides valuable insights into the long-term management of international investment relationships in the natural resource sector. Ghana's development of both mining and petroleum governance frameworks offers a third perspective on how states can navigate tensions between sovereignty and investment protection across different resource sectors.

The comparative analysis has focused on four primary dimensions of sovereignty in natural resource governance: constitutional and legal frameworks establishing resource ownership and management authority; taxation powers and their treatment in international arbitration; regulatory autonomy in environmental protection, local content requirements, and community relations; and financial implications of investment disputes for sovereign debt and asset valuation. Across these dimensions, the research has examined both the constraints that

international investment frameworks place on sovereign authority and the adaptive strategies that states develop to navigate these constraints.

The methodological approach has combined doctrinal legal analysis with a comparative assessment of institutional frameworks and dispute outcomes across the three jurisdictions. This approach has enabled the identification of both common challenges and distinctive responses, providing a nuanced understanding of how resource-rich African states can better protect sovereign rights whilst maintaining compliance with international obligations. The focus on specific arbitration cases, particularly Uganda's disputes with Heritage Oil and Tullow Oil, Nigeria's various petroleum arbitrations, and Ghana's experience with the Balkan Energy case, has grounded the analysis in concrete examples of sovereignty challenges and responses.

This concluding chapter begins with a synthesis of key findings from the comparative analysis, identifying patterns and variations in how the three states have navigated tensions between sovereignty and investment protection. The chapter then presents conclusions directly addressing the research objectives regarding the impact of international arbitration on state sovereignty, the effectiveness of legal and institutional frameworks, the implications for sovereign debt and asset valuation, and the evaluation of domestic mechanisms for protecting sovereignty. Based on these conclusions, the chapter offers recommendations for strengthening sovereign rights protection in international investment arbitration, focusing on legal frameworks, institutional capacity, treaty negotiation, and regional coordination. The chapter further identifies areas requiring additional research and concludes with reflections on the evolving nature of sovereignty in contemporary natural resource governance.

Through this structured approach, the chapter aims to provide a comprehensive assessment of how resource-rich African states can better navigate the complex interaction between international investment obligations and sovereign rights in natural resource governance. The findings and recommendations presented here have significance not only for the three focus countries but also for other resource-rich developing nations seeking to maximise benefits from resource extraction whilst maintaining essential sovereign authority in a globalised investment environment.

5.2 Summary of Key Findings

The comparative analysis of Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana's experiences with international investment arbitration reveals several crucial findings regarding the complex relationship between state sovereignty and investment protection in natural resource governance. These findings demonstrate both common challenges across the three jurisdictions and distinctive responses shaped by each country's particular circumstances, constitutional frameworks, and development priorities.

The constitutional frameworks for resource ownership across all three countries establish robust foundations for asserting sovereign control over natural resources, though with significant variations in structure and implementation. Uganda's Constitution vests ownership of natural resources in the people, with the government holding these resources in trust for the citizens. This people-centred ownership model creates a constitutional imperative for government management that benefits the broader population. Similarly, Ghana's constitutional framework vests resource ownership in the President on behalf of the people, whilst adding a significant procedural safeguard through the requirement for parliamentary ratification of natural resource agreements. Nigeria's Constitution takes a more centralised approach, vesting control of mineral resources in the federal government rather than recognising direct ownership by the people or local communities. These constitutional differences create distinctive dynamics in how states engage with international investors and respond to investment disputes, whilst highlighting the fundamental tension between domestic constitutional imperatives and international investment protection obligations.

The impact of international arbitration on taxation powers represents perhaps the most direct challenge to sovereign authority across all three jurisdictions. Uganda's disputes with Heritage Oil and Tullow Oil regarding capital gains taxation demonstrated how investment arbitration can subject core sovereign taxation decisions to international scrutiny. Nigeria has faced numerous challenges to its attempts to modify fiscal terms in production-sharing contracts, with international oil companies frequently contesting tax assessments through both domestic litigation and international arbitration. Similarly, Ghana has encountered resistance to revisions of taxation arrangements in both the mining and petroleum sectors. However, all three countries have developed adaptive strategies for preserving taxation authority whilst managing investment protection obligations, including more sophisticated approaches to treaty negotiation, legislative frameworks, and institutional capacity building. The evolution of these

approaches demonstrates how states can maintain essential fiscal sovereignty whilst navigating the constraints imposed by international investment obligations.

The preservation of regulatory autonomy in environmental protection, local content requirements, and community relations has required careful calibration between legitimate public interest objectives and investment protection commitments across all three jurisdictions. Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana have all established increasingly comprehensive regulatory frameworks governing their natural resource sectors, yet the implementation of these frameworks continues to be shaped by consideration of potential investment claims. Environmental regulations, in particular, have faced scrutiny through investment arbitration when applied to existing operations, creating tensions between evolving standards and investor expectations of regulatory stability. Similarly, local content requirements designed to enhance domestic participation in resource sectors have sometimes faced challenges regarding compatibility with investment protection standards. Despite these constraints, all three countries have developed increasingly sophisticated approaches to designing and implementing regulatory measures that advance legitimate public interest objectives whilst minimising vulnerability to investment claims.

The financial implications of investment disputes present substantial challenges for sovereign debt management and fiscal planning in all three countries. When states face adverse arbitral awards in natural resource disputes, the resulting financial obligations can impose significant burdens on public finances, with potential implications for debt sustainability and development priorities. Furthermore, the arbitral valuation of natural resource assets in expropriation or contract termination cases raises fundamental questions about appropriate methodologies for determining compensation. These financial challenges have prompted all three countries to develop institutional mechanisms for managing financial risks associated with investment disputes, including contingency planning, sovereign wealth funds, and strategic approaches to dispute resolution that minimise fiscal impacts. The evolution of these financial strategies represents an important dimension of how these states have adapted to the challenges posed by international investment arbitration.

The legal and institutional mechanisms for protecting sovereign rights have evolved significantly in all three jurisdictions, demonstrating adaptive responses to the challenges of international investment arbitration. Uganda has established a Strategic Investment Dispute Management Framework and undertaken a comprehensive review of its model production-

sharing agreements to incorporate more balanced provisions regarding stabilisation, dispute resolution, and regulatory authority. Nigeria has enacted the Petroleum Industry Act 2021, establishing a comprehensive governance framework that seeks to balance investor protection with the preservation of sovereign authority. Ghana has leveraged its constitutional requirement for parliamentary ratification of resource agreements to strengthen democratic oversight of investment arrangements and enhance the state's position in subsequent disputes. These legal and institutional adaptations demonstrate how states can develop more sophisticated approaches to navigating the constraints imposed by international investment frameworks.

Regional and continental approaches to investment governance provide additional dimensions of how these states are collectively addressing challenges in balancing sovereignty with investment protection. Through participation in initiatives such as the ECOWAS investment framework, the East African Community's regional standards, and the African Continental Free Trade Agreement Investment Protocol, these states are contributing to reshaping the international investment regime in ways that provide greater recognition of legitimate regulatory space and development objectives. These regional initiatives potentially strengthen individual states' positions in navigating international investment law by establishing collective approaches to key challenges in resource governance. The continued evolution of these regional frameworks represents an important aspect of how African states are seeking to reform international investment law to better accommodate sovereign interests.

The evolution of investment treaty practice across all three jurisdictions demonstrates increasing sophistication in balancing investment protection with the preservation of sovereign authority. Early-generation investment treaties signed by these countries often contained limited safeguards for regulatory space, creating significant constraints on sovereign authority through broadly worded protection standards and stabilisation commitments. However, more recent treaties demonstrate greater attention to preserving essential regulatory space through explicit recognition of the right to regulate, more precise definition of protection standards, and appropriate exceptions for legitimate public interest measures. This evolution in treaty practice represents an important adaptation to the challenges experienced in the arbitral interpretation of earlier-generation investment agreements.

The institutional capacity for managing investment disputes has emerged as a critical factor influencing how effectively states can protect sovereign interests within international investment frameworks. All three countries have invested in building specialised expertise in

international investment law within government legal departments, regulatory agencies, and state-owned enterprises. These capacity development efforts enable more sophisticated engagement with international investment frameworks, including more strategic approaches to treaty negotiation, dispute prevention, and arbitration proceedings when disputes arise. The continued strengthening of this institutional capacity represents an essential component of how these states assert effective sovereignty within the constraints of international investment law.

Transparency and accountability mechanisms have emerged as increasingly important safeguards for sovereign rights protection across all three jurisdictions. Nigeria's implementation of the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative, Ghana's provisions for transparency in petroleum revenue management, and Uganda's requirements for disclosure of natural resource agreements all establish frameworks for enhanced public scrutiny of resource governance. These transparency mechanisms potentially strengthen state positions in investment disputes by demonstrating legitimate public interest motivations for regulatory measures and creating contemporaneous documentation of decision-making processes. Furthermore, these mechanisms potentially enhance the perceived legitimacy of state measures, creating additional barriers to successful investment claims based on allegations of arbitrary or discriminatory treatment.

In conclusion, the comparative analysis reveals both significant constraints on sovereign authority resulting from international investment obligations and sophisticated adaptive strategies that states have developed to navigate these constraints. While international investment arbitration has sometimes limited the full exercise of sovereign rights in taxation, regulation, and resource management, it has also stimulated important legal and institutional innovations that potentially strengthen effective sovereignty in the long term. The experiences of Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana demonstrate that sovereignty in contemporary resource governance involves not only formal legal authority but also practical governance capacity, institutional adaptation, and strategic international engagement. The continued evolution of these approaches will remain essential as these states seek to maximise development benefits from natural resources whilst navigating the complex terrain of international investment law.

5.3 Conclusions Based on Research Objectives

This research was guided by four specific objectives aimed at understanding the complex relationship between international investment arbitration and state sovereignty in natural resource governance. The comparative analysis of Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana's experiences provides the foundation for drawing conclusions regarding each of these objectives, synthesizing the findings into a coherent understanding of how resource-rich African states navigate the tension between sovereign authority and investment protection obligations.

Objective 1: To examine how international arbitration decisions affect state sovereignty in matters of taxation and natural resource management in Uganda, with specific reference to the Heritage Oil and Tullow Oil cases.

The examination of Uganda's experience with international arbitration provides several important conclusions regarding the impact on state sovereignty in taxation and resource management. International arbitration has imposed meaningful constraints on Uganda's exercise of taxation powers, subjecting sovereign fiscal decisions to external scrutiny through standards such as fair and equitable treatment and indirect expropriation. The Heritage Oil and Tullow Oil disputes demonstrate how even when Uganda successfully defended its sovereign authority to impose capital gains tax, the arbitration process itself created procedural and resource burdens that represent practical limitations on sovereignty.

However, the constraints imposed by international arbitration have also stimulated important institutional adaptations that potentially strengthen effective sovereignty in the long term. Uganda has developed more sophisticated approaches to tax assessment and collection, strengthened the legal foundations for taxation measures, and enhanced coordination between revenue authorities and legal departments. These institutional adaptations demonstrate how sovereignty in contemporary resource governance involves not merely formal legal authority but also practical governance capacity and strategic international engagement.

Furthermore, the impact of international arbitration on Uganda's resource management authority extends beyond taxation to encompass regulatory space, environmental standards, and development timelines. While investment treaties and arbitration create potential constraints on regulatory evolution, Uganda has developed increasingly sophisticated approaches to preserving essential regulatory authority whilst managing investment protection

obligations. The resulting governance landscape involves careful navigation of both constraints and opportunities within interconnected domestic and international legal systems.

Objective 2: To analyse the legal and institutional frameworks governing natural resource ownership and management in Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana, particularly focusing on constitutional provisions vis-à-vis international investment obligations.

The comparative analysis of legal and institutional frameworks reveals important conclusions regarding the interaction between constitutional provisions and international investment obligations. All three countries have established robust constitutional foundations for asserting sovereign ownership of natural resources, yet the expression of this ownership varies significantly - from Uganda and Ghana's people-centred models to Nigeria's more centralized federal ownership. These constitutional frameworks create the primary legal basis for state regulation of natural resource exploitation, yet their practical implementation occurs within a web of international obligations that sometimes constrain the full exercise of constitutionally established authority.

The tension between constitutional imperatives and international obligations is particularly evident in areas such as fiscal governance, environmental regulation, and benefit-sharing mechanisms. International arbitration sometimes interprets investment treaties in ways that limit states' ability to fully implement constitutional mandates regarding resource management for public benefit. However, all three countries have developed adaptive approaches to managing this tension, including more sophisticated treaty negotiation, strategic litigation in domestic courts, and institutional capacity building.

The institutional frameworks for resource governance have evolved significantly across all three jurisdictions, reflecting the growing assertion of sovereign authority to shape investment patterns and secure greater benefits from resource exploitation. From early post-independence arrangements emphasizing investment attraction to more recent frameworks prioritizing national participation, environmental protection, and community benefits, these evolving approaches demonstrate the dynamic nature of sovereignty in resource governance. The continued strengthening of these institutional frameworks represents a crucial aspect of how these states navigate tensions between constitutional imperatives and international obligations.

Objective 3: To evaluate the implications of international arbitration decisions on sovereign debt and asset valuation in the natural resource sectors of the selected countries.

The evaluation of financial implications reveals the significant impacts of international arbitration on sovereign debt management and asset valuation in natural resource sectors. When states face adverse arbitral awards, the resulting financial obligations can impose substantial burdens on public finances, with potential implications for debt sustainability and development priorities. Furthermore, the arbitral valuation of natural resource assets using income-based methodologies such as discounted cash flow creates considerable uncertainty regarding potential liabilities, complicating sovereign financial planning.

The financial challenges extend beyond specific award amounts to encompass broader economic impacts, including potential effects on sovereign credit ratings, borrowing costs, and fiscal policy options. These financial dimensions represent important practical constraints on sovereign authority, potentially limiting states' ability to pursue preferred development pathways and public policy objectives. The financial asymmetry between multinational corporations and resource-dependent states further complicates the assertion of sovereign rights through arbitration, creating incentives for settlement in some cases despite strong sovereign claims.

However, all three countries have developed institutional mechanisms for managing these financial challenges, including contingency planning for potential liabilities, sovereign wealth funds for resource revenue management, and strategic approaches to dispute resolution that minimize fiscal impacts. These financial strategies represent an important dimension of how these states have adapted to the challenges posed by international investment arbitration. The continued evolution of these approaches will remain essential as these states seek to balance financial stability with the assertion of sovereign rights in natural resource governance.

Objective 4: To assess the effectiveness of domestic mechanisms in Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana for protecting state sovereignty while maintaining compliance with international investment obligations.

The assessment of domestic mechanisms reveals both strengths and limitations in how effectively these states balance sovereignty protection with investment obligation compliance. All three countries have established increasingly sophisticated legal and institutional frameworks for preventing and managing investment disputes, demonstrating strategic

approaches to navigating the complex terrain of international investment law. These mechanisms include constitutional safeguards, comprehensive legislative frameworks, specialized regulatory agencies, and strategic approaches to dispute prevention and management.

Uganda's Strategic Investment Dispute Management Framework, Nigeria's comprehensive reforms through the Petroleum Industry Act, and Ghana's constitutional requirement for parliamentary ratification of resource agreements all demonstrate innovative approaches to strengthening sovereign positions whilst maintaining compliance with international obligations. These domestic mechanisms have achieved significant success in certain disputes, as demonstrated by Uganda's defence of its taxation measures in the Heritage Oil case and Ghana's partial success in the Balkan Energy arbitration.

However, these domestic mechanisms face important limitations in addressing structural imbalances within the international investment regime. The procedural and substantive asymmetries in investment arbitration, the broad interpretive discretion exercised by arbitral tribunals, and the financial and capacity constraints faced by developing states all create challenges that domestic mechanisms alone cannot fully resolve. Furthermore, the legacy of earlier-generation investment treaties and contracts containing unbalanced provisions continues to constrain the effectiveness of more recent domestic reforms.

The most effective approaches combine domestic mechanisms with strategic engagement in international reform initiatives, including both bilateral treaty renegotiation and participation in regional and continental frameworks. This multi-level approach enables states to address both immediate dispute prevention and management priorities whilst contributing to the longer-term reshaping of the international investment regime. The continued evolution of these comprehensive approaches will remain essential as these states seek to strengthen sovereign rights protection whilst maintaining appropriate investment frameworks for development.

In conclusion, the examination of these four research objectives demonstrates that the relationship between international investment arbitration and state sovereignty in natural resource governance involves complex interactions across multiple dimensions. While international arbitration creates meaningful constraints on certain aspects of sovereign authority, it has also stimulated important legal and institutional innovations that potentially strengthen effective sovereignty in the long term. The experiences of Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana demonstrate that sovereignty in contemporary resource governance involves not only

formal legal authority but also practical governance capacity, institutional adaptation, and strategic international engagement. The continued evolution of these multi-dimensional approaches to sovereignty assertion will remain crucial as these states further develop their natural resource sectors within the global investment framework.

5.4 Recommendations for Strengthening Sovereign Rights Protection

Based on the comparative analysis of Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana's experiences with international investment arbitration, several important recommendations emerge for strengthening sovereign rights protection in natural resource governance. These recommendations address legal frameworks, institutional capacity, treaty negotiation, and regional coordination, providing practical guidance for resource-rich African states seeking to better navigate the complex terrain of international investment law.

5.4.1 Legal and Policy Recommendations

A fundamental recommendation concerns the strengthening of constitutional and legislative frameworks governing natural resource ownership and management. Resource-rich states should establish clear constitutional provisions regarding resource ownership that explicitly recognize the state's authority to regulate natural resources for public benefit. These constitutional provisions should be complemented by comprehensive legislative frameworks that establish detailed parameters for investment in natural resource sectors, including specific provisions regarding taxation authority, environmental standards, local content requirements, and community benefits. Uganda's Petroleum (Exploration, Development and Production) Act 2013, Nigeria's Petroleum Industry Act 2021, and Ghana's Petroleum (Exploration and Production) Act 2016 all provide valuable models for establishing robust legislative foundations for resource governance.

States should further develop more sophisticated approaches to contractual stabilization that preserve essential regulatory space whilst providing appropriate certainty for investors. Rather than broad freezing clauses that prevent any regulatory evolution, states should adopt more balanced approaches such as economic equilibrium provisions that preserve the right to regulate while addressing legitimate investor concerns regarding the financial implications of

regulatory changes. These balanced stabilization approaches enable states to implement necessary regulatory reforms in areas such as environmental protection and community relations whilst maintaining viable investment frameworks.

Transparency and accountability mechanisms should be strengthened as essential safeguards for sovereign rights protection. Resource-rich states should establish comprehensive frameworks for transparency in contract negotiation, revenue management, and regulatory decision-making. Nigeria's implementation of the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative, Ghana's Petroleum Revenue Management Act provisions for revenue transparency, and Uganda's Public Finance Management Act requirements for petroleum revenue reporting demonstrate valuable approaches to enhancing transparency in resource governance. These transparency mechanisms potentially strengthen state positions in investment disputes by demonstrating legitimate public interest motivations for regulatory measures.

Furthermore, states should establish robust frameworks for community participation in resource governance decisions. Ghana's requirement for community development agreements in mining operations and Nigeria's host community provisions in the Petroleum Industry Act provide models for ensuring that local communities directly affected by resource exploitation have meaningful input into governance decisions and receive appropriate benefits. These community participation frameworks potentially strengthen the legitimacy of regulatory measures and provide additional grounds for defending sovereign actions in investment disputes.

5.4.2 Institutional Capacity Development

A critical recommendation concerns the strengthening of institutional capacity for managing investment relationships and disputes. Resource-rich states should establish dedicated units within justice ministries or attorney-general departments focused on investment treaty negotiation, dispute prevention, and arbitration management. Uganda's Strategic Investment Dispute Management Framework provides a valuable model for establishing comprehensive institutional approaches to handling investment disputes, including mechanisms for early identification of potential disputes, inter-agency coordination, and strategic management of proceedings when disputes arise.

States should further invest in developing specialized expertise in international investment law within government legal departments, regulatory agencies, and state-owned enterprises. This capacity development should include not only legal expertise but also technical knowledge regarding the financial, environmental, and social dimensions of natural resource governance. The establishment of knowledge management systems to retain institutional memory regarding investment relationships and disputes represents an important aspect of this capacity development.

Coordination mechanisms between different government agencies involved in natural resource governance should be strengthened to ensure consistent approaches to investment protection across different regulatory domains. These coordination frameworks enable more coherent engagement with international investment obligations, reducing vulnerability to claims based on inconsistent treatment or regulatory incoherence. Nigeria's inter-ministerial committees for petroleum governance and Ghana's multi-agency oversight of mining operations demonstrate valuable approaches to enhancing coordination in resource governance.

States should also establish robust frameworks for financial risk assessment and management regarding investment disputes. These frameworks should include mechanisms for evaluating potential financial exposure from investment claims, contingency planning for adverse awards, and strategic approaches to dispute resolution that minimize fiscal impacts. The integration of these financial risk assessment mechanisms into broader fiscal planning and sovereign debt management represents an important dimension of institutional capacity for handling investment disputes.

5.4.3 Strategic Approaches to Treaty Negotiation and Implementation

Resource-rich states should adopt more strategic approaches to investment treaty negotiation, with careful attention to preserving essential regulatory space for sustainable development. New investment agreements should include explicit provisions recognizing the right to regulate for legitimate public interest objectives, including environmental protection, public health, and development considerations. These provisions should be complemented by appropriate exceptions for taxation measures, environmental regulations, and other areas of essential sovereign authority.

States should further incorporate more precise definitions of investment protection standards in treaty negotiations, reducing interpretive uncertainty and potential constraints on sovereign authority. The fair and equitable treatment standard, in particular, should be clearly defined to prevent expansive interpretations that unduly constrain legitimate regulatory evolution. Similarly, indirect expropriation provisions should clearly exclude non-discriminatory regulatory measures designed to protect legitimate public welfare objectives.

The inclusion of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms in investment agreements represents another important recommendation. States should incorporate requirements for negotiation, mediation, or conciliation before formal arbitration proceedings, creating opportunities for more balanced and context-sensitive dispute resolution. Furthermore, investment agreements should establish limitations on the availability of arbitration for certain types of disputes, particularly those involving taxation measures or other core sovereign functions.

States should also consider inserting provisions requiring the exhaustion of domestic remedies before international arbitration becomes available. This approach strengthens the role of domestic courts in resolving investment disputes and potentially enhances the coherence between domestic and international legal frameworks. Ghana's investment legislation containing provisions regarding domestic dispute resolution before international arbitration provides a valuable model for this approach.

5.4.4 Regional and Continental Coordination

A final set of recommendations concerns the strengthening of regional and continental approaches to investment governance. Resource-rich African states should actively engage with initiatives such as the African Continental Free Trade Agreement Investment Protocol, contributing to the development of investment frameworks that better reflect African development priorities and sovereign interests. These regional frameworks potentially establish more balanced approaches to investment protection and create opportunities for harmonized standards across jurisdictions.

States should further strengthen regional capacity development initiatives in international investment law, creating mechanisms for shared learning and expertise development across countries. The African Legal Support Facility and similar regional institutions provide valuable

platforms for enhancing collective capacity to handle investment disputes effectively. The pooling of resources and expertise at the regional level potentially enables more sophisticated engagement with international investment frameworks than individual states could achieve independently.

The development of regional arbitration centres represents another important recommendation for strengthening sovereign positions in dispute resolution. By establishing arbitration venues within the region with arbitrators more familiar with African development contexts and legal traditions, states potentially improve the contextual understanding applied in investment dispute resolution. The Cairo Regional Centre for International Commercial Arbitration and similar institutions provide models for developing regional expertise in investment arbitration.

In conclusion, these recommendations for strengthening sovereign rights protection address multiple dimensions of the relationship between international investment arbitration and state sovereignty in natural resource governance. By enhancing legal frameworks, building institutional capacity, adopting strategic approaches to treaty negotiation, and strengthening regional coordination, resource-rich African states can better navigate the complex terrain of international investment law whilst maintaining essential sovereign authority over natural resources. The implementation of these recommendations will require sustained commitment and strategic vision but offers significant potential for establishing more balanced frameworks for investor-state relations that better serve national development objectives.

5.5 Areas for Further Research

The comparative analysis of Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana's experiences with international investment arbitration has revealed several important areas requiring additional scholarly attention. These areas represent both knowledge gaps in current understanding and emerging challenges that will likely shape the evolution of natural resource governance in the coming years. By identifying these areas for further research, this study aims to stimulate additional scholarly inquiry that can further enhance understanding of the complex relationship between international investment arbitration and state sovereignty.

5.5.1 Empirical Research on Regulatory Chill

A crucial area requiring further investigation concerns the empirical dimensions of regulatory chill in natural resource governance. While the theoretical literature has extensively discussed the potential for investment treaty obligations to constrain legitimate regulatory action, more empirical research is needed regarding how these constraints actually influence policy development in resource-rich African states. Such research should examine decision-making processes within government ministries and regulatory agencies to determine how consideration of potential investment claims shapes regulatory approaches, particularly in politically sensitive areas such as environmental protection, taxation, and community benefits. This empirical work would provide valuable insights into the practical dimensions of sovereignty constraints that extend beyond formal legal limitations to encompass subtle influences on regulatory development.

5.5.2 Valuation Methodologies and Asset Assessment

The valuation methodologies applied in natural resource investment disputes represent another important area for further research. Current approaches to asset valuation, particularly the application of discounted cash flow methodology in arbitral proceedings, raise fundamental questions about appropriate discount rates, production projections, and price forecasts. Further research should examine how these methodologies affect compensation determinations in natural resource disputes and explore alternative approaches that might better balance investor protection with state interests in resource management. This research has significant implications for sovereign debt management and financial planning in resource-rich states facing investment claims.

5.5.3 Regional Harmonization of Investment Frameworks

The development of regional and continental approaches to investment governance in Africa represents a promising but understudied area requiring additional research. While initiatives such as the African Continental Free Trade Agreement Investment Protocol and regional investment frameworks within economic communities show potential for establishing more balanced approaches to investment protection, further research is needed regarding the

implementation challenges and effectiveness of these regional frameworks. This research should examine how regional approaches interact with existing bilateral investment treaties, domestic legislation, and international arbitration mechanisms, assessing their potential for reshaping the investment landscape in ways more favourable to sovereign interests.

5.5.4 Capacity Development and Knowledge Transfer

Further research is needed regarding effective approaches to building institutional capacity for managing investment relationships and disputes in resource-rich developing states. While this study has identified capacity constraints as a significant challenge in all three focus countries, additional research should examine successful capacity development initiatives, identify transferable best practices, and explore innovative approaches to knowledge management and retention. This research has important practical implications for strengthening state positions in investment arbitration and enhancing sovereign authority in resource governance.

5.5.5 Community Participation and Benefit-Sharing

The relationship between community participation in resource governance and sovereign authority in investment relations represents another important area for further research. While this study has identified community benefit-sharing mechanisms in all three countries, additional research should examine how these mechanisms influence the legitimacy of regulatory measures and strengthen state positions in defending public interest regulations. This research should explore innovative approaches to integrating community perspectives into resource governance whilst maintaining coherent national frameworks for investment management.

5.5.6 Climate Change Implications for Resource Governance

An emerging area requiring urgent scholarly attention concerns the implications of climate change imperatives for investment protection in natural resource sectors. As states implement more stringent climate policies, including restrictions on fossil fuel exploitation and enhanced environmental standards, further research is needed regarding how these measures interact with

existing investment protection obligations. This research should examine how states can navigate the transition to low-carbon economies whilst managing potential investment claims arising from regulatory changes affecting established resource operations.

5.5.7 Technology and Data Sovereignty

The rapid evolution of technology in natural resource extraction raises important questions about data sovereignty and regulatory authority that require further research. As resource operations become increasingly digitized, with extensive data collection regarding resource characteristics, extraction processes, and environmental impacts, additional research is needed regarding ownership and control of this data within international investment frameworks. This research should examine how states can assert sovereignty over resource data whilst maintaining appropriate investment protection frameworks.

5.5.8 Interdisciplinary Methodological Approaches

Finally, further research should explore interdisciplinary methodological approaches that can enhance understanding of the complex relationship between investment arbitration and state sovereignty. While legal analysis provides essential insights into formal institutional arrangements, the integration of perspectives from political economy, development studies, and international relations could provide a more comprehensive understanding of how sovereignty operates across multiple dimensions in contemporary resource governance. This methodological innovation has significant potential for developing more nuanced approaches to strengthening sovereign rights within international investment frameworks.

In conclusion, these areas for further research represent important opportunities to deepen understanding of how resource-rich African states can better navigate the complex terrain of international investment law whilst maintaining essential sovereign authority over natural resources. By addressing these knowledge gaps and emerging challenges, future research can contribute to the development of more balanced frameworks for investor-state relations that better serve national development objectives whilst providing appropriate protection for legitimate investment interests.

5.6 Overall Conclusion

This research has examined the complex tension between international investment arbitration and state sovereignty in natural resource governance through a comparative analysis of Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana's experiences. The findings reveal a nuanced reality in which sovereignty operates not as an absolute concept but as a multidimensional framework constantly navigating between domestic imperatives and international obligations. The experiences of these three resource-rich African states demonstrate that effective sovereignty in contemporary resource governance involves sophisticated engagement with international frameworks rather than rigid assertions of absolute authority.

The constitutional and legal foundations for resource ownership in all three countries establish clear normative bases for sovereign authority, yet the practical exercise of this authority occurs within a web of international obligations that create significant constraints on certain dimensions of sovereign action. The impact of investment arbitration on taxation powers, regulatory autonomy, and financial planning demonstrates how international obligations can limit state discretion in core areas of resource governance. However, these constraints have also stimulated important legal and institutional innovations that potentially strengthen effective sovereignty in the long term.

The evolution of legal and institutional mechanisms for protecting sovereign rights across all three jurisdictions demonstrates growing sophistication in navigating the complex terrain of international investment law. From Uganda's Strategic Investment Dispute Management Framework to Nigeria's comprehensive reforms through the Petroleum Industry Act and Ghana's constitutional safeguards for resource agreements, these countries have developed increasingly robust approaches to the assertion of sovereign authority within international constraints. These adaptive responses suggest that sovereignty in contemporary resource governance involves not only formal legal authority but also practical governance capacity and strategic international engagement.

Regional and continental initiatives for reforming investment governance further demonstrate how African states are collectively seeking to reshape the international investment regime to better accommodate sovereign interests and development priorities. Through participation in frameworks such as the African Continental Free Trade Agreement Investment Protocol, these states are contributing to the development of more balanced approaches to investment protection that preserve essential regulatory space whilst providing appropriate certainty for

investors. These collective efforts potentially strengthen individual states' positions by establishing harmonized standards across jurisdictions and creating greater bargaining power in international forums.

Looking forward, the continued evolution of sovereignty in natural resource governance will likely involve further refinement of both domestic and international frameworks. At the domestic level, resource-rich African states should continue strengthening legal foundations, building institutional capacity, and developing sophisticated approaches to dispute prevention and management. At the international level, continued engagement with reform initiatives offers opportunities for reshaping investment frameworks to better reflect the legitimate interests of resource-rich developing nations. This multi-level approach offers the most promising pathway for navigating the complex relationship between investment protection and sovereign authority.

The experiences of Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana offer valuable lessons for other resource-rich developing nations seeking to maximize benefits from natural resource exploitation whilst maintaining essential sovereign authority. These lessons include the importance of clear constitutional and legislative frameworks, robust institutional capacity, strategic approaches to treaty negotiation and implementation, effective transparency mechanisms, and meaningful community engagement in resource governance. By implementing approaches that incorporate these principles, resource-rich developing nations can better protect legitimate sovereign interests while maintaining appropriate frameworks for international investment.

The tension between international arbitration and sovereign states in natural resource governance undoubtedly remains a fundamental challenge for resource-rich African countries. However, the evolution of more sophisticated approaches to managing this tension suggests that states are not merely passive recipients of international constraints but active participants in shaping how these constraints operate in practice. Through continuous learning, adaptation, and strategic engagement, these states are developing more balanced frameworks that can better accommodate both investment protection and sovereign regulatory authority.

In conclusion, this research contributes to understanding the evolving nature of sovereignty in contemporary natural resource governance, demonstrating how states navigate complex intersections between domestic and international legal frameworks to assert effective sovereign control over national resources. While international investment arbitration creates meaningful constraints on certain aspects of sovereign authority, it has also stimulated important legal and

institutional innovations that potentially strengthen effective governance in the long term. The path forward lies not in the rejection of international investment frameworks but rather in their thoughtful recalibration to better accommodate the legitimate sovereign interests of resource-rich states. Through such recalibration, international investment law can better fulfil its intended purpose of supporting sustainable development whilst respecting the fundamental sovereign rights of all nations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Books

Amazu A Asouzu, *International Commercial Arbitration and African States: Practice, Participation and Institutional Development* (Cambridge University Press 2001).

Denis J Galligan, *Due Process and Fair Procedures* (Oxford University Press 1996).

Dominic Dagbanja, *The Investment Treaty Regime and Public Interest Regulation in Africa* (Oxford University Press 2024).

Gus Van Harten, *Investment Treaty Arbitration and Public Law* (Oxford University Press 2007).

James Thuo Gathii, *War, Commerce, and International Law* (Oxford University Press 2010).

John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* (Harvard University Press 1971).

Kate Miles, *The Origins of International Investment Law: Empire, Environment and the Safeguarding of Capital* (Cambridge University Press 2013)

M Sornarajah, *Resistance and Change in the International Law on Foreign Investment* (Cambridge University Press 2015)

M Sornarajah, *The International Law on Foreign Investment* (4th edn, Cambridge University Press 2017)

Makane Moïse Mbengue and Stefanie Schacherer, *The Africa Mining Vision: Towards a Holistic Approach to Mineral Governance?* (Springer 2018)

Muthucumaraswamy Sornarajah, *The International Law on Foreign Investment* (4th edn, Cambridge University Press 2017).

Tarcisio Gazzini, *Interpretation of International Investment Treaties* (Hart Publishing 2016).

Tarcisio Gazzini, *The Interpretation of International Investment Treaties* (Bloomsbury 2016).

Tarcisio Gazzini, *The Interpretation of International Investment Treaties* (Hart Publishing 2016)

William Richard Scott, *Institutions and Organizations: Ideas, Interests, and Identities* (SAGE 2014).

Won Kidane, *The Culture of Investment Arbitration* (Oxford University Press 2017).

B. Book Chapters

Ademola Oluborode Jegede, 'Protecting Indigenous Peoples' land rights in global climate governance' in Sébastien Duyck, Sébastien Jodoin and Alyssa Johl (eds), *Routledge Handbook of Human Rights and Climate Governance* (Routledge 2018).

Badru Bukenya and Jaqueline Nakaiza, 'Closed but Ordered: How the Political Settlement Shapes Uganda's Deals with International Oil Companies' in Arnim Langer, Ukoha Ukiwo and Pamela Mbabazi (eds), *Oil Wealth and Development in Uganda and Beyond: Prospects, Opportunities and Challenges* (Leuven University Press 2020).

Benedict Kingsbury and Stephan Schill, 'Investor-State Arbitration as Governance: Fair and Equitable Treatment, Proportionality and the Emerging Global Administrative Law' in *ICCA Congress Series* (2009).

Chilenye Nwapi, 'A Survey of the Literature on Local Content Policies in the Oil and Gas Industry in East Africa' in T Binns, K Lynch and E Nel (eds), *The Routledge Handbook of African Development* (Routledge 2018)

Cyril Obi, 'Oil and Development in Africa: Some Lessons from the Oil Factor in Nigeria for the Sudan' in Luke Patey (ed), *Oil in Sudan: Lessons from Oil Management in Asia and Africa* (Danish Institute for International Studies 2007).

Emilia Onyema, 'Rethinking the Role of African National Courts in Arbitration' in Emilia Onyema (ed), *Rethinking the Role of African National Courts in Arbitration* (Kluwer Law International 2018).

Emmanuel Laryea, 'Evolution of International Investment Law and Implications for Africa' in Nicholas Francis Botchway (ed), *Natural Resource Investment and Africa's Development* (Edward Elgar Publishing 2011).

Ibironke Odumosu-Ayanu, 'Governments, Investors and Local Communities: Analysis of a Multi-Actor Investment Contract Framework' in Freya Baetens (ed), *Investment Law within International Law: Integrationist Perspectives* (Cambridge University Press 2013)

Jacqueline Peel and Kyla Tienhaara, 'Regulatory Chill and the Threat of Arbitration' in Charles N Brower and Stephan W Schill (eds), *Research Handbook on International Investment Law* (Edward Elgar 2019)

Joe Oloka-Onyango, 'Courting the Oil Curse or Playing by the Rules? An Analysis of the Legal and Regulatory Framework Governing Oil in Uganda' in Arnim Langer, Ukoha Ukiwo and Pamela Mbabazi (eds), *Oil Wealth and Development in Uganda and Beyond: Prospects, Opportunities and Challenges* (Leuven University Press 2020).

Julien Chaisse and Jamieson Kirkwood, 'Chinese Puzzle: Anatomy of the (Invisible) Belt and Road Investment Treaty' in Julien Chaisse (ed), *China's International Investment Strategy: Bilateral, Regional, and Global Law and Policy* (Oxford University Press 2019)

Mark Van Hoecke, 'Legal Doctrine: Which Method(s) for What Kind of Discipline?' in Mark Van Hoecke (ed), *Methodologies of Legal Research* (Hart Publishing 2011).

Mohammed Amidu, Rester Togormey and Dominic Dokbilla Naab, 'Natural Resources Tax Administration and Reforms in Africa' in Mohammed Amidu, Abdallah Ali-Nakyea and Joshua Yindenaba Abor (eds), *Taxation and Management of Natural Resources in Africa* (Springer Nature 2024).

Oyeniyi Abe, 'Untying the Gordian Knot: Re-Assessing the Impact of Business and Human Rights Principles on Extractive Resource Governance in Sub-Saharan Africa' in *American University International Law Review* (2016).

Peter Muchlinski, 'The Framework of Investment Protection: The Content of BITs' in Karl Sauvant and Lisa Sachs (eds), *The Effect of Treaties on Foreign Direct Investment* (Oxford University Press 2009).

Tarcisio Gazzini, 'Nigeria and International Investment Law' in Emilia Onyema (ed), *The Transformation of Arbitration in Africa: The Role of Arbitral Institutions* (Kluwer Law International 2016).

Tsatsu Tsikata, 'Re-Shaping the Framework for Petroleum Exploration and Production – Ghana's Experience' in Einar H Bandlien (ed), *Policy and Management of Petroleum Resources* (Nopec a.s 1990).

William Park, 'Arbitrability and Tax' in Loukas Mistelis and Stavros Brekoulakis (eds), *Arbitrability: International and Comparative Perspectives* (Kluwer Law International 2009).

Willy Mutunga, 'Constitution-Making and Extractive Governance in Kenya' in Tony Addison and Alan Roe (eds), *Extractive Industries: The Management of Resources as a Driver of Sustainable Development* (Oxford University Press 2018)

Wilson Bahati Kazi, 'Getting a Good Deal?: An Analysis of Uganda's Oil Fiscal Regime' in Arnim Langer, Ukoha Ukiwo and Pamela Mbabazi (eds), *Oil Wealth and Development in Uganda and Beyond: Prospects, Opportunities, and Challenges* (Leuven University Press 2020).

Yinka Omorogbe, 'Resource Control and Benefit Sharing in Nigeria' in Lila Barrera-Hernández and others (eds), *Sharing the Costs and Benefits of Energy and Resource Activity: Legal Change and Impact on Communities* (Oxford University Press 2016).

C. Journal Articles

Anne M Kjær and others, 'When 'Pockets of Effectiveness' Matter Politically: Extractive Industry Regulation and Taxation in Uganda and Tanzania' (2021) 8 The Extractive Industries and Society 294.

Annette Kuteesa and others, 'Public Expenditure Governance in Uganda's Agricultural Extension System' (2018) ACODE Policy Research Paper Series, No. 84.

Anthea Roberts and Taylor St John, 'UNCITRAL and ISDS Reforms: Segmentation, Incrementalism, and Possible Impasses' (2020) 21 Journal of World Investment & Trade 467

Austin D Ablo and Ragnhild Overa, 'Networks, Trust and Capital Mobilisation: Challenges of Embedded Local Entrepreneurial Strategies in Ghana's Oil and Gas Industry' (2015) 53 Journal of Modern African Studies 391.

Austin D Ablo, 'Local Content and Participation in Ghana's Oil and Gas Industry: Can Enterprise Development Make a Difference?' (2015) 2 The Extractive Industries and Society 320.

Badru Bukenya and William Muhumuza, 'The politics of core public sector reform in Uganda: Behind the façade' (2017) ESID Working Paper No. 85.

Brian Z Tamanaha, 'Understanding Legal Pluralism: Past to Present, Local to Global' (2008) 30 Sydney Law Review 375.

Christoph Schreuer, 'Fair and Equitable Treatment in Arbitral Practice' (2005) 6 Journal of World Investment & Trade 357.

Cyril Obi, 'Oil Extraction, Dispossession, Resistance, and Conflict in Nigeria's Oil-Rich Niger Delta' (2010) 30 Canadian Journal of Development Studies 219.

Delia Sanchez Trancon and Xavier Leflaive, 'The implementation of the Polluter Pays principle in the context of the Water Framework Directive' (2024) OECD Environment Working Papers, No. 238.

Diana Rosert, 'The Stakes Are High: A Review of the Financial Costs of Investment Treaty Arbitration' (2014) 15 Journal of International Economic Law 447

Dominic Dagbanja, 'The Development Objective as an Imperative in Interpretation of International Investment Agreements' (2018) 44 The University of Western Australia Law Review 144.

Dominic N Dagbanja, 'The Investment Treaty Regime and Development Policy Space in Ghana' (2016) 17 Journal of World Investment & Trade 834.

Emeka Duruigbo, 'Permanent Sovereignty and Peoples' Ownership of Natural Resources in International Law' (2006) 38 George Washington International Law Review 33.

Emilia Onyema, 'African Participation in the ICSID System: Appointment and Disqualification of Arbitrators' (2019) 34 ICSID Review 466.

Emilia Onyema, 'Effective Utilization of Arbitrators and Arbitration Institutions in Africa by Appointors' (2008) 11 VJ 307.

Emilia Onyema, 'Regional Arbitration Institution for ECOWAS: Lessons from OHADA Common Court of Justice and Arbitration' (2014) 17 International Arbitration Law Review 99.

Emmanuel Gaillard and Yas Banifatemi, 'The Meaning of "and" in Article 42(1), Second Sentence, of the Washington Convention' (2003) 18 ICSID Review 375.

Emmanuel Kasimbazi, 'Environmental Regulation of Oil and Gas Exploration and Production in Uganda' (2012) 30 Journal of Energy & Natural Resources Law 185.

Emmanuel Kasimbazi, 'Uganda's Petroleum Experience: A History of Exploration and Production' (2021) 39 Journal of Energy & Natural Resources Law 181.

Emmanuel Laryea, 'Evolution of Investment Dispute Resolution in Africa' (2020) 35 ICSID Review 577.

Hakeem Seriki, 'Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards and Public Policy – A Note of Caution' (2000) 3 Arbitration International 351.

Hamed El-Kady and Mustaqeem De Gama, 'The Reform of Investment Treaties: An African Perspective' (2020) 21 Journal of World Investment & Trade 112.

Hamed El-Kady and Mustaqeem De Gama, 'The Reform of the International Investment Regime: An African Perspective' (2019) 34 ICSID Review - Foreign Investment Law Journal 482

Hamed El-Kady and Mustaqeem De Gama, 'The Reform of the International Investment Regime: An African Perspective' (2019) 34 ICSID Review - Foreign Investment Law Journal 482.

Hermas Abudu and Rockson Sai, 'Examining Prospects and Challenges of Ghana's Petroleum Industry: A Systematic Review' (2025) 6 Energy Reports 841.

Ibrahima Diallo, 'The ICSID Rule of Arbitration and the Protection of Foreign Investment in Developing Countries' (2020) 31 King's Law Journal 442.

Ignatius Joseph Obeng, Edward Asiedu Ofori and Isaac Eshun, 'Land Ownership Rights And Access To Farmlands By Farmers And Herders In The Kwahu East District in The Eastern Region Of Ghana' (2023) 8 International Journal of Humanities, Art and Social Studies (IJHAS) 9.

James E Anderson and others, 'Trade and Investment in the Global Economy' (2017) NBER Working Paper 23566.

James Gathii and Sergio Puig, 'Introduction to the Symposium on Investor-State Dispute Settlement in Africa' (2016) 110 AJIL Unbound 225.

James Gathii, 'The Incomplete Transformation of Investment Law in Africa' (2018) 18 Oregon Review of International Law 331.

James Thuo Gathii, 'Reform and Retrenchment in International Investment Law' (2021) SSRN Papers.

James Thuo Gathii, 'The Neoliberal Turn in Regional Trade Agreements' (2011) 86 Washington Law Review 421

Jarrod Wong And Abdallah Abuelfutuh Ali, 'The Legislative Stabilization Clause' (2022) 55 International Law And Politics 67.

Jesse Salah Ovadia, 'Local Content Policies and Petro-Development in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Comparative Analysis' (2016) 49 Resources Policy 20.

Karin Buhmann, 'Public Regulators and CSR: The "Social Licence to Operate" in Recent United Nations Instruments on Business and Human Rights and the Juridification of CSR' (2016) 136 Journal of Business Ethics 699

Kevin P Gallagher, Sarah Sklar and Rachel Thrasher, 'Quantifying the Policy Space for Regulating Capital Flows in Trade and Investment Treaties' (G-24 Working Paper 2019).

Kingsley David Kojo Nyanyi, 'Prospects And Challenges Of The Ghana Investment Promotion Centre (GIPC) In Promoting Foreign Direct Investment In Ghana' (2020) 11 IJONESS 139.

Kweku Ainuson, 'Enforcement of international and national arbitration awards in Ghana – legal basis, challenges and obstacles' (2018) 4 KAS African Law Study Library - Librairie Africaine d'Etudes Juridiques 407.

Laura Paler, 'Oil discoveries and political windfalls: evidence on presidential support in Uganda' (2023) 11 Political Science Research and Methods 903.

Laura Smith, James Van Alstine and Anne Tallontire, 'The Making of an Oil Frontier: Territorialisation Dynamics in Uganda's Emerging Oil Industry' (2022) 12 The Extractive Industries and Society 101188.

Leon E Trakman, 'Choosing Domestic Courts over Investor-State Arbitration: Australia's Repudiation of the Status Quo' (2012) 35 UNSWLJ 979.

Lorenzo Cotula, 'Investment Treaties and Sustainable Development: Investment Liberalisation in Africa's Mining Sector' (2016) 17 Journal of World Investment & Trade 148.

Lorenzo Cotula, 'Investment treaties and sustainable development: investment liberalisation' (2014) IIED Briefing Paper.

Lorenzo Cotula, 'Land and Investment Treaties: Exploring the Interface' (2016) 5 IIED Briefing Papers 1

Lorenzo Cotula, 'Raising the Bar on Responsible Investment: What Role for Investment Treaties?' (2018) IIED Briefing Papers.

Lorenzo Cotula, 'Reconciling Regulatory Stability and Evolution of Environmental Standards in Investment Contracts: Towards a Rethink of Stabilization Clauses' (2008) 1 Journal of World Energy Law and Business 158

Lorenzo Cotula, 'Reconciling Regulatory Stability and Evolution of Environmental Standards in Investment Contracts' (2017) 18 Journal of World Energy Law & Business 45.

Lorenzo Cotula, 'Reconciling Regulatory Stability and Evolution of Environmental Standards in Investment Contracts: Towards a rethink of stabilization clauses' (2008) 1 Journal of World Energy Law & Business 158.

Makane Moïse Mbengue and Stefanie Schacherer, 'The "Africanization" of International Investment Law: The Pan-African Investment Code and the reform of the international investment regime' (2017) 18 Journal of World Investment & Trade 414.

Makane Moïse Mbengue, 'Africa's Voice in the Formation, Shaping and Redesign of International Investment Law' (2019) 34 ICSID Review 455.

Malcolm Langford, Daniel Behn and Runar Lie, 'The Revolving Door in International Investment Arbitration' (2017) 20 Journal of International Economic Law 301

Mathias M Siems, 'The Taxonomy of Interdisciplinary Legal Research: Finding the Way Out of the Desert' (2009) 7 Journal of Commonwealth Law and Legal Education 5.

Matthew Tyce, Abdul Abdulai and Kojo P Asante, 'Confronting Shifting Energy Landscapes and Contested Domestic Politics: Ghana's National Oil Company and the Global Energy Transition' (2024) 119 Energy Research & Social Science 103901.

Michael Faure and Wanli Ma, 'Investor-State Arbitration: Economic and Empirical Perspectives' (2020) 41 Michigan Journal of International Law 1.

Mirjam A Ros-Tonen and others, 'Human Insecurities in Gold Mining: A Systematic Review of Evidence from Ghana' (2021) 8 The Extractive Industries and Society 100951.

Mukalere Hope Mwagale and Tajudeen Sanni, 'International Tax Arbitration And Petroleum Dispute Resolution: A Case Study Of Uganda' (2019) ResearchGate.

Nadine Panjrath, 'The Cost of Investment Treaty Arbitration' (2018) 35 Journal of International Arbitration 1.

Nancy A Welsh, 'Making Deals in Court-Connected Mediation: What's Justice Got to Do With It?' (2001) 79 Washington University Law Quarterly 787.

Okechukwu Ejims, 'The Impact of Nigerian International Petroleum Contracts on Environmental and Human Rights of Indigenous Communities' (2013) 21 African Journal of International and Comparative Law 345.

Olabisi D Akinkugbe, 'Reverse Contributors? African State Parties, ICSID, and the Development of International Investment Law' (2019) 34 ICSID Review 434.

Olufemi Amao, 'Corporate Social Responsibility, Multinational Corporations and the Law in Nigeria: Controlling Multinationals in Host States' (2008) 52 Journal of African Law 89.

Paul J DiMaggio and Walter W Powell, 'The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields' (1983) 48 American Sociological Review 147.

Paul Stevens and others, 'Resource Curse Revisited' (2015) Research Paper (Chatham House, Royal Institute of International Affairs)

Peter Kasaija, 'Oil Agreements in Uganda: A Tale of Two Disputes' (2016) 4 Journal of African Law and Natural Resources 87.

Peter Quartey and Emanuel Abbey, 'Ghana's Oil Governance Regime: Challenges and Policy Solutions' (2018) CRPD Working Paper No. 70.

Ransford Gyampo, 'Transparency and Accountability in the Management of Oil Revenues in Ghana' (2016) 51 Africa Spectrum 79.

Rebecca Hollander-Blumoff and Tom R Tyler, 'Procedural Justice and the Rule of Law: Fostering Legitimacy in Alternative Dispute Resolution' (2011) 30 Journal of Dispute Resolution 1.

Rhuks Temitope Ako, Lawrence Ogechukwu Obokoh and Patrick Okonmah, 'Forging Ahead: The ECOWAS Common Investment Market and the Regional Investment Policy Complement' (2019) 27 African Journal of International and Comparative Law 81.

Rhuks Temitope Ako, 'Nigeria's Land Use Act: An Anti-Thesis to Environmental Justice' (2009) 53 Journal of African Law 289.

Richard Woolley, 'Expropriation, Regulation and Taxation under NAFTA Chapter 11: Toward a Consistent Standard' (2009) 2 Journal of International Dispute Settlement 355

Rob van Gestel and Hans-Wolfgang Micklitz, 'Revitalizing Doctrinal Legal Research in Europe: What About Methodology?' (2011) European University Institute Working Papers.

Rudolf Dolzer, 'Fair and Equitable Treatment: Today's Contours' (2014) 12 Santa Clara Journal of International Law 7.

Sally Engle Merry, 'Legal Pluralism' (1988) 22 Law & Society Review 869.

Sam Hickey, 'The politics of state capacity and development in Africa: Reframing and researching 'pockets of effectiveness' (2019) ESID Working Paper No. 117.

Sara Ghebremusse, 'Conceptualizing the Developmental State in Resource-Rich Sub-Saharan Africa' (2015) 8 Law and Development Review 467.

Sara Seck, 'Human Rights and Investment Law: Bridging the Divide in African Investment Disputes' (2018) 19 Journal of World Investment & Trade 89.

Shafic Suleman and Joshua Jebuntie Zaato, 'Achieving Sustainability in Ghana's Upstream Oil and Gas Sector: The Role of the National Oil Company' (2022) 20 Oil, Gas & Energy Law Intelligence 1.

Soji Oyeranmi and Lawrence Dube, 'The Petroleum Industry Bill and the Nigerian Economy: A Review' (2021) 25 International Journal of Current Research in the Humanities 175.

Solomon Ebobrah, 'Critical Issues in the Human Rights Mandate of the ECOWAS Court of Justice' (2010) 54 Journal of African Law 1.

Stephan Schill, 'Deference in Investment Treaty Arbitration: Reconceptualizing the Standard of Review' (2012) 3 Journal of International Dispute Settlement 577.

Sufian Jusoh and Hanim Kamaruddin, 'Bridging the Gap: Capacity Building for Investment Treaty Arbitration in Developing Countries' (2021) 38 Journal of International Arbitration 235

Sunday Akinlolu Fagbemi, 'A Critical Analysis of the Mechanisms for Settlement of Investment Disputes in International Arbitration' (2017) 8 NAUJILJ 46.

Susan D Franck, 'Empirically Evaluating Claims About Investment Treaty Arbitration' (2007) 86 North Carolina Law Review 1.

Susan D Franck, 'The Legitimacy Crisis in Investment Treaty Arbitration: Privatizing Public International Law Through Inconsistent Decisions' (2005) 73 Fordham Law Review 1521.

Tarcisio Gazzini, 'Interpretation of International Investment Treaties in Africa' (2017) 18 Journal of World Investment & Trade 231.

Terry Hutchinson, 'The Doctrinal Method: Incorporating Interdisciplinary Methods in Reforming the Law' (2015) 8(3) Erasmus Law Review 130.

Thomas Kendra, 'State Counterclaims in Investment Arbitration - A New Lease of Life?' (2013) 29 Arbitration International 575.

Thomas Kojo Stephens, 'Sustainable Decommissioning in Ghana: Historical Developments, Current Practice and Challenges' (2023) 14 The Journal of Sustainable Development, Law and Policy 81.

Thomas Wälde and George Ndi, 'Stabilizing International Investment Commitments: International Law Versus Contract Interpretation' (1996) 31 Texas International Law Journal 215.

Toni Marzal, 'Conjuring markets: valuation in comparative international economic law' (2024) 27 Journal of International Economic Law 353.

Tony Addison and Alan Roe, 'Extractive Industries: The Management of Resources as a Driver of Sustainable Development' (2018) 44 Oxford Development Studies 45

Uche Ewelukwa Ofodile, 'Africa and International Investment Agreements' (2018) 11 Law & Development Review 1.

Uché Ewelukwa Ofodile, 'Africa and International Investment Dispute Resolution: From Resistance and Withdrawal to Reform' (2020) 91 University of Colorado Law Review 1.

Won Kidane, 'Contemporary International Investment Law Principles: A "Africanized" Perspective' (2018) 59 Harvard International Law Journal 421

Won Kidane, 'The China-Africa Factor in the Contemporary ICSID Legitimacy Debate' (2014) 35 University of Pennsylvania Journal of International Law 559.

Won Kidane, 'The Culture of Investment Arbitration: An African Perspective' (2019) 34 ICSID Review - Foreign Investment Law Journal 411

Won Kidane, 'The Culture of Investment Arbitration: An African Perspective' (2019) 34 ICSID Review - Foreign Investment Law Journal 411.

Yinka Omorogbe, 'The Legal Framework for the Production of Petroleum in Nigeria' (1987) 5 Journal of Energy & Natural Resources Law 273.

Zainab Usman, 'The Successes and Failures of Economic Reform in Nigeria's Post-Military Political Settlement' (2020) 119 African Affairs 1.

D. Reports

African Legal Support Facility, 'Building legal capacity within the extractives sector in Uganda' (ALSF 2024).

African Legal Support Facility, 'Building Legal Capacity within the Extractives Sector in Uganda' (ALSF 2024) https://africanlegalsupportfacility.com accessed 17 February 2025

African Tax Administration Forum, 'Annual Report 2023: Building efficient and effective tax administrations in Africa' (ATAF 2023).

Amnesty International, 'Nigeria: Petroleum, Pollution and Poverty in the Niger Delta' (Amnesty International Publications 2009).

Andrew Bauer, Paul Bagabo and Thomas Scurfield, 'Setting Up Uganda's National Mining Company to Boost Sustainable Development' (Natural Resource Governance Institute 2025).

Angelo Izama and Hashim Wasswa Mulangwa, 'Understanding The Tax Dispute: Heritage, Tullow, And The Government Of Uganda' (ACODE Infosheet No. 16, 2011).

Diana Rosert, 'The Stakes Are High: A review of the financial costs of investment treaty arbitration' (International Institute for Sustainable Development 2014).

East African Community Secretariat, 'Comparative Analysis of Petroleum Legislation in the EAC Partner States' (EAC 2020).

Ghana Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative, 'Ghana EITI Annual Progress Report 2022' (GHEITI 2023).

ICSID, 'Annual Report 2018' (World Bank 2018).

International Institute for Sustainable Development, 'Award in Heritage v. Uganda case surfaces, revealing details of the arbitration over tax dispute in relation to oil field sale' (Investment Treaty News, 15 April 2016).

Lorenzo Cotula, 'Raising the Bar on Responsible Investment: What Role for Investment Treaties?' (IIED Briefing Papers, 2018)

Luke Patey, 'Report Title: Oil in Uganda: Hard bargaining and complex politics in East Africa' (Oxford Institute for Energy Studies 2015).

Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development, 'National Oil and Gas Policy for Uganda' (Republic of Uganda 2018).

Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, 'National Investment Policy' (Republic of Uganda 2019).

Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs, 'Strategic Investment Dispute Management Framework' (Republic of Uganda 2018).

Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs, 'Strategic Investment Dispute Management Framework' (Republic of Uganda 2018)

Pamela K Mbabazi, 'The Oil Industry in Uganda: A Blessing in Disguise or an All Too Familiar Curse?' (2013) Nordiska Afrikainstitutet.

Sam Hickey, 'The Politics of State Capacity and Development in Africa: Reframing and Researching "Pockets of Effectiveness"' (ESID Working Paper No 117, 2019)

Tullow Oil, 'Annual Report and Accounts 2019' (Tullow Oil plc 2020).

Uganda Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (UGEITI), 'UGEITI Report for Fiscal Year 2019-20' (UGEITI 2022).

UNCTAD Investment Policy Hub, 'International Investment Agreements Navigator' (2013).

UNCTAD, 'Investor-State Disputes: Prevention and Alternatives to Arbitration' (2010).

UNCTAD, 'Reform of Investor-State Dispute Settlements: In Search of a Roadmap' (IIA Issues Note No 2, June 2013).

UNCTAD, 'World Investment Report 2019: Special Economic Zones' (UN 2019).

E. Dissertations and Theses

David Kirangwa Sseremba, 'Oil And Community Development In Uganda: Citizens' expectations and participation in the oil and natural gas sector' (Master's dissertation Diaconia University of Applied Sciences 2020).

Mazzin Ezeldin, 'Arbitrability of Tax Disputes in Commercial and Investment Arbitration' (Master's dissertation, Saarland University 2021).

F. Internet Sources

Directorate of Petroleum, 'Petroleum Exploration History' (n.d) https://www.petroleum.go.ug/index.php/who-we-are/who-weare/petroleum-exploration-history accessed on 15 February 2025.

Edward Machin, 'Heritage Oil Commences Arbitration Against Ugandan Government' (CDR News, 7 May 2011) https://www.cdr-news.com/categories/arbitration-adr/heritage-oil-commences-arbitration-against-ugandan-government/ accessed 15 February 2025.

Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs, 'About the Solicitor General's Office' (Republic of Uganda 2024) http://www.justice.go.ug/content/solicitor-general accessed 17 February 2025.

Uganda Revenue Authority, 'Large Taxpayers Office' (URA 2024) https://ura.go.ug accessed 17 February 2025.

UNCTAD, 'International Investment Agreements Navigator: Uganda' (Investment Policy Hub, 2022) https://investmentpolicy.unctad.org/international-investment-agreements/countries/218/uganda accessed 14 February 2025.

G. Newspaper Articles and Press Releases

Agather Atuhaire, 'Uganda vs. Heritage Oil; London Arbitration Resumes 4th December' (URN 2013).

Graham Baxter, 'Heritage Oil Announces Sale of Ugandan Assets to Tullow' (Heritage Oil Press Release, 6 January 2010).

Tullow Oil, 'Tullow agrees farm-down to CNOOC and Total' (Press Release, 2 February 2012).

Uganda Revenue Authority, 'Tax Assessment Notice to Heritage Oil and Gas Ltd' (27 February 2010).