1. John W H Denton AO, Secretary-General of the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC); former DFAT; and former CEO of Corrs Chambers Westgarth

Comments received 11 November 2026

Whatever one's views on the particular features of ISDS, Australian businesses investing abroad must benefit from access to neutral and effective dispute resolution where adequate remedies may not otherwise be available. From a business perspective, I would favour preserving Australia's flexibility to negotiate appropriate protections on a treaty-by-treaty basis, rather than excluding one category of dispute resolution in advance. There is also considerable scope today to design mechanisms that encourage consultation and mediation at an early stage, while retaining arbitration as an ultimate means of resolving disputes where settlement is not possible. In my view, that more calibrated approach would better protect Australia's interests, including those of Australian businesses investing overseas.

The International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) has participated in the UNCITRAL discussions on reform of investor-State dispute settlement. ICC has recognised the need to address legitimate concerns about the functioning of the existing system and has been supportive of meaningful reform. At the same time, our approach has been to favour a framework that preserves choice and flexibility, both for investors and for States, rather than prescribing a single model for the resolution of investment disputes. In our view, a modern investment dispute resolution framework should offer an appropriate range of mechanisms, allowing the parties and States negotiating investment agreements to determine which mechanisms are best suited to their circumstances.

2. Associate Professor Rajesh Sharma, RMIT University

Comments received 11 November 2026

I am of the view that doing away with ISDS Arbitration completely is not a good approach. There will be some disputes which must be resolved fully and finally. So there must be a forum to resolve any issues which parties cannot resolve by themselves or with the help of a third party (eg in Mediation or conciliation). This is also important from granting justice to parties.

While keeping ISDS mechanism, the government can emphasise on using negotiation, mediation or any dispute prevention mechanism in its agreements. ISDS Mediation has been widely accepted in the UNCITRAL Group III as the means of resolving ISDS dispute. Even model clauses have been agreed to be used in the future as well as the current BITS and FTAs (investment part). You may note that Australia has been actively participating in UNCITRAL Group III (ISDS Reform) discussions.

Australia is a signatory to the Singapore Convention and during the deliberation of the Singapore Convention there was a consensus that the Singapore Convention will apply on ISDS Mediation. Australia has not taken reservation to exclude Government and government agencies, so it is possible to use mediation as a method of resolving investment disputes. Any settlement agreement resulting from mediation will be final and binding on parties and that can be enforced in any countries which has signed and ratified the Singapore Convention. It is also important to note that mediation can be used even during the arbitration process as well as after arbitral award is issued if parties agree. So, Arbitration and mediation can be used together and as a parallel proceeding. If there is no arbitration process available to parties then in cases where parties do not reach any agreement during negotiation or mediation then there will be no avenue left for parties to seek justice outside of host-state courts.

I also encourage and request the Government should consider ratifying the Singapore Convention as soon as possible so that investors and other commercial partners will be encouraged to use mediation in resolving their disputes with Australian parties including against government in ISDS disputes.

3. Lee Carroll, Partner, Johnson Winter Slattery

Comments received 11 November 2026

The Trade and Investment Agreements (Consultation) Bill 2026, introduced to the Senate on 1 July 2026, if enacted, would prevent the Minister for Trade from signing any new free trade agreement or bilateral investment treaty containing provisions for investor-state dispute settlement (known as ISDS), with no room for Ministerial discretion.

The Explanatory Memorandum frames the Bill's objective as being to ensure that Australia's agreements "safeguard Australia's interests, benefit the Australian community, and reflect Australian values". Much of the public debate has centred on Australia's exposure as a respondent to investor claims (and the taxpayer dollars spent defending those claims). Neither the Bill nor the Explanatory Memorandum address the larger, and less-discussed, risk to Australian companies investing offshore. For these companies, ISDS is, in effect, the only means by which investment protections can be enforced against a country in the event of adverse government action impacting the company's investment. Where does the Bill leave those Australian companies?

With respect, the public concern regarding ISDS is often overstated. The vice is not ISDS. That is, the vice is not in the form of dispute resolution chosen (arbitration of the dispute between investor and country). The vice, so alleged, stems from the substantive rights granted to foreign investors and the extent to which those rights limit a government's right to regulate.

In older treaties, investment protections were often ill-defined and broadly expressed. Older treaties were notoriously investor-friendly, drafted to give comfort to the investor. But the investment treaty landscape has changed. In recent times there has been a clear movement away from the protection of investors and towards the restoration of a government's right to regulate. Countries, globally, have reconsidered how investment protections are framed, so as to preclude an overly expansive interpretation of an investor's rights, and have confined to whom those protections are afforded, narrowing the definition of "investor" to exclude shell companies for example. There has been a conscious narrowing of state obligations and curtailing of perceived limits on a state's right to regulate. Many treaties now include a range of general exceptions to the investment protections offered within, to expressly permit the host State to regulate in the public interest or in a manner that is sensitive to the environment for example. And, often, the ISDS mechanism cannot be used to challenge a State's public health measures.

Modern treaties aim to, and do in fact, better balance the right of an investor to bring a claim with the right of governments to regulate in the public interest. That work continues in the redrafting and recrafting of state obligations and investment protections within newer international investment treaties. But it is a step too far to remove ISDS from these treaties, which is often the only means by which those recrafted investment protections can be enforced and governments held to account to protect Australian investments where the rule of law is weak. The Australian government's blanket prohibition on ISDS in any new investment agreement should be rejected. At the very least, ISDS should be considered on a case-by-case basis.

4. Professor Luke Nottage

Submission dated 26 October 2026 (LN03) following my request for comment on 22 October 2026. The authorised letterhead PDF follows in full, without alteration, including Appendices A and B (20 pages).

THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

Dr Luke Nottage ***BCA/LLB/PhD (VUW), LLM, LLD (Kyoto)***

Professor of Comparative and Transnational Business Law
Co-Director, Australian Network for Japanese Law (ANJeL)

Minister for Trade, Senator the Hon Don Farrell
senator.farrell@aph.gov.au

Cc: Shadow Minister for Trade, Senator the Hon Matthew Canavan
senator.canavan@aph.gov.au

Re: Submission on the anti-ISDS provisions in the Trade and Investment Agreements (Consultation) Bill 2026[1]

With a strong sense of déjà vu (from 2014), I oppose this Bill's clauses 16(2)(a) and 23(c) that simply state that a (trade) Minister must not sign a proposed free trade agreement or bilateral investment treaty if it "includes provision for investor-state dispute settlement" (ISDS). I hope the Australian government deletes these provisions, or better still supports the Senate referring this controversial Bill to its Foreign Affairs and Trade Committee for proper public consultation.

I have been a Professor at Sydney Law School since 2012, cross-appointed since April 2026 as Professor of Law at The University of Tokyo, writing and lecturing on comparative and international business. One area of expertise is international investment regulation, treaties and dispute resolution.

Since 2010 I have made ten substantial Submissions to Parliament and the Government (listed in **Appendix A**) regarding investment treaty ratifications and reviews, often called to give oral evidence to Committees and/or being cited in their reports. Given emergent public concern, somewhat curiously since it is only a procedure rather than a substantive commitment typically provided nowadays through treaties, I have addressed consideration attention in these Submissions (and related publications) on ISDS. I have focused on ISDS arbitration, in which the third-party neutrals can give binding decisions, unlike much less popular ISDS conciliation or mediation – where they can only facilitate the disputing investor and host state reaching an amicable settlement.

From the outset I have presented principled and empirically-grounded reasons why ISDS arbitration understandably became the primary mechanism in international law to make credible host states' commitments in investment treaties to welcome inbound investment

[1] https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Bills_Legislation/Bills_Search_Results/Result?bId=s1498

Faculty of Law
New Law Building F10
Eastern Avenue
The University of Sydney
NSW 2000 Australia

T +61 2 9351 0210
F +61 2 9351 0200
luke.nottage@sydney.edu.au
sydney.edu.au/law/anjel

ABN 15 211 513 464
CRICOS 00026A

THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

(especially less mobile FDI) by offering improved market access and/or subsequent protections of investment against expropriation without adequate compensation, discrimination, lack of fair and equitable treatment, and other minimum standards widely expected and enforced through international law. My work carefully counters glib assertions to show how there is significant evidence that ISDS-backed provisions contribute to more cross-border FDI, are used by Australia's outbound investors, and do not lead to excessive extra regulatory chill in a developed democratic economy like ours.

Despite arguing that ISDS arbitration remains better than alternative mechanisms, such as inter-state arbitration or individually negotiated investment contracts, I have also made various suggestions for improving ISDS procedures through treaty negotiations and drafting. I have been pleased that successive Australian governments have often joined with other states (in bilateral, regional and UNCITRAL multilateral fora) in pursuing and often achieving such initiatives (such as more transparency in ISDS, befitting the greater public interests than in purely commercial arbitration). I also urged more public consultation in developing a Model BIT for Australia (as recommended by a committee in 2015), which has not occurred but DFAT led a public consultation to review Australia's old treaties.[2]

My research and publications,[3] including in eminent peer-reviewed journals and edited book collections, also often show how states that have been subjected to initial inbound treaty-based claims have not abandoned ISDS completely because they recognize its net benefits in promoting cross-border investment and minimum standards for the rule of law (around Asia and contrasting Australia, see my recently published article[4]). Australia instead seems to have over-reacted when the Labor/Greens coalition shifted to a blanket anti-ISDS policy when in power over 2011-3, partly in response to Australia's first-inbound claim (by Philip Morris Asia under an old BIT with Hong Kong, renegotiated in 2019 so better balanced). The Albanese Labor Government in 2022 reverted to this policy, under a pre-election commitment but without any public consultation, perhaps responding to further recent inbound claims by (Australia's Clive Palmer controlled)

---

[2] Compare **(in Appendix A)** https://japaneselaw.sydney.edu.au/2015/06/senates-report-into-australias-treaty-making-process-and-isds-model/ and https://www.dfat.gov.au/trade-and-investment/discussion-paper-review-australias-bilateral-investment-treaties

[3] Many of my papers are available in open-access or freely via http://ssrn.com/author=488525, and are also listed at https://japaneselaw.sydney.edu.au/2026/03/my-cv-and-recent-papers-presentations/ . Extracted as **Appendix B** are the publications (and media commentary) most relevant to investment treaties and ISDS.

[4] Luke Nottage, "Evolving Antipodean, Asian and European Ambivalence Around ISDS Arbitration", 36 Griffith Law Review (September 2026) 1-22, OPEN ACCESS at https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10383441.2026.2732469

Zeph under the ASEAN Australian NZ FTA. Yet Australia won the Philip Morris claim on jurisdiction, and has done so recently again in the first Zeph claim (regarding extreme Western Australian government measures concerning an iron ore project).[5] Perhaps now Australia is (over-)reacting to an ISDS claim from a Chinese investor regarding the Port of Darwin dispute, but whether and when that will progress to any outcome adverse to Australia is far from obvious.[6]

In light of this trajectory, with Asian partner economies much more sanguine, I am therefore bemused to find this Bill now proposing to legislate for Australia a blanket prohibition on not only this Government, but also all future Governments (unless and until they manage to amend such legislation), regarding negotiations towards and agreement on any form of ISDS (even it seems mediation, surely raising far fewer concerns than arbitration). It is even more curious to find a Labor Government now proposing this "nuclear option", given that in 2014 the Labor Senators on the Senate's Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation committee agreed with its recommendation not to enact a similar "anti-ISDS" *Trade and Foreign Investment (Protecting the Public Interest) Bill* proposed by a Greens Senator, stating in their Additional Comments:[7]

> "**Executive responsibility**
> 1.15 In our parliamentary system the responsibility for negotiating and signing international treaties, including trade and investment treaties, is vested in the executive government.
> 1.16 Previous Labor Governments have utilised this executive treaty making power to enter treaties, agreements and contracts to make progressive reforms in the national interest, including protecting workers against unfair dismissal; saving the Franklin River through world heritage listing; ratifying the Kyoto Protocol to tackle climate change, and tackling discrimination and other abuses of human rights.

---

[5] Updating the above article on the latter case, see https://www.ag.gov.au/international-relations/publications/federal-supreme-court-switzerland-judgement-set-aside-application-zeph-investments-translated and https://www.ag.gov.au/international-relations/publications/federal-supreme-court-switzerland-judgement-revision-application-zeph-investments-translated. Given this setback for the investor and similar jurisdictional objections in the remaining Zeph claims (about Queensland state measures regarding coal mine linked projects), it seems unlikely those will proceed or can ultimately succeed.

[6] For an early analysis of key facts and issues, see Tianqi Gu and Luke Nottage (20 May 2025) https://eastasiaforum.org/2025/05/19/australias-port-of-darwin-move-risks-isds-arbitration-with-china/

[7] Available via https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Bills_LEGislation/Bills_Search_Results/Result?bId=s951. For my Submission, responses to Questions on Notice following oral evidence given, and other context, see: Luke Nottage, "The 'Anti-ISDS Bill' Before the Senate: What Future for Investor-State Arbitration in Australia?" XVIII International Trade and Business Law Review (2015) 245-293, https://ssrn.com/abstract=2483610 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2483610

> 1.17 Governments are ultimately accountable to the people through the ballot box for their exercise of executive power.
> 1.18 In our view it is not desirable to radically constrain the executive's treaty-making power in the manner proposed by this bill."

The Labor Senators' point in 2014 remains very apposite. If the current Bill had been in place when the Albanese Labor Government was conducting negotiations for the Second Protocol of the ASEAN Australia NZ FTA, it would not have permitted the Trade Minister to sign the Protocol that maintains AANZFTA's ISDS provisions (albeit with reasonable compromises of a Work Program to keep reviewing such provisions, along with a delayed phase-in for the new investment liberalisation commitments under the Protocol).[8] Yet the Labor Government, along with the Coalition in Opposition, agreed (after public consultation through the Joint Standing Committee on Treaties) that the overall Protocol deal was very much in Australia's national interest and so should be ratified. As remarked originally for example by the Trade Minister:[9]

> "The AANZFTA upgrade will create new commercial opportunities for Australians, for our exporters and investors to work hand-in-hand with businesses in Southeast Asia. This will cement Australia as a partner of choice in an open and inclusive region."

As the Government added after Australia's ratification:

> "Coming 15 years after the Agreement's original entry into force on 1 January 2010, AANZFTA's continued relevance underscores the importance of cooperative, collective and regional efforts to liberalise markets, expand the benefits of trade, and grow regional economic integration, for our mutual prosperity. The AANZFTA Upgrade reinforces regional commitment to an open, rules-based, non-discriminatory trading system."

Back in 2014, the Senate committee's report on the Greens' anti-ISDS Bill had reached the recommendation against that enactment with a conclusion that is even more true today, given improvements in the ISDS regime that Australia has engaged with since then:

> "2.59 On balance the committee is not convinced that legislation is the best mechanism by which to address the concerns raised about risks associated with ISDS provisions. The committee agrees with Professor Nottage and others that the risks associated with ISDS can and should be managed more effectively and in ways which

[8] For my Submission and later evidence to JSCOT in Parliament supporting Protocol ratification, see https://japaneselaw.sydney.edu.au/2024/05/australias-anti-isds-approach-again-aanzfta-protocol-to-be-ratified/. The present Bill in clause 9(1) captures such a Protocol as an "amendment" to an FTA, defined as " as "a change to the text of the agreement that significantly modifies Australia's rights or obligations under the agreement."

[9] See further attributable quotes from the Minister (and Assistant Ministers) at https://www.trademinister.gov.au/minister/don-farrell/media-release/deepening-economic-ties-our-asean-partners.

> do not require legislation, including careful treaty drafting (of both old and new agreements) and development of a well-balanced Model Investment Treaty.67
> 2.60 The committee is of the view that many of the alleged risks to Australian sovereignty and law making arising from the ISDS system are overstated and are not supported by the history of Australia's involvement in negotiating trade agreements. While the committee acknowledges that past experience may not be an accurate guide to the future in terms of potential ISDS claims against Australia, it stresses that the investment treaty arbitration field is evolving in positive ways to enable countries, including Australia, to put exclusions in place, limit the application of ISDS to the investment sections of agreements, and generally tighten up the wording of agreements. The committee is of the view that it is far more important for Australia to manage any risks associated with ISDS provisions than to reverse its longstanding treaty practice and opt out of the ISDS system altogether.
> 2.61 The committee accepts the view that the ISDS system has improved significantly over recent years both in the way treaties are drafted in relation to ISDS clauses and in the way that cases are argued and how arbitrators decide cases. Australia therefore stands to gain more by remaining actively engaged with the international investment law system, including where ISDS provisions apply. The committee is concerned that were Australia to legislate for a blanket ban on ISDS provisions in trade agreements, it would be sending a message to existing and potentially new trading partners that Australia was turning inward-looking and distancing itself from the international law system.
> 2.62 The committee is of the view that a blanket ban on ISDS would impose a significant constraint on the ability of Australian governments to negotiate trade agreements that benefit Australian business. …"

In addition, on a technical level, it is bizarre that the Bill does not include a definition of ISDS. It presently encompasses investor-state mediation as well as arbitration, despite the former's much lesser impact on host states. The Bill should also have indicated whether it intended to preclude signing an investment agreement providing for an EU-style "investment court" arbitration (as I proposed in the context of AANZFTA Protocol ratification hearings as a possible compromise, also potentially for ongoing and complex negotiations over investment protections eg with India, the EU and under the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership FTA.[10] Unless ISDS is defined in this Bill to exclude such an investment court mechanism, it will also preclude Australia signing such a multilateral mechanism that has been extensively debated and seemingly reaching a

[10] See further (also OPEN ACCESS) Luke Nottage, "Australia's Ambivalence Again Around Investor-State Arbitration: Comparisons with Europe and Implications for Asia", 39(2) *ICSID Review - Foreign Investment Law Journal* (2024) 320–346, https://academic.oup.com/icsidreview/article/39/2/320/7749344

finalized form in UNCITRAL Working Group III, including years of Australian contributions.[11]
Further, this Bill's provisions further jar with the Trade Minister's very recent comments, in response to the Opposition questioning ratification of the FTA signed with the EU (but curiously omitting investment protections), that:[12]

> "The world is now falling into two camps – it's either the tariffs and protectionist camp or the free-trade camp … Australia's national interest depends upon being a free-trade country. That is the source of our future prosperity and we need to send this message to the world."

Overall, the Bill's anti-ISDS provisions seem instead an embarrassingly uninformed swing to and appeal to the far left, given also that this Labor Government has conducted no proper public consultation nor offered views (or anything in the Explanatory Memorandum) on recent best evidence and developments around investment treaties – and ISDS in particular. In an era when the far right is joining with the far left – not only in Australia but also in some other Western democracies – in retreating from the post-WW2 international rules-based order, I hope and trust we do not pass these parochial and retrograde provisions in the Bill.

I would be very happy to provide further elaboration and information to you or any parliamentary Committee.

Yours sincerely,

Luke R Nottage

[11] See generally https://uncitral.un.org/en/multilateralpermanentinvestmentcourt
[12] Paul Kelly, "'Dud' Trade Deal: Libs Rebuff ALP" *The Weekend Australian* (24-5 October 2026) p1.

THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

Appendix A:

1. Submission to Parliament (JSCOT) on ratifying the Second Protocol to Amend AANZFTA, https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Joint/Treaties/AANZFTASecondProtocol/Submissions **(4 January 2024)**; invited to give evidence at hearings on **25 March 2024 -** https://japaneselaw.sydney.edu.au/2024/05/australias-anti-isds-approach-again-aanzfta-protocol-to-be-ratified/
2. DFAT *Review of Australia's Bilateral Investment Treaties*, Submission dated **14 September 2020**, https://www.dfat.gov.au/trade-and-investment/discussion-paper-review-australias-bilateral-investment-treaties
3. Australian Parliament, Submissions to two JSCOT treaty ratification inquiries, both quoted in respective JSCOT Reports recommending ratification:
   - HK and Indonesia investment treaties (including evidence given **26 August 2019)** via eg https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Joint/Treaties/A-HKFTA;
   - Mauritius "UN ISDS Convention" on transparency, submission dated **27 August 2019** via https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Joint/Treaties/ISDSUNConvention .
4. Australian Parliament, Submission to second JSCOT inquiry into Peru-Australia FTA, **2 November 2018**, quoted (at 4.18 and 4.26-28) of its Report No 138
5. Australian Parliament, Submissions to Senate and JSCOT inquiries into ratifying the CPTPP, **April 2018**, including oral evidence given to at JSCOT hearings on **15 June**, https://japaneselaw.sydney.edu.au/2018/04/the-tpp-is-back-submission-to-australian-parliamentary-inquiries/ - Answers to Questions on Notice later incorporated into:
   - Luke Nottage and Ana Ubilava "Costs, Outcomes and Transparency in ISDS Arbitrations: Evidence for an Investment Treaty Parliamentary Inquiry" 21(4) *Intl Arb L Rev* 111-7 (2018) https://ssrn.com/abstract=3227401
6. Australian Parliament, Submissions to the Senate Committee Inquiry into ratifying the TPP: No 3 (**September 2016**)

http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Senate/Foreign_Affairs_Defence_and_Trade/TPP/Submissions

7. Australian Parliament, Senate and JSCOT inquiries into the China-Australia Free Trade Agreement (**August 2015**)
   - Elaborating on: https://japaneselaw.sydney.edu.au/2015/06/compromised-isds-backed-investment-commitments-in-the-china-australia-fta/
8. Australian Senate, Inquiry into the Commonwealth's Treaty Making Process at http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Senate/Foreign_Affairs_Defence_and_Trade/Treaty-making_process:
   - submission dated **25 February 2015**, transcript of Evidence given at Committee hearings on **5 May**, via https://japaneselaw.sydney.edu.au/2015/03/submission-to-the-senate-inquiry-into-the-commonwealths-treaty-making-process/
   - cited approvingly in the majority report of **25 June 2015**: https://japaneselaw.sydney.edu.au/2015/06/senates-report-into-australias-treaty-making-process-and-isds-model/
9. Australian Senate, Inquiry into *The Trade and Foreign Investment (Protecting the Public Interest) Bill 2014*, submission dated **2 April 2014**, with a version at https://japaneselaw.sydney.edu.au/2014/09/the-anti-isds-bill-before-the-australian-parliament/
   - Evidence given at the Committee hearings on **6 August 2014**, from 2.08-3.10 in the video-recording available at http://parlview.aph.gov.au/mediaPlayer.php?videoID=233409&operation_mode=parlview
   - Incorporated into a paper at http://ssrn.com/abstract=2483610
10. Productivity Commission, "Review of Bilateral and Regional Trade Agreements", Supplementary Submission, **12 August 2010**, at http://www.pc.gov.au/projects/study/trade-agreements

Appendix B Luke Nottage – Publications and Media on Investment Treaties and Investor-State Arbitration (ISDS)

A. Books

- Luke Nottage, International Commercial and Investor-State Arbitration: Australia and Japan in Regional and Global Contexts (2021, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar) [12 chapters] (awarded LLD by publications, Kyoto University, 2022)

B. Edited Books

- Corruption, Illegality and Asian Investment Arbitration (Nobumichi Teramura, Luke Nottage and Bruno Jetin, eds, April 2024, Springer – for series Asia in Transition) [16 chapters (4 co-authored), with a Foreword by Dr Amokura Kawharu] xviii + 454pp (open access: https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-981-99-9303-1)
- New Frontiers in Asia-Pacific International Arbitration and Dispute Resolution (Luke Nottage, Shahla Ali, Bruno Jetin and Nobumichi Teramura, eds, 2021, Wolters Kluwer) [15 chapters (5 co/authored), with a Preface from Michael Hwang SC] xxxvi + 374pp
- International Investment Treaties and Arbitration Across Asia (Julien Chaisse and Luke Nottage, eds, 2018, Leiden: Brill) [21 chapters (3 co-authored), with a Preface from former Chief Justice of Australia Robert French] xxxiii + 691pp
- Foreign Investment and Dispute Resolution Law and Practice in Asia (Vivienne Bath and Luke Nottage, eds: 2011, London: Routledge) xix + 273pp [12 chapters (including two co-authored) plus Preface from the then IBA President]
- International Arbitration in Australia (Luke Nottage and Richard Garnett, eds: 2010, Sydney: Federation Press) 296pp [11 chapters, including five co-authored (three lead-authored), plus Foreword by Spigelman CJ]

C. Book Chapters

2026 (forthcoming)

- Robert Stendel and Luke Nottage, "Concurrent Investor-State Claims before Domestic Courts and Investment Treaty Arbitration Tribunals" in Martin Jarrett et al (eds) The Rise of Domestic Courts in International Investment Law (OUP) forthcoming

2024

- Nobumichi Teramura, Luke Nottage and Bruno Jetin, "Bribery and Other Serious Illegality in Asian Investment Arbitration", in ibid (eds), Corruption, Illegality and Asian Investment Arbitration (Springer) 1-35
- Sirilaksana Khoman, Luke Nottage and Sakda Thanitcul, "Foreign Investment, Corruption, Investment Treaties and Arbitration in Thailand" in Nobumichi Teramura, Luke Nottage and Bruno Jetin (eds), Corruption, Illegality and Asian Investment Arbitration (Springer) 393-421

THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

- Longer version (Nottage et al) retitled at https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4407011

- Nobumichi Teramura, Luke Nottage and Bruno Jetin, "Towards a More Harmonised Asian Approach to Corruption and Illegality in Investment Arbitration", in ibid (eds), Corruption, Illegality and Asian Investment Arbitration (Springer) 423-446

2023

- "International Arbitration and Society at Large" in Stefan Kroell, Andrea Bjorkland and Franco Ferrari (eds) Cambridge Compendium of International Commercial and Investment Arbitration: Volume I (Cambridge University Press) 389-423
  - Manuscript version at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3116528

2022

- "Mixing Methodologies in Empirically Investigating Investor-State Arbitration" (with Shiro Armstrong), in Daniel Behn, Ole Kristian Fauchald and Malcolm Langford (eds) The Legitimacy of Investment Arbitration: Empirical Perspectives (Cambridge University Press) 315-364
  - Extract as: Sydney Law School Research Paper No 16/74, http://ssrn.com/abstract=2824090
  - Summarised also in: http://kluwerarbitrationblog.com/2016/10/14/tpp-and-foreign-investment-does-isds-promote-fdi/ and http://afia.asia/2016/11/does-isds-promote-fdi-asia-pacific-insights-from-and-for-australia-and-india/

2021

- Ana Ubilava and Luke Nottage, "Novel and Noteworthy Aspects of Australia's recent Investment Agreements and ISDS Policy: The CPTPP, Hong Kong, Indonesia and Mauritius Transparency Treaties" in Nottage et al (eds) New Frontiers in Asia-Pacific International Arbitration and Dispute Resolution (Wolters Kluwer) 115-140
  - Manuscript version at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3548358
- Luke Nottage and Bruno Jetin, "New Frontiers in Asia-Pacific Trade, Investment and International Business Dispute Resolution" in Nottage et al (eds) New Frontiers in Asia-Pacific International Arbitration and Dispute Resolution (Wolters Kluwer) 1-38
  - Manuscript version at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3635795
- "Rebalancing Investment Treaties and Arbitration in the Asian Region", in Mahdev Mohan and Chester Brown (eds) The Asian Turn in International Investment (Cambridge University Press) 379-398
  - Updating and expanding JWIT article (2016) at http://ssrn.com/abstract=2685941

2020

- "International Investment Agreements and Investor-State Arbitration in Asia" (with Vivienne Bath) in Julien Chaisse, Leila Choukroune and Sufian Jusoh (eds) New Handbook of International Investment Law (Berlin: Springer)
  - Longer version at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3544458

2018

- "Investment Treaty Arbitration Claims Over Tobacco Plain Packaging: Running Out of Puff?" (with Jarrod Hepburn) in Puja Kapai and Hughes Tang (eds) The Flow of Change: Celebrating Twenty Years of the Hochelaga Lectures (Faculty of Law, University of Hong Kong) 159-82
  - expanding Hepburn and Nottage, "A Procedural Win for Public Health Measures" [Casenote on Philip Morris Asia v Australia] 18 Journal of World Investment and Trade (2017) 307-19, manuscript at http://ssrn.com/abstract=2842065

2017

- "Asian Investment and the Growth of Regional Investment Agreements" (with Vivienne Bath) in Christoph Antons (ed) Routledge Handbook of Asian Law (London: Routledge) 182-99

2016

- "Investor-State Arbitration Policy and Practice in Australia" in Armand de Mestral (ed), Second Thoughts: Investor-State Arbitration Between Developed Democracies (Waterloo: Centre for International Governance Innovation, 2017) 377-430
  - Updating IGI Investor-State Arbitration Series, Paper No 6, https://www.cigionline.org/publications/investor-state-arbitration-policy-and-practice-australia
  - Sydney Law School Research Paper 15/97, http://ssrn.com/abstract=2685941

2015

- Luke Nottage and Simon Butt, "Recent International Commercial Arbitration and Investor-State Arbitration Developments Impacting on Australia's Investments in the Resources Sector" in Philip Evans and Gabriel Moens (eds) Arbitration and Dispute Resolution in the Resources Sector: An Australian Perspective (Berlin: Springer) 153-79
  - Also Sydney Law School Research Paper No. 13/17 (2013), http://ssrn.com/author=488525
- "The ASEAN Comprehensive Investment Agreement and 'ASEAN Plus' – The Australia-New Zealand Free Trade Area (AANZFTA) and the PRC–ASEAN Investment Agreement" (with Vivienne Bath) in Marc Bungenberg, Joern Griebel, Stephan Hobe & August Reinisch (eds) International Investment Law (Baden-Baden et al: Nomos / Beck / Hart) 283-303

THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

- Also Sydney Law School Research Paper No. 13/69 (2013), http://ssrn.com/abstract=2331714

2014

- "In/formalization and Glocalization of International Commercial Arbitration and Investment Treaty Arbitration in Asia" in Joachim Zekoll, Moritz Baelz and Iwo Amelung (eds) Formalisation and Flexibilisation in Dispute Resolution (Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff / Brill) 211-49
  - Manuscript version at https://ssrn.com/abstract=2987674

2013

- "Investor-State Arbitration Policy and Practice after Philip Morris Asia v Australia", in Leon Trakman and Nicola Ranieri (eds) Regionalism in International Investment Law (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 452-74
  - earlier version in (2012) 5 Transnational Dispute Management, http://www.transnational-dispute-management.com/article.asp?key=1880
  - with a shorter version in the 22 Australian Product Liability Reporter 154-58 and the ACICA Newsletter (August 2011), also Sydney Law School Research Paper No. 12/26, http://ssrn.com/abstract=2041680
- "Japan" (with Shotaro Hamamoto) in Chester Brown (ed) Commentaries on Selected Model Investment Treaties (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 347-91
  - with a longer version as: "Foreign Investment In and Out of Japan: Economic Backdrop, Domestic Law, and International Treaty-Based Investor-State Dispute Resolution", Transnational Dispute Management 5 (2011); Sydney Law School Research Paper No. 10/145, http://ssrn.com/abstract=1724999

2012

- "Free Trade Agreement and Investment Treaty Innovations to Promote More Sustainable Financial Markets for Consumers" in Claudia Lima Marques et al (eds) The Global Financial Crisis and the Need for Consumer Regulation (Porto Alegre: Orquestra Editora) 493-500
  - SCIL Working Paper No. 31

2011

- "Foreign Investment and Dispute Resolution Law and Practice in Asia: An Overview" (with Vivienne Bath) in Vivienne Bath & Luke Nottage (eds) Foreign Investment and Dispute Resolution Law and Practice in Asia (London: Routledge) 1-24
  - also: Sydney Law School Research Paper No. 11/20, http://ssrn.com/abstract=1789306

D. Refereed Articles

THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

2026 (forthcoming)

- "Evolving Antipodean, Asian and European Ambivalence Around ISDS Arbitration: A Compromise Way Forward?" 36 Griffith Law Review 1-22 https://doi.org/10.1080/10383441.2026.2732469

2025

- "Cross-Fertilisation in International Commercial Arbitration, Investor-State Arbitration and Mediation: The Good, the Bad and the Ugly?" 50(3) Monash University Law Review 369-405 (2024), https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4872129
- Nobumichi Teramura and Luke Nottage "Corruption and Illegality Provisions in East and South Asian Investment Agreements: An Empirical Analysis" 28 Journal of International Economic Law https://academic.oup.com/jiel/advance-article/doi/10.1093/jiel/jgaf013/8142422
- "Australia's Ambivalence Again Around Investor-State Arbitration: Comparisons with Europe and Implications for Asia", 39(2) ICSID Review – Foreign Investment Law Journal 320–346 https://academic.oup.com/icsidreview/article/39/2/320/7749344
    - With shorter version of Part 1 in: ACICA Review (June 2023) 50-55

2024

- Luke Nottage and Robert Stendel "Concurrent Investor-State Disputes Before Domestic Courts and Investment Arbitration Tribunals: Philip Morris, Vattenfall and Beyond" 64(3) Virginia Journal of International Law 1-42
    - Also: MPIL Research Paper Series 2023-17, https://ssrn.com/abstract=4530150

2023

- Luke Nottage and Nobumichi Teramura, "Japan's International Investment, Evolving Treaty Practice and Arbitration Related to Corruption and Illegality", 55 Journal of Japanese Law 63-99
    - Also: "Foreign Investment, Treaties, Arbitration and Bribery: Comparing Japan" in Nobumichi Teramura, Luke Nottage and Bruno Jetin (eds), Corruption, Illegality and Asian Investment Arbitration (Springer, 2024) https://ssrn.com/abstract=4475053

2021

- James Claxton, Luke Nottage and Ana Ubilava, "Mandatory Investor-State Conciliation Before Arbitration in Asia-Pacific Treaties: New Developments and Implications for India and Australia" XIII Indian Journal of International Economic Law 209-217 (via https://ijiel.in/)

2020

- Chiara Giorgetti, Steven Ratner, Jeffrey Dunoff, Shotaro Hamamoto, Luke Nottage, Stephan Schill and Michael Waibel "Independence and Impartiality of Adjudicators in Investment Dispute Settlement: Assessing Challenges and Reform Options" 21(2-3) Journal of World Investment and Trade, 441-74
  - Earlier ACFI concept paper via https://www.cids.ch/academic-forum-concept-papers
- "Mediating Japan-Korea Trade and Investment Tensions" (with James Claxton and Brett Williams), 54(4) Journal of World Trade 591-614
  - Longer version: Sydney Law School Research Paper No. 19/73, https://ssrn.com/abstract=3497299, updated in Nottage et al (eds) New Frontiers in Asia-Pacific International Arbitration and Dispute Resolution (Kluwer, 2021)
- "Confidentiality versus Transparency in International Arbitration: Asia-Pacific Tensions and Expectations" 16(1) Asian International Arbitration Journal 1-26
  - Sydney Law School Research Paper No. 19/52, https://ssrn.com/abstract=3444692

2018

- "Has ISDS Gone Rogue for Australia and New Zealand? CPTPP (C-3PO), RCEP (R2-D2) and Beyond" (with Amokura Kawharu) Yearbook on International Investment Law and Policy 2017, 536-69
  - Based on the first half of: Sydney Law School Research Paper No. 18/03, https://ssrn.com/abstract=3116526
- "The Curious Case of ISDS Arbitration Involving Australia and New Zealand" (with Amokura Kawharu) 44(2) University of Western Australia Law Review 32-70
  - https://classic.austlii.edu.au/au/journals/UWALawRw/2018/36.html
  - Based on the second half of: Sydney Law School Research Paper No. 18/03, https://ssrn.com/abstract=3116526

2017

- "Models for Investment Treaties in the Asian Region: An Underview" (with Amokura Kawharu), 34(3) Arizona Journal of International and Comparative Law 461-528
  - Sydney Law School Research Paper No 16/87, http://ssrn.com/abstract=2845088
  - First half adapted as "Foreign Investment Regulation and Treaty Practice in New Zealand and Australia: Getting it Together in the Asia-Pacific": Chaisse and Nottage (eds) International Investment Treaties and Arbitration Across Asia (Brill, 2018) 445-85
- "Special Issue: International Investment Arbitration in Southeast Asia" (with Sakda Thanitcul) 18(5-6) Journal of World Investment and Trade 793-835
  - Abridged from: Sydney Law School Research Paper No 16/95, https://ssrn.com/abstract=2862272

THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

- Expanded into "International Investment Treaties and Arbitration Across Asia: A Bird's Eye View" (with Julien Chaisse and Sakda Thanitcul) in Chaisse and Nottage (eds) International Investment Treaties and Arbitration Across Asia (Brill, 2018) 3-56

- "International Investment Arbitration in Thailand: Limiting Contract-based Claims While Maintaining Treaty-based ISDS" (with Sakda Thanitcul) 18(5-6) Journal of World Investment and Trade 767-92
  - Abridged from: "The Past, Present and Future of International Investment Arbitration in Thailand" (with Sakda Thanitcul) Sydney Law School Research Paper No 16/31, http://ssrn.com/abstract=2770889
  - Reprinted in: Chaisse and Nottage (eds) International Investment Treaties and Arbitration Across Asia (Brill, 2018) 117-58

2016

- "Rebalancing Investment Treaty Arbitration: Two Approaches" 17 Journal of World Investment and Trade 1015-40
  - Sydney Law School Research Paper 15/97, http://ssrn.com/abstract=2685941
- "The TPP Investment Chapter and Investor-State Arbitration in Asia and Oceania: Assessing Prospects for Ratification", 17 Melbourne Journal of International Law 313-48
  - Sydney Law School Research Paper No 16/28, http://ssrn.com/abstract=2767996
  - Significantly expanded and updated as "The Investment Chapter and ISDS in the CPTPP: Lessons from and for Southeast Asia" in Cassey Lee and Pritish Bhattacharya (eds) The Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership: Implications for Southeast Asia (Singapore: ISEAS, 2021) 55-111

2015

- "The Evolution of Foreign Investment Regulation, Treaties and Investor-State Arbitration in Australia" 21 New Zealand Business Law Quarterly 266-76
- "Investment Treaty Arbitration Policy in Australia, New Zealand and Korea" 25(3) Journal of Arbitration Studies (Korea) 185-223
  - Also Sydney Law School Research Paper 15/66, http://ssrn.com/abstract=2643926
- "Investment Treaty Arbitration 'Down Under': Policy and Politics in Australia" (with Jurgen Kurtz), 30 ICSID Review 465-80
  - Longer version as Sydney Law School Research Paper 15/45, http://ssrn.com/abstract=2561147
- "Do Many of Australia's Bilateral Treaties Really Not Provide Full Advance Consent to Investor-State Arbitration? Analysis and Regional Implications of Planet Mining v Indonesia" 1 (2015) Transnational Dispute Management
  - Also Sydney Law School Research Paper 14/39, http://ssrn.com/abstract=2424987

THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

- Updated and elaborated as "The Limits of Legalisation in Asia-Pacific Investment Treaty Arbitration" in Julien Chaisse and Tsai-Yu Lin (eds), International Economic Law and Governance: Essays in Honour of Mitsuo Matsushita (Oxford: OUP, 2016) 153-79

- "The 'Anti-ISDS Bill' Before the Senate: What Future for Investor-State Arbitration in Australia?" XVIII International Trade and Business Law Review 245-93
  - Longer version as Sydney Law School Research Paper No. 14/76, http://ssrn.com/abstract=2483610

2014

- "Investor-State Arbitration: Not in the Australia-Japan Free Trade Agreement, and Not Ever for Australia?" 38 Journal of Japanese Law 37-52
  - Also Sydney Law School Research Paper No. 15/45 (2015) http://ssrn.com/abstract=2602130
- "Assessing Treaty-Based Investor-State Dispute Settlement: Abandon, Retain or Reform?" (with Christian Campbell and Sophie Nappert) Transnational Dispute Management 1 (2014)
  - Earlier version as Sydney Law School Research Paper No. 13/40 (2013), http://ssrn.com/abstract=2280182

2013

- "Throwing the Baby with the Bathwater: Australia's New Policy on Treaty-Based Investor-State Arbitration and its Impact in Asia" 37(2) Asian Studies Review 253-72
  - reproduced in Kate Barclay and Graeme Smith (eds) East Asia's Demand for Energy, Resources and Food: The International Politics of Resources (London: Routledge, 2015)
- "Negotiating and Applying Investor-State Arbitration Provisions in Free Trade Agreements and Investment Treaties: Australia, Japan and the Asia-Pacific", 119 (9-10) Hogaku Shimpo (Chuo University) 103-64
  - Also Sydney Law School Research Paper No. 12/84 (November 2012), http://ssrn.com/abstract=2175951

2012

- "Appropriate Treaty-Based Dispute Resolution for Asia-Pacific Commerce in the 21st Century" (with Micah Burch and Brett Williams), 35(3) UNSW Law Journal 1013-43
  - Also Sydney Law School Research Paper No. 12/37, http://ssrn.com/abstract=2065636
- "Novel Treaty-Based Approaches to Resolving International Investment and Tax Disputes in the Asia-Pacific Region" (with Micah Burch) 18 Australian International Law Journal (2011) 127-140
  - Also Sydney Law School Research Paper No. 11/66, http://ssrn.com/abstract=1938758

- "Investment Arbitration in Asia: Five Perspectives on Law and Practice" (with Romesh Weeramantry) 28 Arbitration International 19-62
  - Shorter version in Vivienne Bath & Luke Nottage (eds) Foreign Investment and Dispute Resolution Law and Practice in Asia (London: Routledge) 25-52
  - Updating and expanding: SCIL Working Paper No 21 and Sydney Law School Research Paper No. 12/27, http://ssrn.com/abstract=2041686

2011

- "The Rise and Possible Fall of Investor-State Arbitration in Asia: A Skeptic's View of Australia's 'Gillard Government Trade Policy Statement'" Transnational Dispute Management 8(5) (2011)
  - Also Sydney Law School Research Paper No. 11/32 (2011), http://ssrn.com/abstract=1860505
  - With introductory part also in 16 The Australian ADR Reporter (July 2011) 49-55

2009

- "'Back to the Future' for Investor-State Arbitrations: Revising Rules in Australia and Japan for Public Interests" (Luke Nottage and Kate Miles) 26(1) Journal of International Arbitration 25-58
  - also: Sydney Law School Research Paper No. 08/62, http://ssrn.com/abstract=1151167
  - updated for Luke Nottage and Richard Garnett (eds) International Arbitration in Australia (Sydney: Federation Press) 222-52
  - reproduced in August Reinisch (ed) Classics in International Investment Law (Elgar, 2014)
  - with an earlier abridged version in 20 JCAA Newsletter 1-8 (July 2008); translated (by Akira Sawai and Keiko Takikita) in (2009) 628 JCA Jyanaru 28-38

E. Other Academic Articles and Papers

2023

- Luke Nottage, Sirilaksana Khoman and Sakda Thanitcul, "Investment, Corruption, Investment Treaties and Arbitration in Thailand" (April 2023) https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4407011

2019

- Jeffrey Dunoff, Chiara Giorgetti, Shotaro Hamamoto, Luke Nottage, Steven Ratner, Stephan Schill and Michael Waibel, "Independence" of Investment Dispute Arbitrators – Concept Paper, Working Group 6, Academic Forum for ISDS (University of Geneva, April 2019) via https://www.cids.ch/academic-forum-concept-papers (provided to delegates at UNCITRAL Working Group III meetings on ISDS reform)

THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

2018

- Luke Nottage and Ana Ubilava, "Costs, Outcomes and Transparency in ISDS Arbitrations: Evidence for an Investment Treaty Parliamentary Inquiry" 21(4) International Arbitration Law Review 111-7
- Amokura Kawharu and Luke Nottage, "Renouncing Investor-State Settlement in Australia, then New Zealand: Déjà vu?" Sydney Law School Research Paper No. 18/03, https://ssrn.com/abstract=3116526

2016

- "How Would a New Labor Government in Australia (Re)negotiate Trade and Investment Agreements?" (with Leon Trakman) CIGI Commentary (22 June 2016)
- "The TPP Investment Chapter: JSCOT Parliamentary Inquiry" 4(1) ACICA Review (June 2016) 33-34

2015

- "The TPP Investment Chapter: Mostly More of the Same", 3(2) ACICA Review (December 2015)
- "ISDS in the TPP Investment Chapter: Mostly More of the Same", 20 KLRCA Newsletter, October-December
- "The 2015 Senate Inquiry into the Commonwealth's Treaty Making Process – and ISDS Policy for Australia", 3(1) ACICA Review (June 2015) 48-51

2014

- "The Anti-ISDS Bill Before the Australian Parliament" The CIArb Australia News (September 2014) 21-25
    - with some ideas restated at: http://kluwerarbitrationblog.com/blog/2014/08/27/the-anti-isds-bill-before-the-australian-senate

2013

- "The Fundamental Importance of Foreign Direct Investment to Australia in the 21st Century: Reforming Treaty and Dispute Resolution Practice" (with Shiro Armstrong, Jürgen Kurtz and Leon Trakman), Sydney Law School Research Paper No. 13/90 (2013) http://ssrn.com/abstract=2362122

F. Other Articles, Essays and Blog Contributions

- "Confidentiality versus Transparency in International Commercial and Investment Treaty Arbitration in Australia, Japan and Beyond" (with Andrew Paton) 7(2) ACICA Review 54-56 (December 2019) and other contributions via https://acica.org.au/acica-review/

- "Clive Palmer versus (Western) Australia" The Conversation (10 September 2020), https://theconversation.com/profiles/luke-nottage-3037/articles
- "Investor-state Arbitration Provisions: What Future?" 3(1) East Asia Forum Quarterly 33-4 (January-March 2011)
- Since 2014: occasional contributor to the Kluwer Arbitration Blog at http://kluwerarbitrationblog.com/author/lukenottage/ and Kluwer Mediation Blog at http://mediationblog.kluwerarbitration.com/author/luke-nottage/
    - Eg "Pioneering Mandatory Investor-State Conciliation Before Arbitration in Asia-Pacific Treaties: IA-CEPA and HK-UAE BIT" (5 September 2020), http://arbitrationblog.kluwerarbitration.com/2020/09/05/pioneering-mandatory-investor-state-conciliation-before-arbitration-in-asia-pacific-treaties-ia-cepa-and-hk-uae-bit/

G. Media Appearances

2020

- 10 September: The Conversation, "Clive Palmer versus (Western) Australia …", https://theconversation.com/clive-palmer-versus-western-australia-he-could-survive-a-high-court-loss-if-his-company-is-found-to-be-foreign-145334

2019

- 26 August: Australian Financial Review, evidence in parliamentary inquiry (Hong Kong and Indonesia investment treaties) cited by Andrew Tillett, "Trade Pacts Needed Among Global Turmoil"
- 2 March: Dominion Post (New Zealand), cited extensively in Will Harvie, 'The Forgotten "Free Trade" Dispute' regarding "The Curious Case of ISDS Arbitration Involving Australia and New Zealand" (with Amokura Kawharu)

2018

- 29 March: Bloomberg BNA's International Trade Daily, cited in Murray Griffin, "Pacific Pact Could Limit Who Sits on Investor Dispute Panels"

2015

- 28 December: The Australian, "Free-trade legal fears in Philip Morris claim up in smoke"
- 23 December: Radio New Zealand, "TPP opens NZ to legal attacks – opponents"
- 18 December: ABC News Fact check, "Fact file: Your questions on the Trans-Pacific Partnership answered"
- 6 November: The Australian, cited in Rowan Callick, "Experts test Robb safeguard claims"
- 5 May: The Australian, cited in Rowan Callick, "High Court counts for little in China row"

- 1 April: Australian Financial Review, cited in Greg Earl, "Australia should fix Trans-Pacific Partnership investor protection" – referring to paper at http://ssrn.com/abstract=2561147

2014

- 11 April: The Australian, cited by Rowan Callick, "Exporter Beefed Up by Japan FTA Deal", p18
- 8 April: The Wire radio, interviewed by Tim Roxburgh, "'Best Ever' Trade and Investment Deal with Japan: Is There a Downside?"; Sydney Morning Herald (= "Free Trade Pact 'Not to Everyone's Liking'", The Age, 9 April, p6); 9 April: The New Daily
- 18 February: The Australian, cited in Rick Wallace and Rowan Callick, "Korea FTA Hailed as One of the Best"

2013

- 21 September: The Australian, cited in Rowan Callick, "Coalition Launches Sale of the Century" (on investor-state arbitration policy)
- 19 August: The Australian, cited in Rowan Callick, "Opportunities Missed in Regional Trade Deals" (on investor-state arbitration policy)
- 3 June: The Australian, cited in Rowan Callick, "Coalition to Pursue HK Deals" (on investor-state arbitration policy and double tax treaties)
- 17 May: TV Asahi (Hodo Station news) interview, on implications of Australia's new policy on investor-state arbitration for TPP treaty negotiations
- 8 May: NHK World Radio interview, "What Do Australia and Others Expect from Japan in Regional FTA Negotiations?"

2012

- 20 November: Phnom Penh Post, cited in Erika Mudie, "Warning on Investment in Laos"
- 2 November: The Australian (p10), cited by Rowan Callick, "Arbitration Hitch Holds Up FTAs"
- 16 May: Jakarta Globe, "Divestment of Foreign Mining Interests in Indonesia"; also East Asia Forum