UNIDROIT - A RETROSPECTIVE

Garrv Loddha Jain

ABSTRACT

This paper focus on one of the Global Legal Organisations governing principles of International and Commercial Contracts i.e. the UNIDROIT. The paper discuses the foundations of the Unidroit and how it came into being. It analyses the rules and regulations and the workings of the UNIDROIT, along with the work it has done globally. It also discusses some limitations and challenges the UNIDROIT faces and overall how the organisation affects the global legal order by its conventions.

1. Introduction

There are several arguments against the conventional and still prevalent strategy of "nationalizing" cross-border transactions and subjecting them to local law as if they were only domestic contracts. The most significant piece of soft law in the area of general contract law, the UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts, first published in 1994 and currently in their fourth edition (2016), offers a viable alternative to the conventional State-law-centered conflict-of-laws approach. About the UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts, the goal of this study is to provide insight into how international arbitrators operate.

2. What is UNIDROIT?

The goal of UNIDROIT, formally known as the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law, an intergovernmental organization with headquarters in Rome, is to harmonize international private law among nations by enacting model laws, sets of principles, guidelines, and international conventions. The Secretariat, the Board of Directors, and the General Assembly make up the bulk of UNIDROIT's tripartite organizational structure. The Secretariat, UNIDROIT's executive body, is in charge of carrying out the organization's Work Program. It is governed by the Secretary-General, who is chosen by the Management Committee at the Institute President's recommendation. The Secretary-General is supported by a group of multinational employees and civil servants.

The Governing Council decides how the Institute will fulfil its legal obligations, and it also controls how the Secretariat will carry out the Work Program that it creates. The President of the Institute serves as an ex officio member of the Board of Directors, and 25 other members were elected, most of them distinguished judges, attorneys, and university professors in addition to national politicians. The Institute's President serves as the Governing Council's chair and is also an ex officio member of the body. The General Assembly is UNIDROIT's highest governing body; it approves the Institute's yearly budget, and its Work Program every three years, and names the members of the Board of Directors for terms of five years. Each member state's government is represented by one of its members of this body. The Ambassador of a Member State of the Organization alternately holds the Presidency of the General Assembly for a period of one year.

According to its Organic Statute, UNIDROIT's goal is to create contemporary, uniform laws that are, when necessary, harmonized with private law lato sensu. Forays into public law are periodically essential due to the difficulties in defining specific boundaries as well as the overlap of transactional and regulatory features. The rules developed by UNIDROIT also fall under substantive private law; they only tangentially reference conflict of laws norms. Due to its independence from other international organizations, UNIDROIT has been able to take a stance that makes it an especially effective platform for discussing the more technical than the political aspects of legal harmonization or unification.

2.1 When and Why was UNIDROIT formed?

The International Institute for the Unification of Private Law had its origins in the year 1926. The League of Nations, the organization that preceded the United Nations, then decided to establish it in Rome. It began its work two years later, but it had already left the League of Nations in 1940 to form its own autonomous international body. The "UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts" and the "Convention on International Interests in Mobile Equipment" are two of its most significant accomplishments, and these will be reviewed and discussed in more detail below. The original one was released in 1994, followed ten years later by a redesigned and expanded version. The second was executed in 2001. Both will eventually be revised and issued again. More than 70 studies and draughts have been produced by UNIDROIT during the course of its more than 75-year history. As of 2007, the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law (UNIDROIT, 2007) Achievements of UNIDROIT, n.d.

Diplomatic conferences called by UNIDROIT member nations have established the following conventions and model laws:

1. (1964) Convention relating to a Uniform Law on the Formation of Contracts for the International Sale of Goods (The Hague)
2. (1964) Convention relating to a Uniform Law on the International Sale of Goods (The Hague)
3. (1970) International Convention on the Travel Contract (Brussels)
4. (1973) Convention providing a Uniform Law on the Form of an International Will (Washington)
5. (1983) Convention on Agency in the International Sale of Goods (Geneva)

6. (1988) UNIDROIT Convention on International Financial Leasing (Ottawa)
7. 1988) UNIDROIT Convention on International Factoring (Ottawa)
8. (1995) UNIDROIT Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects (Rome)
9. (2001) Convention on International Interests in Mobile Equipment (Cape Town)
10. (2001) Protocol to the Convention on International Interests in Mobile Equipment on Matters specific to Aircraft Equipment (Cape Town)
11. (2007) Luxembourg Protocol to the Convention on International Interest in Mobile Equipment on Matters specific to Railway Rolling Stock (Luxembourg).

2.2 The UNIDROIT Rules

The project to design the contract's Principles was approved by the UNIDROIT Governing Council in 1971, but a working group wasn't established until 1980.

In 1994, the initial set of the principles was accepted. They consist of a Preamble and 119 articles broken down into seven chapters, including "General Provisions" (Chapter 1); "Formation" (Chapter 2); "Validity" (Chapter 3); "Interpretation" (Chapter 4); "Content" (Chapter 5); "Performance" (Chapter 6); and "Non-Performance" (Chapter 7). Chapter 7 contains four sections: "Non-Performance in General," "Right to Performance," "Termination," and "Damages." Chapter 6 has two sections addressing "Performance in General" and "Hardship," respectively.

In 2004, the second set of Principles was released. The 2004 Principles add new chapters on "Set off" (Chapter 8), "Assignment of Rights, Transfer of Obligations, Assignment of Contracts" (Chapter 9), and "Limitation Periods" (Chapter 10), as well as a new section 2 to Chapter 2 on the "Authority of Agents," to the 1994 Principles rather than replacing them.

In 2010, the third set of principles was finished. The 2010 edition updates parts of the sections in the general provisions, the reasons for avoidance, and termination in addition to adding new sections on illegality, conditions, restitution in failed contracts, and a plurality of obligors and obliges. Additionally, the Principles have been rearranged in various ways. The principles are meant to provide forth guidelines that apply to most legal systems. The rules were created to take into account the unique needs of global trade, to the degree that they do not reflect these

principles. The "black-letter rules" are complemented with in-depth explanations, along with illustrations, that are fundamental to the principles.

In the preamble, the declared goals of the principles are listed: When the parties agree that they should rule their contract, they will be put into effect. They may be used in cases when the parties have stipulated that their agreement would be controlled by general legal principles, the lex mercatoria, or something similar. When the parties have not specified laws to regulate their agreement, they may be applied. They could be used to clarify or add to international instruments of uniform law. They could be used to clarify or add to domestic legislation. They might act as a guide for legislators at the state and international levels. The principles should be categorized as one of the large family of non-binding legal guidelines known as "soft law."

These include the adoption of international trade phrases, the codification of traditions and usages, and model legislation. The 2010 Principles have official publications in English, French, German, Italian, and Spanish. Chinese, Greek, Hungarian, Japanese, Portuguese, Russian, and Ukrainian versions have been published informally. The 2004 Principles are also available in versions that are written in Arabic, Korean, Romanian, and Vietnamese.

Given that no country has ratified the principles as positive law, it is important to consider whether they qualify as "law" under the principles of private international law. This suggests that the parties' selection of the principles under a choice-of-law provision might not be regarded as a legitimate choice of law. This is still a worry that may be avoided with careful legal representation, even though one might believe that an arbitral tribunal will allow the parties more leeway on this than a court might. The parties shouldn't give the tribunal a legal dilemma by selecting the principles as "terms" of the agreement rather than the actual decision of the underlying substantive law. A model clause to include in the contract has been offered by UNIDROIT in recognition of this potential issue.

It is important to recognize that there are currently no clear-cut interpretations of the clauses of the principles. The principles are merely mentioned in passing in a significant percentage of the 142 published court decisions that are included in the UNILEX database and do not provide any analysis. The UNILEX database also contains fewer than 200 documented arbitral judgements. Because of this, unlike many domestic laws and the CISG, there isn't a sizable body of decisions interpreting the principles to provide many of the clauses the comfort of clear meaning. Additionally, as was already indicated, a certain level of specificity had to be avoided

when writing the principles to make them general principles for international business operations. It would not have been feasible to reach a consensus without this degree of generality. The rules must be clear and enforced in particular areas of international commercial law. Domestic and international laws both have the benefit of being immediately uniform and enforceable due to their binding nature. The principles, like any soft law instrument, pose the question of whether it can be enforced to the extent that parties are concerned about it, whether by choice of law or inclusion into the agreement.

3. Conclusion

The fact that cross-border transactions are still largely governed by national laws despite the increasing internationalization of trade has several drawbacks, as demonstrated in the previous remarks, and soft law instruments like the UNIDROIT Principles could be a viable alternative to a strictly positivist or State law-centered conflict-of-laws approach. However, why is it that despite the UNIDROIT Principles generally acknowledged inherent merits, their applicability to international contracts and dispute resolution is, at least initially, still fairly limited? None of the frequent justifications is compelling. Not the claim that, as a purely private codification, the principles lack the "democratic legitimacy" required to be a truly binding or "positive" body of legal principles. Apart from the fact that an intergovernmental organization like UNIDROIT oversaw and provided final approval for the development of the UNIDROIT Principles, which were created by independent experts from around the world, domestic courts, when asked to apply a foreign State law, do not give a damn about how that law was made in its country of origin and only make sure that its content does not violate any domestic laws. It also shouldn't matter because the principles don't contain any regulations for particular contracts and simply address broad contract law issues. Nothing prevents parties from specifying a specific domestic law in addition to the principles when selecting them as the rules of law governing their contract, to fill any possible gaps in the Principles. Of course, such rules are typically agreed upon by the parties on a case-by-case basis or by reference to their standard terms. Finally, it is both too much and too little to argue that the UNIDROIT Principles do not provide the essential certainty and predictability of outcomes in the absence of an adequately established body of case law addressing its use in practice. Too little because more and more decisions—not just arbitral awards but also court decisions that apply the UNIDROIT Principles in one way or another—are reported and annotated so that it may not take too long before the principles will also be confirmed; too much because even highly sophisticated national laws,

let alone less developed ones, do not always provide such clear and predictable solutions for the constantly changing scenario of cross-border business transactions. What is the actual cause of the UNIDROIT Principles' thus far unspectacular performance in reality, then? In essence, the solution is very straightforward and depressing. The primary cause is the legal profession's ingrained conservatism and a significant degree of provincialism. Even now, let alone in the past, the vast majority of lawyers receive legal education that is exclusively focused on one legal system: that of their home nation. Foreign laws, and international uniform law conventions, let alone soft law instruments like the UNIDROIT Principles, receive little to no attention. It makes sense that most attorneys will advise their clients to insist on using their national law in cross-border transactions if they have the bargaining power to do so, or else to use a third country's domestic law when assisting them with such transactions. As demonstrated by numerous empirical studies conducted around the world, the majority of international commercial contracts contain a choice-of-law clause that favors the national law of one of the parties or, if neither party is in a position to impose its law, favors so-called neutral laws—typically English law or Swiss law—with little to no consideration of their inherent merits in comparison to other options. Nevertheless, despite the continued supremacy of national laws, there are some "market niches" that the UNIDROIT Principles genuinely successfully fill. The principles may serve valuable purposes as lex contracuts in addition to the already noted significance of the Principles as "global backdrop law".

References

1. Berger, K. P. (1998). International Arbitral Practice and the UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts. The American Journal of Comparative Law, 46(1), 129-150.
2. https://www.spacelegalissues.com/what-is-unidroit/
3. Gruber, U. P. (2010). International Institute For The Unification Of Private Law. In Handbook of Transnational Economic Governance Regimes (pp. 169-176). Brill Nijhoff.
4. Andreas Giese (Author), 2007, UNIDROIT - How it contributed to international trade harmonization, Munich, GRIN Verlag, https://www.grin.com/document/186409
5. Gabriel, H. D. (2013). The Use of UNIDROIT Principles as Neutral Law in Arbitration. J. Arb. Stud., 23, 39.