



DISERTASI

**Investment Dispute Settlement Mechanism:
A Comparative Study between Indonesia and China**

Disusun oleh:
LUO YUAN YUAN
NIM. 208211001

PROGRAM STUDI DOKTOR HUKUM
FAKULTAS HUKUM
UNIVERSITAS TARUMANAGARA
2025



Pengesahan

Nama : LUO YUAN YUAN
NIM : 208211001
Program Studi : DOKTOR HUKUM
Judul Disertasi : Mekanisme Penyelesaian Sengketa Investasi:
Studi Perbandingan antara Indonesia dan China
Title : Investment Dispute Settlement Mechanism: A Comparative
Study between Indonesia and China

Disertasi ini telah dipertahankan di hadapan Dewan Penguji Program Studi
DOKTOR HUKUM Fakultas Hukum Universitas Tarumanagara pada tanggal 21-
November-2024.

Tim Penguji:

1. AMAD SUDIRO, S.H., M.Hum, M.M., Dr., MKn., Prof
2. ABDUL GANI ABDULLAH, S.H., Dr., Prof
3. R. M. GATOT P. SOEMARTONO, SE.,SH.,MM.,LLM, Dr.
4. ARIAWAN GUNADI, S.H., M.H., Dr. Prof.
5. GUNARDI LIE, S.H., M.H., Dr. Prof.
6. RICHARD C.ADAM, S.H., LL.M., Dr.

Yang bersangkutan dinyatakan: **LULUS.**

Pembimbing:

ABDUL GANI ABDULLAH, S.H., Dr., Prof
NIK/NIP: 10218002

Pembimbing Pendamping:

R. M. GATOT P. SOEMARTONO,
SE.,SH.,MM.,LLM, Dr.
NIK/NIP: 10289008

Jakarta, 21-November-2024

Ketua Program Studi

MELLA ISMELINA F. RAHAYU, S.H., M.Hum., Dr., Prof.

Persetujuan

Nama : LUO YUAN YUAN
NIM : 208211001
Program Studi : DOKTOR HUKUM
Judul : Investment Dispute Settlement Mechanism
Comparative Study between Indonesia and China


Disertasi ini disetujui untuk diuji

Jakarta, 25-September-2024

Pembimbing:
ABDUL GANI ABDULLAH, S.H., Dr., Prof
NIK/NIP: 10218002

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'A. G. Abdullah', written over a horizontal line.

Pembimbing Pendamping:
R. M. GATOT P. SOEMARTONO,
SE.,SH.,MM.,LLM, Dr.
NIK/NIP: 10289008

A large, stylized handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'R. M. Gatot P. Soemartono', written over a horizontal line.

Pernyataan

Nama : LUO YUAN YUAN
NIM : 208211001
Program Studi : DOKTOR HUKUM
Judul : Mekanisme Penyelesaian Sengketa Investasi:
Studi Perbandingan antara Indonesia dan China

Dengan ini menyatakan bahwa disertasi ini merupakan hasil kerja saya sendiri di bawah bimbingan Tim Pembimbing dan bukan hasil plagiasi dan/atau kegiatan curang lainnya.

Jika saya melanggar pernyataan ini, maka saya bersedia dikenakan sanksi sesuai aturan yang berlaku di Universitas Tarumanagara.

Demikian pernyataan ini saya buat dengan sebenarnya, untuk dipergunakan sebagaimana mestinya.

Jakarta, 25-September-2024
Yang menyatakan



luo yuan yuan

LUO YUAN YUAN
NIM. 208211001

Table of Content

CHAPTER I BACKGROUND	5
1. THE OVERVIEW OF CURRENT WORLD ISDS MECHANISM	6
1.1 LOCAL REMEDY	6
1.2 DIPLOMATIC PROTECTION	6
1.3 International Arbitration	7
1.4 The Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR)	13
2. THE GENERAL EVALUATION OF THE CURRENT WORLD ISDS MECHANISM	14
2.1 Problems of Current International Arbitration	14
2.2 ADR Performs Poorly in Practice	16
2.3. The Less Popularity of Local Remedy	17
2.4. The Unpractical Usage of Diplomatic Protection	17
3. THE OVERVIEW OF CURRENT INDONESIA ISDS MECHANISM	18
3.1 LOCAL REMEDY IN INDONESIA	19
3.2 INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION IN INDONESIA	21
3.3 ADR IN INDONESIA	23
4. THE OVERVIEW OF CURRENT CHINESE ISDS MECHANISM	24
4.1 LOCAL REMEDY IN CHINA	24
4.2 ARBITRATION RESOLUTION IN CHINA	26
4.3 ADR IN CHINA	28
5. PROBLEM STATEMENT	29
5.1 WHAT REFORMS ARE REQUIRED FOR THE CURRENT INTERNATIONAL ISDS SYSTEM?	30
5.2 HOW SHOULD INDONESIA IMPROVE THE CURRENT ISDS SYSTEM?	30
5.3 WHAT KIND OF EFFORTS CHINA STILL NEED TO DO ON CURRENT ISDS SYSTEM?	30
6. RESEARCH PURPOSE	30
6.1 Beneficial for the Investors	31
6.2 Significant to the Governments	32
6.3 Enrich the Academic Circle	33
7. LITERATURE REVIEW	33
7.1 Indonesia scholars	33
7.2 Chinese Scholars	38
7.3 International Scholars	44
8. METHODOLOGY	48
8.1 Research Method	48
8.2 Research Specification	49
8.3 Research Stage	49
8.4 Data Collection technique	49
8.5 Analysis Method	49
8.6 Analysis Tools used	49
CHAPTER II THEORETICAL BASIS	50
1. THE CLARIFICATION OF CERTAIN RELEVANT CONCEPT	50
1.1 Investment	50
1.2 Investor	51
1.3 Investment Dispute	52
1.4 Investment Dispute Settlement	52
1.5 Capital, Foreign Capital, Domestic Capital	52
2. THEORETICAL BASIS FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF EXPERTS	53
2.1 Indonesian Experts	53

2.2 International Experts.....	55
2.3 Chinese Experts	60
3.THEORETICAL BASIS FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF LAWS &TREATIES	67
3.1 The Local Remedy	67
3.11 The Theoretical Basis from the Perspective of International Law	68
3.12 The Theoretical Basis from the Perspective of Chinese Domestic Law.....	70
3.13 The Theoretical Basis from the Perspective of Indonesia Domestic Law	71
3.2 International Arbitration.....	71
3.21 The Theoretical Basis from the Perspective of International Treaty	71
3.22 The Theoretical Basis from the Perspective of Indonesia Domestic Law	73
3.23 The Theoretical Basis from the Perspective of Chinese Domestic Rule	73
3.3 Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR)	74
3.31 The Theoretical Basis from the Perspective of International Treaty	74
3.32 The Theoretical Basis from the Perspective of Indonesia Domestic Law	76
3.33 The Theoretical Basis from the Perspective of Chinese Domestic Law.....	76
CHAPTER III RESEARCH FINDINGS	77
1. THE REFORM OF ISDS GOES INEFFICIENT AND NO CONSENSUS REACHED YET	77
2.THE PROBLEM OF CURRENT ISDS ITSELF	88
2.1 Inconsistencies in Investment Arbitration	88
2.2 Selection and Ethical Standards of Arbitrators	89
2.3 ADR Has Not Play an Important Role in ISDS Yet	90
2.4 The Defective Structure of ISDS System	90
2.5 Both Indonesia and China Has Various Problems in Their Own ISDS	91
CHAPTER IV ANALYSIS	91
1.THE COMPARISON ON THE LOCAL REMEDY	91
1.1 FORK-IN-THE-ROAD CLAUSE.....	92
1.2 EXHAUSTION OF LOCAL REMEDIES IN CHINA.....	96
1.3 EXHAUSTION OF LOCAL REMEDIES IN INDONESIA.....	100
2. THE COMPARISON ON THE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION	103
3. THE COMPARISON OF CURRENT ADR	178
3.1 THE ADR IN ICSID	178
3.2 ADR CONCERNING UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS RESULTING FROM MEDIATION/SINGAPORE CONVENTION.....	180
3.3 THE REASON FOR THE UNPOPULARITY OF THE ADR IN PRACTICE/THE SHORTAGE OF ADR	181
3.31 THE SHORTAGE OF EXPERIENCED PROFESSIONAL AND INDEPENDENT MEDIATORS GROUP.....	181
3.32 THE CONCILIATION PROCEDURE RULES ARE TOO SIMILAR TO ARBITRATION	182
3.33 AVOIDANCE OF ACCOUNTABILITY BY HOST GOVERNMENTS	182
3.34 THE ENFORCEMENT OF THE ADR SETTLEMENT IS HARD TO ASSURE.....	182
3.35 THE PUBLIC LACKS THE UNDERSTANDING OF THE ADR SYSTEM	183
3.4 THE ADVANTAGES OF ADR.....	183
3.41 THE FLEXIBILITY OF THE MEDIATION AS THE IMPORTANT ROLE IN ADR.....	183
3.42 THE MOST TIME SAVING APPROACH FOR ISDS	185
3.43 BOTH THE INTERNATIONAL WORLD AND SOME STATES ARE AWARE OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ADR ..	185
3.44 THE SERIES ISSUES CAME ACROSS IN INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION SYSTEM	191
3.45 THE HISTORICAL MARKS AND DEVELOPMENT OF ADR SINCE FROM ANCIENT CHINA.....	191
3.46 THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ADR IN CHINA’S HISTORICAL PERIOD WAS IN THE FORMAT OF MEDIATION ...	192
3.47 THE HISTORICAL MARKS AND DEVELOPMENT OF ADR IN INDONESIA.....	194
3.5 WHAT KIND OF ADR SYSTEM SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED?	202
3.51 FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF INDONESIA CONCERNING THE THEORY ASPECT	202
3.52 FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF CHINA CONCERNING THE ADR.....	205

3.53 THE SOLUTION FOR THE WORLD ADR SYSTEM	206
4. THE DESIGN OF ESTABLISHING THE MULTILATERAL INVESTMENT COURT	219
4.1 THE SIGNIFICANT OF ESTABLISHING THE MULTILATERAL INVESTMENT COURT	219
4.2 THE STRUCTURE DESIGN OF MULTILATERAL INVESTMENT COURT	224
4.3 THE ENFORCEMENT OF THE JUDGEMENT	231
4.4 THE REASON THAT CHINA SHOULD SUPPORT THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE MULTILATERAL INVESTMENT COURT	231
4.5 THE REASON OF INDONESIA SHOULD SUPPORT THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT COURT	233
5. WHY DOES THE ISDS SYSTEM SHOULD EXCLUDE ARBITRATION?	236
5.1 THE REASON FROM THE NATURE OF THE ARBITRATION	236
5.2 THE INEVITABLE PROBLEMS IN PRACTICE	238
6. THE COMPARISON ON THE ASPECT OF INVESTMENT INCENTIVE IN INDONESIA AND CHINA	243
6.1 THE OVERVIEW OF INVESTMENT INCENTIVE IN CHINA	244
6.2 THE OVERVIEW OF INVESTMENT INCENTIVE IN INDONESIA	250
CHAPTER V CONCLUSION.....	253
1. THE WORLD ISDS SYSTEM SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED BY “TRIANGLE “SYSTEM	254
2. WHAT KIND OF REFORM SHOULD INDONESIA DO?	261
2.1 SUPPORT THE “TRIANGLE” SYSTEM	261
2.2 IMPROVE THE RECOGNITION AND ENFORCEMENT SYSTEM	261
2.3 ACCELERATE THE PACE OF LEGAL EXPERTS’ INVOLVEMENT IN INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT WORLD STAGE	264
3. WHAT KIND OF CHANGES SHOULD CHINA TAKE?	265
3.1 DESIGN THE RECOGNITION AND ENFORCEMENT SYSTEM.....	265
3.2 ESTABLISH THE INVESTMENT INSURANCE SYSTEM.....	266
3.3 GUIDE THE CORPORATE TO TAKE THE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY.....	268
4. THE RELIEF THAT THE INVESTOR CAN SEEK FOR THE FAIL OF RECOGNITION AND ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURE	270
REFERENCES	272