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With the aim of creating an autonomous regime for the interpretation and application of the contract, boilerplate clauses are often inserted into international commercial contracts without negotiations or regard for their legal effects. The assumption that a sufficiently detailed and clear language will ensure that the legal effects of the contract will only be based on the contract, as opposed to the applicable law, was originally encouraged by English courts, and today most international contracts have these clauses, irrespective of the governing law. This collection of essays demonstrates that this assumption is not fully applicable under systems of civil law, because these systems are based on principles, such as good faith and loyalty, which contradict this approach.
Features

- Explains the most typical effects of boilerplate clauses under the law of a series of countries to assist practising lawyers who use them in commercial contracts • Demonstrates that international contracts are affected by the applicable law to a previously unsuspected extent, thus inducing practitioners and academics alike to reconsider their reliance on the possibility of uniformly interpreting and applying standard contract wording • Explains how contracts shall be interpreted if they are written on the basis of a law different from the law that governs them, thus providing practitioners with the instruments to write and interpret contracts in the awareness of the governing law

Table of Contents

Introduction
Part I. How Contracts Are Written In Practice: 1. Negotiating international contracts: does the process invite a review of standard contracts from the point of view of national legal requirements? David Echenberg
2. Multinational companies and national contracts Maria Celeste Vettese
Part II. Methodological Challenges: 3. Does the use of common law contract models give rise to a tacit choice of law or to a harmonised, transnational interpretation? Giuditta Cordero Moss
4. Common law based contracts under German law Gerhard Dannemann
5. Comparing exculpatory clauses under Anglo-American law: testing total legal convergence Edward T. Canuel
6. Circulation of common law contract models in Europe: the impact of European Union system Jean-Sylvestre Bergé
Part III. The Applicable Law's Effects on Boilerplate Clauses: 7. The common law tradition: application of boilerplate clauses under English law Edwin Peel
8. The Germanic tradition: application of boilerplate clauses under German law Ulrich Magnus
9. The Romanistic tradition: application of boilerplate clauses under French law Xavier Lagarde, David Méheut and Jean-Michel Reversac
10. The Romanistic tradition: application of boilerplate clauses under Italian law Giorgio De Nova
11. The Nordic tradition: application of boilerplate clauses under Danish law Peter Møgelvang-Hansen
12. The Nordic tradition: application of boilerplate clauses under Finnish Law Gustaf Möller
13. The Nordic tradition: application of boilerplate clauses under Norwegian law Viggo Hagstrøm
14. The Nordic tradition: application of boilerplate clauses under Swedish law Lars Gorton
15. The East European tradition: application of boilerplate clauses under Hungarian law Attila Menyhárd
16. The East European tradition: application of boilerplate clauses under Russian law Ivan S. Zykin
17. Conclusion: the self-sufficient contract, uniformly interpreted on the basis of its own terms: an illusion, but not fully useless Giuditta Cordero Moss.
## APA Project

### Research Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Autumn 09</th>
<th>Spring 10</th>
<th>Autumn 10</th>
<th>Spring 11</th>
<th>Autumn 11</th>
<th>Spring 12</th>
<th>Autumn 12</th>
<th>Spring 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company law</td>
<td>Cathrine Bjoland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition Law</td>
<td>Nicolai Nielsen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property and Insolvency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbitrability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ulrik Tetzschener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hedda Bjørart Roald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Arbitration and the not unlimited party autonomy:

The impact of intellectual property rules and of the arbitrability rule on the enforceability of arbitral awards

Date: 22 November 2011

Place: Statoil ASA, Drammensveien 264. Vækerø 0283 Oslo
The impact of intellectual property rules and of the arbitrability rule on the enforceability of arbitral awards

9.00-9.45
The framework: Arbitration law and the New York Convention as limits to party autonomy – Professor Giuditta Cordero-Moss, University of Oslo

Ongoing research on intellectual property law as a limit to party autonomy in arbitration – Research Assistant Hedda Bjøralt Roald, University of Oslo
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List of topics for discussion

**Intellectual Property:**

**Assumptions:**

- Parties are free to choose the law governing their contracts;
- Contracts may have implications beyond the area of contract law. These legal effects will be subject not to the law chosen by the parties, but to the law applicable according to the relevant choice-of-law rule;
- Arbitral tribunals are bound to follow the will of the parties;
- Arbitral awards must be recognised and enforced without review of the merits or of the application of law;
- If the arbitral tribunal applies the law chosen by the parties instead of the applicable law, it is an error of law that does not affect the validity or enforceability of the award;
- Under certain circumstances, an award may be declared invalid or unenforceable (i.a., if the award is in contrast with the public policy of the court);
- Under certain circumstances, disregard of the applicable law may lead to conflict with public policy (if the award conflicts with some rules of company law, competition law) or other grounds for invalidity or unenforceability (non-compliance with rules on legal capacity).

**Thesis:**

Within the law of intellectual property some rules protect so important interests, that an award following the parties' choice and disregarding these applicable rules will risk being declared invalid or unenforceable.

**Discussion to demonstrate the thesis:**

- Examples (not necessarily involving Norwegian law) of contracts with intellectual property law implications, where the parties try to circumvent the applicable law by choosing a more liberal law/ have not taken into account the consequences of choosing another law: Patent- and trademark licenses
- Explanation of what interests are affected by applying a foreign law
- Explanation of which infringements of these interests may be considered as a violation of public policy
List of topics for discussion

Arbitrability:

Arbitration clauses and arbitrability

Assumptions:
- Courts shall not accept jurisdiction on dispute where there is a valid arbitration agreement between the parties
- If a dispute is on a matter that is not arbitrable, courts have jurisdiction
- If an arbitral award was rendered in a dispute on a matter that is not arbitrable, the award may be set aside or refused enforcement
- Arbitrability is determined by the internal law of the court that is deciding on the validity of the award (the court of the place of arbitration) and of the law of the court that is deciding on the enforcement of the award (the court of the place of enforcement)
- The purpose of the arbitrability rule is to ensure accurate application of rules by the courts in areas where states do not consider it appropriate to delegate the resolution of disputes to private mechanisms

Thesis:
- The arbitrability rule is traditionally a general rule containing abstract criteria restricting access to arbitration for certain types of claim.
- The arbitrability rule is increasingly being used at a pre-award stage to restrict access to arbitration in case it likely, in the specific case, that the arbitral tribunal will not grant an award in accordance with relevant overriding mandatory rules or public policy rules.

Discussion to demonstrate the thesis:
- Comparison of the arbitrability rule, the public policy rule and of the overriding mandatory rules.
- The Second Look doctrine’s role in allowing disputes with public policy implications to be referred to arbitration.
- The impact public policy rules and overriding mandatory rules of the forum state may have on the effectiveness of arbitration agreements.
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