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Energy Under NAFTA

- The key aspects of energy under NAFTA were located under the Energy and Basic Petrochemical Chapter 6 of NAFTA.
- The inclusion of this Chapter in the negotiations was perhaps the most difficult area at that time.
- A relevant step to establish the basis for a future North American energy market.
- Changes under USMCA and now less controversial than under original.
- Rules of origin and energy proportionality.
Energy Under NAFTA

- The original NAFTA Energy Chapter 6 was based on three important principles:
  1. A full respect for the constitutional restrictions of each party;
  2. The need to strengthen and increase trade of energy products and services by a gradual and sustained liberalization; and
  3. The need to create competitive energy sectors.
Energy Under NAFTA

- Under Chapter 6 of NAFTA, the parties agreed to specific provisions with respect to:
  - Import and export restrictions;
  - Export taxes and other export related measures;
  - Regulatory energy measures; and
  - National security measures

- Other specific areas of NAFTA relevant for the oil and gas sector were investor-state disputes and protection of investments
MEXICAN ENERGY REFORM
2013 Mexican Energy Reform

- Long awaited general amendment to the Mexican Energy Provisions at all levels
- Most relevant amendments were specifically focused on Articles 25, 27, and 28 of the Mexican Federal Constitution
- Amendments published in the Federal Official Gazette on December 20, 2013
- Diverse amendments to Federal Provisions followed publication in diverse dates
- Transformation of state-owned enterprises to “for-profit State companies” (FPSC) providing a better platform for efficient competition and investment of the private sector in the energy industry
- Creation of new regulatory bodies in charge of implementation and regulation of energy related provisions as well as to establish, conduct, coordinate, and execute energy policy
General Considerations Regarding Energy Reform

- Hydrocarbons continue to be considered of Mexican ownership
- USMCA Chapter 8 replicates in an express manner the hydrocarbon ownership declaration stated since the 2013 Reform
- Specific requirements from the new administration to include Chapter 8 wording in USMCA irrespective of its general declaration nature of a provisions already included in the Mexican Federal Constitution
Among the main effects arising from the Energy Reform of 2013 are:

- Possibility for private entities to participate in hydrocarbons, electricity and gas sectors;
- Midstream and downstream activities subject to federal permits;
- Upstream activities carried through bidding processes, direct granting or adjudication and other kinds of specific contracts and agreements; and
- Generation and marketing of electric power under governmental authorization and participation in transmission, distribution and other activities through agreements with the National Center for Energy Control (CENACE).
The trade of energy products among the United States, Mexico, and Canada is “alive and kicking.”

“North American trade in energy products is significant and growing. The USMCA provides a predictable framework for the United States, Mexico, and Canada to continue expanding this trade, which has been marked by rapidly increasing US exports.”

Office of the US Trade Representative
Energy Under the USMCA (cont’d)

• USMCA does not have an energy chapter and moves some of NAFTA’s energy provisions to other parts of the agreement
  - Energy chapter that had been negotiated was dropped at the request of Mexico’s incoming government
  - Canada and the United States negotiated a side letter to CUSMA on energy
    - Side letter offers a fail-safe, binding guarantee that stakeholders will not be subject to treatment that is worse than what is now applied
    - Applies only to energy regulatory measures at the central level of government
Energy Under the USMCA (cont’d)

- Encourages cooperation in the energy sector
- Provisions that require Canada and the United States to establish or maintain an independent regulatory authority, and the establishment of transparency requirements for the authorization process in the energy sector
- Requirements for Canada and the United States to provide a right of appeal or judicial review of certain decisions concerning these authorizations in accordance with each Party’s law
- Measures governing access to or use of energy infrastructure must be “neither unduly discriminatory nor unduly preferential”
Energy Under the USMCA (cont’d)

- Locks-in Mexico’s Energy Reform
  - The USMCA adds a new chapter specifically recognizing Mexico’s ownership of hydrocarbons and its rights to reform the constitution and domestic legislation.
  - Other provisions in the USMCA, such as the investor-state dispute settlement (ISDS) provisions in regard to Mexico’s energy sector, would help protect private US energy projects in Mexico.

- Zero Tariff in Trade of Energy Products
Energy Under the USMCA (cont’d)

• Addresses originating issues and pipeline transportation of hydrocarbons
  - The USMCA allows up to 40 per cent of non-originating diluent in pipelines for transportation of crude oil without affecting the eligibility for duty free treatment under the Agreement
  - Longstanding Canadian industry request
    - The blend bitumen and heavy crude oil with condensates or diluents to transport the oil by pipeline
    - The blended crude may no longer qualify as “wholly obtained or produced” in Canada if the diluent itself did not qualify as NAFTA originating
    - Some Canadian crude shipments did not qualify for duty free treatment under the NAFTA and were subject to American duty
Energy Under the USMCA (cont’d)

• Removal of the Proportionality Requirement
  (*Article 605 in NAFTA*)

  ➢ No government measure may reduce the proportion of the supply of an energy product to the other Party based on recent export levels

  ➢ A so-called “proportionality” provision contained in the energy chapters of both CUSFTA and NAFTA, which required Canada to export a fixed share of its energy production to the United States even in times of energy shortages
EXCEPTIONS TO ENERGY UNDER USMCA
Reservations and Exceptions

• These are established in each chapter or in Annexes I to IV (non-conforming measures)

• Annex 2-A, exceptions to “National Treatment” and “Import and Export Restrictions”
  ➢ Mexico established an exception for export permits pursuant to the Hydrocarbons Law

• Present and future measures exempted from USMCA principles and obligations (Annex I and II)
Non-Conforming Measures

- Each party determines:
  - Sector and subsector
  - Level of government maintaining the measure

- Exceptions set by each Party, applicable to:
  - National Treatment (NT) (investment and services)
  - Most-Favored-Nation Treatment (MFN) (investment and services)
  - Performance Requirements (investment)
  - Senior Management and Boards of Directors
  - Market Access (services)
  - Local Presence (services)
Non-Conforming Measures (cont’d)

- Non-conforming activities of a state-owned enterprise or designated monopoly (Annex IV)
- Inapplicability of:
  - Non-Discriminatory Treatment and Commercial Considerations
  - Non-Commercial Assistance
Reservations per Country (related to energy)

- Mexico:
  - Foreign investment in nuclear energy
- Canada:
  - NT, local presence and performance requirements for oil and gas
  - NT and MFN for uranium ownership
- US:
  - Investment in atomic energy
  - NT and MFN for mining (related to pipelines)
POSSIBLE VIOLATIONS TO USMCA DERIVED FROM THE CURRENT MEXICAN POSITION IN CONNECTION WITH THE ENERGY INDUSTRY
USMCA vs NAFTA

**NAFTA**
- Exceptions on Chapters VI, XI and Annexes
- Present (1994) and future measures (energy reform 2013)

**USMCA**
- Declaration on Chapter 8
- Some limitations
  - Export permits
  - Article 32.11
Chapter 8

- Respect for the Parties’ sovereignty and their sovereign right to regulate hydrocarbons
- In accordance with their Constitutions and domestic laws, in the full exercise of their democratic processes

NATURE? A DECLARATION OF THE PARTIES OF AN INHERENT RIGHT.
Chapter 8 (cont’d)

- Without prejudice to US and Canada’s rights and remedies available under USMCA, the Parties recognize Mexico’s:
  - Right to reform its Constitution and its domestic legislation
  - Direct, inalienable, and imprescriptible ownership of all hydrocarbons

**EFFECT?** Mexico may reform its Constitution, laws, and regulations but **THESE REFORMS MUST NOT CONTRAVENE USMCA**
Reservations and Exceptions

- National Treatment and access to markets (export permits)
- Present and future measures (foreign investment in nuclear energy)
- Article 32.11 – possible additional reservations by Mexico
  - It may adopt or maintain a measure for which it has not taken a specific reservation in Annexes I, II, and IV (related to Investment, Cross-Border Trade in Services and State-Owned Enterprises and Designated Monopolies).
  - The measure must be consistent with the least restrictive measures that Mexico may adopt or maintain under reservations and exceptions to parallel obligations in other Agreements (ratified before July 1st).
Mexico’s Current Position

- Project of Constitutional reform
- New sector program 2020-2024
- Fossil vs. renewable energies
- Continuous amendments to regulations
- “Rescuing” of CFE and PEMEX
- Checks and balances in Mexico

- Violation to domestic laws and due process of law
- Violation of international law
  - Environmental obligations
  - International trade agreements
Possible Violations and Remedies

- All measures except for export permits, foreign investment in nuclear energy and measures based on other Agreements (CPTPP)
- Investment claims (only available for US and Mexico)
  - National Treatment
  - Most Favored Nation
  - Expropriation and Compensation
- Dispute settlement mechanism due to violations of the Agreement *per se* (Chapter 31)
POSSIBILITY OF CANADA AND UNITED STATES IMPLEMENTING LEGAL REMEDIES AGAINST POTENTIAL USMCA VIOLATIONS
USMCA Legal Remedies
(Disputes among Parties – Ch. 31)

- Closes the loopholes in the NAFTA dispute settlement mechanism that allowed NAFTA parties to block the formation of panels.
  - Adjustments enhance the enforceability of the agreement
- First consult with technical experts
  - The signatories are to make every endeavor to arrive at a mutually satisfactory resolution of all disputes arising out of the USMCA
- If they are not able to reach a resolution, Chapter 31 of the USMCA provides the framework for dispute settlement
  - The Party complaining may select the forum in which to settle the dispute
    - Parties may decide at any time to undertake an alternative method of dispute resolution
USMCA Legal Remedies
(Disputes among Parties – Ch 31. - Continued)

- If that fails, a ministerial panel will review and submit an initial report (150 days + 30 days grace period if needed)
  - 15 days for comments by the Parties and 30 days for panel to issue final report
  - If the final report finds that there is a non-compliance with a party’s obligation; or a party’s action is causing nullification or impairment of the scope, the disputing parties must try to agree on the proper resolution for the dispute within 45 days
  - If unable to resolve the dispute, the complaining party can suspend the responding party’s benefits of equivalent effect to the dispute
  - Panel may be reconvened in certain instances by the responding party to review proposed remedial measures (90 to 120 days to resolve)
USMCA Legal Remedies
(*Investment Protection Standards – Ch. 14*)

- In a significant change from NAFTA, the investment chapter (Chapter 14) of the USMCA only applies to the US and Mexico.
- Narrows the circumstances under which cross-border investors can bring actions under the general rules of ISDS.
- Generally speaking, Chapter 14 provides access to international arbitration for general investments and **covered government contracts**.
  - pre-arbitration conditions and limitations.
- Investors may seek protection for breach of national treatment and most-favored-nation treatment under the general investments protections.
USMCA Legal Remedies
(Investment Protection Standards – Ch 14. - Continued)

• Under the government-covered contracts protections, investors in oil and gas and power generation may also be entitled to protection under the USMCA.
  ➢ While ISDS disputes are extended to covered contracts in the power sector, the definition specifically requires that power services be provided “to the public” on behalf of a governmental authority of the host country (read CFE in Mexico)

• The consent by Canada to ISDS for legacy investment claims will elapse three years after NAFTA’s termination

• Participation of Mexico and Canada in the Trans-Pacific Partnership (otherwise known as the CPTPP)
  ➢ Need to take a fresh look at options
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