TRANSADVISORY
L E G A L

AN ANALYSIS OF STABILIZATION CLAUSES IN NIGERIAN OIL AND GAS CONTRACTS; PRACTICABILITY, ENFORCEABILITY AND ECONOMIC IMPACT.

Rilwan I. Idris
Managing Partner
Transadivsory Legal

Emmanuel B. Arikpo
Associate
Transadivsory Legal

Timothy O. Nworie
Associate
Transadivsory Legal

Transadvisorylegal
Trans_advisory
Transadvisory Legal
Savannah Suites, No. 8
Faskari Street, Area III,
Garki, FCT, Abuja

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Abstract
2. Introduction
3. The Concept and Evolution of Stabilization Clauses
4. Enforceability of Stabilization Clause Under Nigerian Law of Contract.
5. The practical ways to enforce such clauses in Nigeria.
6. Conclusion and Recommendations

Abstract

Stabilization clauses are an indispensable feature of modern petroleum contracts, serving as a contractual mechanism to mitigate political and regulatory risks that may undermine the economic landscape of long-term investments. In the context of Nigeria's oil and gas industry, where the state's sovereign right to regulate its natural resources often conflicts with the commercial interests of foreign investors, stabilization clauses have evolved as tools of balance, enabling investor confidence while at the same time provoking debates over sovereignty, environmental governance, and sustainable development. This article critically examines the nature, function, and enforcement of stabilization clauses within Nigerian oil and gas transactions, exploring their historical evolution, types, and rationale. Ultimately, the article examines how investor protection under stabilization clauses coexists with Nigeria's constitutional sovereignty and sustainable development objectives.

Stabilization clauses are contractual provisions designed to protect investors from changes in law or policy that may affect the economics of their investment. In the context of oil and gas transactions in Nigeria, these clauses are particularly relevant due to the country's history of regulatory changes and policy shifts. This overview provides a comprehensive analysis of stabilization clauses in oil and gas transactions from a Nigerian perspective, including their purpose, types, challenges, and best practices.

1.0. Introduction

The relationship between host states and foreign investors in the oil and gas sector is inherently complex, often characterized by competing interests, which are the sovereign right of the host state to regulate its resources and the investor's legitimate expectation of a stable regulatory environment. To reconcile these conflicts, stabilization clauses have emerged as a critical contractual device. These clauses, typically embedded in production sharing contracts (PSCs), joint venture agreements (JVAs), and host government agreements (HGAs), are designed to ensure that the legal and fiscal regime governing an investment remains predictable throughout the project's lifespan.

The oil and gas industry is a capital-intensive and high-risk sector that requires significant investment and long-term commitment. To attract investment, host states often provide contractual assurances, including stabilization clauses, to protect investors from changes in law or policy that may impact the economics of their investment. In Nigeria, stabilization clauses are commonly included in production sharing contracts (PSCs) and other oil and gas agreements.

In Nigeria, where petroleum operations are the backbone ofour national economy, stabilization clauses play a strategic position in the country's petroleum contractual landscape. They serve as assurances to foreign investors that the legal and fiscal conditions prevailing at the time of contract execution will not be altered to their detriment without due compensation or renegotiation. Such assurances are particularly vital given the state's dual role as both sovereign regulator and commercial participant in petroleum activities.

The Petroleum Industry Act 2021 (PIA) has redefined the legal landscape of Nigeria's petroleum sector, introducing new fiscal frameworks and governance structures. Yet, despite its modernizing ambitions, concerns over regulatory uncertainty and fiscal volatility persist. Concerns that continue to justify the inclusion of stabilization clauses in contractual negotiations.

The enforcement of these clauses, however, remains fraught with legal complexity. Nigerian courts, though limited in exposure to such clauses, have historically exhibited deference to the state's sovereign powers, while arbitral tribunals applying international law have often leaned toward upholding contractual sanctity and legitimate expectations.

The interplay between contractual stability and sovereign authority then forms the core of the stabilization debate. On one hand, investors seek predictability and legal certainty to safeguard multi-billion-dollar capital investments in exploration, production, and infrastructure. On the other hand, Nigeria must retain sufficient flexibility to pursue evolving public policy objectives, including environmental protection, energy transition, and social welfare. The tension between these objectives raises critical questions as to what extent stabilization clauses limit the Nigerian state's legislative and regulatory authority. How effective are such clauses in practice, especially when disputes arise? And how do Nigerian and international tribunals interpret and enforce these provisions within the broader framework of investment law and public policy?

This article seeks to address these questions through a detailed examination of stabilization clauses in Nigeria's oil and gas industry. It situates the discussion within the broader international legal discourse, analyzing experiences of other resource-dependent jurisdictions such as Libya and Angola, where similar contractual and arbitral controversies have shaped the evolution of petroleum investment law.

2.0. Concept and Evolution of Stabilization Clauses

The concept of stabilization clauses traces its origins to the nineteenth century, when developing nations, newly independent from colonial rule, sought to assert sovereignty over their natural resources. Foreign investors, primarily Western oil companies, viewed these newly independent states as politically unstable and legally unpredictable. In response, stabilization clauses were introduced as contractual mechanisms to safeguard investments against arbitrary legislative or administrative actions that could undermine the profitability of petroleum projects. These clauses thus represent a compromise between the sovereign prerogatives of host states and the commercial imperatives of investors.

At their core, stabilization clauses are provisions within state contracts, particularly concession agreements, production sharing contracts (PSCs), and host government agreements (HGAs), designed to ensure that the legal, fiscal, and regulatory framework applicable at the time of contract execution remains stable or that any subsequent adverse changes will trigger compensatory adjustments. The underlying objective is to neutralise the impact of political risk, the risk that future changes in law or policy will erode the economic assumptions underpinning the investment.

2.1. Historical Development

The earliest stabilization clauses appeared in the concession agreements of the 1950s, such as those between Middle Eastern states and multinational oil companies, notably the 1950 ARAMCO concession. These clauses became more prominent following the wave of nationalisations in the 1960s and 1970s, where resource-rich nations sought to reclaim control over their petroleum industries. International cases such as ***Texaco v Libya and LIAMCO v Libya*** cemented the jurisprudential significance of stabilization clauses, recognising them as contractual assurances capable of restraining or compensating for unilateral state action inconsistent with contractual commitments.

In Nigeria, the development of stabilization clauses followed the country's evolution as a major oil producer and member of the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC). The early concessionary regime of the 1950s and 1960s, dominated by multinational companies such as Shell-BP, largely mirrored the legal traditions of other OPEC states, granting expansive rights to investors with minimal state intervention. However, the nationalisation policies of the 1970s, including the establishment of the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (NNPC) in 1977, marked a shift towards greater state participation and control. To reassure investors in this new era of state dominance, stabilization clauses were incorporated into production sharing contracts and joint venture agreements, ensuring that subsequent legislative or fiscal changes would not erode investors' economic interests.

2.2. Nature and Function

Stabilization clauses serve a dual function: first, as an instrument of risk allocation between the investor and the host state; and second, as a guarantee of predictability in long-term investments. The host state promises not to unilaterally alter the economic landscape to the detriment of the investor, while the investor, in turn, commits capital and technology for resource exploitation. The legal theory upholds that stabilization clauses rest on the doctrine of pacta sunt servanda, the principle that agreements must be honoured, balanced with the host state's sovereign right to legislate for public welfare.

There are four notable types of stabilization clauses: **Freezing clauses**, which fix the applicable law at the time of contract execution, shielding investors from future legal changes; **Intangibility clauses,** which prevent unilateral alteration or termination of the contract by the host state; **Rebalancing (economic equilibrium) clauses**, which allow parties to renegotiate terms to restore financial balance when new laws affect profitability; and **Allocation of burden clauses,** which predefine which party bears the cost or benefit of subsequent legal or fiscal changes. Together, these clauses protect investors from adverse shifts in a host state's legal and regulatory environment.

The Nigerian practice aligns more closely with the rebalancing model, as reflected in most Production Sharing Contracts (PSCs) executed by the NNPC on behalf of the government. These contracts typically include provisions allowing for the renegotiation of fiscal terms in response to legislative amendments that materially affect the contractor's economic benefits. This approach reflects a practical balance, acknowledging Nigeria's need for legislative flexibility while maintaining investor confidence in the stability of contractual commitments.

2.3. Legal Foundations

The legitimacy of stabilization clauses is rooted in both contractual autonomy and international investment law. From a contractual standpoint, these clauses express the parties' mutual intent to regulate future conduct, forming part of the governing law of the contract. From an international law perspective, stabilization clauses have been reinforced by the doctrines of acquired rights and legitimate expectations, which protect investors from arbitrary or retroactive state interference.

However, the enforceability of such clauses remains contentious in domestic legal systems, particularly where constitutional principles, such as the supremacy of legislation, prevail. In Nigeria, section 4(1) of the 1999 Constitution vests legislative authority in the National Assembly, while section 1(3) affirms the Constitution's supremacy. Thus, no contractual provision can oust legislative competence. The practical implication is that while stabilization clauses may bind the executive arm or state-owned corporations like the NNPC, they cannot constitutionally fetter the legislative powers of the National Assembly. This legal reality limits the absolute efficacy of freezing clauses under Nigerian law, thereby reinforcing the preference for economic equilibrium provisions that rely on renegotiation rather than legislative restraint.

3.0 Enforceability of Stabilization Clause Under Nigerian Law of Contract

In many legal systems, including common law, stabilization clauses are enforceable provided they are clearly drafted and unambiguous. However, their enforceability may be challenged, especially when they contravene public policy or constitutional principles, such as a state's sovereign right to legislate. In cases involving state parties, courts and tribunals may be reluctant to uphold stabilization clauses that excessively limit a state's legislative power, particularly when public interest or national sovereignty is at stake.

The Frustrated Contracts Act (in the UK) and similar legislation in other jurisdictions provide mechanisms for dealing with circumstances where performance becomes impossible due to changes in law or regulation, but the application of these laws to stabilization clauses remains complex. Arbitration, especially in international contexts, often provides a more flexible framework for enforcing stabilization clauses, as it may take into account international law principles that limit the ability of states to unilaterally modify contractual terms.

Ultimately, the enforceability of stabilization clauses depends on the specific contract's terms, the governing jurisdiction’s legal framework, and the nature of the change triggering the clause. Parties drafting such clauses must carefully consider legal risks, ensure compliance with local and international regulations, and include dispute resolution mechanisms that safeguard their interests against future changes in the legal environment.

3.1 Relationship between Sanctity of Contract, Discharge by Frustration, and Stabilization Clauses.

The principles of sanctity of contract, discharge by frustration, and stability clauses are interconnected in how they deal with the enforcement and modification of contractual obligations in the face of unforeseen circumstances. Each principle addresses different aspects of a contract’s enforceability and its ability to adapt to changing conditions.

3.2 Sanctity of Contract

The principle of sanctity of contract holds that once parties voluntarily enter into a contract, they are bound to fulfill their obligations under that contract (pacta sunt servanda). This principle upholds the idea that contracts are sacred and must be honoured unless legally invalid or unenforceable. It is fundamental in contract law as it ensures predictability and trust in business relationships.

3.2.1 Connection to Stabilization Clauses: The sanctity of contract directly supports the enforceability of stability clauses, which are designed to preserve the agreed-upon terms (such as legal/regulatory frameworks) for the duration of the contract. Stability clauses align with the sanctity of the contract by aiming to protect one party from unforeseen changes that could undermine the original terms.

3.2.2 Connection to Discharge by Frustration: The sanctity of contract is somewhat in tension with discharge by frustration. While the sanctity of contract suggests a party should adhere to the contract, frustration allows for an exception when external, unforeseen circumstances make performance impossible or radically different. Thus, while sanctity upholds the binding nature of a contract, frustration offers a remedy when performance becomes impractical due to no fault of the parties.

3.3 Discharge by Frustration

Discharge by frustration occurs when an unforeseen event radically changes or makes the performance of the contract impossible. This principle allows for the termination of the contract if the fundamental basis of the contract is destroyed.

3.3.1 Connection to Stabilization Clauses: Stability clauses are designed to prevent the frustration of a contract by protecting parties from certain changes (e.g., regulatory changes) during the contract term. If the contract includes a stability clause and a triggering event (such as a change in law) occurs, the stability clause may override a claim of frustration by providing a clear remedy (compensation, renegotiation, or enforcement of the original terms) rather than terminating the contract.

3.3.2 Connection to Sanctity of Contract: Discharge by frustration is an exception to the sanctity of contract. It allows a contract to be terminated when performance becomes impossible due to circumstances beyond either party's control. This undermines the strict application of the sanctity of contract, but balances it by offering a fair solution when fulfilling the contract would be unjust or unreasonable.

3.4 Change of Laws that Govern Contracts in Nigeria.

A fundamental issue in Nigerian contract and investment law is whether a sovereign government that has entered into a binding agreement with an investor can lawfully evade its obligations by altering or repealing the laws governing that contract. In simpler terms, can the government claim that a contract has been "frustrated" merely because legislative or regulatory changes have made performance inconvenient or undesirable?

If the answer to this question is in the affirmative, it would create a deeply unsettling precedent for investors. It would suggest that a government may unilaterally escape contractual responsibility by changing its domestic laws and effectively defeating the principle of pacta sunt servanda (agreements must be kept). This would undermine investor confidence and make Nigeria's investment climate legally unstable.

3.4.1 The Doctrine of Frustration and Its Application to Sovereign Entities

Under Nigerian law, the doctrine of frustration discharges a contract where performance has become impossible, illegal, or radically different from what was originally contemplated, provided that the change is not the fault of either party. The Supreme Court in Attorney-General of Cross River State v. Attorney-General of the Federation affirmed that frustration applies to all classes of contracts, whether between private individuals or involving government entities.

However, the same decision emphasized that frustration can only arise from events beyond the control of the contracting parties and not from self-induced actions. Therefore, where the government itself enacts a law or regulation that renders performance more difficult or impossible, it cannot credibly claim frustration. The government would, in effect, be relying on its own act to invalidate a contract, contrary to the equitable principle that no one should benefit from their own wrong.

Accordingly, a contract cannot properly be said to be frustrated merely because the sovereign party, acting through legislation or executive order, has altered the legal environment. In such a case, the impossibility of performance is self-created, not external or unforeseen. This will now take us the analysis of its enforceability

3.4.2 Enforceability under Nigerian Law

Research shows that Nigerian domestic law does not contain a general statutory recognition of “freezing” or stabilization clauses. Their enforceability thus depends primarily on the terms of the contract, the governing law, and the dispute resolution clause. Nigerian courts may be reluctant to treat stabilization clauses as overriding future legislative acts, because of the constitutional principle of legislative supremacy. Consequently, a clause that purports to restrict Parliament or a State House of Assembly from making new laws could be viewed as contrary to public policy or unconstitutional.

Nevertheless, stabilization clauses may still be enforceable contractually, meaning that while a future law may validly apply, the investor may have a right to compensation or renegotiation if the law adversely affects the contract. This is a common approach in international investment law and arbitral practice.

3.5 Application of Stabilization Clauses to Different Contractual Relationships.

3.5.1 Federal Government and Foreign Investors

Contracts between the Federal Government of Nigeria and foreign investors are governed by a combination of:

- Nigerian domestic laws (including the Companies and Allied Matters Act, 2020, and the Nigerian Investment Promotion Commission Act);
- Bilateral Investment Treaties (BITs) between Nigeria and the investor's home country; and
- Customary international law principles on state responsibility and treaty obligations.

Where a stabilization clause is contained in a contract covered by a BIT, and a dispute arises, the investor can seek recourse before the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID), established under the Washington Convention of 1965. Nigeria is a contracting state to the Convention, and Section 1 of the ICSID (Enforcement of Awards) Act provides that ICSID awards are enforceable in Nigeria as if they were judgments of the Supreme Court.

This framework offers strong protection to foreign investors. The decision in Texaco Overseas Petroleum Co. v. Government of the Libyan Arab Republic illustrates that a sovereign state cannot invoke its internal law or sovereignty to repudiate an international contractual commitment. Therefore, a foreign investor can, in principle, enforce a stabilization clause against Nigeria through international arbitration.

3.5.2 Federal Government and Nigerian Investors

For Nigerian investors contracting with the Federal Government, the legal position is somewhat different. In the absence of an applicable BIT, the investor's remedies will generally lie in Nigerian courts, unless the contract expressly provides for international arbitration. However, the substantive rules governing the enforceability of a stabilization clause would largely mirror those applicable to foreign investors.

The main distinction lies in jurisdiction and enforcement: domestic investors cannot ordinarily rely on international treaty protections designed for foreign investors. Yet, the Nigerian judiciary has shown increasing respect for arbitration agreements and commercial autonomy, suggesting that a stabilization clause, if properly drafted could still be upheld domestically.

3.5.3 Federal Government and Another Sovereign State

Where the Federal Government of Nigeria enters into an agreement with another sovereign nation, the contract is governed by public international law rather than domestic law. In this context, the International Court of Justice (ICJ) or other international tribunals have jurisdiction.

Under Article 27 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a state cannot invoke its internal laws as justification for failing to perform its treaty obligations. Consequently, stabilization or freezing clauses in inter-state contracts are more readily enforceable. Decisions of the ICJ are binding on the parties and must be executed in good faith, even if they contradict domestic policy considerations.

3.5.4 State Governments and Private Investors

Contracts between a State Government and an investor raise distinct constitutional challenges. By virtue of Section 4(5) of the 1999 Constitution (as amended), Federal laws prevail over inconsistent state laws, and state legislative powers are limited to matters within the Concurrent or Residual Lists.

Thus, a stabilization clause in a contract between a state and an investor will only be valid if it falls within the legislative competence of the state. If the subject matter is within the Exclusive Legislative List, the clause and possibly the entire contract may be ultra vires and unenforceable. Practitioners must therefore exercise careful due diligence to ensure that the transaction falls within the state's constitutional authority.

4.0 The practical ways to enforce such clauses in Nigeria

Enforcing a stabilization clause in Nigeria can be challenging but achievable if the necessary legal processes are followed. A stabilization clause is often included in contracts, particularly in industries like oil and gas, infrastructure, and mining, to ensure that the terms of the contract remain unchanged over time, even if there are legislative or regulatory changes in the country. The practical ways to enforce such clauses in Nigeria are outlined below:

Clear Drafting of the Stabilization Clause

The clause should be clearly defined in the contract to avoid ambiguities. It should specify what circumstances trigger its application, how long the stabilization will last, and the precise rights and obligations of the parties. Research shows that stabilization clauses, which are centred on economic equilibrium, are much more enforceable than the freezing clauses.

The clause may state that if changes to Nigerian laws, taxes, or regulations adversely affect the investment, the terms of the contract will be adjusted to preserve the economic balance as initially agreed upon, or the investor will be greatly compensated in damages.

Bilateral Negotiation and Agreement

A stabilization clause may require the parties involved to negotiate changes in the event of new regulations or laws. This negotiation should be outlined as a formal process within the clause, specifying timelines and procedures.

In the event of changes in laws that affect the contract, the parties may be obligated to renegotiate and adapt the contract terms, ensuring both sides remain in balance.

Legal Recourse through Arbitration

Arbitration is a common dispute resolution mechanism in Nigeria for enforcing contracts, especially for international agreements. If one party claims that a new regulation or law violates the stabilization clause, they may seek recourse through arbitration.

Nigeria has a growing practice of using international arbitration centers (such as the Nigerian Arbitration and Conciliation Act and the Lagos Court of Arbitration) for resolving commercial disputes. The enforcement of stabilization clauses can be pursued through arbitration proceedings.

The arbitration process would allow the parties to argue whether a new law constitutes a breach of the contract and whether the stabilization clause should apply.

Judicial Enforcement

Court proceedings may also be pursued if arbitration fails or if the terms of the stabilization clause are violated in a manner that directly impacts the contract's core obligations.

Nigerian courts, particularly the Federal High Court, can be approached to enforce a contract's stabilization clause. The court can examine whether there has been a significant regulatory change and decide whether the clause applies to preserve the contract terms.

The court’s decision would rely on contract law principles, and the judicial interpretation would focus on ensuring that both parties fulfill their commitments under the contract, adjusting terms where applicable, to achieve a better result in courts, stabilization clauses should lean more on economic equilibrium, other than outright freezing of legislative powers

Sovereign Guarantees and Protection

For international agreements, especially in resource-rich sectors (such as oil and gas), stabilization clauses may be backed by sovereign guarantees from the Nigerian government. This may offer a higher level of protection to foreign investors, ensuring that even in the event of regulatory changes, the terms agreed upon in the contract remain valid.

The government's backing of the clause through bilateral investment treaties (BITs) or investment protection agreements can provide added security, making it easier to enforce stabilization clauses in Nigeria.

Recourse to the Nigerian Investment Promotion Commission (NIPC)

Section 24 of The NIPC Act has several guarantees for foreign Investors. NIPC can provide support for enforcing investment protection laws. If the stabilization clause is part of an agreement that qualifies for investment protection under Nigerian law, the NIPC may intervene to ensure compliance with the protection clauses.

The NIPC promotes favourable conditions for foreign investments and ensures that foreign investors are not adversely impacted by changes in laws and regulations. If a dispute arises concerning the enforcement of a stabilization clause, the NIPC can assist with negotiations and, if necessary, facilitate legal action.

5.0 Conclusion and Recommendations

Stabilization clauses are an important feature of oil and gas contracts in Nigeria, providing investors with a degree of protection against changes in law or policy. However, these clauses must be carefully drafted to balance the interests of investors and the host state. By understanding the purpose, types, and challenges of stabilization clauses, investors and host states can work together to create a more stable and predictable investment environment in Nigeria.

To enforce a stabilization clause in Nigeria, the clause must be clearly drafted, and it's crucial to have mechanisms such as arbitration, judicial recourse, or governmental support in place. Investors must also consider negotiation strategies and, where applicable, take advantage of sovereign guarantees or diplomatic assistance to ensure their contractual rights are upheld. Understanding Nigerian contract law, as well as utilizing dispute resolution mechanisms like arbitration, can go a long way in ensuring that stabilization clauses are effectively enforced.

Nigeria must, as a matter of necessity, enact laws that clearly acknowledge and define stabilization clauses and scope, and draftsmen of contracts should use more clauses that guarantee economic equilibrium, other than outright freezing of legislative powers.

References

1. Thomas Wälde, 'Renegotiating Acquired Rights in the Oil and Gas Industries: Industry and Political Cycles Meet the Rule of Law' (2008) 1 Journal of World Energy Law and Business 55.
2. Kaniye S A Ebeku, Oil and the Niger Delta People in International Law: Resource Rights, Environmental and Equity Issues (Lit Verlag 2006) 8
3. Petroleum Industry Act 2021, ss 6, 104, and 311.
4. Ibrahim Aliyu and Musa Yakubu, 'Legal Stability in Nigeria's Petroleum Industry: The Role of Stabilization Clauses' (2019) 10 Nigerian Journal of Energy Law and Policy 14.
5. Anthony Asika, 'Stabilization Clauses and State Sovereignty in Nigeria's Petroleum Contracts' (2020) 4 Nigerian Law Review 122.
6. Peter Cameron, International Energy Investment Law: The Pursuit of Stability (2nd Edition, Oxford University Press 2017) 112.
7. Kaj Hobér, Investment Arbitration in the Energy Sector: Intergovernmental and Commercial Disputes (OUP 2018) 67.
8. Andrew P Newcombe and Luis Paradell, Law and Practice of Investment Treaties: Standards of Treatment (Kluwar Law International 2009) 376
9. Texaco Overseas Petroleum Co v Government of the Libyan Arab Republic (1977) 17 ILM 1.

References

10. Libyan American Oil Co (LIAMCO) v Government of the Libyan Arab Republic (1981) 20 ILM 1.
11. Kaniye S A Ebeku, Oil and the Niger Delta People in International Law: Resource Rights, Environmental and Equity Issues (Lit Verlag 2006) 93.
12. Ibrahim Aliyu and Musa Yakubu, 'Legal Stability in Nigeria's Petroleum Industry: The Role of Stabilization Clauses' (2019) 10
13. Nigerian Journal of Energy Law and Policy 14.
    International Institute for Sustainable Development. (2021, 24 June). Stabilization Clauses and Implications for Human Rights and Gender Equality. https://www.iisd.org/itn/2021/06/24/stabilization-clauses-and-implications-for-human-rights and-gender-equality-sangwani-patrick-ngambi/
14. Peter D Cameron, Oil, Gas, and Mining: A Sourcebook for Understanding the Extractive Industries (World Bank 2017) 231.
15. Rudolf Dolzer and Christoph Schreuer, Principles of International Investment Law (2nd edition, OUP 2012) 147
16. AGIP SpA v Government of the People's Republic of the Congo (1979) 21 YB Comm Arb 95.
17. Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999 (as amended) ss 1(3) and 4(1).

References

18. Abolade, Akinkunmi, Enforceability of Stabilisation Clauses in State-Investor Agreements in Nigeria (August 13, 2024).
19. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4925855 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4925855
    2012) 16 NWLR (Pt. 1327) 425-634
20. ibid
21. International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (Enforcement of awards) Acts 2004
22. Texaco Overseas Petroleum Co v Government of the Libyan Arab Republic (1977) 17 ILM 1.
23. Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties 1969
24. 1999 Constitution
25. Section 251 of the 199 Constitution
26. Nigerian Investment Promotion Commission (NIPC) Act, 2004