As far as the general principles are concerned, while there are some that can be identified more easily, since they are
underlying one or more specific provisions, there are others the identification of which is more difficult, and leads to
these principles not enjoying overall acceptance. As for the former category, the most important one is that of party
autonomy, as also acknowledged by courts and arbitral tribunals. The importance of this principle can easily be
derived from the fact that it is that principle that confers dispositive nature to the CISG and, thus, a subsidiary role to
it (which leads to the rules of the CISG to merely be default rules). In this author’s opinion, this means that
where there is a conflict between the principle of party autonomy and any other general principle, the former always
prevails.

Although doubts have been expressed in the past as to whether the principle of good faith constitutes one of the general
principles upon which the CISG is based, nowadays both commentators and courts acknowledge that the principle of
good faith is one of the general principles referred to in Art. 7(2) CISG. This does not mean, however, that the principle of
good faith can be used to justify any equitable result. Rather, the principle at hand, like all other general principles
underlying the CISG, have to be used solely when the gap is one that requires resort to general principles. Thus, as
mentioned already, one must criticize a German court for going too far when it stated that an explicit declaration of
avoidance of the contract was not nec-essary once the seller had refused to perform its obligations, even though the
CISG itself expressly requires such declaration, since to insist ort such a declaration would be against the principle of
good faith.

Although the principle of good faith has already been resorted to by courts to solve specific matters governed by, albeit
not settled in, the CISG, commentators have stated that the principle of good faith is generally too vague to serve any
practical purpose, which lead to the identification of general principles that can be traced back to that of good faith, but
which have a narrower scope and may be of more use in practice. Among these general principles, both courts and commentators list that of the prohibition of *venire contra factum proprium* as well as that of estoppel, which some commentators consider to be comparable to one another, and which can be derived from specific provisions of the CISG, such as Artt. 16(2) and 29(2). Furthermore, from the principle of good faith another more specific principles has been derived, namely that pursuant to which parties are required to cooperate with each other, which

requires, inter alia, parties to exchange Information relevant for the Performance of their respective obligations.

The aforementioned principles (of party autonomy and good faith) are not the only general principles which can be derived from one or more specific CISG provisions. The principle of informality (or freedom from form requirements, which can be derived from Art. 11 CISG) also constitutes such a general principle, as also pointed out by courts, from this principle it follows, among other things, that the parties are also free to modify or terminate their contract in any form be it either in writing or orally or in any other form. Even an implied termination of the contract has been held possible.

Another such general principle is that of mitigation set forth in Art. 77 CISG, pursuant to which a party who relies on a breach of contract must take such measures as are reasonable in the circumstances to mitigate the loss, including loss of profit, resulting from the breach, in order to avoid the party in breach to be entitled to claim a reduction in the damages in the amount by which the loss should have been mitigated.

Similarly, the following general principles underlying a CISG Provision have been identified: the principle - underlying Art. 9 (2) CISG - pursuant to which the parties are bound, unless otherwise agreed, by a usage of which they knew or ought to have known and which in international trade is widely known to, and regularly observed by, parties to contracts of the type involved in the particular trade concerned; the principle pursuant to which the creditor is entitled to interest on sums in arrears, irrespective of any notice of default; the principle - of Civil Law origin - pursuant to which damages are limited to foreseeable ones, a principle that, as much as that of full compensation, can be derived from Art. 74 CISG; the principle, laid down in Art. 27 CISG, pursuant to which for the purpose of the effectiveness of a declaration or notice its dispatch is sufficient, unless otherwise stated in the CISG; the principle pursuant to which official holidays or non-business days are included in calculating a period of time which, however, has to be extended where the last day of the period falls on such holiday or non-business day; the principle, to be derived from Art. 84 CISG, pursuant to which the party at fault has to refund the amounts equal to its enrichment; the principle enshrined in Art. 40 CISG acknowledged both by commentators and courts, pursuant to which "a grossly negligent unknowing buyer appears to be more protection-worthy than a seller acting fraudulently", as well as the principle "impossibilia nulla est obligatio", which underlies Art. 46(1) CISG.

Apart from the foregoing general principles, which all can be traced back to specific provisions, there are other general principles which can be derived by looking at a wider, more comprehensive context, which, however, does not exclude that specific provisions constitute a starting point for determining whether a general principle exist. One such principle is that of "reasonable-ness" to which the CISG often refers, while at times the CISG refers to the parties as having (to have) the qualities of "reason-able persons", at other times, the CISG requires that the parties act within a "reasonable" period of time.

Other principles of the kind at hand include: the principle pursuant to which the party acting in reliance upon a Situation created by opposing party is to be protected, a principle to be derived from Artt. 16(2) and 29(2); the principle of favor con-
tractus,\textsuperscript{386} “which means that, whenever possible, a Solution should be adopted in favour of the valid existence of the contract and against its premature termination on the initiative of one of the parties,”\textsuperscript{387} thus making the avoidance of the contract a remedy of last resort;\textsuperscript{388} the principle pursuant to which the avoidance of the contract, where the contract is severable, solely affects the part of the contract the breach relates to;\textsuperscript{389} the principle pursuant to which “each party has to bear the costs of its Obligation”;\textsuperscript{390} the principle, to be derived \textit{inter alia} from Artt. 58(1)

and 71(1),\textsuperscript{391} pursuant to which a party is entitled to withhold its Performance in case of the opposing party’s breach of contract\textsuperscript{392} as well as the principle of simultaneous exchange of Performances.\textsuperscript{393} The “functional equivalence approach”, too, must be considered a general principle underlying the CISG;\textsuperscript{394} this is relevant for the purpose of determining the CISG’s relationship with domestic law.\textsuperscript{395}

Case law has dealt with the issue of whether a general principle in respect of the place of Performance of monetary obligations exist. One court expressly stated that “since the purchase price is payable at the place of business of the seller”, under Article 57 CISG, “this indicates a general principle valid for other monetary claims as well”,\textsuperscript{396} a view also taken by other courts.\textsuperscript{397} Never-the-less, in this author’s opinion a general principle cannot be derived from the CISG as to the place of Performance of the monetary Obligation,\textsuperscript{398} an opinion also shared by courts.\textsuperscript{399}

Similarly, this author\textsuperscript{400} does not share the view held by some commentators\textsuperscript{401} according to which the CISG is based upon the general principle pursuant to which the creditor’s place of business controls all questions relating to payment such as currency. Since the issue of currency is not at all governed by the CISG,\textsuperscript{402} as courts have offen pointed out,\textsuperscript{403} it is impossible to identify a general principle upon which the CISG is based. Since, as often stated by courts,\textsuperscript{404} set-off is not a matter governed by the CISG

either, no general principle underlying the CISG can exist. Rather, resort is to be had directly to the applicable law through private international law rules to deal with such issues.\textsuperscript{405}

According to some courts\textsuperscript{406} and commentators,\textsuperscript{407} the issue of the allocation of the bürden of proof is not governed by the CISG, which is why resort is to be had to the applicable domestic law to settle that issue. If this were true, it would obviously run counter the wording of Art. 7(2) CISG to attempt to identify a general principle in respect of that issue. In this author’s opinion,\textsuperscript{408} the foregoing view has, however, to be rejected. The issue of bürden of proof is a matter governed by, albeit not explicitly settled in, the CISG,\textsuperscript{409} thus imposing upon the interpreter the need to settle the issue of allocation of bürden proof from within the CISG itself, namely through resort to a general principle, if such principle exist. According to both case law and legal writing, two general principles can be derived from Art. 79(1) CISG\textsuperscript{410} and, at least according to one court, Art. 2(a) CISG: the principle pursuant to which the party which wants to derive beneficial legal consequences from a legal provision has to prove the existence of the factual prerequisites of the provision,\textsuperscript{411} in other words, \textit{ei in-cumbit probatio qui diät, non qui negat},\textsuperscript{412} and that according to which the party claiming an exception has to prove the factual prerequisites of that exception.\textsuperscript{413} According to one court, this means, e.g., that “a party who claims that the Convention does not apply because the transaction is not international must prove the lack of internationality, and a party who claims that the Convention does not apply because its applicability has been excluded as provided in Art. 6 must prove the existence of the agreement to exclude. There is no doubt that a party who seeks damages for breach by the other party must prove the breach, the damage and the causal nexus between the two, and it has to show that the damages are recoverable under Article 74 of the Convention [...] . Concerning the question of the lack of conformity of the goods in the instant case, the aforementioned general principle yields a result similar to the outcome under Italian and German law - that it is the buyer's responsibility to prove the existence of a lack of conformity.”\textsuperscript{414}

[...]
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Referring Principles:

I.1.1 - Good faith and fair dealing in international trade
I.2.1 - Standard of reasonableness
I.2.2 - Trade usages
I.1.2 - Prohibition of inconsistent behavior
IV.4.1 - Freedom of form
IV.5.3 - Interpretation in favor of effectiveness of contract
IV.2.5 - Holidays and non-business days
V.1.4 - Principle of simultaneous performance; right to withhold performance
VII.2 - Principle of foreseeability of loss
VII.4 - Duty to mitigate
VII.6 - Duty to pay interest
XII.1 - Distribution of burden of proof