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1. INTRODUCTION

- ADR and litigation are part of an overall system.

- For international DR, much discussion on interface or cross-fertilisation between IL & ICA

- Focus here more on ICA & ISA
  - ie foreign investors arbitrating vs host states, usually now under BITs or FTAs with home states (aka ISDS)

- Plus interface with IM (limited, but pushed also by DM)
  - Arb-Med with same neutral
  - Med-Arb with different neutrals
2. THE EXPLOSION IN INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION (IA)

• Underpinned by the 1958 New York Convention
  • Art II stay of litigation: kickstarts the (foreign-seated) IA, ie first phase
  • Art V enforcement of awards (with limited exceptions … not: error of substantive law): regulates the last phase
    • Australia ratified in 1975 (Singapore 1986)

• And by the UNCITRAL Model Law (1985, revised 2006 for IMs)
  • Drawing on NYC concepts and especially (opt-in) 1976 UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules, to regulate especially the middle phase at ICA seat
    • Australia quite quick to adopt, in 1989 like HK (Singapore 1994), then 2010-17 as core also for domestic arbitrations
    • But still struggles to attract many ICA cases
• Spread “East” of ICA especially over last 20 years (Reyes & Gu ‘18):
  • Adopting first NYC, then ML
  • Emergence of pro-arbitration case law
    • eg narrowing ‘public policy’ objection to awards, so ‘deference’ to arbitrators’ rulings on procedure: US/UK → HK → Singapore → Australia (in: Ferrari & Rosenfeld eds, Kluwer ‘23)
  • At least one dedicated int’l arb institution (or several, in PRC; cf India – ad hoc)
    • eg ACICA from ‘85 in Melbourne (rebooted in Sydney), SIAC → HKIAC, AIAC, KCAB, VIAC
  • Other supportive ‘infrastructure’ (including university-level & professional training)

• Gradual increase in ISA involving Asian parties
  • More treaties, with full advance consent (eg PRC, Thailand)+ more FDI = disputes
  • Fewer “institutional barriers” (eg local experts), but not all ratify 1965 ICSID Convention
YET: 3. RESURGENT COSTS AND DELAYS

• Déjà vu? Like 70s-80s, leading from mid-1990s to some countermeasures (eg Rules reforms, revised Model Law)

• But resurgent costs & delays this century is not so obviously driven by national (Anglo-American) litigation style; IA is more global
Singapore International Dispute Resolution Academy (SIDRA) Survey 2022: ¾ external lawyers (39% Singapore), ¼ internal lawyers or execs (57%)  
SO: WHAT NOW DRIVES COSTS & DELAYS?

• Transactions hence disputes are indeed more complex:
  • eg multi-party/contracts, IA does struggle to address these as rooted in consent (Garnett ‘23 MULR)

• BUT also: (i) IA has no real competitor (especially ICA): NYC provides worldwide enforceability of rulings
  • cf even the new Int’l Comm Courts, or 2019 Singapore Mediation Convention (few)

• (ii) Expansion of (large) law firms, especially ‘billable hours’ model

• (iii) Conservatism around controls over legal fees: cf eg
  • Absolute caps based on dispute amount? (IAMA ‘14 = RI ‘16, no more!)
  • Calderbank ‘sealed offers’? Little practice/encouragement

• (iv) Confidentiality & (v) IBA ‘soft’ law? Double-edged (esp now ICA → ISA)
  • Some pushback, eg Swiss Arb Association, Prague Rules ‘18, JCAA Interactive Arb Rules
4. THE FALL OF ARB-MED

• As ICA spread East, the practice of the arbitrator acting as mediator attracted interest (notably, still, in PRC): efficiencies?

• But concerns, especially if ‘caucusing’, over equal treatment and neutrality - led to eg:
  • HK in ‘89 → Singapore ’94 adding that if mediation fails, arbitrator must disclose material information received in confidential caucusing
    • Not used! So from ’15 SIMC/SIAC Arb-Med-Arb, with separate neutrals (29 / 277)
  • CAA (NSW) 1990 innovation also not used, so 2010 revision adds above plus requirement of second consent by parties if mediation fails – not used?
    • ACICA Arb Rules draft had similar model (plus ‘back-up arbitrator’): not adopted
  • Japan adds practice of parties agreeing neutral will not use material information in award, but doesn’t actively advertise Arb-Med (nor Korea)
Recall: SIDRA Survey 2022

- Significant experience with **Arb-Med-Arb** - as many Singaporean respondents!

- Also with **Arb-Med** – maybe as eg 5% of lawyer respondents from PRC, 4% from Japan (and 10% of client user respondents)?

- Cf much higher experience with **Med-Arb** (especially among client users = corporate execs and counsel, valuing especially confidentiality) …

5. THE RISE OF MED-ARB ETC

- Instead, growing use of multi-tiered DR clauses (eg QMUL surveys)
  - Although regional variance: less in international contracts involving eg parties from Korea, Japan, China … more if from the common law jurisdictions in Asia
  - more costs/lawyers leads to courts/legislatures promoting ADR domestically, so commercially supplied mediation services / familiarity grow? But not eg India
- This may also explain few ratifications of 2019 Singapore Mediation Convention

- Also still rare for mandatory mediation before arbitration in ISDS
  - Eg unusually in Australia-Indonesia FTA and HK-UAE BIT, but NOT in Australia-HK BIT, all signed in 2019: with Ana Ubilava et al via https://arbitrationblog.kluwerarbitration.com/author/luke-nottage/
Anyway, ISA tribunals have discussed whether pre-arb good faith negotiations step compliance goes to jurisdiction of tribunal (pre-condition to arb) or admissibility of the claim
  - If former, non-compliance could lead to award annulment
  - If latter (mostly), error of law so not reviewable by courts etc

Influencing (?) debate now in domestic courts:
  - IRC 2012 SGHC suggested usually pre-condition, but recent doubts
  - C v D 2023 HKFCA presumed usually not (so arbitrator determines admissibility), seen as ‘pro-arbitration’ … but is this ‘anti-mediation’?

Arguably should depend on: wording, type of pre-arb steps, when issue arises (stays vs awards), how widespread is ADR?
6. CONCLUSIONS

- ICA and then ISA have grown, spreading from West to East, with arbitrators, counsel and others moving between the fields

- But costs and delays remain problematic in IA

- So ISM is emerging, but especially for commercial disputes, in jurisdictions with high litigation costs hence privately-supplied domestic mediation; NOT yet for ISDS involving foreign investors

- Some cross-overs among ICA, ISA and ISM (all influenced by domestic litigation and DR) may be more productive than others, as with interfaces with international litigation
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