The Hague Academy of International Law Centre for studies and research 2020 programme “Applicable law issues in international arbitration”

Prof. Jean-Marc Thouvenin, Secretary-General of The Hague Academy of International Law, kindly informs us about the Academy’s Centre for studies and research 2020 programme – highly recommended!

The Centre for studies and research of The Hague Academy of International Law welcomes applications for its 2020 programme on “Applicable law issues in international arbitration”.

International arbitration has long been the most successful method for settling all kind of international commercial disputes, and still is – notwithstanding the surrounding criticism – the leading method for settling disputes between foreign investors and the host state. One of the characteristics of international arbitration is that it to a large extent relies on an international or transnational legal framework. The effects of arbitration agreements and of arbitral awards, as well as the role of the courts regarding arbitration agreements and awards, are regulated in international conventions such as the New York or the ICSID Conventions. Furthermore, although there is room for specificities of national law, commercial arbitration acts are largely harmonised especially through the impact of the UNCITRAL Model Law. Similarly, even if arbitral institutions try to distinguish one from each other by providing for some
specific tools, the essential content of arbitration rules does not vary. It can be said, consequently, that the transnational framework of arbitration is intended to create to the extent possible an autonomous system of dispute resolution, which can be applied in a uniform way irrespective of the country in which the proceedings take place or the award is sought enforced. The procedural autonomy of arbitration may also have an impact on how arbitral tribunals relate to the substance of the dispute.

As arbitral awards are final and binding, and domestic courts and ICSID annulment committees do not have the power to review them in the merits, arbitral tribunals enjoy a considerable flexibility in selecting and applying the rules of law applicable to the dispute, even though they are constrained to respect the will of the parties. Legal literature has strongly emphasized that this flexibility creates an expectation of delocalization: both from the procedural and from the substantive point of view, arbitration is described as a method for settling disputes that strives for uniformity on a transnational level and should not be subject to national laws. The autonomy and flexibility of arbitration, however, are not absolute. The international instruments that regulate arbitration either make, in some contexts, reference to national law or call for the application of (general or concrete) international law. Also, they do not cover all aspects of arbitration, thus leaving room for national regulation. Additionally, the restricted role that courts and ICSID ad hoc committees have in arbitration does not completely exclude that national law may have an impact. While court and committee control is not a review in the merits, application of the parameters for validity or enforceability of an award, even where these parameters are harmonised, may depend on national regulation.

Importantly, the definition of what disputes are arbitrable is left to national law. While the scope of arbitrability has
been significantly expanded starting from the last two decades of the last century, there are signs now that it may be restricting. The scope of arbitrability may be looked upon as a measure of the trust that the legal system has in arbitration. From another perspective, it may represent the way in which States approach the settlement of international commercial disputes: intending to keep an exclusive power by means of the exclusion of private deciders, or adopting the role of controllers of the regularity of arbitration. As far as investment arbitration is specifically concerned, it is well known that States’ attitudes are diverse and may change from time to time. In both cases, States’ policy choices may have an impact on applicable law issues.

All the foregoing considerations, succinctly exposed, are the frame for the present topic. On such a basis, it is possible to develop two lists of issues to be individually addressed. The first list deals with the fundamental aspects of the topic. Among the issues included therein, some refer to all types of arbitration, while others are rather specific to either commercial or investment arbitration. The second list responds to the fact that the applicable law is not necessarily unitary. Indeed, according to the principle of severability, a different law may apply to the procedural aspects and to the substantive aspects of the dispute, and within these two categories there are further possibilities for severing the applicable law. Thus, one can wonder to which issues is it appropriate to apply international sources of law, to which issues is it appropriate to apply soft sources of law, to which is it appropriate to apply national sources of law, and to which issues is it appropriate to apply (or to create) transnational standards. Or a combination of these sources? On which basis may this selection be made, and what are its effects on the autonomy of arbitration, on the expectations of the parties and on the credibility and legitimacy of arbitration as an out-of-court judicial system that enjoys enforceability?
The general and specific above-mentioned questions may be discussed for each of the following issues:

I. General issues

1. Available rules of law regarding substantive issues – The strength of soft sources
2. Available rules of law regarding procedural issues – The scope and applicability of the lex arbitri
3. Selection of the applicable law by the parties (???)
4. How do arbitrators ascertain the rules of law applicable to the merits?
5. Overriding mandatory rules of a law not chosen by the parties
6. How do arbitrators interpret international contracts?
7. How do arbitrators interpret international treaties?
8. Effects of precedents in arbitration
9. Iura novit arbiter
10. Control by domestic courts of the law applied to the merits
11. Control by means of procedural public policy
12. Misapplication of the law as manifest excess of powers of the tribunal under ICSID Convention

II. Specific cases of determination of the applicable law

1. Validity of the arbitration agreement and effects on non-signatories
2. Assignment of contract containing an arbitration clause
3. Qualification of the arbitrators
4. Production and admissibility of evidence
5. Legal privilege
6. Emergency arbitrator: procedural and substantive issues
7. Interim measures
8. Legal capacity to sign the disputed contract
9. Interests on the awarded amounts
10. Arbitrability
11. Res iudicata
12. Liability of arbitrators

The co-directors of the 2020 Centre (Prof. Giuditta Cordero-Moss (University of Oslo) & Prof. Diego Fernández Arroyo (Sciences Po, Paris)) invite applications from researchers including students in the final phase of their doctoral studies, holders of advanced degrees in law, political science, or other related disciplines, early-stage professors and legal practitioners. Applicants should identify the specific topic on which they intend to write. Participants will be selected during the spring of 2020, and will convene at The Hague from August 17 to September 4, 2020, to finalize their papers. The best articles will be included in a book to be published in the fall of 2021.

Further information is available here.

Arbitration and Protest in Hong Kong

Authors: Jie (Jeanne) Huang and Winston Ma

Following the promulgation of the judicial interpretation by the Supreme People’s Court (“SPC”) on 26 September 2019, Arrangement Concerning Mutual Assistance in Court-ordered Interim Measures in Aid of Arbitral Proceedings by the Courts of the Mainland and of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (“Arrangement”) signed by Mainland China and Hong Kong on 2 April 2019 came into effect in Mainland China from 1 October 2019. This Arrangement provides mutual recognition and enforcement of interim measures between Hong Kong and Mainland China. It has generated broad coverage.[1] This post tries to add to the discussion by providing the first case decided
under the Arrangement on 8 October 2019, and more broadly, the reflections on the continuing protests in Hong Kong and arbitration under “One Country, Two Systems’.

1. Mutual recognition and enforcement of interim measures between Hong Kong and Mainland China

Hong Kong Arbitration Ordinance has long been allowing parties to arbitral proceedings in any place to apply to the courts of Hong Kong for interim measures. Interim measures include injunction and other measures for the purpose of maintaining or restoring the status quo pending determination of the dispute; taking action that would prevent, or refraining from taking action that is likely to cause, current or imminent harm or prejudice to the arbitral proceedings; preserving assets; or preserving evidence that may be relevant and material to the resolution of the dispute. However, in contrast to the liberal Hong Kong counterpart, people’s courts in Mainland China are conservative. Chinese law limits interim measures to property preservation, evidence preservation and conduct preservation. More important, Mainland courts generally only enforce interim measures in support of arbitration administered by domestic or foreign-related arbitration institutions of the People’s Republic of China (PRC). This is because Article 272 of Chinese Civil Procedure Law provides that where a party applies for a preservation measure, the foreign-related arbitral institution of PRC shall submit the party’s application to the intermediate people’s court at the place of domicile of the respondent or at the place where the respondent’s property is located. Article 28 of Chinese Arbitration Law states that if one of the parties applies for property preservation, the arbitration commission shall submit to a people’s court the application of the party in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Civil Procedure Law. Article 10 of Chinese Arbitration Law restricts arbitration institutions to those registered with the judicial administrative department of the relevant province, autonomous
region or municipalities directly under the Central Government.[2]

There are few exceptions to the Mainland conservative approach. First, since 2017, *ad hoc* arbitration has been permitted in China's pilot free trade zones.[3] Therefore, Mainland courts are likely to issue interim measures in support of such *ad hoc* arbitration. Second, a party to a maritime arbitration seated outside of Mainland China can apply for property preservation to the Chinese maritime court of the place where the property is located.[4] However, the property to be preserved was limited to vessels, cargos carried by a vessel, and fuel and supplies of a vessel.[5]

The third exception is created by the recent Arrangement. Arbitral proceedings commenced both before and after 1 October 2019 are potentially caught by the Arrangement, under which property, evidence and conduct preservation orders could be granted by the courts in Mainland China to assist the Hong Kong arbitration.

The scope of the Arrangement confines to arbitral proceedings seated in Hong Kong and administered by institutions or permanent offices meeting the criteria under Article 2 of the Arrangement. Six qualified institutions have been listed on 26 September 2019, being Hong Kong International Arbitration Centre ("HKIAC"), ICC Hong Kong, CIETAC Hong Kong, Hong Kong Maritime Arbitration Group, eBRAM International Online Dispute Resolution Centre and South China International Arbitration Centre (Hong Kong). Future applications will also be considered and the list may be subject to alteration.

Articles 3-5 of the Arrangement set out the procedural requirements for applying to the courts in Mainland China for interim measures. Since time is of essence, application can be made by a party to the arbitration directly to the relevant Mainland Chinese court before an arbitration is accepted by an arbitration institution.[6] If the arbitration has been
accepted, the application should be submitted by the arbitration institution or representative office.\[7\]

Article 8 of the Arrangement further reflects the importance of timeliness by demanding the requested court to make a decision after examining the application “expeditiously”. Nevertheless, the Arrangement is silent on the specific time limit applicable to the court’s examination process. Pursuant to Article 93 of the *Chinese Civil Procedure Law*, the court is to make an order within 48 hours after receiving an application for property preservation prior to the commencement of arbitration; Furthermore, Article 4 of the *Provisions of the SPC on Several Issues concerning the Handling of Property Preservation Cases by the People’s Courts* demands the court to make an order within 5 days after the security is provided, and within 48 hours in cases of emergency.

The first case decided under the Arrangement demonstrates how “expeditiously” a people’s court can make a decision. In the morning of 8 October 2019, the Shanghai Maritime Court received a property preservation application submitted by HKIAC. In this case, the arbitration applicant is a maritime company located in Hong Kong and the respondent is a company in Shanghai. They concluded a voyage charter party which stated that the applicant should provide a vessel to transport coal owned by the respondent from Indonesia to Shanghai. However, the respondent rescinded the charter party and the applicant claimed damages. Based on the charter party, they started an *ad hoc* arbitration and ultimately settled the case. According to the settlement agreement, the respondent should pay the applicant USD 180,000. However, the respondent did not make the payment as promised. Consequently, the respondent brought an arbitration at the HKIAC according to the arbitration clause in the settlement agreement. Invoking the Arrangement, through the HKIAC, the applicant applied to the Shanghai Maritime People’s Court to seize and freeze the
respondent’s bank account and other assets. The Shanghai Court formed a collegial bench and issued the property preservation measure on the same date according to the Arrangement and Chinese Civil Procedure Law.

2. Protests in Hong Kong

As the first and so far the only jurisdiction with the special Arrangement through which parties to arbitration can directly apply to Mainland Chinese courts for interim measures, Hong Kong has been conferred an irreplaceable advantage while jockeying to be the most preferred arbitration seat for cases related to Chinese parties. Arbitration that is ad hoc or seated outside Hong Kong cannot enjoy the benefits of the Arrangement. Parties to an arbitration seated in Hong Kong are encouraged to select one of the listed institutions to take advantage of the Arrangement. Meanwhile, the Arrangement also attracts prominent international arbitration institutions to establish permanent offices in Hong Kong.

One may argue that the Arrangement is the necessary consequence of the “One Country, Two Systems” principle and the increasingly close judicial assistance between Mainland China and Hong Kong. Especially in the context of China’s national strategy to develop the Greater Bay Area, the notion of “one country, two systems, three jurisdictions” makes Hong Kong the only common-law jurisdiction to deal with China-related disputes.[8]

However, to what extent may the recent protests negatively impact on the arbitration industry in Hong Kong? Notably, London and Paris have also experienced legal uncertainly (Brexit in the UK) and protests (Yellow vests movement in France) in recent years. Nevertheless, the Hong Kong situation is more severe than its western counterparts in two aspects.
First, currently, the protestors have impacted on the traffic inside Hong Kong. Last month, they even blocked the Hong Kong airport. It is not surprising that parties may want to move the hearings outside of Hong Kong just for the convenience of traffic, if the arbitration is still seated in Hong Kong. Second, the continuation of protests and the uncertainty of the Chinese government’s counter-measures may threaten parties’ confidence in choosing Hong Kong as the seat for arbitration. The Arrangement brings an irreplaceable advantage to Hong Kong to arbitrate cases related with Chinese parties. However, this significance should not be over-assessed. This is because by choosing a broad discovery and evidence rule, parties and tribunals have various means to deal with the situation where a party wants to hide a key evidence. Arbitration awards can be recognized and enforced in all jurisdictions ratified the New York Convention. Therefore, the value of the Arrangement is mainly for cases where the losing party only has assets in Mainland China for enforcement.

The flourish of arbitration in Hong Kong is closely related to Mainland China. However, Hong Kong, if losing its social stability due to the protests, will lose its arbitration business gradually. In the Chinese Records of the Grand Historian (Shiji by Han dynasty official Sima Qian), there is a famous idiom called “cheng ye xiao he bai ye xiao he”. It means the key to one’s success is also one’s undoing. It is the hope that Mainland China and Hong Kong can find a solution quickly so that the arbitration industry in Hong Kong can continue to be prosperous. This is more important than the implementation of the Arrangement.
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There are different opinions regarding whether Article 10 and 28 of Chinese Arbitration Law restrict the interim measures to arbitration administered by Chinese arbitration institutions. See the judgment of [2016] E 72 Cai Bao No. 427 issued by Wuhan Maritime Court. In this case, the Ocean Eleven Shipping Corporation initiated an arbitration in HKIAC against Lao Kai Yuan Mining Sole Co., Ltd. The applicant was a company in South Korea and the respondent a Chinese company. The parties had disputes over a voyage charter party. In order to ensure the enforcement of the coming award in Mainland China, the applicant applied to Wuhan Maritime Court to freeze USD 300,000 in the respondent’s bank account or seizure, impound or freeze other equivalent assets. The People’s Insurance Company provided equivalent insurance for the applicant’s property preservation application. Wuhan Maritime Court permitted the property preservation application according to Article 28 of Chinese Arbitration Law and Article 103 of the Civil Procedure Law. However, this case is inconsistent with majority cases where Chinese courts rejected to issue interim measures for arbitration administered by ad hoc or arbitration institutions registered outside of Mainland China.

Due Process in International Commercial Arbitration—October 18, 2019 New York University

Conference on Due Process in International Commercial Arbitration will be held on 18 Oct 2019 at the New York University Lester Pollack Colloquium Room, organised by NYU Centre for Transnational Litigation, Arbitration and Commercial Law.
This event will discuss the topics addressed in the national reports drafted on the basis of a questionnaire prepared by Professors Franco Ferrari, Dietmar Czernich, and Friedrich Rosenfeld. The ultimate goal behind the national reports and the discussion that will take place at the conference is to provide the necessary background information for the preparation of a set of guidelines on due process in international arbitration. The purpose of these guidelines is twofold. On the one hand, they will identify the appropriate standard of due process that arbitrators should apply in international arbitration proceedings. On the other hand, they will contain recommendations on how arbitrators can respond to misuses of due process by recalcitrant parties. To this end, they will identify appropriate case management techniques that help to ensure the efficiency of the proceedings. For further information, please find the Due Process Conference Program October 2019.

Rethinking Choice of Law and International Arbitration in Cross-border Commercial Contracts

Written by Gustavo Becker*

During the 26th Willem C. Vis Moot, Dr. Gustavo Moser, counsel at the London Court of International Arbitration and Ph.D. in international commercial law from the University of Basel, coordinated the organization of a seminar regarding choice of law in international contracts and international arbitration.
The seminar’s topics revolved around Dr. Moser’s recent book *Rethinking Choice of Law in Cross-Border Sales* (Eleven, 2018) which has been globally recognized as one of the most useful books for international commercial lawyers.

On April 15th, taking place at Hotel Regina, in Vienna, the afternoon seminar involved a panel organized and moderated by Dr. Moser and composed of Prof. Ingeborg Schwenzer, Prof. Petra Butler, Prof. Andrea Bjorklund, and Dr. Lisa Spagnolo. The panel addressed three core topics in the current scenario of cross-border sales contracts: Choice of law and Brexit, drafting choice of law clauses, and CISG status and prospects.

The conference started with a video presentation in which Michael Mcllwrath (*Baker Hughes, GE*) addressed his perspectives on how Brexit might impact decisions from companies regarding choice of law clauses in international contracts, its effects on the recognition of London as the leading seat for dispute resolution, and the position of English law as the most applicable law in international contracts.

In Mr. Mcllwrath’s perspective, in spite of Brexit, London will still remain a significant place for international dispute resolution as it adopts globally recognized commercial law principles, is an arbitration friendly state and enjoys a highly praised image as a safe seat for international cases. However, in order to try to predict the impact of Brexit in international dispute resolution, Mr. Mcllwrath collected data released by arbitral institutions and found that in the years leading up to the Brexit vote, London did not grow as a seat of arbitration significantly. Considerable growth nonetheless has been seen outside the traditional centers of international arbitration. Therefore, the big issue involving Brexit, in Mr. Mcllwrath’s view, is the uncertainty that companies will face with the UK’s unsettled political future. For this reason, the revision of contract policies is now likely to be undertaken
and the choice of English law in international contracts might be affected.

Prof. Schwenzer pointed out that the whole discussion about Brexit and its effects on international dispute resolution depends primarily on the type of Brexit that will be chosen and the agreements between Europe and Great Britain. In her point of view, one of the main questions is whether the UK will join the Lugano Convention, which would make the enforcement of English court decisions easier in European State-members. Prof. Schwenzer also highlighted that, in terms of choice of law, there will be uncertainty issues regarding the regulations that have been imported from Europe and are now part of the English legal system. The problem might be how these rules will be developed further as the Court of Justice of the European Union will no longer be responsible for interpreting this part of English law.

Furthermore, Prof. Bjorklund stated that, whilst the choice of English law will require more caution after Brexit, the well-recognized security related to arbitration in the UK is likely to continue as long as the New York Convention, the English Arbitration Act, and the arbitration friendly character of English commercial courts will not likely change. However, in the point of view of an international arbitration counsel, certainly, the “risks of arbitrating in the UK” will leave some room for parties to choose arbitration in other places rather than in London or – at least – to start rethinking the classic choice for English-seated arbitration.

Concerning the choice of English law, Prof. Butler reminded the audience of two important regulations which should be analyzed in the context of Brexit: Rome I for deciding which contract law is applicable in international cases, and the Brussels Regulation to define which court is entitled to decide a case and how to enforce and recognize foreign decisions within the EU. According to Prof. Butler, under the first Brexit bill, the statutes signed within the EU regime
would still apply. However, subject to confirmation from the English government, the development of these laws might no longer be applicable.

Dr. Spagnolo added that whether a country joins an international instrument sometimes has little to do with rational factors and are often “emotional”. In this sense, one of the arguments that the political environment seems to emphasize nowadays under the notion of nationalism is the maintenance of sovereignty. According to Dr. Spagnolo, this is a dangerous consideration to be emphasized in an environment that relies on commercial sense and needs basic guarantees of international harmonization, such as the enforcement of foreign awards or the application of a uniform law.

Regarding the topic “drafting choice of law clauses”, Mr. McIlwrath highlighted the “emotional” features involving the choice of law. In his opinion, as Dr. Moser has demonstrated in his book, many choices of law decisions are driven by factors such as how many times a specific law had already been applied by a law firm or what law the attorneys involved in that contract were already familiar with. Considering this, Mr. McIlwrath understands that Brexit can make lawyers rethink the application of English law, even though this might be dependant upon whether financial institutions and companies currently based in London will or will not move away from the UK.

Prof. Schwenzer highlighted that what Dr. Moser has found in his research regarding the emotional aspect of the choice of law is a proving fact of what she has experienced in practice: choice of law decisions are mostly emotionally charged and seldom rational. One example is that even though Swiss law is arguably the second most chosen law in international contracts, in Prof. Schwenzer’s view, Swiss law is not predictable: in core areas of contract law, such as limitation of liability, Swiss law is not advantageous for commercial contracts in her opinion. Prof. Schwenzer added that this
shows that lawyers seldom analyze the pros and cons of laws deeply before applying them in international commercial contracts.

Concluding the panel discussions, Dr. Moser brought up the topic “CISG status and prospects”. While discussing this matter, all the panelists agreed upon the urgent need of global initiatives to increase awareness and improve knowledge of the CISG for both young lawyers who are sitting for the bar exam, and for judges who will face international commercial cases and might not be familiar with the CISG or even prepared to apply its set of provisions.

*With contributions from Gustavo Moser

---

**Conference on “Access to Justice and Arbitration”, London, 7 June 2019**

On 7 June 2019, the School of Law at Royal Holloway, University of London and the School of Law at Middlesex University organise a conference on the topic of “Access to Justice and Arbitration”. The conference is hosted at Royal Holloway.

The aim of the conference is to initiate a focused debate about access to justice in arbitration that would enable a larger public discussion about the specific role of access to justice in arbitration.

The full programme will be published shortly. For further
Alan Uzelac on the current challenges to investor-state arbitration in Europe

Prof. Uzelac has published recently an article on the current challenges to investor-state arbitration in Europe. The article comes almost as a birthday present, to celebrate one year after the CJEU published its famous Achmea ruling. The summary of the article reads as follows:

This paper addresses the current challenges to investor-state arbitration in Europe. Two parallel developments are outlined: the current change in the EU policy towards arbitration provisions in multilateral and bilateral investment treaties, and the consequences of the Achmea case decided by the Court of Justice of the European Union in March 2018. The author analyses the critical arguments behind the current European anti-arbitration stance and concludes that while some of them (but not all) may have some foundation, a sufficient number of reasons speak against the radical dismantling of the system of international investment arbitration. An analysis of the proposed alternatives shows that they fail to deliver viable solutions for diagnosed problems. In particular, the replacement of ad hoc tribunals by a multilateral investment court (MIC) seems to be a step in the wrong direction. The ISDS has played an important role in the global fostering of international investment by securing a basically fair system of dispute resolution in a very specific field. Its deficiencies are not beyond repair; on the other hand, the
alternatives offered suffer from flaws that are the same or much more troubling. The author concludes that the consequences of the ‘change of tide’ in the approach to investor-state dispute resolution are likely to be detrimental to the very goals of those who advocate the abandoning of investment arbitration.

The article was published in the journal Access to Justice in Eastern Europe (AJEE), and is available in full text here.

The U.S. Arbitration-Litigation Paradox

The U.S. Supreme Court is well-known for its liberal pro-arbitration policy. In The Arbitration-Litigation Paradox, forthcoming in the Vanderbilt Law Review, I argue that the U.S. Supreme Court’s supposedly pro-arbitration stance isn’t as pro-arbitration as it seems. This is because the Court’s hostility to litigation gets in the way of courts’ ability to support arbitration—especially international commercial arbitration.

This is the arbitration-litigation paradox in the United States: On one hand, the U.S. Supreme Court’s hostility to litigation seems to complement its pro-arbitration policy. Rising barriers to U.S. court access in general, and in particular in transnational cases (as I have explored elsewhere), seems consistent with a U.S. Supreme Court that embraces arbitration as an efficient method for enforcing disputes. Often, enforcement of arbitration clauses in these cases leads to closing off access to courts, as Myriam Gilles and others have documented.
But there’s a problem. As is perhaps obvious to experts, arbitration relies on courts—for enforcing arbitration agreements and awards, and for helping pending arbitration do what it needs to do. So closing off access to courts can close access to the litigation that supports arbitration. And indeed, recent Supreme Court cases narrowing U.S. courts’ personal jurisdiction over foreign defendants have been applied to bar arbitral award enforcement actions. Courts have also relied on forum non conveniens to dismiss award-enforcement actions.

That’s one way in which trends that limit litigation can have negative effects on the system of arbitration. But there’s another way that the Court’s hostility to litigation interacts with its pro-arbitration stance, and that’s in the arbitration cases themselves.

The Supreme Court has a busy arbitration docket, but rarely hears international commercial arbitration cases. Instead, it hears domestic arbitration cases in which it often states that the “essence” of arbitration is that it is speedy, inexpensive, individualized, and efficient—everything that litigation is not.

(As an aside, this description of the stark distinction between arbitration and litigation is widely stated, but it’s a caricature. The increasingly judicialized example of international commercial arbitration shows this is demonstrably false. As practiced today, international commercial arbitration can be neither fast, nor cheap, nor informal.)

But in the United States, arbitration law is mostly trans-substantive. That means that decisions involving consumer or employment contracts often apply equally to the next case involving insurance contracts or international commercial contracts.
In the paper, I argue that the Court’s tendency to focus on arbitration’s “essential” characteristics, and to enforce these artificial distinctions between arbitration and litigation, can be harmful for the next case involving international commercial arbitration. It could undermine the likelihood of enforcement of arbitration awards where the arbitral procedure resembled litigation or deviated from the Court’s vision of the “essential virtues” of arbitration.

To prevent this result, I argue that any revisions of the U.S. Federal Arbitration Act should pay special attention not only to fixing the rules about consumer and employment arbitration, but also to making sure that international commercial arbitration is properly supported. In the meantime, lower federal courts should pay no heed to the Supreme Court’s seeming devotion to enforcing false distinctions between arbitration and litigation, particularly in the international commercial context.

Call for papers: The use of comparative law methodology in international arbitration

The International Academy of Comparative Law is launching a new journal in 2019 to foster scientific discussion about the use of comparative law. The Ius Comparatum Journal (ICJ) is dedicated to the methodological aspects of comparative law. It covers all fields of law where the methods and techniques of comparative law are at stake.

The editorial board of the journal welcomes abstracts from scholars as well as practitioners, including staff of arbitral
institutions. Papers will be published in French or English online before the publication in print of the first issue of the Journal at the end of summer 2019.

The deadline for submissions is 6 January 2019.

The full text of the call is available here.

---

New online service on International Arbitration

The publisher’s blurb is as follows:

“The Chinese perspective on The South China Sea Arbitration, is just one of the 40+ texts searchable on the new online service, International Arbitration.

The service is made up of content from three respected publishing brands (Hart Publishing, CH Beck-Nomos and Bloomsbury Professional). It provides access to materials by over 60 respected author names with the speed and convenience of online research.

International coverage in depth and breadth

The content covers a broad range of jurisdictions from arbitration centres all over the world including:

- China
- New York
- Switzerland
- Germany
- The Middle East

**Expert authors and contributors**

Authors and contributors are drawn from leading firms and academic institutions, including:

- Allianz SE
- Gleiss Lutz
- PriceWaterhouseCoopers
- Herbert Smith Freehills LLP
- Freshfields Bruckaus Deringer
- Oxford University
- University College London

Regional experts include Kun Fan on Arbitration in China and Reinmar Wolff on the New York Convention.

You can only fully appreciate the quality of International Arbitration by trying it for yourself. For more information, or to sign up for a free trial please visit [http://www.bloomsburylawonline.com/internationalarbitration/](http://www.bloomsburylawonline.com/internationalarbitration/)

---

**TDM Call for Papers: Special**
Issue on Cybersecurity in International Arbitration

We are pleased to announce a forthcoming Transnational Dispute Management (TDM, ISSN 1875-4120, www.transnational-dispute-management.com) Special Issue on “Cybersecurity in International Arbitration.”

International arbitration has the advantage over litigation of allowing parties to resolve their disputes privately and confidentially if desired. In our increasingly digitized world, attention to cybersecurity in individual arbitration matters is required in order to maintain that advantage and the confidence of parties in the integrity of the arbitral process.

International arbitration typically involves multiple participants in multiple locations, the storage and transmission of significant amounts of confidential, sensitive and commercially valuable digital data and numerous electronic communications. Even where the proceeding is public or non-confidential in part, certain aspects, such as arbitrator deliberations and party internal communications and work product, almost always must remain confidential to protect the integrity of the process.

In a world where businesses, law firms, government entities, educational institutions and other large data custodians are under threat or already have been breached, international arbitration obviously is not immune. There are already a few documented instances where the process has been compromised and anecdotal evidence of attempted intrusion into proceedings and data held by various participants.

There is a manifest need for the international arbitration community to begin to develop a shared understanding of the
scope of the threat and the appropriate response. There is an emerging consensus that cybersecurity is an important consideration that should be addressed early in the international arbitration process and that reasonable cybersecurity measures should be adopted. Nonetheless, questions abound, including, to cite just a few examples, the specific responsibilities of the various participants in the process, the scope of measures that should be adopted, the scope of party autonomy to determine such measures, the availability of resources and concerns that cybersecurity requirements may increase the expense of arbitration and create a resource gap that could disadvantage less-resourced participants.

It is hoped that papers submitted for the Special Issue will advance the conversation by addressing some of the questions described here and potentially identifying issues the international arbitration community will need to consider.

Suggestions for possible paper topics include:

- Commentary on the Draft ICCA-CPR-New York City Bar Association Protocol for Cybersecurity in Arbitration (available here)
- Cybersecurity best practices for different participants in the arbitral process, including institutions, counsel, arbitrators, parties, and experts, and suggestions as to model language to be used in procedural orders, stipulations, expert engagement letters, etc. For example, what factors should parties considering using a third-party platform to share and store arbitration-related information take into account? An article on the arbitrator’s responsibility to protect the integrity of the process is linked here and here.
- What can and should be done on a systemic basis to address cybersecurity in international arbitration? Should cybersecurity be the subject of soft law, for instance? If so, in what form and who should lead?
• How should tribunals resolve party conflicts about reasonable security measures, breach notification obligations, and related costs?
• How should cybersecurity breaches or failures to implement required cybersecurity measures in the arbitral process be addressed? For example, should there be a default presumption regarding the admissibility of evidence attained from a data breach? Should arbitrators entertain applications for damages and/or sanctions?
• Are there limits to party autonomy to determine the cybersecurity measures to be applied in individual matters? Are there institutional or tribunal interests that may in some circumstances override the parties’ agreement? If so, how are these interests defined and where does the power derive to apply them?
• What is the correct liability standard for cybersecurity breaches? Should there be a safe harbor?
• What is the correct standard to test the adequacy of cybersecurity measures? Is a reasonableness standard adequate to protect the process?
• Comparative analysis of ethical rules and obligations governing the conduct of lawyers around the globe in relation to cybersecurity and conclusions as to implications for international arbitration proceedings and the existence of either transnational norms or conflicts
• How do considerations of fairness and equality relate to the implementation of cybersecurity measures in international arbitrations? For instance, how should differences in infrastructure and party resources be taken into account in assessing the appropriate level of cybersecurity measures in individual matters? Is there a minimum level of security required to protect the integrity of arbitration process that should be implemented in all arbitrations?
• How do data privacy regimes relate to cybersecurity and what are the implications for international arbitration
proceedings?

- Arbitration of business-to-business data breaches

This special issue will be edited by independent arbitrators Stephanie Cohen and Mark Morril.

This call for papers can also be found on the TDM website here https://www.transnational-dispute-management.com/news.asp?key=1707