
DISPUTE RESOLUTION JOURNAL®

A Publication of the American Arbitration Association®-
International Centre for Dispute Resolution®

July-August 2025

Volume 79, Number 2

Editor's Note: (Re)Imagine

Victoria Prussen Spears

Reimagining the Mediator's Settlement Proposal

Theo Cheng and Harold Coleman Jr.

Key Reforms to Arbitration Act 2025 Are Set to Reinforce the UK's Position as World Leader in Arbitration

Reem Ayad

Three-Dimensional Chess: Harmonizing Dispute Resolution Clauses in Commercial Insurance Programs

Elizabeth J. Dye and Mark J. Plumer

International Commercial Courts: A Global Disputes Practitioner's Perspective—Part II

Markus Burianski and Lisa Fleckenstein

Cross-Border Perspective on Arbitral Awards: Law and Practice

Fargaleet Khokhar

The View from Europe: What's New in European Arbitration?

Stephan Wilske, Björn P. Ebert, Hans Biezenaar, José Ángel Rueda, and David Sandberg

Dispute Resolution Journal®

A Publication of the American Arbitration Association®-
International Centre for Dispute Resolution®

Volume 79, Number 2

July-August 2025

- 113 Editor's Note: (Re)Imagine**
Victoria Prussen Spears
- 117 Reimagining the Mediator's Settlement Proposal**
Theo Cheng and Harold Coleman Jr.
- 129 Key Reforms to Arbitration Act 2025 Are Set to Reinforce the UK's Position as World Leader in Arbitration**
Reem Ayad
- 135 Three-Dimensional Chess: Harmonizing Dispute Resolution Clauses in Commercial Insurance Programs**
Elizabeth J. Dye and Mark J. Plumer
- 139 International Commercial Courts: A Global Disputes Practitioner's Perspective—Part II**
Markus Burianski and Lisa Fleckenstein
- 157 Cross-Border Perspective on Arbitral Awards: Law and Practice**
Farqaleet Khokhar
- 187 The View from Europe: What's New in European Arbitration?**
Stephan Wilske, Björn P. Ebert, Hans Biezenaar, José Ángel Rueda, and David Sandberg

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ

President

Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS

Senior Vice President

Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

STACY A. ALEXEJUN

Partner

Quarles & Brady LLP

ELIZABETH A. EDMONDSON

Partner

Jenner & Block LLP

JENNIFER L. BARNETT

Vice President and Senior Counsel

American Arbitration

Association/International Centre

for Dispute Resolution

THARA GOPALAN

Vice President

American Arbitration

Association/International Centre

for Dispute Resolution

ALBERT BATES JR.

Partner

Troutman Pepper Hamilton

Sanders LLP

DAVID E. HARRELL JR.

Partner

Locke Lord LLP

JOHN D. BRANSON

Partner

Squire Patton Boggs (US) LLP

B. TED HOWES

Independent Arbitrator

Howes Arbitration

THEO CHENG

Arbitrator and Mediator

ADR Office of Theo Cheng LLC

PATRICK R. KINGSLEY

Partner

Stradley Ronon Stevens &

Young LLP

WADE CORIELL

Partner

King & Spalding LLP

TIMOTHY K. LEWIS

Senior Counsel

Blank Rome LLP

SASHE D. DIMITROFF

Partner

Baker & Hostetler LLP

GREGORY R. MEEDER

Partner

Holland & Knight LLP

ELIZABETH ZAMORA MERAZ

Partner

Nixon Peabody LLP

KEVIN O'GORMAN

Partner

Norton Rose Fulbright US LLP

NATHAN D. O'MALLEY

Partner

Musick Peeler

DHARSHINI PRASAD

Partner

Willkie Farr & Gallagher (UK) LLP

L ANDREW S. RICCIO

Partner

Baker & McKenzie LLP

LISA M. RICHMAN

Partner

McDermott Will & Emery LLP

PETER K. RUNDLE

Rundle Law Corporation

CHIRAAG SHAH

Partner

Morrison & Foerster LLP

LAURA K. VEITH

Partner

K&L Gates LLP

DANA WELCH

Arbitrator

Welch ADR

FREDA L. WOLFSON

Partner

Lowenstein Sandler LLP

LOUISE WOODS

Partner

Vinson & Elkins RLLP

DISPUTE RESOLUTION JOURNAL®

The Journal of the American Arbitration Association®-International
Centre for Dispute Resolution® (AAA®-ICDR®)

ISSN 1074-8105 (print) and 25733-606X (digital).

© American Arbitration Association-International Centre for Dispute Resolution. All rights reserved under the U.S. Copyright Act. No part of this publication may be reproduced, reprinted, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including but not limited to digital, electronic, mechanical, recording, or photocopying, without prior written permission.

The Dispute Resolution Journal is © 2025 American Arbitration Association, Inc. All rights reserved. No part of the Dispute Resolution Journal may be reproduced, transmitted or otherwise distributed in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical without written permission from the American Arbitration Association, Inc. Any reproduction, transmission or distribution of the material herein is prohibited and is in violation of US and international law. American Arbitration Association, Inc., expressly disclaims any liability in connection with the articles contained in the Dispute Resolution Journal or its contents by any third party. The views expressed by authors in these articles are not necessarily those of the American Arbitration Association, Inc. The American Arbitration Association, Inc., assumes no responsibility for the content and materials contained in these articles. The information provided in these articles do not, and is not intended to, constitute legal advice; instead, all information, content, and materials are for general informational and educational purposes only. Information in these articles may not constitute the most up-to-date legal or other information. Use of, and access to, these articles or any resources contained within the articles do not create an attorney-client relationship between the readers, authors, contributors, contributing law firms, or the American Arbitration Association, Inc. Do not consider these articles to be a substitute for obtaining legal advice from a qualified attorney licensed in your state.

Article Submissions

Direct editorial inquiries and send materials for publication to: Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway, #18R, Floral Park, NY 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 631.291.5541.

Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to arbitrators and mediators, attorneys and law firms, in-house counsel, corporate officers, government agencies and their counsel, senior business executives, and anyone interested in dispute resolution.

This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering dispute resolution, legal, accounting, or other professional services or advice in this publication. If dispute resolution, legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

Subscriptions

Digital and print subscriptions to the Dispute Resolution Journal are available for purchase through the AAA-ICDR's online store, <https://aaaeducation.org/bookstore>.

Reprint Permissions

Please send requests to reproduce Dispute Resolution Journal articles to the AAA-ICDR's Publications Department Elizabeth Bain, Director of Publications, at baine@adr.org.

ISSN 1074-8105 (print) and 25733-606X (digital).

The cover of this journal features the painting *Close Hauled*, a drawing by Rockwell Kent, 1930, electrotype on paper.

Publishing Staff

Director of Publications: Elizabeth Bain

Production Editor: Sharon D. Ray

Cover Design: Sharon D. Ray

Cite this publication as:

Dispute Resolution Journal® (The Journal of the American Arbitration Association®-International Centre for Dispute Resolution® (AAA®-ICDR®))

Editorial Office

American Arbitration Association

120 Broadway, Floor 21

New York, NY 10271

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to American Arbitration Association-International Centre for Dispute Resolution, 120 Broadway, 21st Floor, New York, NY 10271

To reach Customer Service:

Elizabeth Bain

Available 8:00 AM-5:00 PM Eastern Time

(401) 431-4837

baine@adr.org

Key Reforms to Arbitration Act 2025 Are Set to Reinforce the UK's Position as World Leader in Arbitration

Reem Ayad¹

In this article, the author discusses the key changes that commercial parties should consider as the UK's new arbitration law amends the existing 1996 act.

For commercial parties globally, England has long been heralded as a leader for dispute resolution, particularly in arbitration. To maintain its competitive position, in 2022, the Law Commission of England and Wales conducted a review of the current framework, the Arbitration Act 1996, and subsequently made recommendations for various improvements to be incorporated into the Arbitration Bill.

The government has stated that it intends to introduce the reforms “as soon as practicable.”² This is in keeping with governmental support of London as an international arbitration hub: its stated hope is that the reforms will “turbocharge the UK's position as the world-leader in arbitration” by (1) making arbitration “fairer and more efficient by simplifying procedures to reduce costs,” and (2) strengthening “courts’ powers to support

¹ The author, an attorney in the London office of Troutman Pepper Locke LLP, may be contacted at reem.ayad@troutman.com.

² The 2025 Act's provisions on “Extent,” “Commencement and transitional provision,” and “Short title” came into effect immediately on 24 February 2025 when the 2025 Act received Royal Assent. The remainder of the provisions will come into force on a date selected by the secretary of state by regulation(s).

emergency arbitration so time-sensitive decisions can be made more easily.”

The new Arbitration Act 2025 introduces enhancements and brings further clarity to the 1996 Act. Its effect will be to amend the existing 1996 Act, rather than to replace it. Below is a summary of key changes commercial parties should consider.

Determining the Law That Governs the Arbitration Proceedings

The 2025 Act provides welcome clarity as to the choice of law governing the arbitration where the parties have failed to expressly state this. In doing so, it effectively reverses the common law position.

Following a period of inconsistency as to the position at common law, the Supreme Court decision in *Enka v. Chubb*³ determined that if an arbitration clause is silent as to the governing law, the choice of law made in the contract containing the arbitration agreement applies to the arbitration proceedings.

The 2025 Act introduces welcome clarity by setting out the position as a matter of statute. This is achieved through the new Section 6A, whereby if the parties have not expressly agreed on the governing law within an arbitration agreement, then the law of the seat of the arbitration will apply to the arbitration proceedings.

The introduction of this default rule is intended to bring more certainty to the question of applicable governing law where an arbitration agreement does not specify one, and to reduce preliminary disputes litigating the choice of law.

Section 6A(2) clarifies that the express agreement by the parties of a governing law to the underlying contract, does not constitute the parties’ express agreement of the law of the arbitration for the purposes of Section 6A(1). Other caveats to the default rule have been included in Section 6A(3).⁴

³ *Enka v. Chubb* [2020] UKSC 38.

⁴ The default rule shall not apply to an arbitration agreement derived from a standing offer to submit disputes to arbitration where the offer is

The default rule does not apply to proceedings that commenced prior to the 2025 Act coming into force.

Arbitrators' Power to Make an Award on a Summary Basis

Section 39A provides an express power for a tribunal to make an award on a summary basis where a party has no real prospect of succeeding on a particular aspect or issue of their case. This power is triggered where a party applies for summary disposal of an issue and the parties have not otherwise agreed to exclude this power from the arbitration proceedings. This has the obvious ambition of promoting efficiency and saving the parties time and costs.

Challenges to Arbitration Awards in the English Courts Based on Lack of Jurisdiction

Following the Supreme Court's decision in *Dallah v. Pakistan*⁵ and under Section 67 of the 1996 Act, a party could challenge an arbitration award in the English courts on grounds that the tribunal lacked substantive jurisdiction.⁶ Until now, this has provided a means to a full rehearing of the dispute, as opposed to a review of the tribunal's decision. The 2025 Act shall prevent parties from submitting new evidence or grounds of objection to the English court that had not already been put before the arbitral tribunal. Furthermore, the English court shall no longer be able to rehear evidence previously heard by the arbitral tribunal, save

contained in a treaty, or legislation of a country or territory outside the United Kingdom, Section 6A (3)(a) and (b).

⁵ *Dallah v. Pakistan* [2010] UKSC 46.

⁶ Section 30 (1) Arbitration Act 1996. A tribunal's competence to rule on its own jurisdiction, i.e., as to "(a) whether there is a valid arbitration agreement, (b) whether the tribunal is properly constituted, and (c) what matters have been submitted to arbitration in accordance with the arbitration agreement."

when it would be in the interests of justice. Under this section, the court may confirm, vary, set aside, declare an award has no effect (in whole or part), or remit an award to the tribunal for reconsideration.

This provision is therefore expected to reduce the potential delays that parties might incur as a result of jurisdiction challenges.

Emergency Arbitrator Powers

When the 1996 Act was enacted, it did not include provision for the appointment of emergency arbitrators to provide urgent relief in circumstances where an arbitral tribunal is not fully constituted. Since then, many arbitral institutions have introduced rules to enable emergency arbitrators to make interim orders that are open to modification by a tribunal, once fully constituted.

The amendments introduced by the 2025 Act grants powers to emergency arbitrators to make orders in relation to Section 44 of the 1996 Act (including powers to make interim orders relating to evidence) and peremptory order, which are equal to those made by an arbitral tribunal.

Furthermore, the changes included in the 2025 Act permit a party to apply to court for interim relief in support of arbitration, including in relation to third parties. This is a significant power because arbitral tribunals ordinarily have no powers over third parties and can only make decisions concerning the parties to the arbitration agreement. Notably, parties may use this provision to garner the support of the English court against third parties, whether seated in England or elsewhere, for example, to obtain an order for witness evidence from a third party.

Extension of Arbitrator Rights and Duties

The 2025 Act bolsters the 1996 Act legislation by extending the rights and duties of arbitrators. Under the 1996 Act, arbitrators are required to disclose factors affecting their impartiality. The changes to be introduced under Section 23A of the 2025 Act

in relation to the appointment of arbitrators extend a duty to disclose relevant circumstances that shall include what they ought reasonably to be aware in addition to what they actually know.

Furthermore, the 2025 Act provides further protection to arbitrators, including immunity from civil suit and exclusion of any liability following the resignation of an arbitrator, unless the resignation was unreasonable.

This provision should provide arbitrators with comfort that they may make decisions, acting reasonably, independently, and in good faith, without fear of civil suit from disgruntled or dissatisfied parties.

Power to Award Costs Despite No Substantive Jurisdiction

The 2025 Act incorporates amendments to Section 61 of the 1996 Act clarifying that arbitral tribunals may make costs awards even in circumstances where they, or a court, have declared that the tribunal has no jurisdiction in respect of the dispute.

Implications

The 2025 Act shall apply to arbitration agreements whenever they were made, but it shall not apply to arbitration proceedings that have already commenced or to any related court proceedings.⁷

Once in force, when drafting arbitration clauses in cases where the governing law of the main contract and the seat are different, practitioners should consider specifying the governing law for the arbitration clause. If the governing law is not specified in the arbitration agreement and if London is specified as the

⁷ Section 17(4)(ii). This includes “court proceedings (whenever commenced) in connection with pre-commencement arbitral proceedings or an award made in pre-commencement arbitral proceedings...” Furthermore, the 2025 Act shall not apply to “any other court proceedings commenced before the day on which the section making the amendment comes into force”—Section 17(4)(iii).

seat of the arbitration, English law will govern the arbitration agreement. In view of the English court's pro-arbitration stance and expertise in supporting arbitration, practitioners and commercial parties are expected to welcome the introduction of these provisions, which should ultimately reduce satellite litigation as to the law applicable to an arbitration agreement.

Until now, the 1996 Act has been largely unaltered and has proven to be an effective and robust framework for the conduct of arbitration, ultimately culminating in England having forged a reputation as a leading seat for commercial parties globally. The amendments to be introduced by the 2025 Act constitute positive developments to the UK's statutory arbitration framework and should bolster England's reputation as a leader for international arbitration.