

New Frontiers in Asia-Pacific International
Arbitration and Dispute Resolution

International Arbitration Law Library

VOLUME 59

Editors

Professor Julian D.M. Lew QC has been involved with international arbitration for more than forty years as counsel, as arbitrator and as an academic. He is the founder and has been the Head of the School of International Arbitration, Centre for Commercial Law Studies, Queen Mary University of London since its creation in 1985. He is now an independent international arbitrator at 20 Essex Street, London.

Stavros Brekoulakis is Professor at Queen Mary University of London and an associate member of 3 Verulam Buildings (Gray's Inn). He is a leading academic in international arbitration and has led, or been involved in, several projects with ICCA, ICC Commission and ILA. He also acts as an independent arbitrator and has been appointed as chairman, sole arbitrator, co-arbitrator and emergency arbitrator under the rules of all the major arbitration rules.

Introduction

Since its first volume published in 1993, this authoritative practitioner-oriented series has published in-depth and analytical works on niche aspects of international arbitration, authored by specialists in the field.

Objective

This authoritative and established series covering in-depth analyses of niche areas appeals to both practitioners and academics. The series includes specific monographs and PhD dissertations of high quality, which are practical and cover issues not fully explored in general texts.

Frequency

A volume is published whenever an interesting topic presents itself.

The titles published in this series are listed at the end of this volume.

New Frontiers in Asia-Pacific International Arbitration and Dispute Resolution

Edited by

Luke Nottage

Shahla Ali

Bruno Jetin

Nobumichi Teramura

 Wolters Kluwer

Published by:

Kluwer Law International B.V.
PO Box 316
2400 AH Alphen aan den Rijn
The Netherlands
E-mail: international-sales@wolterskluwer.com
Website: lrus.wolterskluwer.com

Sold and distributed by:

Wolters Kluwer Legal & Regulatory U.S.
7201 McKinney Circle
Frederick, MD 21704
United States of America
Email: customer.service@wolterskluwer.com

Printed on acid-free paper.

ISBN 978-94-035-2855-7

e-Book: ISBN 978-94-035-2863-2
web-PDF: ISBN 978-94-035-2871-7

© 2021 Kluwer Law International BV, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without written permission from the publisher.

Permission to use this content must be obtained from the copyright owner. More information can be found at: lrus.wolterskluwer.com/policies/permissions-reprints-and-licensing

Printed in the United Kingdom.

Editors

Dr Luke Nottage is Professor of Comparative and Transnational Business Law at the University of Sydney Law School, Camperdown, Australia, founding Co-Director of the Australian Network for Japanese Law (ANJeL) and Special Counsel at Williams Trade Law. He specialises in comparative and transnational business law (especially arbitration and product safety law), with a particular interest in Japan and the Asia-Pacific. Luke has or had executive roles in the Australia-Japan Society (NSW), the Law Council of Australia's International Law Section, the Australian Centre for International Commercial Arbitration, and the Asia-Pacific Forum for International Arbitration. Luke is also a Rules Committee Member of the Australian Centre for International Arbitration (ACICA) and listed on the Panel of Arbitrators for the AIAC (formerly KLRCA), BAC, JCAA, KCAB, NZIAC, SCIA and TAI. Luke serves on Working Group 6 (examining arbitrator neutrality) for the Academic Forum on ISDS. He qualified as a lawyer in New Zealand in 1994 and in New South Wales in 2001 and has consulted for law firms and organisations worldwide (including ASEAN, the EC, OECD, UNCTAD and the Japanese government). His sixteen other books include *International Arbitration in Australia* (Federation Press, 2010, eds) and *International Investment Treaties and Arbitration Across Asia* (Brill, 2018, eds). He is or has been Visiting Professor teaching and researching at universities throughout Asia, Oceania, Europe and North America.

Dr Shahla Ali is Professor and Associate Dean (International) and Deputy Director of the LLM in Arbitration and Dispute Resolution at the Faculty of Law of the University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong. Her research and practice centre on questions of governance, development and the resolution of cross-border disputes in the Asia-Pacific region. Shahla is the author of *Court Mediation Reform* (Edward Elgar, 2018), *Governing Disasters: Engaging Local Populations in Humanitarian Relief* (Cambridge University Press, 2016), *Consumer Financial Dispute Resolution in a Comparative Context* (Cambridge University Press, 2013), and *Resolving Disputes in the Asia Pacific Region* (Routledge, 2010), and she writes for law journals in the area of comparative ADR. She has consulted with USAID, IFC/World Bank and the United Nations on issues pertaining to access to justice, peace process negotiation training and land use conflict

resolution. She serves as a bilingual arbitrator (English/Chinese) with CIETAC, HKIAC (ADNDRC) and SIAC and has served on the IBA Drafting Committee for Investor-State Mediation Rules, the DOJ Mediation Regulatory Committee, the UN Mediation Roster and the FDRC Appointments Committee. Prior to HKU, she worked as an international trade attorney with Baker & McKenzie in its San Francisco office. She received her JD and PhD from UC Berkeley, Berkeley, California, in Jurisprudence and Social Policy and BA from Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Dr Bruno Jetin is Associate Professor and Director of the Institute of Asian Studies, University of Brunei Darussalam (UBD), Bandar Seri Begawan, Brunei. His current work focuses on the ASEAN Economic Community, the One Belt One Road initiative, Chinese investments in South-East Asia, and the impact of income distribution on growth in Asia. He is also an expert in the automobile industry. Before joining UBD, he was a researcher at the Institute for Research on Contemporary Southeast Asia (IRASEC, CNRS-MAEE, Bangkok) and Associate Professor at the University of Paris 13 Sorbonne Paris Cité, Villetaneuse, France, where he obtained his PhD in Economics and was Deputy Director of the Research Center in Economics. He was also involved in promoting taxes on financial transactions as alternative sources for financing development as well as innovative regulation of global finance. Bruno's recent publications include *ASEAN Economic Community: A Model for Asia-Wide Integration?* (Palgrave MacMillan 2016, edited with Mia Mikic); *Global Automobile Demand* (Palgrave MacMillan 2015, two edited volumes); *International Investment Policy for Small States: The Case of Brunei*, in *International Investment Treaties and Arbitration Across Asia* (Julien Chaisse and Luke Nottage eds., Brill 2018, with Julien Chaisse); *One Belt-One Road Initiative and ASEAN Connectivity*, in *China's Global Rebalancing and the New Silk Road* (B.R. Deepak ed., Springer 2018).

Dr Nobumichi Teramura is Associate at the Centre for Asian and Pacific Law at the University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia (CAPLUS), and Legal Consultant at Bun & Associates (Cambodia). He is the author of *Ex Aequo et Bono as a Response to the Over-Judicialisation of International Commercial Arbitration* (Wolters Kluwer, 2020), based on his doctoral thesis from the University of New South Wales, Kensington, Australia, that received a PhD Excellence Award when completed in 2018. Nobu also published recently in the *Asian International Arbitration Journal* (2019) and *ASA Bulletin* (2020) and has co-authored a chapter comparing Australia forthcoming in Larry di Matteo et al (eds) *The Cambridge Handbook of Judicial Control of Arbitral Awards* (Cambridge University Press, 2020). Specialising in commercial law, his current research interests include legal integration in Asia and legal development for South-East Asian nations severely affected by colonisation and the Cold War, including Cambodia, Vietnam, Laos and Myanmar. He has teaching and research experience in Asia-Pacific jurisdictions including the Philippines, Australia, Japan, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Cambodia and Brunei.

Contributors

Vivienne Bath is Professor of Chinese and International Business Law at Sydney Law School, Camperdown, Australia, and Director of the Centre for Asian and Pacific Law at the University of Sydney (CAPLUS). Her teaching and research interests are in international business and economic law, private international law and Chinese law. She has first-class honours in Chinese and in law from the Australian National University, and an LLM from Harvard Law School. She has also studied in China and Germany and has extensive professional experience in Sydney, New York and Hong Kong, specialising in international commercial law, with a focus on foreign investment and commercial transactions in China and the Asian region. Representative publications include: Vivienne Bath & Gabriël Moëns, *Law of International Business in Australasia* (2nd ed., Federation Press 2019); *Overlapping Jurisdiction and the Resolution of Disputes Before Chinese and Foreign Courts*, 17 Yearbook of International Private Law 111-150 (2015-2016) and The South and Alternative Models of Trade and Investment Regulation – Chinese Outbound Investment and Approaches to International Investment Agreements, in *Recalibrating International Investment Law: Global South Initiatives* (Fabio Morosini & Michelle Rattón Sanchez Badin eds., Cambridge University Press, 2018).

James Claxton is Professor of Law at Rikkyo University, Tokyo and Adjunct Faculty for the White & Case International Arbitration LLM at University of Miami Law School, Coral Gables, Florida, as well as an independent arbitrator and mediator. He teaches and researches in the fields of international investment law, business and human rights, and international dispute settlement. Previously, he was Legal Counsel at the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID) in Washington and attorney in the international arbitration practices of law firms in Paris. James regularly advises dispute resolution institutions in Asia and is a member of various working groups devoted to improving international dispute resolution systems.

The Hon Clyde Croft AM SC is Professor of Law at Monash University in Melbourne, as well as a commercial arbitrator and mediator. Until retiring in 2019 he was the judge in charge of the Arbitration List, the Taxation List, and a General Commercial List in the

Contributors

Commercial Court of the Supreme Court of Victoria. Prior to his Court appointment in 2009, he practised extensively in property and commercial law and was an arbitrator and mediator in property, construction and general commercial disputes, domestically and internationally. Dr Croft was appointed Senior Counsel in 2000 and holds BEc, LLB and LLM from Monash University, Melbourne, Australia, and PhD from the University of Cambridge, Cambridge, England. He has chaired the Expert Advisory Committee of the UNCITRAL National Co-ordination Committee of Australia (UNCCA) to support UNCITRAL Working Group II (Disputes) since May 2018. He represented the Asia Pacific Regional Arbitration Group (APRAG) at UNCITRAL from 2005 to 2010, revising the UNCITRAL Model Law and Arbitration Rules, and later co-authored *A Guide to the UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules* (Cambridge University Press, 2013). Dr Croft is Life Fellow of the Australian Centre for International Commercial Arbitration (ACICA) and of the Resolution Institute (incorporating the Institute of Arbitrators and Mediators Australia), Fellow of the Arbitrators' and Mediators' Institute of New Zealand (AMINZ), the Chartered Institute of Arbitrators, the Australian Academy of Law and UNCCA.

Weixia Gu is Associate Professor at the University of Hong Kong Faculty of Law and Co-Chair of the American Society of International Law Asia-Pacific Interest Group. Her research focuses on international arbitration, dispute resolution, private international law and cross-border legal issues. She is the author, editor, and co-editor of three books, including *The Developing World of Arbitration in the Asia Pacific* (Hart, 2018) and *Arbitration in China: Regulation of Arbitration Agreements and Practical Issues* (Sweet & Maxwell, 2012). She is the author of more than fifty journal articles, and her recent works appear in leading international and comparative law journals, such as the *American Journal of Comparative Law*, *Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law*, *Cornell International Law Journal*, among others. Her scholarship has been cited by the US Federal Court 11th Circuit, Texas Supreme Court, Hong Kong High Court, Singapore Law Gazette, and China Council for the Promotion of International Trade. Dr Gu is an elected member of the International Academy of Comparative Law and sits on the governing councils of Hong Kong Institute of Arbitrators and China Society of Private International Law. She also serves as a panel-listed arbitrator in a number of leading arbitration institutions in China and Asia. Before joining the Faculty, she was selected as an Honorary Young Fellow to the New York University Law School, New York City, New York, in association with her Fulbright Award from the US Department of State.

Dr Hu Jiexiang is Professor at the KoGuan Law School at the Shanghai Jiao Tong University. His research areas include public international law, international economic law and WTO law. He holds BA and MA from Hangzhou Normal University, Hangzhou City, China, MPhil in Law from Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China, and PhD from the University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, Scotland. In the past three decades, Professor Hu has published more than ten books and one hundred articles in both Chinese and English. He has been awarded various honours by the Ministry of Education of China and Shanghai Municipality for his excellence in teaching and is currently leading several national research programmes.

Dr Jeanne Huang is Associate Professor at the University of Sydney Law School. She was previously Senior Lecturer at the University of New South Wales, and Associate Professor/Associate Dean at Shanghai University of International Business and Economics School of Law in China. She obtained her Doctor of Juridical Science (SJD) from Duke University School of Law in 2010. She was Foreign Research Fellow at the Max Planck Institute for Comparative and International Private Law in Hamburg, and also had research experience at The Hague Academy of International Law, and the Paris-based Academy of International Arbitration Law. Jeanne teaches and researches in the fields of private international law, e-commerce regulation, international investment law and dispute resolution (international litigation and arbitration). She has published four books including *Interregional Recognition and Enforcement of Civil and Commercial Judgments: Lessons for China from US and EU Laws* (Hart, 2014) and her articles have appeared in many peer-reviewed law journals, with extensive competitive funding, including from the China National Social Science Fund. In 2015, she won the First Prize of Excellent Scholarship awarded by the China Society of Private International Law and the Nomination Award of the Dong Biwu Prize for Youth Research in Law. Jeanne serves as an arbitrator at the Hong Kong International Arbitration Center, Shanghai International Economic and Trade Arbitration Commission (Shanghai International Arbitration Center), Nanjing Arbitration Commission and Xi'an Arbitration Commission. She also serves as an expert witness on issues of private international law and Chinese law in courts in Australia and the US.

Dr Michael Hwang SC is a Singapore-based international arbitrator. He was the Deputy Chief Justice of the Dubai International Financial Centre (DIFC) Courts upon its establishment in 2005, and subsequently was appointed as Chief Justice in 2010, retiring at the end of 2018. Throughout that period, he has continued practising as an international arbitrator in commercial and treaty arbitrations. He has written two volumes of essays on international arbitration and international dispute resolution, respectively, and was awarded an honorary LLD from the University of Sydney.

Albert Monichino QC is a Melbourne-based barrister and arbitrator, with over twenty-five years of experience in resolving commercial disputes domestically and internationally. He was appointed Senior Counsel in 2010 and is a former Vice President (Convenor) and Co-Chair of the Arbitration and ADR Section for the Commercial Bar Association of the Victorian Bar (COMMBAR). Albert is a Chartered Arbitrator and Past President of the Chartered Institute of Arbitrators Australian Branch (CI Arb, 2014-2017), and is a Fellow of CI Arb, ACICA, the Resolution Institute and the Singapore Institute of Arbitrators. He writes extensively on international commercial arbitration in Australia and the Asia-Pacific, including an annual Australian survey for the *Australian Dispute Resolution Journal*.

Anselmo Reyes SC practises as an arbitrator. He was Professor of Legal Practice at Hong Kong University from October 2012 to September 2018. Before that, he was a judge of the Hong Kong High Court from September 2003 to September 2012, when he was in charge of the Construction and Arbitration List (2004-2008) and the Commercial and Admiralty Lists (2008-2012). He was Representative of the Hague Conference on

Contributors

Private International Law's Regional Office Asia Pacific from April 2013 to July 2017. He became an International Judge of the Singapore International Commercial Court in January 2015.

Dr Jaivir Singh is Professor at the Centre for the Study of Law and Governance, Jawaharlal Nehru University, having previously taught at the University of Delhi, New Delhi, India. Trained as an economist at the Delhi School of Economics, University of Delhi, his research work aims at an interdisciplinary exploration of the interaction between the law and the economy. He has published on diverse topics including the Indian constitution, regulation, labour law, competition law, corporate law and international investment treaties.

Dr S.I. Strong is Associate Professor at the University of Sydney Law School, specialising in international dispute resolution and comparative law, particularly international commercial arbitration and large-scale (class and collective) suits. Prior to joining the University of Sydney, she taught at the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford as well as Georgetown Law Center and the University of Missouri. Dr Strong is an experienced practitioner, having acted as Counsel at Baker & McKenzie after working as a dual-qualified lawyer (US attorney and English solicitor) in the New York and London offices of Weil, Gotshal & Manges. She has published over 130 award-winning books, chapters and articles in Europe, Asia and the Americas, including *Legal Reasoning Across Commercial Disputes: Comparing Judicial and Arbitral Analyses* (anticipated 2021), *Arbitration of Trust Disputes: Issues in National and International Law* (2016), and *Class, Mass, and Collective Arbitration in National and International Law* (2013) from Oxford University Press as well as *International Commercial Arbitration: A Guide for U.S. Judges* (2012) from the Federal Judicial Center. Dr Strong's scholarly work has been translated into Spanish, French, Russian and Chinese and has been cited as authority by numerous state and federal courts and international tribunals. She sits as an arbitrator and mediator on a variety of international commercial and trust-related matters.

Ana Ubilava is Research Assistant and PhD candidate at the University of Sydney Law School, where she is in the final stages of completing a thesis on investor-state mediation. She has published on international dispute resolution in several periodicals including the *Journal of World Investment and Trade*. Ana is also Executive Coordinator of the Australian Network for Japanese Law (ANJeL).

The Hon Marilyn Warren AC QC is Vice-Chancellor's Professorial Fellow at Monash University, where she is a member of its Global Leaders Summit, and teaches postgraduate commercial law and international arbitration. She was a long-serving Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Victoria (2003-2017), and earlier on that Court (1998-2003) included service as the Judge in Charge of the Commercial List and the Corporations List (now combined as the Commercial Court). Professor Warren was a foundation Council member of the Asian Business Law Institute in Singapore. She now also sits as a domestic and international commercial arbitrator and is a member of the

Dawson Chambers Senior Arbitrator Group at the Victorian Bar (where she became Queen's Counsel in 1997).

A. Vijayalakshmi Venugopal is Senior Lecturer at Taylor's University Law School in Malaysia. Her teaching and postgraduate supervisory experience includes WTO law, international dispute resolution, international sale of goods and intellectual property law. She was a visiting lecturer at the University of Rotterdam Business School. She holds Master's in Law and Educational Psychology and has presented conference papers in these fields. She is the author of three books, and articles in peer-reviewed law journals.

Dr Brett Williams is an Australian Legal Practitioner, is the principal of Williams Trade Law and an Honorary Senior Lecturer at the University of Sydney Law School. His legal practice specialises in the law of the World Trade Organization and of bilateral and regional trade agreements, including representation in WTO dispute settlement, accession issues, and also trade issues under Australian law. He has taught WTO law at Sydney Law School since 2001 and is Research Affiliate of both the Sydney Centre International Law and the Centre for Asian and Pacific Law at the University of Sydney. His publications include the co-edited book *China and the World Trade System* (Cambridge University Press, 2003), building on his PhD research, and articles on WTO negotiations on agricultural trade, China's WTO accession, trade in services and innovations in dispute settlement mechanisms in trade agreements. Brett also serves on the Editorial Board of the *Australian International Law Journal*. He has held various professional positions, including on the Executive of the International Law Section of the Law Council of Australia (2012-2016) and as inaugural co-chair of the International Economic Law Interest Group of the Australia New Zealand Society of International Law (2010-2012).

Summary of Contents

Editors	v
Contributors	vii
Foreword	xxiii
List of Abbreviations	xxv
List of Figures	xxix
List of Tables	xxxii
Acknowledgements	xxxiii
CHAPTER 1	
New Frontiers in Asia-Pacific Trade, Investment and International Business Dispute Resolution	
<i>Luke Nottage & Bruno Jetin</i>	1
CHAPTER 2	
An International Commercial Court for Australia: An Idea Worth Taking to Market	
<i>Marilyn Warren & Clyde Croft</i>	41
CHAPTER 3	
New Frontiers for International Commercial Arbitration in Australia: Beyond the 'Lucky Country'	
<i>Albert Monichino & Nobumichi Teramura</i>	73

Summary of Contents

CHAPTER 4		
Confidentiality and Transparency in International Arbitration: Asia-Pacific Tensions and Expectations		
<i>Luke Nottage</i>		97
CHAPTER 5		
Novel and Noteworthy Aspects of Australia's Recent Investment Agreements and ISDS Policy: The CPTPP, Hong Kong, Indonesia and Mauritius Transparency Treaties		
<i>Ana Ubilava & Luke Nottage</i>		117
CHAPTER 6		
New Frontiers in Hong Kong's Resolution of 'One Belt One Road' International Commercial and Investor-State Disputes		
<i>Shahla Ali</i>		141
CHAPTER 7		
Harmonizing the Public Policy Exception for International Commercial Arbitration along the Belt and Road		
<i>Weixia Gu</i>		165
CHAPTER 8		
Recent Developments in China in Cross-Border Dispute Resolution: Judicial Reforms in the Shadow of Political Conformity		
<i>Vivienne Bath</i>		187
CHAPTER 9		
Malaysia's Involvement in International Business Dispute Resolution		
<i>A. Vijayalakshmi Venugopal</i>		209
CHAPTER 10		
Disruption as a Catalyst for International Dispute Services in Japan: No Longer Business as Usual?		
<i>James Claxton, Luke Nottage & Nobumichi Teramura</i>		235
CHAPTER 11		
Litigating, Arbitrating and Mediating Japan-Korea Trade and Investment Tensions		
<i>James Claxton, Luke Nottage & Brett Williams</i>		257
CHAPTER 12		
Indian Investment Treaty Practice: Qualitatively and Quantitatively Assessing Recent Developments		
<i>Jaivir Singh</i>		283

Summary of Contents

CHAPTER 13	
FTA Dispute Resolution to Protect Health and the Environment	
<i>Jie (Jeanne) Huang & Jiayang Hu</i>	309
CHAPTER 14	
Promoting International Mediation Through the Singapore Convention on Mediation	
<i>S.I. Strong</i>	333
CHAPTER 15	
Expanding Asia-Pacific Frontiers for International Dispute Resolution: Conclusions and Recommendations	
<i>Nobumichi Teramura & Shahla Ali & Anselmo Reyes</i>	351
Index	365

Table of Contents

Editors	v
Contributors	vii
Foreword	xxiii
List of Abbreviations	xxv
List of Figures	xxix
List of Tables	xxxii
Acknowledgements	xxxiii
CHAPTER 1	
New Frontiers in Asia-Pacific Trade, Investment and International Business Dispute Resolution	
<i>Luke Nottage & Bruno Jetin</i>	1
§1.01 Introduction	1
§1.02 Transformations in Trade and Investment Flows in and Around Asia	3
§1.03 Proliferation of IIAS in Asia	9
§1.04 Belated Expansion of Asia-Related ISDS Arbitrations	15
§1.05 Emergence of Regional Centres and New Initiatives for International Dispute Resolution	17
§1.06 Key Developments in Key Jurisdictions: Chapter Summaries and Further Context	19
[A] Australia (and New Zealand)	19
[B] Japan (and Korea)	28
[C] Hong Kong, China and BRI	31
[D] India and Malaysia	33
[E] Other Regional Developments	34

Table of Contents

§1.07	Conclusions	35
	Appendix: Investment, Treaties and ISDS Claims in the Asian Region	37
CHAPTER 2		
	An International Commercial Court for Australia: An Idea Worth Taking to Market	
	<i>Marilyn Warren & Clyde Croft</i>	41
§2.01	Introduction	42
§2.02	Existing International Legislative Architecture	44
	[A] The New York Convention	44
	[B] The Hague Choice of Court Convention	46
§2.03	International Commercial Courts	50
	[A] An Alternative to International Commercial Arbitration	51
	[B] The London Commercial Court: Building on a History of Innovation	53
	[C] Other International Models	55
§2.04	SICC: A Case Study	57
	[A] Composition of the Court	57
	[B] Governing Legislation	58
	[C] Approach to Procedure	59
	[D] Confidentiality	60
	[E] Rules of Evidence, Determining Foreign Law, and Joinder	61
	[F] Appeals	63
	[G] Enforceability of Judgments	63
§2.05	An Australian International Commercial Court	65
	[A] Sovereign Base and Composition of the Court	66
	[B] Appeals	66
	[C] Scope of Jurisdiction, Procedure, and the Enforceability of Judgments	67
	[D] The Australian Consumer Law	68
§2.06	Impact of COVID-19	68
§2.07	Conclusion	69
CHAPTER 3		
	New Frontiers for International Commercial Arbitration in Australia: Beyond the ‘Lucky Country’	
	<i>Albert Monichino & Nobumichi Teramura*</i>	73
§3.01	Introduction	73
§3.02	IAA-Related Developments in Australian Courts Since 2016	77
	[A] <i>Sino Dragon Trading Ltd. v. Noble Resources International Pte Ltd.</i>	78
	[B] <i>Re Samsung C&T Corporation</i>	81
	[C] <i>Trina Solar (US) Inc. v. Jasmin Solar Pty Ltd.</i>	82
§3.03	Future IAA Reforms to Enhance Australia as a Regional ICA Hub	85
	[A] Indemnity Costs for Failed Challenges to Arbitral Awards	85

Table of Contents

	[B] Subpoenas for Supporting Foreign Arbitration	87
	[C] Choice of Law Rules on the Existence and Scope of Arbitration Agreements	88
	[D] Limiting or Excluding the Application of ACL to Cross-Border Business-to-Business Transactions	89
	[E] Defining ‘Australian Law’	90
	[F] Catching Up with Recent Innovations	91
	[G] Clarifying Arbitrability of Trust Disputes	91
	[H] Centralisation of Judicial Power	92
§3.04	Conclusion	95
CHAPTER 4		
Confidentiality and Transparency in International Arbitration: Asia-Pacific Tensions and Expectations		
	<i>Luke Nottage</i>	97
§4.01	Introduction: Confidentiality Versus Transparency in Asia-Pacific International Arbitration	98
§4.02	Australia: Ambitious but Ambivalent?	104
	[A] ICA	104
	[B] Australia’s Investment Treaties and Arbitration	106
§4.03	Japan: Modest and Measured?	108
	[A] ICA	108
	[B] Japan’s Investment Treaties and ISDS	110
§4.04	Conclusions and Broader Implications	111
CHAPTER 5		
Novel and Noteworthy Aspects of Australia’s Recent Investment Agreements and ISDS Policy: The CPTPP, Hong Kong, Indonesia and Mauritius Transparency Treaties		
	<i>Ana Ubilava & Luke Nottage</i>	117
§5.01	Introduction	118
§5.02	ISDS in AHKIA and IA-CEPA	121
§5.03	Costs and Delays in ISDS as Addressed by CPTPP, IA-CEPA and AHKIA	128
§5.04	Transparency Through CPTPP, IA-CEPA, AHKIA and the Mauritius Convention	134
§5.05	Conclusions	140
CHAPTER 6		
New Frontiers in Hong Kong’s Resolution of ‘One Belt One Road’ International Commercial and Investor-State Disputes		
	<i>Shahla Ali</i>	141
§6.01	Introduction: Hong Kong and the Belt and Road Initiative	141
§6.02	Hong Kong as a Leading International Dispute Resolution Hub	144
	[A] Legislative and Regulatory Framework	144
	[B] Institutional Framework	147

Table of Contents

	[C] Judicial Framework	148
§6.03	Recent Reform of Hong Kong’s ICA and ISDS Regime	150
	[A] Legislative and Regulatory Reform	150
	[B] Institutional Reform: BRI Specific Initiatives	150
	[C] Judicial Reform: New Initiatives in ICA and ISDS	152
	[1] ICA	152
	[2] ISDS	153
§6.04	New Frontiers in Dispute Resolution Development in Hong Kong: New Initiatives in ICA and ISDS for BRI	156
	[A] Hong Kong: China Interim Measures Arrangement	156
	[B] New Players in ISDS	157
	[C] Hong Kong’s Contribution to Investor-State Mediation	158
§6.05	Conclusion	161
CHAPTER 7		
Harmonizing the Public Policy Exception for International Commercial Arbitration along the Belt and Road		
	<i>Weixia Gu</i>	165
§7.01	Introduction	165
§7.02	China’s BRI and an Economically Integrated Asia	168
§7.03	Arbitration as a Primary Vehicle for International Dispute Resolution	170
§7.04	Regional Harmonization of the Public Policy Exception in Asia for Arbitral Enforcement under the BRI	171
	[A] The Case for Harmonizing Arbitration Laws in the Asia Region	171
	[B] The Public Policy Exception under Article V2(b) of the NYC	173
	[C] Grounds for Successful Invocation of the Public Policy Exception	175
	[D] Harmonizing the ‘Public Policy Exception’ under Article V2(b) of the NYC	176
§7.05	Details for Harmonizing the Public Policy Exception under the BRI	177
	[A] Drawing from the Experiences of the EU and OHADA	177
	[1] ‘EU Public Policy’ for EU Member States	178
	[2] A ‘Uniform’ Public Policy Under OHADA	179
	[B] Substantive Contents of a Harmonized Public Policy	180
	[1] Procedural Contraventions of Public Policy	181
	[2] Substantive Contraventions of Public Policy	182
	[C] Challenges and Other Aspects of Public Policy Harmonization	183
	[1] Compatibility of Legal Systems and National Cultures Along the Belt and Road	183
	[2] Creation of ‘Transnational’ Public Policy	184
§7.06	Conclusion	185

CHAPTER 8	
Recent Developments in China in Cross-Border Dispute Resolution: Judicial Reforms in the Shadow of Political Conformity	
<i>Vivienne Bath</i>	187
§8.01 Introduction	187
§8.02 The Role of the SPC and Judicial Reform	189
§8.03 One-Stop Diversified Dispute Resolution and Mediation	190
§8.04 ICA Developments	191
§8.05 Online Dispute Resolution	194
§8.06 New Options for Dispute Resolution: The CICC	195
§8.07 Internationalization with Chinese Characteristics	197
[A] Internationalization of the Chinese Legal System and Chinese law	197
[B] The Domestication of ISDS	199
[C] Unresolved Issues Affecting Cross-Border Dispute Resolution: Chinese Private International Law	201
§8.08 Conclusion	206
CHAPTER 9	
Malaysia's Involvement in International Business Dispute Resolution	
<i>A. Vijayalakshmi Venugopal</i>	209
§9.01 Introduction	209
§9.02 Malaysia's Actual Involvement in Dispute Resolution	210
[A] Malaysia as a Party in International Business Dispute Resolution Cases	210
[1] World Trade Organization	210
[2] Investor-State Dispute Settlement	216
[3] World Intellectual Property Organization	220
[B] Malaysia as a Venue for International Dispute Resolution	222
[1] Malaysian Organisations Focused on ADR	223
[2] Enforceability of Awards, Settlements and Judgments	226
§9.03 Malaysia's Potential Involvement in International Dispute Resolution	229
§9.04 Concluding Remarks	232
CHAPTER 10	
Disruption as a Catalyst for International Dispute Services in Japan: No Longer Business as Usual?	
<i>James Claxton, Luke Nottage & Nobumichi Teramura</i>	235
§10.01 Introduction: Revisiting 'Reluctant Claimants' in Japan	236
§10.02 Assessing Japan's (In)Capacity in International Arbitration	243
[A] Japan's ICA Capacity	246
[B] Japan's ICA Incapacity	247
§10.03 The Japan International Mediation Centre in Kyoto	249
[A] Establishment and Structure of JIMC-Kyoto	251
[B] Prospects for JIMC-Kyoto	252

Table of Contents

§10.04	Conclusions	255
CHAPTER 11		
Litigating, Arbitrating and Mediating Japan-Korea Trade and Investment Tensions		
<i>James Claxton, Luke Nottage & Brett Williams</i>		257
§11.01	Introduction: Complex Multi-Faceted Tensions	257
§11.02	Korea Versus Japan in the WTO	262
§11.03	Japan Versus Korea under the 1965 Treaty or Two Investment Agreements	271
§11.04	Japanese Companies Versus Korea Through ISDS	274
§11.05	Mediation to Assist an Overall Negotiated Settlement	277
CHAPTER 12		
Indian Investment Treaty Practice: Qualitatively and Quantitatively Assessing Recent Developments		
<i>Jaivir Singh</i>		283
§12.01	Introduction	283
§12.02	The ISDS Arbitration Claims Against India	284
	[A] The Earliest Case(s)	286
	[B] The 2G Case and Other Claims Related to the Telecommunications Sector	287
	[C] Taxation-Related and Other Cases Following from Executive Action	289
§12.03	Reactions to Cases by India	291
	[A] The New Model Treaty	291
	[1] The 2014 DNMT: Changes in Definitions, Substantive Standards and Procedure	292
	[2] The Law Commission Report	293
	[3] The New Model Treaty	294
	[B] Terminations, New Treaties and New Laws	295
	[C] Summing Up India's Reactions	299
§12.04	Assessing the Developments: Empirical and Theoretical Perspectives	299
	[A] Empirical Analysis of IIA Impact on FDI into India	300
	[B] Another New Frontier: Shifting Towards Trade-Inspired Rights?	304
§12.05	Conclusion	307
CHAPTER 13		
FTA Dispute Resolution to Protect Health and the Environment		
<i>Jie (Jeanne) Huang & Jiexiang Hu</i>		309
§13.01	Introduction	309
§13.02	The Role of MARPOL 73/78	313
§13.03	Challenges for FTAs to Address Vessel-Sourced Pollution and Proposed Solutions	316
	[A] FOC	316

Table of Contents

[B] The Vague Role of Coastal States	319
[C] Affecting Trade or Investment Between the Parties	322
[D] Dispute Resolution	324
§13.04 Implications for IHR in the Context of the COVID-19 Pandemic	327
§13.05 Conclusion and Proposals	330
CHAPTER 14	
Promoting International Mediation Through the Singapore Convention on Mediation	
<i>S.I. Strong</i>	
§14.01 Introduction	333
§14.02 Measuring ‘Success’: Goals of the Singapore Convention on Mediation	335
§14.03 DSD and the Singapore Convention	337
§14.04 Structural Concerns	339
§14.05 Potential Solutions to Structural Concerns	343
§14.06 Effect of Non-legal Forces on the Development of International Commercial Mediation	347
§14.07 Conclusion	349
CHAPTER 15	
Expanding Asia-Pacific Frontiers for International Dispute Resolution: Conclusions and Recommendations	
<i>Nobumichi Teramura, Shahla Ali & Anselmo Reyes</i>	
§15.01 Introduction	351
§15.02 From Rule-Taker to Rule-Maker	353
§15.03 The Asia-Pacific Region in the Age of COVID-19	360
Index	365

Foreword

This is a book which looks forward to possible future outcomes in the development of cross-border dispute resolution in the Asia-Pacific region, focusing on major economies in East and South Asia, as well as neighbouring countries such as Australia which are closely linked economically and geographically. The principal questions posed are whether: (a) international commercial arbitration can improve its attractiveness through law reform and case law development, overcoming criticisms about cost and delay; (b) growing concerns about ISDS issues in current investment treaties will lead to Asian states to become rule-makers in international investment law, rather than continue as rule takers; (c) innovations in existing or new fields can assist the Asia-Pacific region in developing international dispute settlement mechanisms further. It is therefore an exciting book that challenges existing procedures and frameworks for cross-border dispute resolution both in commercial and in treaty arbitration, rather than being another book which is simply descriptive of the existing mechanisms (valuable as such books might be).

There are clearly catalysts for change within the existing framework of dispute resolution in Asia, and several could be real game changers, like China's Belt and Road Initiative (examined in detail in Chapter 7) and the Singapore Convention on Mediation (Chapter 14). The team of writers specially assembled for this project have impressive credentials, led by the prolific and perceptive Professor Luke Nottage, and supported by several authors whom I have the privilege of knowing personally, and whose work I can wholeheartedly recommend as being worth reading, for both their knowledge and their experience, but particularly for their insight.

The various authors are not simply writing about existing practices and procedures in the region, but are examining the situation on the ground with a critical eye, and making informed observations about where changes are needed and educated guesses about the chances of reforms being successful, and the consequences if they are not. It has been written in the time of COVID-19 and accordingly points out the special challenges to the field of international dispute resolution in this unprecedented situation. Those include whether lawyers can adapt to new technological solutions to overcome the difficulties of conducting virtual hearings, and whether players in the

field of dispute resolution can continue to afford the time and cost of long drawn-out forensic procedures to resolve the inevitable disputes that have been caused by the pandemic, or whether there will be added impetus to use mediation in place of confrontation. There are also protectionist issues affecting the future of maintaining the rule of law in settling cross-border commercial disputes. Local judges might be influenced by the fact that certain apparent breaches of contract have been caused by events beyond the control of their local businesspeople, and the law may become stretched or even disregarded for what may be perceived to be a fairer commercial solution when performance of a contractual obligation has been rendered impossible in the light of conditions brought on by the pandemic. Such situations could lead possibly to foreign judgments and/or foreign arbitration awards not being recognised or enforced, relying on an overly liberal interpretation of the doctrine of public policy to justify such non-enforcement.

There are also challenges arising from internal social and political challenges in certain Asian jurisdictions such as Malaysia and Hong Kong, where rule of law issues may affect investor confidence in those territories. This mistrust of the application of the rule of law will likely also lead to an international lack of confidence in the reliability of the dispute resolution system of the countries concerned, and Hong Kong in particular may find it difficult to maintain the hitherto proud record of independence and efficiency of its courts and arbitral tribunals. And there are legacy challenges which were there in several Asian countries before COVID-19 and remain as challenges to be overcome, without which their attractiveness as international investment and commercial centres will surely decrease if the legacy problems are not resolved.

The best introduction to this book is actually to start from the succinct final chapter (Chapter 15) jointly authored by Professors Anselmo Reyes, Shahla Ali and Nobumichi Teramura. This gives an excellent summary of the aims and contents of the fourteen preceding chapters and will highlight to readers which chapters might be of particular interest and therefore help determine in which order to read which chapters, although all fourteen are worth reading.

I therefore congratulate Professors Nottage, Ali, Jetin and Teramura and their team of other authors on producing a timely and lively study. It will certainly stimulate ideas and discussion among its readers and perhaps also contribute to some positive changes in the jurisdictions which are the subject of this critical study.

*Dr Michael Hwang SC
Singapore, 31 July 2020*

List of Abbreviations

AANZFTA	ASEAN Australia-New Zealand FTA
ACIA	ASEAN Comprehensive Investment Agreement
ACICA	Australian Centre for International Commercial Arbitration
ADR	Alternative Dispute Resolution
AFTINET	Australian Fair Trade and Investment Network
AG	Australia Group
A-HKFTA	Australia-Hong Kong Free Trade Agreement
AHKIA	Australia-Hong Kong Investment Agreement
AIAC	Asian International Arbitration Centre
AIIB	Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank
APEC	Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
BAC	Beijing Arbitration Commission
BIT	Bilateral Investment Treaty
BRI	Belt and Road Initiative
CAJAC	China-Africa Joint Arbitration Centre
CCJA	Cour Commune de Justice et d'Arbitrage
CEDR	Centre for Effective Dispute Resolution
CEPA	Closer Economic Partnership Agreement
CFA	Court of Final Appeal
CFI	Court of First Instance
CICC	China International Commercial Court
CIDS	Geneva Center for International Dispute Settlement
CIETAC	China International Economic and Trade Arbitration Commission
CISTEC	Center for Information on Security Trade Control

List of Abbreviations

CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora
CJEU	Court of Justice of the European Union
CLC	International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage
CMAC	China Maritime Arbitration Commission
CMG	China Merchants Group
CPTPP	Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership
DSB	Dispute Settlement Body
DSD	Dispute System Design
DSU	Dispute Settlement Understanding
ETCO	Export Trade Control Order
EU	European Union
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
FEO	Foreign Exchange Order
FET	Fair and Equitable Treatment
FOC	Flag of Convenience
FTA	Free Trade Agreement
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
GDPR	General Data Protection Regulation
GFC	Global Financial Crisis
GVC	Global Value Chains
HKAO	Hong Kong Arbitration Ordinance
HKIAC	Hong Kong International Arbitration Commission
HKMAAL	Hong Kong Mediation Accreditation Associated Limited
IAA	International Arbitration Act
IA-CEPA	Indonesia-Australia Comprehensive Economic Partnership Agreement
IACT	International Arbitration Centre in Tokyo
IBA	International Bar Association
ICA	International Commercial Arbitration
ICC	International Chamber of Commerce
ICCA	International Council for Commercial Arbitration
ICJ	International Court of Justice
ICP	Internal Control Procedure
ICSID	International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes
IHR	International Health Regulations 2005
IIA	International Investment Agreement
ILA	International Law Association
IMO	International Maritime Organization

List of Abbreviations

IOPP	International Oil Pollution Prevention
ISA	Investor-State Arbitration
ISDS	Investor-State Dispute Settlement
JAA	Japan Association of Arbitrators
JCAA	Japan Commercial Arbitration Association
JIDRC-Osaka	Japan International Dispute Resolution Centre-Osaka
JIMC-Kyoto	Japan International Mediation Centre-Kyoto
JSCOT	Joint Standing Committee on Treaties
KCAB	Korean Commercial Arbitration Board
KLRCA	Kuala Lumpur Regional Centre for Arbitration
LCIA	London Court of International Arbitration
LDP	Liberal Democratic Party
MARPOL 73/78	The International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships 1973 as Modified by the Protocol of 1978
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreement
METI	Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (Japan)
MFN	Most-Favoured Nation
MNE	Multinational Enterprise
MSTCR	Missile Technology Control Regime
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Agreement
NDB	New Development Bank
NDRC	National Development and Reform Commission (People's Republic of China)
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
NSG	Nuclear Supplies Group
NT	National Treatment
NYC	New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards
OBOR	One Belt One Road
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OHADA	Organization for the Harmonization of African Business Law
Paris-MoU	Paris Memorandum of Understanding
PCA	Permanent Court of Arbitration
PRC	People's Republic of China
PTPA	Peru Trade Promotion Agreement
RCEP	Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership
ROK	Republic of Korea
SCC	Stockholm Chamber of Commerce
SCIA	Shenzhen Court of International Arbitration
SIMC	Singapore International Mediation Centre
SPC	Supreme People's Court

List of Abbreviations

TFAAB	Trade for All Advisory Board
TOMAC	Tokyo Maritime Arbitration Commission
TPP	Trans-Pacific Partnership
UN	United Nations
UNCITRAL	United Nations Commission on International Trade Law
UNCLOS	United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNTS	United Nations Treaty
USD	United States Dollar
VCLT	Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties
WA	Wassenaar Arrangement
WHO	World Health Organization
WMD	Weapons of Mass Destruction
WTO	World Trade Organization

List of Figures

Figure 1.1	Inflows of Foreign Direct Investment in Asia, 1990-2018
Figure 5.1	Averages and Medians of Lengths of ISA Proceedings (In Months)
Figure 5.2	Transparency and Outcomes in ISA
Figure 12.1	Number of BITs Signed by India Over Time

List of Tables

Table 1.1	UNCTAD FDI Estimates by the Ultimate Investor, Share in Inward FDI Stock, 2017, Selected Countries
Table 1.2	Separate ISDS-Backed Investment Treaty Commitments Among RCEP Parties (and India)
Table 1.3	ISDS-Backed Commitments in IIAs Between Japan and the ASEAN Member States
Table 5.1	Average Arbitration Costs from Recent Empirical Studies
Table 6.1	Number of Arbitration Cases in Leading Asian Arbitral Institutions
Table 7.1	The Belt and Road Nations Categorised by Region
Table 7.2	Adoption of the New York Convention by Belt and Road Nations
Table 7.3	Adoption of the Model Law by Belt and Road Nations
Table 12.1	Parameters Estimated Using Generalised Method of Moments

Acknowledgements

We co-editors are very grateful for all other thirteen authors to this fifteen-chapter book, for completing their manuscripts so efficiently despite the extra challenge of the global COVID-19 pandemic. That unexpectedly created a further ‘new frontier’ for Asia-Pacific international arbitration and dispute resolution, and also impacted on the original two overarching themes for this book. One of those was how different jurisdictions can develop as attractive seats for international commercial arbitration despite concerns about its delays and costs, amidst established and emerging venues as well as new competition from international commercial courts and mediation. The second theme was whether and how Asia-Pacific states could be becoming ‘rule-makers’ rather than ‘rule takers’ when engaging in international investment treaty making and dispute settlement with foreign investors.

Many of us were fortunately able to meet in person over 2019 to discuss these themes and present some earlier versions of this book’s chapters or related papers, in conferences hosted in July at the University of Hong Kong (HKU) and in November at the University of Sydney. We are grateful for other presentations and feedback, and funding provided by both universities’ central administrations to facilitate those public events as well as for research assistance (University of Sydney/HKU Strategic Partnership Award). Nottage also acknowledges further research funding from the Sydney Law School’s Legal Scholarship Support Fund, and Ali acknowledges the Government of Hong Kong’s University Grants Committee for its kind support through its GRF Grant (HKU 17604318) and a 2019 University of Hong Kong Knowledge Exchange Award. For editorial and other assistance, we also thank student interns for 2019 (Grace Huang) and 2020 (Troy Lee and Novea Chan), from the Centre for Asian and Pacific Law at the University of Sydney.

Acknowledgements

We are also grateful for several journals (some as copyright holders) for permission to publish significantly updated and/or expanded versions of several chapters in this book, as indicated in their respective opening footnotes.

Luke Nottage
Shahla Ali
Bruno Jetin
Nobumichi Teramura
(31 July 2020)

CHAPTER 2

An International Commercial Court for Australia: An Idea Worth Taking to Market*

Marilyn Warren & Clyde Croft

The time has come for Australia to join others in establishing a new ‘international commercial court’ as another international dispute resolution option, especially for the Asia-Pacific region. This chapter outlines the existing international legislative architecture (the 1958 NYC (New York Convention) for international arbitration, inspiring the 2005 Hague Choice of Court Convention), and the models provided by London’s venerable Commercial Court and since 2015 the Singapore International Commercial Court (SICC) (including the latter’s composition, jurisdiction, procedure and confidentiality provisions, appeals, and cross-border enforceability of its judgments – facilitated by Singapore ratifying the 2005 Hague Convention). It uses these topics to frame the proposal for an Australian international commercial court (AICC), including the possibility of allowing its litigants to exclude the application of the Australian Consumer Law (which otherwise may apply also to many business-to-business disputes). It concludes that the COVID-19 pandemic has bolstered the case for such a new court, by minimising the obstacle of Australia’s physical distance as litigation has had to move rapidly online, and because the pandemic’s economic dislocation will undoubtedly lead to more cross-border disputes.

* The authors acknowledge the research assistance of Michaela Glass of the Faculty of Law, Monash University. The opinions expressed are the authors’ own.

§2.01 INTRODUCTION

It is commonly thought that we are now living in a unique period of internationalisation or globalisation.¹ Never before has there been such accessibility to communications and (until the coronavirus disease of 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic) to international air travel, but this is, in itself, deceptive. In many respects we are, at least from a legal perspective, only now moving again to a period of internationalism. Internationalism declined during the twentieth century for a variety of reasons, the exploration of which time does not permit. Nevertheless, an important factor seems to have been the rise of the nation state at the expense of former world empires or other transnational organisations. Global trading empires, such as the British Empire, provided coherent and coordinated legal systems throughout the world, together with some consistent legislative models, enforceability of judgments and court process available between different parts of the Empire and, of course, appeals to one court, the Privy Council.²

The development of coherent systems of transnational law continued into the twentieth century in this context. There were, for example, a variety of proposals for the federation of the British Empire and, in that context, it was proposed that there be established a court akin to the United States (US) Supreme Court to resolve constitutional and other matters or, perhaps more broadly, a similarly reconstituted House of Lords.³ This transnational or international thinking had its origins in the eighteenth century, but it seems that as the commercial dominance and power of England rose throughout the nineteenth century, the readiness of the common law to accept settled rules of international law declined. So, in the latter part of the eighteenth century, ‘if English law was silent, it was the opinion of both Lord Mansfield and Blackstone that a settled rule of international law must be considered to be part of English law, and enforced as such’.⁴ By the latter part of the nineteenth century, however, a threshold question had been interposed – namely ‘whether the particular rule of international law has been received into, and so become a source of, English law’.⁵

As the power and significance of the nation state grew, we moved into our legal silos – with apologies to more twenty-first-century terminology – and away from the free flow of commerce and the law merchant with its transnational mercantile courts, which were so active in the middle ages. Consequently, it became necessary to explore new ways of providing support for world trade – with transnational legislation and transnational dispute resolution.⁶ This process led to the development of one of the

1. Cf., earlier great internationalisation or globalisation events brought about as a result of technology, such as the invention of the electrical telegraph: see Tom Standage, *The Victorian Internet: The Remarkable Story of the Telegraph and the Nineteenth Century's On-Line Pioneers* (Walker Publishing Company 1998).

2. See Frank Safford & George Wheeler, *Privy Council Practice* (Sweet & Maxwell 1901).

3. See, e.g., Seymour Ching-Yuan Cheng, *Schemes for the Federation of the British Empire* 72, 112 (Columbia University Press 1931).

4. William S. Holdsworth, *The Relation of English Law to International Law*, in *Essays in Law and History* 260, 261 (A.L. Goodhart & H.C. Hanbury eds., Clarendon Press 1946).

5. *Ibid.*, 267.

6. In the present context, this includes the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (10 Jun. 1958) (‘NYC’), the UNCITRAL Model Law on International

most important pieces of international ‘legislation’, namely, the 1958 *Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards* – generally known in this context as the New York Convention (NYC).

The ready enforcement of arbitral awards internationally had, by the 1950s, become critical as the then rapid rise of nation states, particularly given the post-Second World War independence movements, posed significant problems for the enforcement of court judgments internationally – problems that were not solved by international conventions or domestic legislation.⁷ Neither could produce the universality of enforceability of determinative decisions, by way of court judgments, as was achieved by the NYC with respect to arbitral awards. Additionally, the enforceability of a court judgment obviously follows determination of the matter by a national court. As one party’s national court in an international dispute is not generally going to be neutral from the point of view of the other party, it is unlikely to be an attractive venue – no matter how good the quality of the particular national court. There are, however, some exceptions, such as the English Commercial Court, the reasons for which are explored further in this chapter.

Consequently, to date, international arbitration, with neutral arbitrators selected by the parties or an impartial international arbitral institution and seated in a neutral forum, has proved much more attractive than litigation in the courts.⁸ These issues would only have become more pressing but for the conclusion and success of the NYC, as globalisation and privatisation produced a plethora of parties to international transactions and consequent disputes and litigation.⁹

Without in any way denigrating or detracting from the process and success of international commercial arbitration, a variety of factors – to which we will turn shortly – indicate a desire by international commercial parties to have the option of access to, what may generally be described as, an international commercial court or courts. Moreover, the developing architecture of international ‘legislation’ marks this as a propitious time for the development of international commercial courts. As will be discussed, this is also an ideal time for Australia to establish an international commercial court.

Commercial Arbitration 1985 (amended on 7 Jul. 2006) (‘Model Law’), and in terms of more substantive law, United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods (11 Apr. 1980) (‘CISG’). The CISG is applied in Victoria by the Sale of Goods (Vienna Convention) Act 1987 (Vic).

7. See, e.g., the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Judgments in Civil and Commercial Matters (1 Feb. 1971) (‘Hague Convention’); and, in terms of domestic legislation, see, e.g., Foreign Judgments Act 1991 (Cth).

8. References to the ‘seat’ of an arbitration are to ‘Juridical Seat’, which has consequences in terms of the *lex arbitri* and court ‘supervision’. See Article 20 of the Model Law.

9. See Robert Briner, *Philosophy and Objectives of the Convention*, Conference Paper for New York Convention Day on 10 Jun. 1998, published in *Enforcing Arbitration Awards under the New York Convention – Experience and Prospects* 9, 10 (United Nations 1999).

§2.02 EXISTING INTERNATIONAL LEGISLATIVE ARCHITECTURE

Before considering existing international commercial court models, it is helpful to provide two brief examples of transnational legislation which form an important part of the international legislative architecture to which reference has been made. As will become apparent, the success of the NYC in particular serves to emphasise the need for simple ‘single-tiered’ structures which do not involve anything in the nature of double exequatur or ‘localisation’. Moreover, the Hague *Convention on Choice of Court Agreements* (‘the Choice of Court Convention’),¹⁰ which came into force in 2015, has the potential to revolutionise international dispute resolution on a scale equivalent to the NYC.

[A] The New York Convention

The NYC has been described as ‘the single most important pillar on which the edifice of international arbitration rests’¹¹ and also as a Convention which ‘perhaps could lay claim to be the most effective instance of international legislation in the entire history of commercial law’.¹² The outstanding success of the NYC is demonstrated very clearly by the fact that the network of convention countries has grown to 160 during the sixty-one years since its birth.¹³ The application of the NYC and its provisions for the enforcement of foreign arbitration agreements and the recognition and enforcement of foreign arbitral awards is regulated in Australia by Part II of the *International Arbitration Act 1974* (Cth).¹⁴

The NYC greatly simplified and expedited the recognition and enforcement process established by the Geneva Convention because it eliminated the double exequatur problem that had existed since 1927.¹⁵ More particularly, this difficulty, which arose under the Geneva Convention, arose because, in relation to recognition and enforcement, it was necessary, in effect, to demonstrate that an arbitral award which was sought to be enforced outside the country of its origin had become final in the country where it was made. This was known as the problem of double exequatur – because it meant that international arbitral awards, far from being rendered as something in the nature of international instruments, were fundamentally dependent

10. Convention on Choice of Court Agreements (30 Jun. 2005) (‘Convention on Choice of Court Agreements’).

11. J. Gillis Wetter, *The Present Status of the International Court of Arbitration of the ICC: An Appraisal*, 1 Am. Rev. Int’l Arb. 91 (1990).

12. Lord Michael Mustill, *Arbitration: History and Background* 6(2) J. Int’l Arb. 43 (2019). See also Stephen Schwebel, *A Celebration of the United Nations New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards*, 12 Arb. Int’l 823 (1996); Alan Redfern & Martin Hunter, *Law and Practice of International Commercial Arbitration* 441 (Sweet & Maxwell 4th ed. 2004).

13. Information as to the extent of the application of the NYC is available from the UNCITRAL website, at www.uncitral.un.org.

14. See further Monichino & Teramura, in this volume.

15. Convention on the Execution of Foreign Arbitral Awards (26 Sep. 1927) (‘Geneva Convention’), which followed on from the Protocol on Arbitration Clauses (24 Sep. 1923).

upon the arbitration laws in the country of their origin, regardless of any international consensus or views in the country in which enforcement may have been sought. The need to ‘delocalise’ these measures increased as a result of the expansion of international trade after the conclusion of the Second World War. The NYC, in eliminating this double *exequatur* problem, thereby significantly ‘delocalised’ and institutionalised international arbitral awards. They became ‘international currency’ to be considered and assessed in the courts of a country or countries of enforcement, rather than the instruments the validity and effectiveness of which was always to be determined in a critical respect by the laws and courts of the country of their origin, namely the seat of the arbitration.

The process of ‘enlightenment’ or the ‘Eureka moment’ that occurred in the development of the NYC in this critical respect is described in a paper given by Pieter Sanders presented at ‘New York Convention Day’, which was held at the United Nations Headquarters on 10 June 1998 to celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the NYC. It should be noted that Pieter Sanders was described as ‘the principal architect of the New York Convention’ when delegates at the Eleventh International Bar Association (IBA) International Arbitration Day, held on 1 February 2008 at New York to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the Convention, viewed the premiere screening of ‘Pieter Sanders at 95 – Reflections on the New York Convention’. In any event, Pieter Sanders recalled, in 1998:¹⁶

My review of the Convention’s history will deal in particular with what, during the Conference, was called the ‘Dutch proposal’. It was conceived during the first weekend of the Conference. I spent that week-end at the house of my father-in-law in a suburb of New York. I can still see myself sitting in the garden with my small portable type-writer on my knees. It was there, sitting in the sun, that the ‘Dutch proposal’ was conceived. Upon return to New York on Monday, 26 May, this draft was presented to the Conference.

At the meeting of Tuesday, 27 May, this proposal was welcomed by many of the delegates. The meeting decided that the Dutch proposal would be the basis for further discussions. I will not go into details of these discussions and the amendments made. I will only mention that the Conference, initially, preferred not to deal in the Convention with the arbitration agreement, as the Dutch proposal did. Preference was first given to a separate Protocol, as we knew from the Geneva Protocol on Arbitration Clauses (Geneva, 1923) (the 1923 Geneva Protocol). Nevertheless, at a very late stage of the Conference, a provision on the arbitration agreement was inserted in the Convention, the present article II.

Was the Dutch proposal really, as Professor Matteucci called it, ‘a very bold innovation’? At the time, I regarded that as rather a logical follow-up of the Geneva Convention on the Execution of Foreign Arbitral Awards (Geneva, 1927) (the 1927 Geneva Convention), taking into account the experience gained since then in the increased use of arbitration for solution of international business disputes.

The main elements of the ‘Dutch proposal’ were, first of all, the elimination of the double *exequatur*, one in the country where the award was made and another one

16. Pieter Sanders, *The Making of the Convention*, Conference Paper for New York Convention Day (10 Jun. 1998), published in *Enforcing Arbitration Awards under the New York Convention – Experience and Prospects* 3, 3-4 (United Nations 1999).

in the country of enforcement of the award. Under the 1927 Geneva Convention we always requested both. It is logical to require an exequatur only in the country where enforcement of the award is sought and not also in the country where the award was made, but no enforcement is sought. Another element of the proposal was to restrict the grounds for refusal of recognition and enforcement as much as possible and to switch the burden of proof of the existence of one or more of these grounds to the party against whom the enforcement was sought. This again stands to reason.

However, nothing is perfect in this world. After 40 years of practice with the Convention its text could certainly be improved. For example, one could consider the introduction of uniform rules for the procedure of enforcement. In this respect, the Convention only contains the requirement that the award and arbitration agreement shall be supplied to the court (article IV) and that no more onerous conditions or higher fees should be imposed than when enforcement of a domestic award is sought (article III).

The Convention provides for two possible reservations: the first that the Convention applies only on the basis of reciprocity and the second that it will apply only to disputes which are considered to be commercial under the national law of the state relying upon this reservation.¹⁷ A significant proportion of states have relied upon the reciprocity reservation, which has the effect of limiting the application of the NYC to arbitral awards within the jurisdiction of another convention state only, and not arbitral awards regardless of whether they are made within the jurisdiction of a convention state.¹⁸

[B] The Hague Choice of Court Convention

A recent addition to the international legislative architecture directed towards international commercial dispute resolution is the Hague Choice of Court Convention. The Convention of 30 June 2005, which came into force on 1 October 2015, aims at ensuring the effectiveness of choice of court agreements – also known as ‘forum selection clauses’ or ‘jurisdiction clauses’ – between parties to international commercial transactions.

Parties to international commercial transactions often seek to agree in advance on how disputes arising out of the transaction between them will be resolved. Well-advised parties realise that this is desirable, if not essential, in order to manage the risk associated with disputes that may arise in the future. For reasons already discussed, parties have tended to refer disputes which may arise to arbitration, thereby seeking to take advantage of the international enforcement mechanisms of the NYC. In some cases, parties will agree to litigate before a designated court but, as already discussed, this is less likely where the potential court is a national court of one of the parties.

17. See the NYC Article I(3).

18. Approximately 30% of ‘Convention’ states have applied the ‘reciprocity’ reservation and also approximately 30% the ‘commercial’ reservation. Australia has not applied either reservation.

Moreover, choice of court agreements have not always been respected under divergent national rules, particularly when cases are brought before a court other than one designated by the parties. This is a position sought to be rectified by the Choice of Court Convention, with a view to promoting greater legal certainty for cross-border business and creating a climate more favourable to international trade and investment. The Convention contains ‘three basic rules’ to give effect to choice of court agreements:¹⁹

- (1) the chosen court must in principle hear the case (Article 5);
- (2) any court not chosen must in principle decline to hear the case (Article 6); and
- (3) any judgment rendered by the chosen court must be recognised and enforced in other Contracting States, except where a ground for refusal applies (Articles 8 and 9).

The Convention applies in international cases to exclusive choice of court agreements ‘concluded in civil or commercial matters’ (Article 1). The Convention does not apply to exclusive choice of court agreements to consumer and employment contracts and to a number of other specified matters, including wills and succession, insolvency, composition and analogous matters and the carriage of passengers and goods (Article 2). These exclusions generally reflect the existence of more specific international instruments and national, regional or international rules which provide for exclusive jurisdiction for some of these matters.

The Convention applies to ‘exclusive choice of court agreements’ (Article 1). Article 3 provides that for the purposes of the Convention an ‘exclusive choice of court agreement’ means an agreement concluded by two or more parties that meets the requirements specified in paragraph (c) of Article 3 and designates, for the purpose of deciding disputes which may have arisen or may arise in connection with a particular legal relationship, the courts of one Contracting State or one or more specific courts of one Contracting State to the exclusion of the jurisdiction of any other courts. The formalities for such an agreement, as specified in Article 3(c), are that the agreement must be concluded or documented in writing or by any other means of communication which renders information accessible so as to be useable for subsequent reference. In other words, the Convention well accommodates the digital age. Additionally, a Contracting State may declare that it will recognise and enforce judgments given by courts designated in a non-exclusive choice of court agreement (Article 22).

Also of particular importance are Articles 6 and 9. Article 6 makes provision for the obligations of a court which has not been chosen by the parties in their agreement:

Article 6
Obligations of a court not chosen

19. Hague Conference on Private International Law, *The Hague Convention of 30 June 2005 on Choice of Court Agreements – Outline of the Convention*, Conference Paper for Workshop on Effective Enforcement of Business Contracts and Efficient Resolution of Business Disputes Through the Hague Choice of Court Agreements Convention 1 (1 Sep. 2015).

A court of a Contracting State other than that of the chosen court shall suspend or dismiss proceedings to which an exclusive choice of court agreement applies unless–

- a) the agreement is null and void under the law of the State of the chosen court;
- b) a party lacked the capacity to conclude the agreement under the law of the State of the court seised;
- c) giving effect to the agreement would lead to a manifest injustice or would be manifestly contrary to the public policy of the State of the court seised;
- d) for exceptional reasons beyond the control of the parties, the agreement cannot reasonably be performed; or
- e) the chosen court has decided not to hear the case.

Article 9 of the Convention makes provision for the refusal of recognition or enforcement, but in very limited terms, terms which are reminiscent of the limited grounds for refusal of enforcement of foreign arbitral awards under the NYC. It will be seen that one of the grounds for refusal of the recognition is manifest incompatibility with ‘public policy’ of the state in which enforcement is sought. The ‘public policy’ exception has been a vexed issue with respect to enforcement under the NYC.²⁰ It would be expected that a similarly restrictive interpretation of the expression ‘public policy’ under Article 9 of the Choice of Court Convention would be adopted. The provisions of Article 9 are as follows:

Article 9

Refusal of recognition or enforcement

Recognition or enforcement may be refused if–

- a) the agreement was null and void under the law of the State of the chosen court, unless the chosen court has determined that the agreement is valid;
- b) a party lacked the capacity to conclude the agreement under the law of the requested State;
- c) the document which instituted the proceedings or an equivalent document, including the essential elements of the claim,
 - i. was not notified to the defendant in sufficient time and in such a way as to enable him to arrange for his defence, unless the defendant entered an appearance and presented his case without contesting notification in the court of origin, provided that the law of the State of origin permitted notification to be contested; or
 - ii. was notified to the defendant in the requested State in a manner that is incompatible with fundamental principles of the requested State concerning service of documents;
- d) the judgment was obtained by fraud in connection with a matter of procedure;
- e) recognition or enforcement would be manifestly incompatible with the public policy of the requested State, including situations where the specific proceedings leading to the judgment were incompatible with fundamental principles of procedural fairness of that State;

20. See *Indian Farmers Fertiliser Cooperative Ltd., v. Gutnick* [2015] VSC 724 and, on appeal, *Gutnick v. Indian Farmers Fertiliser Cooperative Ltd.* (2016) 49 V.R. 732; as well as *Monichino & Teramura*, in this volume. Proposing regional harmonisation for the public policy exception, see also Gu, in this volume.

- f) the judgment is inconsistent with a judgment given in the requested State in a dispute between the same parties; or
- g) the judgment is inconsistent with an earlier judgment given in another State between the same parties on the same cause of action, provided that the earlier judgment fulfils the conditions necessary for its recognition in the requested State.

Finally, it is also important to observe that the provisions of Article 3(b) provide that a choice of court agreement which designates the courts of one Contracting State or one or more specific courts of one Contracting State are deemed to be exclusive unless the parties have expressly provided otherwise.

To date, thirty-two states, including the European Union Member States, the US, Singapore and China, have signed the Convention. Australia is yet to become a signatory. However, the Convention was tabled in the Federal Parliament along with a detailed National Interest Analysis in June 2016.²¹ The National Interest Analysis states:²²

Accession to the Convention is in Australia's national interest. Implementing the Convention will provide greater clarity and certainty for Australian businesses in the resolution of disputes arising from international transactions. Furthermore, accession to the Convention by Australia will facilitate party autonomy in civil and commercial contracts, making the process of determining jurisdiction more transparent and predictable.

The National Interest Analysis goes on to set out the proposed implementation of the Convention in Australia and states:²³

[21] It is proposed that the Convention will be implemented domestically through a new International Civil Law Act. This Act will also implement the *Hague Principles on Choice of Law in International Commercial Contracts* approved by the Hague Conference on Private International Law on 19 March 2015 ('Principles'). The Principles consist of 12 articles designed to clarify the operation of contracts with cross-border elements in international commercial law. They establish the basic rule that international commercial contracts are to be governed by the law chosen by the parties, subject to certain limitations. The Principles are a guide to best practice with respect to the recognition of party autonomy in choice of law in international commercial contracts. They are neither binding in international law, nor a model law, but are designed to be incorporated into State law in the manner most appropriate to each State, so as to develop and harmonise State laws.

[22] The Convention and the Principles are well suited to implementation via a single Act, which will provide clear, consistent and accessible Australian private international law rules and principles to litigants in Australia and abroad.

[23] For international proceedings, the treatment of exclusive choice of court agreements is currently governed by the common law, and the Trans-Tasman

21. *National Interest Analysis on Australia's Accession to the Convention on Choice of Court Agreements*, A.T.N.I.A. 7 (2016).

22. *Ibid.*, [6].

23. *Ibid.*, 7 [21]–[24].

Proceedings Act for Trans-Tasman litigation. Exclusive choice of court agreements are generally regarded as enforceable in Australia, subject to certain limitations relating to the validity of the agreement and public policy considerations.

[24] The proposed International Civil Law Act will codify the common law relating to choice of court agreements, clarify areas of uncertainty, and broaden the range of situations in which choice of court agreements will be given effect by Australian courts, consistent with Convention obligations. It will also set out the circumstances in which the recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments can occur in Australia. In accordance with the provisions of the Convention, the new Act will limit the possible grounds for refusing to give effect to an exclusive choice of court agreement.

It is, of course, early days for the development of the Choice of Court Convention, and it remains to be seen whether it will replicate the success of the NYC in providing a global web of enforceability for the judgments of courts of Contracting States the same way as the NYC has achieved for arbitral awards. There are, however, reasons for thinking that commercial parties will see the need for such global coverage and that states, including Australia, will respond accordingly. Of particular note in the present context, the Choice of Court Convention also has the potential to help further facilitate the effectiveness and attractiveness of international commercial courts, as well as helping drive the establishment of such courts.

§2.03 INTERNATIONAL COMMERCIAL COURTS

There are presently at least five well-established examples of courts which have been described as ‘international commercial courts’. They are the relatively newly established SICC,²⁴ the London Commercial Court,²⁵ the Qatar International Court (QIC),²⁶ the courts of the Dubai International Financial Centre (DIFC)²⁷ and the Abu Dhabi Global Market (ADGM).²⁸ The London Commercial Court has a long lineage which is readily traceable to the work of Lord Mansfield who, as Chief Justice of the Court of Kings Bench, drew on the expertise of special commercial juries for the purpose of informing the court in deciding commercial cases.²⁹ When one looks at these courts, it is readily seen that, beyond the common feature that they hear disputes involving

24. See SICC, *Singapore International Commercial Court*, www.sicc.gov.sg (accessed 28 Apr. 2020).

25. See *Courts and Tribunals Judiciary*, www.judiciary.gov.uk/you-and-the-judiciary/going-to-court/high-court/queens-bench-division/courts-of-the-queens-bench-division/commercial-court/ (accessed 28 Apr. 2020).

26. See *Qatar International Court and Dispute Resolution Centre*, www.qicdrc.com.qa (accessed 28 Apr. 2020). The QIC was formerly known as the Civil and Commercial Court of the Qatar Financial Centre.

27. See DIFC Courts, *Dubai International Financial Centre Courts*, <http://difccourts.ae/> (accessed 28 Apr. 2020).

28. See ADGM, *Abu Dhabi Global Market*, <http://adgm.com/doing-business/adgm-courts/about-us/> (accessed 28 Apr. 2020).

29. John Thomas, *Commercial Justice in the Global Village: The Role of Commercial Courts* [41]–[43], Speech for DIFC Academy of Law Lecture in Dubai (1 Feb. 2016).

international parties, they provide examples of the variety of international commercial court models.

In the last two years, several further courts have also been founded and styled as ‘international commercial courts’. Evidently they reflect major shifts in world order, such as Brexit and China’s Belt and Road initiative. In the mould of the more established forebears, there is now the Netherlands Commercial Court (NCC),³⁰ the International Commercial Chamber of the Paris Court of Appeal (CICAP),³¹ the Chamber for International Commercial Disputes of the Landgericht Frankfurt am Main,³² the Chinese International Commercial Courts (CICCs) in the cities of Shenzhen and Xi’an,³³ and the Astana International Financial Court (AIFC) in Kazakhstan.³⁴

These courts are municipal courts in that they are established under the legislation of the states in which they are situated, with jurisdiction to hear international cases. They commonly deal with international commercial matters, sometimes including matters where more than one party is foreign to the state within which the court is based. It is therefore imperative that these courts are attuned to the needs and realities of international commerce and in the course of their work set standards for resolving international disputes. Before considering these existing international commercial court models further, though, it is necessary to say something about the developing need for an alternative to international commercial arbitration.

[A] An Alternative to International Commercial Arbitration

Despite the undeniable success of international commercial arbitration – success which is attributable in no small part to the widespread adoption and implementation of the NYC and the Model Law – there is a growing recognition of a need for an alternative to arbitration for international disputing parties. In the Opening Lecture for the DIFC Courts Lecture Series 2015, Singapore’s Chief Justice Sundaresh Menon attributed the preference of some commercial parties for litigation over arbitration to a variety of push and pull factors. As Menon CJ put it:³⁵

30. See NCC, *Netherlands Commercial Court*, <https://www.rechtspraak.nl/English/NCC/Pages/default.aspx> (accessed 28 Apr. 2020).

31. Guillaume Croisant, *The Belgian Government Unveils Its Plan for the Brussels International Business Court (BIBC)*, Kluwer Arbitration Blog (25 Jun. 2018), <http://arbitrationblog.kluwerarbitration.com/2018/06/25/the-belgian-government-unveils-its-plan-for-the-brussels-international-business-court-bibc/> (accessed 28 Apr. 2020); Xandra Kramer, *The International Business Courts Saga Continued: NCC First Judgment – BIBC Proposal Unplugged*, Conflict of Laws.net (27 Mar. 2019), <http://conflictolaws.net/2019/the-international-business-courts-saga-continued-ncc-first-judgment-bibc-proposal-unplugged/> (accessed 28 Apr. 2020).

32. See *Chamber for International Commercial Disputes*, <https://ordentliche-gerichtsbarkeit.hessen.de/ordentliche-gerichte/lgb-frankfurt-am-main/lg-frankfurt-am-main/chamber-international> (accessed 28 Apr. 2020).

33. See CICC, *China International Commercial Court*, <http://cicc.court.gov.cn/html/1/219/index.html> (accessed 28 Apr. 2020); and Bath, in this volume.

34. See AIFC, *Astana International Financial Centre*, <http://aifc-court.kz/> (accessed 28 Apr. 2020).

35. Sundaresh Menon, *International Commercial Courts: Towards a Transnational System of Dispute Resolution* [12]–[13], Opening Lecture for DIFC Courts Lecture Series 2015 in Dubai (2015) (citations omitted).

12. The main pull factors are that certain cases are better suited for a process that is relatively open and transparent, equipped with appellate mechanisms, the options of consolidation and joinder, and the assurance of a court judgment.
13. The main push factors relate to the actual or perceived problems with arbitration. There are some well-rehearsed (if not universally accepted) issues relating to the lack of regulation in the arbitration industry. Among other things, there is said to be a lack of ethical consensus to guide the increasingly amorphous and diverse body of practitioners, resulting in various ethical issues; a lack of visibility and public accountability in decision making; increasing judicialisation and laboriousness in process resulting in delay accompanied by rising costs; some unpredictability in the enforcement of arbitral awards due to the ad hoc nature of courts' oversight of the enforcement process; and some lack of consistency in arbitral decisions due to the lack of corrective appellate mechanisms or an open body of jurisprudence.

The Chief Justice went on to address what, in our view, forms the crux of the need for an alternative to arbitration, observing that:³⁶

14. ... arbitration, by its very nature, cannot provide a complete solution to propel the vessel of global commerce forward. Arbitration was conceived as an ad hoc, consensual, convenient and confidential method of resolving disputes. It was not designed to provide an authoritative and legitimate superstructure to facilitate global commerce. It cannot, on its own, adequately address such things as the harmonisation of substantive commercial laws, practices and ethics.
15. This is where I believe that international commercial courts have a potentially important role to play. Such courts can be instrumental in facilitating the harmonisation of commercial laws and practices. They also represent an avenue for the advancement of the rule of law as a normative ideal in global commerce. This is because there will be greater external scrutiny of their decisions and processes, with increased pressure to justify decisions against international norms.

Similar sentiments have been expressed by the former Chief Justice of the High Court of Australia, Robert French, who has questioned the capacity for arbitration to contribute to the 'development and international convergence of commercial law'.³⁷ Recognition of the inherently different conceptual bases of arbitration and litigation also helps demonstrate why the establishment of international commercial courts does not pose an existential threat to the practice of international commercial arbitration. This is because international commercial courts are not a replacement for arbitration, but rather they add to the range of options available to parties involved in international commerce. Indeed, Menon CJ gives the example of the London Commercial Court, which has operated 'alongside a vibrant arbitration market' for many years.³⁸ Space does not permit a more comprehensive consideration of the differences between

36. *Ibid.*, [14]–[15].

37. Robert French, *Transnational Dispute Resolution* [14]–[15], Speech for Supreme and Federal Court Judges' Conference in Brisbane (25 Jan. 2016).

38. Menon, *supra* n. 35, [10].

arbitration and litigation, but it is clear that commercial parties will welcome the greater choice.³⁹

[B] The London Commercial Court: Building on a History of Innovation

The London Commercial Court is a division of the Queen's Bench and has a long history dating back to its establishment in 1895. Although the court is, in essence, a municipal court and not a court newly and specially established to deal with international disputes – unlike the SICC and the DIFC courts for example – it does attract an enormous amount of international commercial litigation, including in circumstances where neither the parties nor the subject matter of the disputes has any real or significant connection with the United Kingdom (UK). As indicated previously, international dispute resolution in municipal courts, particularly the courts of the country of nationality of one of the international transactional parties, is generally thought to be unattractive, both for the reasons of lack of a 'neutral' forum and difficulties in the enforceability of judgments. Nevertheless, the London Commercial Court, based, as it is, in one of the world's preeminent financial centres, has attracted this international position through its long history of excellence in its work in the hands of judges of impeccable ability and impartiality.

Consequently, the position of the London Commercial Court might be regarded in this context as unique. So, apart from the clear message with respect to the establishment of any international commercial court – that is, the requirement of judges of impeccability and impartiality – the more immediate issues which need to be addressed in Australia are better illustrated by looking to other international commercial court models. Nevertheless, the English experience does highlight the importance of, and the capacity for, international commercial courts to keep abreast with innovation in the world of commerce. This was particularly well illustrated by former Lord Chief Justice Thomas in his lecture to the DIFC Academy of Law in Dubai in February 2016:⁴⁰

41. ... [A] court must understand the markets and the commercial world. The London Commercial Court has developed and adapted its links with the financial and business community. The aim of those links is to ensure that the judiciary remained abreast of changes in the market. London has a historic advantage. In the 18th Century Lord Mansfield, the creator of the basis of modern English commercial and insurance law, often used special juries drawn from experts in the field: being, for instance, commercial merchants, insurance brokers, traders and so on. Their expertise would be practical expertise. In *Lewis v Rucker* from 1794, for instance, Lord Mansfield drew on the expertise of a special jury to enable him to fashion principles of insurance law. As he explained it, the jury:⁴¹

39. For a comprehensive discussion of the differences between international commercial arbitration and litigation in an international commercial court, see especially *ibid.*, [37]–[56].

40. See Thomas, *supra* n. 29, at [41]–[44].

41. (1761) 2 Burrow 1167.

understood the question very well, and knew more about the subject of it than anybody else present; and formed their judgment from their own notions and experience, without much assistance from anything that passed.

42. That experience helped form the principles which he then went on to articulate in his judgments. In these, and other ways, Lord Mansfield ensured that the courts, and their search for principle, were not divorced from practice and thus the law was moulded to underpin the rapid growth of the UK as a trading state. It was also his common practice to invite his 'jurymen' to dinner, in order to discuss mercantile principles and customs so that he was as up to date as possible. I am afraid to say that even if it were still thought appropriate for judges to invite jurors to dinner, the idea that a modern Chief Justice would be able to invest the same amount of time as Lord Mansfield did in this way is one that bears little scrutiny.
43. The courts in London may no longer have special juries or leisurely dinners, but the London Commercial Court and the Financial List must keep properly abreast with rapidly changing market developments. This is now done through the provision of market seminars by an independent body originally established by the Bank of England, the Financial Markets Law Committee.⁴² It ensures that senior members of the judiciary, and particularly the judges of the Commercial Court and the Financial List, are provided with regular and well-informed updates on changing market practices and the development of new financial products. In addition, to ensure that the Financial List remains relevant to court users and that change is demand-motivated, but judge led, a Financial List Users Committee has been established. Akin to the Commercial Court Users Committee, it is intended to have a broad membership drawn from representatives of legal and market associations, as well as Financial List judges.
44. The creation of the Financial List User Committee is a demonstration of a commitment to court users in the widest sense. In an interconnected world it has long seemed to me that London needed to develop a similar forum for debate at the international level. The London Commercial Court and the Financial List are international in their focus. 80% of work before the London Commercial Court has, at least, one party who is based outside the jurisdiction. Singapore and the DIFC Courts of Dubai, amongst others, are equally outward looking. Business and markets require us to be so. In truth all our Commercial Courts are international dispute resolution centres underneath their individual differences.

The message then is clear – successful international commercial courts must be inherently outward looking, and adapt their processes to the changing needs and expectations of the international market. In furtherance of this goal, Chief Justice Menon and former Lord Chief Justice Thomas have separately indicated their support for the creation of a network or forum of commercial courts which would encourage collaboration between courts and aid the development of best dispute resolution practice.⁴³ As former Lord Chief Justice Thomas put it – expressing sentiments with which we wholeheartedly agree:⁴⁴

42. See *Financial Markets Law Committee*, <http://www.fmlc.org/> (accessed 28 Apr. 2020);

43. Menon, *supra* n. 35, at [67(d)]; Thomas, *supra* n. 29, at [47]–[51].

44. Thomas, *supra* n. 29, at [47].

In our interconnected world, our global village, the judges of the Commercial Courts have a ... role in ensuring our global prosperity continues to be underpinned by an effective legal framework and by law which develops in harmony with the rapidly changing markets and commerce brought about by the digital revolution. The Commercial Courts of the world are not unconnected islands, but have a common duty working together to innovate and to lead.

[C] Other International Models

Returning to Menon CJ's illuminating paper delivered at the DIFC Courts Lecture Series 2015, Singapore's Chief Justice observed that the SICC and the DIFC courts share some fundamental similarities, many of which have already been mentioned. The Chief Justice then turned to focus on the different underlying motivations and ideologies of the two courts:⁴⁵

19. The DIFCC was created to support the economic activities within the Dubai International Financial Centre (DIFC), a purpose-built financial centre strategically located between the East and West.⁴⁶ It seeks to provide a 'platform for business and financial institutions to reach into and out of the emerging markets of the region'. It is conceived of as an independent zone specially created for the specific purpose of supporting a financial market for multinational companies.⁴⁷ The idea is that a capital market could be created in order to provide global businesses with a familiar environment governed by financial regulations and legal rules that are substantially similar to those found in leading common law jurisdictions.⁴⁸ To this end, the DIFCC is a common law court that applies either the law governing the contract in question, or the DIFC's common law system, which is 'based substantially on English law in codified form but with civil law influence'.
20. When the DIFCC was launched about a decade ago, it focused on dealing with matters that arose within the DIFC. The 'internationalisation' of the DIFCC came about in 2011, when its jurisdiction was expanded to include consent jurisdiction. This allowed the DIFCC to hear disputes that were not connected to its physical jurisdiction. With this expansion of its jurisdiction, the DIFCC plays an even more important role in making the DIFC a legal hub for the Middle East and North Africa.
21. This is to be contrasted with the SICC, which is located in South-East Asia, and therefore will likely serve a different demographic. From its inception, the SICC was envisaged as a forum dedicated to handling only international

45. Menon, *supra* n. 35, at [19]–[21] (citations omitted).

46. See DIFC Courts, *FAQ Dubai International Finance Centre Courts*, <https://www.difccourts.ae/faq/> (accessed 28 Apr. 2020), which states 'The Dubai International Financial Centre is an onshore financial centre in the UAE. The DIFC's strategic location, between the markets of the east and west, provides a secure and efficient platform for business and financial institutions to reach into and out of the emerging markets of the region. The Centre offers independent regulation, supportive infrastructure and a tax-efficient regime, as well as a common law system.'

47. Denise Huiwen Wong, *The Rise of the International Commercial Court: What Is It and Will It Work?*, 33 C.J.Q. 205, 208 (2014).

48. *Ibid.*, 209.

commercial disputes.⁴⁹ As such, unlike the DIFCC, the SICC's jurisdiction does not have a significant domestic component, if at all.

Moreover, the drivers for the establishment of the SICC and the DIFC courts were different. As Chief Justice Menon emphasised, the massive growth of transnational trade in Asia and the need for a centre to resolve transnational disputes was the genesis of the SICC.⁵⁰ The driver for establishing the DIFC courts was, however, somewhat different:⁵¹

25. For instance, the DIFCC was effectively established from a blank slate, with all the attendant pioneering benefits. While some of the laws in the DIFC involve fusion between the civil law and the common law, the DIFCC was primarily designed as a common law court operating within a purpose-built English-language common law jurisdiction. The opening page of the DIFCC website proclaims that '[t]he DIFC Courts are an *independent common law judiciary* based in the Dubai International Financial Centre (DIFC) with jurisdiction governing civil and commercial disputes'. In similar vein, Chief Justice Michael Hwang has described the DIFC as 'a common law island in a civil law ocean'. The DIFC's common law system was specifically intended to be 'independent from, but complementary to, the UAE's Arabic-language civil law system, thus offering a choice that strengthens both processes while ensuring public access to world-class justice'. While a French-heritage Arabic language civil law system is available in the Dubai national courts, parties opting for English common law processes go to the DIFCC instead. Consonant with these objectives, the DIFCC's international judges are experienced common law legal professionals from Australia, Malaysia, Singapore and the UK.⁵²

The models for the ADGM Courts in Abu Dhabi, and the QIC in Qatar, are more like that of the DIFC courts. The ADGM Courts commenced operation in 2016 and, like the DIFC courts in Dubai and the AFIC Courts in Kazakhstan, the ADGM Courts service a specially created economic zone within the United Arab Emirates. The ADGM Courts are modelled on the English judicial system and administer legislation based on English, Scots and Australian statutes. The *Application of English Law Regulations 2015*⁵³ also makes the English common law directly applicable in the ADGM – an approach which the ADGM Courts' website proclaims as unique in the Middle East.⁵⁴ Pursuant to the *ADGM Courts, Civil Evidence, Judgments, Enforcement and Judicial Appointments Regulations 2015*, the Court of First Instance has jurisdiction to hear

49. *Ibid.*, 211.

50. Menon, *supra* n. 35, at [22]–[23].

51. *Ibid.*, [25] (citations omitted and emphasis in original).

52. As of 5 Feb. 2015, the international judges are: Chief Justice Michael Hwang, SC (Singapore), Deputy Chief Justice Sir John Murray Chadwick (UK), Justice Sir David Steel (UK), Justice Roger Giles (Australia), Justice Tun Zaki Azmi (Malaysia) and Justice Sir Anthony David Colman (UK).

53. See *ADGM Legal Framework*, <https://en.adgm.thomsonreuters.com/rulebook/application-english-law-regulations-2015-0> (accessed at 28 Apr. 2020).

54. See *Frequently Asked Questions – What Are ADGM Courts?*, <http://adgm.com/doing-business/adgm-courts/frequently-asked-questions/> (accessed at 28 Apr. 2020).

commercial matters which are connected with the ADGM,⁵⁵ as well as ‘jurisdiction as is conferred on it by any request, in writing, by the parties to have the Court of First Instance determine the claim or dispute’.⁵⁶

§2.04 SICC: A CASE STUDY

Returning to the (East) Asian region, the SICC has been established as a curial forum which accommodates parties foreign to its sovereign jurisdiction, where neither the parties nor the subject matter of the dispute have or has any connection with Singapore. Moreover, the SICC will not decline to assume jurisdiction solely on the ground that the dispute is connected to a jurisdiction other than Singapore.⁵⁷ As a result, the SICC provides a useful case study with respect to issues to be considered in establishing an AICC.

[A] Composition of the Court

The SICC is a division of the Singapore High Court and thus part of the Supreme Court of Singapore. The panel of SICC judges is constituted by the existing Supreme Court Judges, as well as international judges appointed for a fixed period and assigned to cases on an ad hoc basis. These Associate International Judges have been appointed from a variety of countries, both within and beyond the region, and are preeminent and experienced commercial judges. As the SICC is part of the Supreme Court of Singapore, provision is made for appeals from the SICC to the Court of Appeal of Singapore, with the appellate Bench drawn from the SICC panel of judges – which, for this purpose, also includes the Associate International Judges. The composition of the SICC generally reflects the position for Singapore High Court proceedings in that proceedings may be disposed of by a single judge, who may be a Singapore Supreme Court Judge or an Associate International Judge. The Chief Justice may, on the application of a party, designate three judges to hear a case. In this respect, regard would be had to the nature of the dispute, its subject matter and, no doubt, the nationality of parties in designating a particular judge or judges to hear the case.

55. See Civil Evidence, Judgments, Enforcement and Judicial Appointments Regulations 2015 (Abu Dhabi Global Market Courts) s. 16(2)(a)–(d); Law No. 4 of 2013 Concerning the Abu Dhabi Global Market, Article 13(6). For legislation affecting the Abu Dhabi Global Market, see *ADGM Rulebook*, <https://en.adgm.thomsonreuters.com/> (accessed at 28 Apr. 2020).

56. Civil Evidence, Judgments, Enforcement and Judicial Appointments Regulations 2015 (Abu Dhabi Global Market Courts), s. 16(2)(e).

57. SICC, *Singapore International Commercial Court User Guides*, Note 1 [5] (31 Jan. 2019), https://www.sicc.gov.sg/docs/default-source/legislation-rules-pd/sicc-user-guides_31jan19.pdf (accessed 28 Apr. 2020).

[B] Governing Legislation

Provision has been made for the SICC in amendments to the Singapore *Supreme Court of Judicature Act*, particularly in section 18D and 18F, which provide for the jurisdiction of the court, certification as to the nature of the intended action and the effect of the parties' jurisdiction agreement.⁵⁸

There are other provisions added to this legislation providing for the composition of the SICC, its powers, the transfer of cases from the SICC to the High Court of Singapore and, significantly, provisions with respect to the rules of evidence, determination of foreign law on submissions rather than as a factual matter to be proved, and for representation by foreign lawyers. These provisions are contained in section 18K, 18L and 18M.⁵⁹ They are also supported by court rules,⁶⁰ and perhaps more significantly from the perspective of an intending international party, by comprehensive and

58. Singapore, cap. 322, 2014 rev. ed. (*Supreme Court of Judicature Act*). These provisions state:

Jurisdiction of Singapore International Commercial Court

18D. –The Singapore International Commercial Court shall have jurisdiction to hear and try any action that satisfies all of the following conditions:

- (a) the action is international and commercial in nature;
- (b) the action is one that the High Court may hear and try in its original civil jurisdiction;
- (c) the action satisfies such other conditions as the Rules of Court may prescribe.

(2) Without limiting subsection (1), the Singapore International Commercial Court (being a division of the High Court) has jurisdiction to hear any proceedings relating to international commercial arbitration that the High Court may hear and that satisfy such conditions as the Rules of Court may prescribe.

Effect of jurisdiction agreement

18F. – (1) Subject to subsection (2), the parties to an agreement to submit to the jurisdiction of the Singapore International Commercial Court shall be considered to have agreed–

- (a) to submit to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Singapore International Commercial Court;
- (b) to carry out any judgment or order of the Singapore International Commercial Court without undue delay; and
- (c) to waive any recourse to any court or tribunal outside Singapore against any judgment or order of the Singapore International Commercial Court, and against the enforcement of such judgment or order, insofar as such recourse can be validly waived.

(2) Subsection (1)(a), (b) and (c) applies only if there is no express provision to the contrary in the agreement.

59. These provisions state:

Rules of evidence in certain cases

18K.(1) The Singapore International Commercial Court–

- (a) shall not be bound to apply any rule of evidence under Singapore law in such cases and to such extent as the Rules of Court may provide; and
- (b) may, in those cases, apply other rules of evidence (whether such rules are found under any foreign law or otherwise) in accordance with the Rules of Court.

(2) In subsection (1), 'rule of evidence' includes any rule of law relating to privilege, or to the taking of evidence.

helpful *Singapore International Commercial Court User Guides*⁶¹ and a very detailed and comprehensive *Singapore International Commercial Court Practice Direction*.⁶²

[C] Approach to Procedure

The approach to procedure generally is encapsulated in the *Report of the Singapore International Commercial Court Committee* in the opening of the discussion on procedure in the then proposed SICC.⁶³

The SICC Rules and practice directions will govern proceedings before the SICC. It is envisaged that these provisions would follow international best practices for commercial dispute resolution. In particular, reference will be taken from the procedure of institutions such as the English Commercial Court. The provisions adopted must be sensitive to the unique needs of commercial users and the commercial Bar. In addition, a model similar to the English Commercial Court Guide which, through consultation with the Users' Committee, may be considered to allow for a flexible and efficient mode of amending the SICC Rules.

In terms of case management generally, interlocutory proceedings are heard by judges in a docket system. The SICC places emphasis on case management, including encouragement of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR), and the use of technology, such as electronic filing and the like.⁶⁴

Determination of foreign law on submissions

18L.(1) The Singapore International Commercial Court may, in such cases as the Rules of Court may prescribe, order that any question of foreign law be determined on the basis of submissions instead of proof.

(2) In determining any question of foreign law on the basis of submissions, the Singapore International Commercial Court may have regard to such matters as the Rules of Court may prescribe.

Representation by foreign lawyers

18M. A party to a case in the Singapore International Commercial Court, or to an appeal from that Court, may in accordance with the Rules of Court be represented by a foreign lawyer who is registered in accordance with Part IVB of the Legal Profession Act (Cap. 161).

60. Supreme Court of Judicature Act, *supra* n. 58, at s. 80.

61. SICC, *supra* n. 57.

62. SICC, *Singapore International Commercial Court Practice Directions* (22 Jul. 2019), [https://www.supremecourt.gov.sg/docs/default-source/default-document-library/sicc-practice-directions---amended-version-\(15-july-2019\).pdf](https://www.supremecourt.gov.sg/docs/default-source/default-document-library/sicc-practice-directions---amended-version-(15-july-2019).pdf) (accessed 28 Apr. 2020).

63. Singapore International Commercial Court Committee, *Report of the Singapore International Commercial Court Committee* [29] (November 2013), https://www.sicc.gov.sg/docs/default-source/modules-document/news-and-article/-report-of-the-singapore-international-commercial-court-committee-_90a41701-a5fc-4a2e-82db-cc33db8b6603-1.pdf (accessed 28 Apr. 2020) (citations omitted).

64. SICC, *supra* n. 62, at [75]–[86], [42]–[60].

It is worthwhile reflecting on the way in which the SICC has developed in a very short period. Chief Justice Menon described the administrative and operational issues with the establishment of the SICC in the following terms:

[it was necessary] to consider a number of administrative and operational issues with the establishment of the SICC. This included such matters as the possible need for a special website; promotional and marketing work to raise awareness; IT and infrastructure needs and the manpower needs of this new division of the court. Underlying all of that was the need for funds. We submitted a bid to the Reinvestment Fund (a government innovation fund) and our bid was successful, as a result of which we were given funds over and above our baseline budget for the specific purpose of financing the SICC.

[D] Confidentiality

As a general rule, SICC proceedings take place in open court. The *Report of the Singapore International Commercial Court Committee* observed that:⁶⁵

Transparency is attractive to some parties and is important for the branding of the SICC. The Committee agreed that confidentiality militates against the development of a body of jurisprudence which will be necessary to enable prospective users of SICC dispute resolution to model their future commercial relations.

The Committee continued, observing that the position may be different where the dispute is one which has no connection with Singapore:⁶⁶

Nevertheless, it is intended that special rules apply for cases which have no substantial connection to Singapore. What constitutes the absence of substantial connection will be further refined in consultation with stakeholders, but will include cases where parties confirm that either (i) Singapore law is not the governing law; or (ii) the choice of Singapore law is the sole connection to Singapore, and agree that it is desirable to maintain confidentiality, the hearing will be conducted in camera, with other appropriate measures, such as the redaction of judgments. Confidentiality will immediately attach on filing unless the position is shown to be misstated later. On the other hand, if one party wishes to have confidentiality but the other does not, the SICC Rules will allow the party requesting for confidentiality to apply to the court, which will consider all the circumstances of the case, including the private interest of the contesting parties and any public interest considerations. In such cases, confidentiality will be extended until the court has disposed of the application.

65. Singapore International Commercial Court Committee, *supra* n. 63, at [32].

66. *Ibid.*, [33].

Parties may apply for hearings in camera and the sealing of court files,⁶⁷ which would result in a position similar to that available in international arbitral proceedings.⁶⁸

[E] Rules of Evidence, Determining Foreign Law, and Joinder

As will be seen from the provisions of section 18K and 18L of the Singapore *Supreme Court of Judicature Act*, considerable flexibility is accorded to the SICC with respect to the application of the rules of evidence and also in relation to the determination of foreign law.⁶⁹ The considerable flexibility provided to the SICC by these provisions mirrors the flexibility enjoyed by arbitral tribunals but with the court having many other advantages flowing from its position and from its sovereign rather than consensual source of power and authority. One particular advantage in this respect is the power to join additional parties under Order 110 of the Singapore Court Rules.⁷⁰ The intent of those powers is summarised in the *SICC User Guides*:⁷¹

7. Once an action is in the Court (i.e. the Court has and has assumed jurisdiction), a person may be joined as a party, including as an additional plaintiff, defendant or as a third or subsequent party, to the action. This is provided that:
 - (a) the requirements in the Rules of Court for joining the person are met (the relevant provisions include Orders 15 and 16);
 - (b) the claims by or against the person:
 - (i) do not include a claim for any relief in the form of, or connected with, a prerogative order (including a mandatory order, a prohibiting order, a quashing order or an order for review of detention); and
 - (ii) are appropriate to be heard in the Court.
8. Unlike the claims between the plaintiffs and the defendants named in the originating process when it was first filed, there is no requirement that the claims by or against a person sought to be joined to the action must be of an international and commercial nature. However, the Court, in exercising its discretion on whether to join that person, would have to decide whether the claims by or against that person are appropriate to be heard in the Court. In exercising that discretion, the Court would have regard to its international and commercial nature: see Order 110, Rule 9(3).

67. Supreme Court of Judicature Act, *supra* n. 58, s. 80, ord. 110 r. 30. Provision for a pre-action procedure that included the power for a certificate of confidentiality to be granted was removed from the Singapore Court Rules by amendment in 2018: Supreme Court of Judicature (Amendment) Act (Singapore, 2018 rev. ed.), s. 3.

68. See, e.g., International Arbitration Act 1974 (Cth) ss 23C–23G; Arbitration Act 1996 (NZ) ss 14–14I.

See, e.g., *Australian Centre for International Commercial Arbitration Rules* (2016) r. 22; *AMINZ Arbitration Rules* (2009) r. 102; *Arbitration Rules of the Singapore International Arbitration Centre* (5th ed. 2013) r. 35. See also Supreme Court of Singapore, *Singapore International Commercial Court Practice Directions* (1 Jan. 2015, as amended by Amendment No. 1 of 2016) [97]; and generally Nottage, in this volume.

69. See SICC, *supra* n. 57, at Note 4.

70. Supreme Court of Judicature Act, *supra* n. 58, at s. 80.

71. SICC, *supra* n. 57, at Note 1, [7]–[11].

9. There is also no requirement that a person sought to be joined to the action must have submitted to the Court's jurisdiction under a written jurisdiction agreement. There is one exception. A State or the sovereign of a State may not be made a party to an action in the Court (whether by joinder or otherwise) unless the State or the sovereign has submitted to the jurisdiction of the Court under a written jurisdiction agreement: see Order 110, r 9(2).
10. Where the person sought to be joined has not agreed in writing to submit to the jurisdiction of the Court, the Court may examine the connecting factors to Singapore in deciding whether to exercise its compulsory jurisdiction and join that person to the action. There is therefore no equivalent of Order 110, Rule 8(2) for joinder cases.
11. However, this does not mean that the Court is bound to consider and give weight to arguments based on connecting factors made by persons sought to be joined. Where the person sought to be joined has submitted to the Court's jurisdiction under a written jurisdiction agreement, for example, the Court may decide to disregard such arguments in deciding whether to join that person. This would be in the discretion of the Court.

These are very extensive powers and avoid the problems encountered in arbitral proceedings in attempting to 'join' other parties to the proceedings. Given the consensual basis of arbitral proceedings, absent cooperation and agreement of the parties to the arbitration agreement and parties to be joined, there are limits to the extent that arbitration legislation and rules can assist to, in effect, achieve joinder.⁷² Powers of joinder such as this also complement and are complemented by the extensive powers of the SICC with respect to Mareva injunctions and associated remedies.⁷³

In relation to foreign law, section 18L of the Singapore *Supreme Court of Judicature Act* represents a significant departure from the usual position at common law, which is that foreign law is a matter to be proved as a question of fact. However, the recommendation of the SICC Committee was that greater flexibility should be allowed in this respect and the same practice adopted with respect to questions of foreign law as is adopted by international arbitral tribunals. Thus, the Committee reported:⁷⁴

Questions of Foreign Law. In line with the international character of the SICC, foreign law need not be pleaded and proved as a fact in proceedings before the SICC, as the Judges can take judicial notice of foreign law with the assistance of oral and written legal submissions, supported by relevant authorities. The SICC would then apply foreign law⁷⁵ to determine the issues in dispute. This would facilitate buy-in from foreign counsel to bring their disputes to the SICC and, at the same time, aligns SICC procedure with the practice in international arbitration. Notwithstanding the position on the applicable conflict of laws rules, consideration should be given to the extent to which Singapore's public policy would be

72. See Clyde Croft, Christopher Kee & Jeff Waincymer, *A Guide to the UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules* 185-92 (Cambridge University Press, 2013) (in relation to Article 17(5) of the *UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules*).

73. SICC, *supra* n. 57, at Note 5.

74. Singapore International Commercial Court Committee, *supra* n. 63, at 17-18, at [34].

75. This can extend to civil law, and the relevant rules can allow for the appointment of judges from civil law jurisdictions.

applicable in each case, and if so, the relevant implications it might have on the resolution of SICC disputes.⁷⁶

Furthermore, the provisions of section 18M with respect to representation by foreign lawyers are clearly significant and important. Apart from reflecting the flexibility enjoyed in this respect in most jurisdictions in the arbitration field, it is important in the present context in two particular respects. First, if foreign law is to be established by submission rather than proof as a fact, considerable advantage may flow from involvement of foreign practitioners from relevant foreign jurisdictions. Second, to close off representation against foreign lawyers engaged by parties would put an international court at considerable disadvantage as compared to international arbitral proceedings. Provision is also made for foreign representation in the Singapore Court Rules, and Practice Directions, as summarised in the SICC User Guides.⁷⁷ For present purposes, it is sufficient to note that the main category of cases in which foreign lawyers may represent parties in the SICC is offshore cases – that is, cases which have no substantial connection to Singapore.

[F] Appeals

Decisions of the SICC are appealable, in the same way as other Singapore High Court decisions, to the Singapore Court of Appeal. The difference with respect to SICC appeals is that the Court of Appeal may be composed of Associate International Judges from the SICC panel and, or alternatively, comprised of judges from the Singapore Court of Appeal – or a mixture of both.⁷⁸ Significantly, the right of appeal is subject to any prior agreement between the parties to limit or vary the scope of an appeal. Apart from wholesale exclusion of the right to appeal, parties may agree to a limited scope of appeal or review on specific grounds modelled after the international arbitration regime, such as breaches of natural justice or defects in the validity and scope of the agreement to submit matters to the SICC.⁷⁹

[G] Enforceability of Judgments

In relation to enforceability, the approach of the SICC is to rely upon existing mechanisms for the enforcement of Singapore judgments, which may be complemented by the provision of model SICC dispute resolution clauses. Additionally, the SICC Committee suggested that the Singapore government may wish to consider negotiating multilateral judgment enforcement agreements, especially within the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) community, bilateral government

76. An example raised in the SICC Committee meeting would be the consideration of the SICC's position towards disputes based on gaming contracts, or otherwise claims which are presupposed upon contracts which ordinarily be considered illegal in many jurisdictions.

77. SICC, *supra* n. 57, at Note 3. *See also* SICC, *supra* n. 62, at [26]–[28].

78. SICC, *supra* n 62, [23]–[25] (noting that in varying circumstances the Court of Appeal may be constituted by two, three or five judges).

79. *Ibid.*, [139].

agreements and the possibility of court to court arrangements. Moreover, it was suggested that an aspect of multilateral government agreements would be for Singapore to consider signing the Choice of Court Convention.

The Committee recommendations with respect to the international enforceability of SICC judgments generally and court to court arrangements are applicable to any jurisdiction and are, consequently, of particular interest and importance in the present context. The Committee's commentary and recommendations in this respect are as follows:⁸⁰

42. As with the judgments of the Supreme Court of Singapore, judgments of the SICC may be enforced in other jurisdictions through reciprocal enforcement provisions, such as the Reciprocal Enforcement of Commonwealth Judgments Act⁸¹ and the Reciprocal Enforcement of Foreign Judgments Act,⁸² is a key factor to be emphasised in marketing and promotion.
43. The existing position may be complemented by the provision of model SICC dispute resolution clauses. A party who has submitted or who has agreed to submit to the SICC's jurisdiction may be deemed to have waived its right to defend against an action based on a SICC judgment in all jurisdictions. This may be expressly agreed upon or incorporated by reference to the SICC Rules in the SICC model dispute resolution clauses. The written consent of parties should be required so as to create issue estoppels which will bind parties to the decision of the referred jurisdiction.
48. *Court to Court Arrangements*. A unique method to market the internationality of SICC judgments would be to have a tie up with a friendly foreign international court, to refer appropriate proceedings to each other's jurisdiction. For example, Order 101 of the Rules of Court reflects the procedure of the Memorandum for Understanding signed between Singapore and New South Wales. The order prescribes that if, in any proceeding before the Singapore High Court or Court of Appeal, a question of foreign law relating to the New South Wales jurisdiction arises, our courts have the power to, on its own motion or upon a party's application, order that an action be commenced in New South Wales for that question of foreign law to be determined.
49. The SICC could have similar arrangements with a friendly and prominent jurisdiction, for example, the English Commercial Court, such that:
 - (a) Where parties have commenced proceedings in the SICC, and a party to the dispute brings an independent but related set of proceedings in the English Commercial Court to determine a question of English law, the

80. Singapore International Commercial Court Committee, *supra* n. 63, at 20 [42]–[43], 21–2 [48]–[51] (emphasis in original).

81. In addition to the UK, the RECJA covers several major jurisdictions in the region: Australia (New South Wales, Queensland, Victoria, etc.), New Zealand, Malaysia, Brunei and India (except the state of Jammu and Kashmir).

82. In particular, the domestic legislation of India recognises Singapore as a 'reciprocating territory' and provides a regime which facilitates the enforcement of a judgment given by a Singapore court. See The Code of Civil Procedure (Singapore) ss 13, 37 & 44A. To maximise the enforceability of a Singapore judgment in India, sufficient regard may have to be accorded to the public policy of India where applicable, and the laws of India would have to be applied where it is expressed to be the governing law of a contract: Rishi Agrawala, *Executability and Enforceability of Foreign Judgments and Decrees in India: Judicial Trends*, Mondaq (23 Oct. 2000), <https://www.mondaq.com/india/Employment-and-HR/9190/Executability-Enforceability-Of-Foreign-Judgments-And-Decrees-In-India-Judicial-Trends-Part-4> (accessed 28 Apr. 2020); and generally Singh, in this volume.

English Commercial Court could refuse the continuation of the proceedings and refer the matter back to the SICC. This would be an express recognition of the SICC's competence to deal with questions involving foreign law, in view of the SICC Panel's international make up.

- (b) If a party to an agreement to resolve commercial disputes in the SICC commences proceedings in the English Commercial Court, the latter would refer parties to bring their dispute to the SICC as a matter of course. A low threshold is needed: so long as there is the *prima facie* existence of a written SICC dispute resolution agreement, the referral will be made, any dispute on whether the commercial dispute falls within the agreement, or the validity of the agreement, would essentially be a dispute over the SICC's jurisdiction, which can and should be decided by the SICC itself. This obviates the existing position in the English common law, which permits the party to continue with the proceedings in the English Commercial Court notwithstanding an *exclusive* SICC dispute resolution clause if it can show strong cause to do so.

50. Singapore would likely need to offer to reciprocate on both (a) and (b).

51. A Memorandum of Guidance with jurisdictions which do not have any reciprocal enforcement treaty with Singapore may also enhance the international enforceability of SICC judgments. The Memorandum would set out the understanding of the court procedures required for the enforcement of each jurisdiction's judgment in the other court, and would promote a positive perception of SICC judgments. A written example would be the Memorandum of Guidance signed between the English Commercial Court and the DIFCC in January 2013.

Finally, it should not be forgotten that judgments for a definite sum of money can also be enforced at common law in a variety of circumstances.⁸³

§2.05 AN AUSTRALIAN INTERNATIONAL COMMERCIAL COURT

As has been discussed, the manner in which other international commercial courts have been established and developed provides useful guidance and issues for consideration in the establishment of an AICC. This does not mean, however, that in establishing an AICC, we should slavishly follow any particular model. Moreover, the Australian legal landscape is, unsurprisingly, different from that in which the international commercial courts that have been considered have been established and developed. An obvious difference in Australia is its federal system of government and courts. On one level, it might be thought that this is an inhibition to national action. Yet thoughtful consideration of possible models indicates, rather, that the federation has the strength of bringing together diverse thought and experience and the legal and economic environments and experience from throughout a diverse continent. Moreover, the establishment of an international commercial court provides the opportunity for the nation as a whole to present an integrated commercial court to the region and to the world. Any legislation would necessarily require clarification and resolution of Australian constitutional aspects that do not arise in England and Singapore.

83. Supreme Court of Victoria, *Practice Note SC Gen 15: Enforcement of Foreign Judgments* (30 Jan. 2017).

[A] Sovereign Base and Composition of the Court

Clearly, the ‘AICC’ would require a sovereign base if it is to be established as a court, rather than something in the nature of an arbitral tribunal. This sovereign base is readily provided by an Australian court which, with enabling legislation, would be empowered to establish a panel of national and international judges along the same lines as the model adopted in Singapore by the SICC.

With the cooperation of these courts, together with the various governments, there would appear to be no inhibition in appointing to the judicial panel the finest sitting and retired commercial judges from the various Australian Courts across the nation. The benefit to Australia, both domestically and internationally, in being able to bring this commercial judicial expertise together needs no further explanation. It should, however, be emphasised that though the AICC would have an analogous international focus to that of the other international commercial courts considered above, there is no reason why the AICC could not also have a national domestic jurisdiction enabling commercial parties from anywhere in Australia to litigate in a forum populated by the best commercial judicial minds in the country.

The panel of judges appointed for the purposes of the AICC would not, of course, be limited to Australian sitting or retired judges or judges within this region. Similarly to the approach taken to populating the panel of international judges adopted by the SICC, the AICC panel would consist of leading commercial judges from jurisdictions across the world, including, for example, Singapore, Hong Kong, New Zealand, the UK, and other jurisdictions where it might be expected or it is found that disputes arise, or in which disputing parties conduct their business. Additionally, consideration should be given to the appointment of international judges from beyond the common law world.

As has been observed, the environment in which the DIFC courts exist has been described as something in the nature of a civil law sea in which the DIFC courts are a common law ‘island’. As is clear from experience with international arbitral tribunals, it is often the case and helpful where parties come from common law and civil law jurisdictions to include within the arbitral tribunal panel of three, arbitrators from both the common law and civil law tradition. This mix of judicial backgrounds may also be very beneficial if, as is contemplated, the AICC is empowered to determine foreign law on the basis of submissions without the need for formal proof as a factual matter.

[B] Appeals

As is clear from the Singapore model, attention also needs to be given to the appellate arrangements, particularly the constitution of the Court of Appeal from judgments at first instance in the AICC. As with the SICC, it is desirable that flexible appellate arrangements be provided for and, particularly, that the Court of Appeal Bench, whether it be composed of two, three or five judges, is able to be selected from the AICC panel of Australian and international judges.

It goes without saying that the appellate procedures from an international commercial court must be flexible and expeditious. In this respect, legislation empowering the Court of Appeal to dispose of matters on the papers and for the filtering of appeals through a leave to appeal mechanism is highly desirable. Experience with expedited appeals and leave to appeal requirements has proved very successful in expediting civil appeals. In light of this experience, there could be no objection to these type of appeal ‘constraints’ with respect to Australian commercial litigation conducted in the AICC and, internationally, such ‘constraints’ would likely be very attractive as they more closely replicate the international arbitral regime where, under the Model Law and the NYC, appeals and challenges to international arbitral awards are severely constrained, with merits appeals simply not permitted.

There will be important policies and aspects of the legislative framework to be developed by state and federal governments taking account of the Australian constitutional structure.

[C] Scope of Jurisdiction, Procedure, and the Enforceability of Judgments

In terms of substantive jurisdiction, there seems every reason to adopt the approach of the SICC and to accommodate and encourage disputes which are ‘disconnected’ from Australia – an approach which is, similarly, adopted by the other courts discussed above. Moving from substance to procedure, it is clear from the nature of an international commercial court and the experience in Singapore and London, particularly, that procedures must be flexible, be provided for clearly in readily accessible court rules, practice notes and user guides, and be supported by administrative structures and court technology which will accommodate the hearing of disputes from across the globe. With respect to technology, clearly basic things like electronic filing, videoconferencing and, as technology develops, e-dispute resolution fora are essential, in order to ensure that the court keeps pace with developments in international commerce.⁸⁴ The 2020 COVID-19 pandemic further highlights both this necessity and the potential for Australia, as elaborated in Part 6 below.

In relation to enforceability of judgments of the AICC, the same issues arise as with respect to the SICC, at least internationally. Singapore, as a member of the Commonwealth of Nations, is in much the same position as Australia and the Australian States and Territories in relation to international enforcement of judgments, and so the Singapore experience and position adopted in this respect is readily applicable to the AICC. A matter which does, however, require particular attention from an Australian perspective is the question of accession to the Choice of Court Convention. As momentum develops internationally in this respect, national accessions to this Convention will become more and more important if countries are to be connected to the international commercial litigation network.

84. See, e.g., Thomas, *supra* n. 29, at [37]–[39].

[D] The Australian Consumer Law

One common argument against an AICC is that international parties would be deterred from electing such a court because they do not wish to be subject to the Australian Consumer Law. Specifically, its regulation of unconscionable conduct has been considered by some commercial litigators to be subjective and unpredictable, working against the ideal of a neutral dispute resolution forum.⁸⁵ Whenever one of the disputing parties has a substantive nexus with Australia, it is most likely the unconscionability provisions apply. The legislation establishing the AICC could allow the parties the option of agreeing to the application of, for example, English law (as readily occurs in contracts). Given the substantial similarities between Australian and English law, the application of such law by Australian sitting and retired judges should be seamless.

There is a longstanding history of English law governing international trade, which would give the AICC the advantage of a familiar element to make it more palatable to the global market. This also promotes international consistency by complementing the London Commercial Court's strict application of English law and the DIFC Court and ADGM Courts' systems, both based on English law. Alternatively, parties might elect New York law, which is frequently used in international commercial transactions. This approach enables parties to experience the benefits of the AICC. There will be legislative policies to be refined in the finalisation of the AICC framework.

§2.06 IMPACT OF COVID-19

The recent global pandemic caused by the COVID-19 outbreak provides pressing incentive to advance the establishment of the AICC. First, because it will lead to a substantial amount of work for such a court. Second, because it minimises the obstacle of Australia's physical distance from the rest of the world.

The virus is likely to generate extensive and significant transborder litigation, not just arbitration or mediation.⁸⁶ Many companies previously involved in international commercial agreements will find themselves insolvent as a result of collapsed supply chains, loss of consumer demand and disruptions to shipping and distribution. Their business partners may sue to recover losses. We can also expect to see manufacturers sued over missed deadlines and extensive litigation over force majeure clauses, with parties seeking to be freed from their contractual obligations on the basis the virus is an 'act of God'.

Another area which may lend itself to transnational litigation is insurance contracts. Typically, businesses have been insured for physical disruptions, such as factories burning down, but may not have contemplated forced closures to stop the spread of a virus. Lastly, the rapid global shift towards digital and remote working and learning functionalities has sparked a swift uptake of AI, software and technology.

85. See, from the current President of the New South Wales Court of Appeal, A.S. Bell, *An Australian International Commercial Court – Not a Bad Idea or What a Bad Idea?* 94 Austl. L.J. 24, 38 (2020).

86. See *further generally* Nottage & Jetin, and other chapters discussing the impact of COVID-19 on international dispute resolution, in this volume.

These contracts typically cross sovereign borders and raise concerns around privacy and international data transfer and storage. All of these developments would be suitable cases for the AICC to hear and provide a substantial amount of work for the court in its early years.

Another element of the coronavirus pandemic which supports the development of the AICC is that it has forced the commercial world to shift to digital, remote working models. Previously, Australia's distance from the rest of the world deterred international parties from choosing it as a dispute resolution hub. This is especially the case for parties located in Europe and America. However, from early 2020 due to the pandemic, most major corporations were operating almost entirely via distance, with most staff working from home. This experience of relying on online databases, cloud hosting services and teleconferencing has proven to commercial parties the effectiveness of these resources. This should make them more receptive to e-dispute resolution fora, electronic filing and the use of videoconferencing during dispute resolution.

Furthermore, Australian Courts are gaining valuable experience with these technologies. At present, in the Commercial Court, the Common Law Division and also the Court of Appeal of the Supreme Court of Victoria matters are being conducted via Zoom and other web platforms. Increased willingness to utilise these technologies, particularly in light of the experience gained from doing so in the pandemic shutdown, means parties would not necessarily need to travel to Australia to use the AICC. This saves parties time and money and can be expected to encourage uptake of the court.

§2.07 CONCLUSION

When the significant trade and investment agreements concluded or being negotiated by Australia are considered with respect to Asia (especially China / Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, India and ASEAN⁸⁷) and the Pacific, the opportunities offered by an Australian international court are almost boundless. Indeed, there is a symmetry in the establishment of an Australian court which would complement the trade agreements.

The proposal for an international commercial court for Australia cannot be left to the courts themselves or the legal profession to develop and agitate. The experiences of Singapore, Dubai, Abu Dhabi, and indeed London, demonstrate that it is vital for there to be government interest and support for such a proposal.

It is also important to be reminded that a proposal for an Australian court occurs within an international context. We have already cited the international trade agreements. Recently, an important legal institute was established in the Asian region in which Australia is an active participant. The Asian Business Law Institute (ABLI) was launched on 21 February 2016 in conjunction with the International Conference on *Doing Business Across Asia – Legal Convergence in an Asian Century*. The purpose or 'mission' of ABLI is to:⁸⁸

87. See further, the chapters respectively by Ali, Claxton/Nottage/Teramura, Claxton/Nottage/Williams, Singh, and Venugopal, in this volume.

88. ABLI, *About Us: Asian Business Law Institute*, <http://abli.asia/ABOUT-US/Introduction> (accessed 28 Apr. 2020).

Undertake and facilitate research into transnational business law possibility for the region, publish in the area of Asian business laws, provide guidance in the field of Asian legal development and to promote the convergence of Asian business laws. The specific 'mission' statement of ABLI states that it is to:

- Evaluate and stimulate the development of Asian law, legal policy, and practice and in particular make proposals for the further convergence of business law among Asian countries and regions;
- Study Asian approaches regarding business laws and practice in drafting legal instruments, restatement law or model rules;
- Conduct and facilitate Pan-Asian research, in particular to draft, evaluate or improve principles and rules which are common to Asian legal systems; and
- Provide a forum, for discussion and cooperation, between the business community and the legal fraternity including, inter alia judges, lawyers, academics and other legal professionals, who take an active interest in business law development.

ABLI has a board of governors. The Australian representatives on the board are former Chief Justice French and the Honourable Kevin Lindgren (formerly on the Federal Court of Australia).

In his keynote address to launch ABLI, the Singaporean Chief Justice Sundaresh Menon said:

Business today is conducted in an environment that is dramatically different from what we have, until recently, been accustomed to. Once upon a time, the market place referred to riotous fairs and bazaars in which merchants gathered to barter and trade. Today, we think of the market place as a metaphysical global interface for the exchange of goods and services, unbounded by both in its reach and its potential.

Indeed, there is considerable international interest in sharing information or, in the words of former Chief Justice French, engaging in 'convergence'. For example, in 2016 the Supreme Court of Victoria received an invitation for the Commercial Court to join an international forum or college of commercial courts across the world. In his invitation, former Lord Chief Justice Thomas wrote:

Such a forum might allow the commercial court judiciary worldwide to share experiences and hold discussions on subjects of mutual interest. It could promote the possibility of common practices. It could even consider developing common or at least converging rules and procedures.

Needless to say, the court accepted the invitation, as did the Supreme Court of New South Wales, the Federal Court of Australia and the High Court of New Zealand. The Standing International Forum of Commercial Courts was thus founded and today extends in its membership to courts more than thirty-five jurisdictions across the Asia-Pacific region, Europe, Africa, the Gulf States and the Americas. Annual meetings commenced in 2017, at which all Australian Courts involved have been represented.

The Standing Committee recently achieved one of its founding objectives: a Multilateral Memorandum on Enforcement of Commercial Judgments for Money.⁸⁹ The Memorandum sets out an understanding of the procedures for the enforcement of a judgment by the courts of one jurisdiction obtained in the courts of another jurisdiction, with each section contributed by the judiciary of the jurisdiction concerned.

A stronger contribution can be made to the rule of law by courts working together than if they are working separately. The early twenty-first century is being defined by something of a return to internationalisation and globalisation, although the form and forms that will take remain to be seen. It is for us to shape those forms in the capacity we can and to make contributions towards global stability, harmonisation and due recognition of the law in the context of commercial enterprise. These common purposes, as well as quality of justice and the manner of its administration provided at commercial courts and arbitral tribunals, international and domestic, should be promoted and indeed marketed.

89. Standing International Forum of Commercial Courts, *Multilateral Memorandum on Enforcement of Commercial Judgments for Money* (June 2019), <https://www.judiciary.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Multilateral-Memorandum-on-Enforcement.pdf> (accessed 28 Apr. 2020).

