

WHITE & CASE



School of International Arbitration

2012 INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION SURVEY

CURRENT AND BEST PRACTICES IN THE ARBITRAL PROCESS

Contact: Jure Zrilic (White & Case Research Fellow in International Arbitration)
j.zrilic@qmul.ac.uk

2012 INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION SURVEY

Queen Mary University of London and White & Case LLP

CURRENT AND BEST PRACTICES IN THE ARBITRAL PROCESS

This is the fourth International Arbitration Survey conducted by the School of International Arbitration, Queen Mary University of London (QMUL). Once again, White & Case LLP is pleased to be the sponsor. This Survey focuses on current and best practices in the arbitral process. Previous surveys have sought the views of in-house counsel only. This year, we are also seeking responses from private practitioners and arbitrators.

As we are surveying different types of participants, not all questions will be applicable to all respondents. Please answer as many questions as you can, and feel free to leave blank any which you are not able to answer. The questionnaire should take approximately **15 minutes** to complete.

Your participation in this questionnaire will be kept **fully confidential**. Your name and the name of your organisation will not appear on any materials connected with the survey without your specific consent. The information gathered by the questionnaire will be stored securely by QMUL and used only for the purposes of the current survey and any subsequent surveys.

The closing date for this questionnaire is **31 May 2012**. The questionnaire can be completed online at <http://survey.opinio.net/s?s=6167> or in PDF format and sent to Jure Zrilic at j.zrilic@qmul.ac.uk. Links to both versions are available on the survey website: <http://www.arbitrationonline.org/survey>. **Please feel free to forward this questionnaire to any other potential respondents.**

In addition to the questionnaire phase of the survey, we will seek to conduct individual interviews with a selection of willing respondents from March to June 2012. If you would prefer to provide an interview rather than complete the questionnaire, please email j.zrilic@qmul.ac.uk.

The survey results will be published in September 2012.

Further information can be obtained from:

Jure Zrilic LLM (Dist)
White & Case Research Fellow in International Arbitration
School of International Arbitration
Centre for Commercial Law Studies
Queen Mary, University of London
67-69 Lincoln's Inn Fields
London WC2A 3JB, UK

Tel: +44 (0)20 7882 8125
Fax: +44 (0)20 7882 8101
Email: j.zrilic@qmul.ac.uk

Information about you and your organisation

i. **Your name:** _____

ii. **Your primary role:**

- In-house counsel (specify position): _____
- Private practitioner (specify position): _____
- Arbitrator
- Other (specify): _____

iii. **Organisation name:** _____

iv. **Business address:** _____

v. **Telephone number:** _____

vi. **Email address:** _____

vii. **Would you be willing to participate in a short interview to discuss points arising from the questionnaire and your answers?** Yes No

viii. **Legal background:**

- Common law
- Civil law
- Other (specify): _____

ix. **List the jurisdiction(s) in which you are qualified:** _____

x. **Primary industry in which your organisation operates:**

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal | <input type="checkbox"/> Hospitality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Banking / Financial Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Industrial / Manufacturing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Construction / Engineering /
Infrastructure | <input type="checkbox"/> Insurance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy | <input type="checkbox"/> Media / Entertainment |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Mining |

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pharmaceuticals | <input type="checkbox"/> Telecommunications / IT |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Retail / Consumer | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Real Estate | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Shipping / Maritime | |

xi. **Geographic scope of your organisation's operations:**

- National (specify): _____
- Regional (specify): _____
- Global

xii. **Over the past 5 years, approximately how many international arbitrations have you and your organisation been involved in?**

<u>You</u>	<u>Your organisation</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> 1-5	<input type="checkbox"/> 1-5
<input type="checkbox"/> 6-10	<input type="checkbox"/> 6-10
<input type="checkbox"/> 11-20	<input type="checkbox"/> 11-20
<input type="checkbox"/> 21-30	<input type="checkbox"/> 21-30
<input type="checkbox"/> 31-50	<input type="checkbox"/> 31-50
<input type="checkbox"/> 50+	<input type="checkbox"/> 50+

NB: In the survey that follows, where a question asks about your arbitrations or experience, please answer based on your own arbitrations or experience (not those of your organisation).

Arbitrator Selection

1.1 By what method do you favour selection of the two co-arbitrators in a three-member arbitral tribunal?

- By each party unilaterally
- By an arbitral institution or appointing authority
- By each party from an exclusive list of arbitrators (e.g., of the institution or appointing authority)
- By agreement of the parties
- Other (specify): _____

1.2 By what method do you favour selection of the sole arbitrator or the chair in a three-member arbitral tribunal?

- By an arbitral institution or appointing authority
- By the parties from an exclusive list of arbitrators (e.g., of the institution or appointing authority)
- By agreement of the parties
- Other (specify): _____

1.3 Should a party-appointed arbitrator be allowed to exchange views with his/her appointing party regarding the selection of the chair?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

1.4 Have you ever interviewed potential arbitrators (yourself or through counsel) or been interviewed as a potential arbitrator?

- Yes
- No

1.5 Do you consider pre-appointment interviews with potential arbitrators appropriate?

- Yes
- No
- Sometimes
- Don't know

1.6 In your view, which of the following subjects are inappropriate for discussion with arbitrators at interviews? (select all that apply)

- Attitude to particular procedures (e.g. evidence by video conference; bifurcation)
- Potential nominations for chair
- Experience and knowledge of a particular legal topic, technical environment or industry
- Prior views expressed, for example, as an expert or arbitrator, on a particular legal issue
- The candidate's position on legal questions relevant to the case
- Whether the candidate is a strict constructionist or someone who is influenced by the equities of the case
- All of the above are appropriate

1.7 Do you believe the interviewing party should, if it appoints the arbitrator:

- Notify the opposing party of the interview?
- Disclose notes of the interview to the opposing party?
- Neither notify nor disclose anything to the opposing party?
- Don't know

1.8 Do you believe the arbitrator should, if appointed:

- Notify the opposing party of the interview?
- Disclose notes of the interview to the opposing party?
- Neither notify nor disclose anything to the opposing party?
- Don't know

2. Organising Arbitral Proceedings

2.1 Over the past 5 years, in what percentage of your arbitrations were the procedural framework and timetable determined at the outset by:

- (a) in-person hearing (with or without written communications): _____%
- (b) telephone or video hearing (with or without written communications): _____%
- (c) written communications only: _____%
- (d) the procedural framework and timetable were not determined at the outset of the arbitration: _____%

2.2 Over the past 5 years, in what percentage of your arbitrations were the IBA Rules on the Taking of Evidence in International Arbitration (IBA Rules) adopted:

- (a) as guidelines: _____%
- (b) as binding rules: _____%

2.3 Do you consider adoption of the IBA Rules in international arbitrations useful?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

2.4 Over the past 5 years, in what percentage of your arbitrations did the arbitrator(s) appoint a tribunal secretary? _____%

2.5 [For those who are primarily arbitrators] What were the typical tasks carried out by the secretary in your arbitrations? (*select all that apply*)

[For all others] What tasks do you believe a tribunal secretary should typically carry out? (*select all that apply*)

- Organisational tasks (*e.g.*, logistical arrangements, coordinating secretarial services)
- Communications with the parties
- Legal research
- Preparing drafts of procedural orders and non-substantive parts of awards
- Preparing drafts of substantive parts of awards
- Discussing the merits of the dispute with one or more of the arbitrators
- Other (specify): _____

2.6 Over the past 5 years, in what percentage of your arbitrations was there bifurcation between jurisdiction and merits?

- (a) In investment-treaty arbitrations: _____%
- (b) In commercial arbitrations: _____%

2.7 In general, have you found bifurcation between jurisdiction and merits to contribute materially toward the efficient resolution of the arbitration?

- Yes
- No
- Depends on the case
- Have no view

2.8 Over the past 5 years, in what percentage of your arbitrations was there bifurcation between liability and quantum? _____%

2.9 In general, have you found bifurcation between liability and quantum to contribute materially toward the efficient resolution of the arbitration?

- Yes
- No
- Depends on the case
- Have no view

2.10 Over the past 5 years, in what percentage of your arbitrations did the tribunal rule at an early stage on a dispositive issue other than jurisdiction? _____%

2.11 Rate the following methods for their effectiveness in expediting arbitral proceedings in your arbitrations over the past 5 years (1 being the most effective and 4 the least). Rate a method only if you have seen it applied.

Method of expediting proceedings					
Appointment of a sole arbitrator	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Never done
Identification by the tribunal of the issues to be determined as soon as possible after constitution	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Never done
Summary disposition of all or part of the issues in dispute	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Never done
Page limits for substantive written submissions	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Never done
Short time limits for exchange of substantive written submissions	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Never done
Simultaneous exchange of substantive written submissions (rather than sequential)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Never done
Limiting each party to one substantive written submission (instead of two rounds)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Never done
Limiting or excluding document production	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Never done
No hearing	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Never done
Provision for short arbitration award without extensive reasoning	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Never done

2.12 Over the past 5 years, how many fast-track arbitrations have you been involved in? *“Fast-track arbitration” is where the time from the initiation of the arbitration through to award is deliberately shorter than would ordinarily be the case, whether because this is imposed by the arbitration clause or by application of expedited arbitration rules or because of other circumstances such as the tribunal’s accepting that there is a need for a decision before a certain date.*

- 0
- 1-5
- 6-10
- 10+

2.13 If your answer to the preceding question is 10+, is this because your arbitrations are in an area where fast-track arbitration is the norm, e.g., commodities arbitration?

- No
- Yes. If yes, which area? _____

2.14 How was it usually decided that an arbitration would be fast-track?

- In the arbitration clause
- By application of expedited arbitration rules
- By consent at the outset of proceedings
- By decision of the tribunal upon the application of a party

2.15 Over the past 5 years, have you drafted or included fast-track provisions in arbitration clauses?

- Yes
- No

2.16 If you have been involved in one or more fast-track arbitrations, how was your experience when compared to a “regular” arbitration?

- Positive
- Negative
- Neutral
- Depends on the case

2.17 Were the shortened time-limits generally complied with?

- Yes
- Sometimes
- No

2.18 Do you favour fast-track arbitration clauses for future contracts?

- Yes
- Yes, depending upon the contract
- No
- Have no view

3. Interim Measures and Court Assistance

3.1 Over the past 5 years, what percentage of your arbitrations has involved requests for interim measures (by either party) to the arbitral tribunal (including the arbitral institution or an emergency arbitrator)?

- 0-10%
- 10-25%
- 25-50%
- 50-75%
- 75-100%

3.2 Over the past 5 years, what percentage of your arbitrations has involved requests for interim measures in aid of arbitration (by either party) to a court?

- 0-10%
- 10-25%
- 25-50%
- 50-75%
- 75-100%

3.3 What percentage of the applications addressed to the arbitral tribunal (including the arbitral institution or an emergency arbitrator) was granted? _____%

- 3.3.1** What was the rate of voluntary compliance with these tribunal-ordered interim measures? _____%
- 3.3.2** In what percentage of arbitrations did a party seek enforcement by a court of these tribunal-ordered interim measures? _____%
- 3.4** In your view, should arbitrators (including the arbitral institution or an emergency arbitrator) in certain circumstances have the power to order interim measures ex parte (i.e., without notice to the party against whom the measure is directed)?
- Yes
- No
- Don't know
- 3.5** Over the past 5 years, how many of your arbitrations have involved an application for security for costs (by either party)?
- 0
- 1-5
- 6-10
- 10+
- 3.6** What percentage of these applications for security for costs did the tribunal grant in whole or in part? _____%
- 3.7** Over the past 5 years, what was the overall effect of interim measures applications before the arbitral tribunal (including the arbitral institution or an emergency arbitrator), and their subsequent resolution, on your arbitrations?
- They usually contributed materially toward the efficient resolution of the arbitration (e.g., by disposing of key issues at an early stage, or by altering the parties' views of the merits of the case and thereby leading to a settlement)
- They usually added materially to the time and cost of the arbitration without commensurate benefit
- Results were too mixed to generalise either way
- There were not sufficient interim measures applications in my cases to draw a conclusion.

4. Document Disclosure

4.1 Over the past 5 years, what percentage of your arbitrations has involved requests for document disclosure by one or more of the parties?

- 0-25%
- 25-50%
- 50-75%
- 75-100%

4.2 In what percentage of these arbitrations do you believe that unfavourable documents in the possession of a party were improperly withheld in violation of disclosure obligations:

- by actions primarily attributable to the party: _____%
- by actions primarily attributable to counsel: _____%
- by actions attributable to both: _____%
- Don't know

4.3 Over the past 5 years, in how many of your arbitrations has the tribunal explicitly drawn an adverse inference for a party's failure to produce documents?

- 0-2
- 3-5
- 6-10
- 10+

4.4 What standard in your view should generally apply for disclosing documents in international arbitration?

- All documents relevant to the issues in dispute
- Article 3(b) of the IBA Rules (i.e. "relevant to the case and material to its outcome")
- Only documents that are specifically identified (i.e., not categories of documents)
- No disclosure
- Other (specify): _____

4.5 In your arbitrations where Article 3 of the IBA Rules applied, did you find that orders for disclosure usually:

- followed the Article 3 standard, i.e. in your view the tribunal ordered production of documents that were not only “relevant to the case” but also “material to its outcome.”
- were broader than the Article 3 standard, i.e. in your view the tribunal ordered production of documents that were not both “relevant to the case” and “material to its outcome.”
- were stricter than the Article 3 standard, e.g., the tribunal ordered production only of specific documents.

4.6 Over the past 5 years, what percentage of your arbitrations has involved the use of a ‘Redfern schedule’ (a table containing the parties’ requests for production and the basis for them, objections by the opposing party, and the tribunal’s decision) as a method for managing the disclosure process? _____%

4.7 Do you consider the Redfern schedule to be an efficient method for managing the disclosure process?

- Yes, better than any alternative
- No
- Depends on the case
- Have no view

4.8 Over the past 5 years, in what percentage of your arbitrations do you believe documents disclosed through the disclosure process have materially affected the outcome of the case?

- 0 – 25%
- 25 – 50%
- 50 – 75%
- 75 – 100%

5. Fact and Expert Witnesses

5.1 Over the past 5 years, in what percentage of your arbitrations was fact witness evidence offered by:

(a) Exchange of written witness statements together with direct examination at the hearing: _____%

(b) Exchange of written witness statements together with limited or no direct examination at the hearing: _____%

(c) Oral testimony only: _____%

5.2 In your view, is the use of written fact witness statements as a substitute for oral direct examination at the hearing generally effective?

Yes

No

Have no view

5.3 Over the past 5 years, in what percentage of your arbitrations were the witnesses questioned at the hearing:

a) Primarily by the tribunal: _____%

b) Primarily by counsel: _____%

5.4 Which method of witness questioning do you prefer:

Primarily by the tribunal

Primarily by counsel

Depends on the case

Don't know

5.5 In your arbitrations over the past 5 years, was mock cross-examination done with the witnesses prior to their appearance at a hearing?

Yes. If so, in what percentage of your arbitrations? _____%

No

5.6 In your view, is mock cross-examination of witnesses prior to their appearance at a hearing generally appropriate?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

5.7 Over the past 5 years, in how many of your arbitrations was there fact witness conferencing ('hot-tubbing')?

- 0
- 1-5
- 6-10
- 10+

5.8 Do you believe fact witness conferencing should be done more often?

- Yes
- No
- Have no view

5.9 In your view, should fact witness evidence be eliminated as a form of evidence in international arbitration?

- No, fact witness evidence is generally an effective form of evidence
- No, fact witness evidence is a necessary evil
- Yes
- Have no view

5.10 Do you think that fact witnesses generally lie when they believe this helps the party on whose behalf they are testifying?

- Yes
- No
- Depends on the witness
- Have no view

5.11 Do you think that fact witnesses generally remember events in a way that favours the party on whose behalf they are testifying?

- Yes
- No
- Depends on the witness
- Have no view

5.12 Do you believe that cross-examination is an effective form of testing fact witness evidence?

- Always
- Usually
- Rarely
- Never

5.13 Over the past 5 years, in what percentage of your arbitrations were expert witnesses involved? _____%

5.14 Of these arbitrations, what percentage of the expert witnesses were appointed by:

- (a) The parties: _____%
- (b) The tribunal: _____%

5.15 Do you consider the use of expert witnesses to be more effective when they are:

- Appointed by the parties
- Appointed by the tribunal
- The same

**5.16 In your arbitrations over the past 5 years, what types of experts were most frequently used?
(rank most frequently used, selecting one option per column)**

Type of Expert	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
Financial/accounting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Legal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Industry-specific	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (specify): _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5.17 Over the past 5 years, in what percentage of your arbitrations were the expert witnesses directed to confer in advance of the hearing in order to identify the issues as to which they agreed/disagreed?

- 0-25%
- 25-50%
- 50-75%
- 75-100%

5.18 In your view, is such a procedure useful?

- Yes
- No
- Depends on the case
- Don't know

5.19 Over the past 5 years, in how many of your arbitrations was there expert witness conferencing ('hot-tubbing')?

- 0
- 1-5
- 6-10
- 10+

5.20 Do you believe expert witness conferencing should be done more often?

- Yes
- No
- Have no view

5.21 Do you believe that cross-examination is generally an effective form of testing expert witness evidence?

- Always
- Usually
- Rarely
- Never

5.22 Over the past 5 years, in what percentage of your arbitrations do you believe cross-examination of fact witnesses and/or expert witnesses has materially affected the outcome of the case?

- 0 – 25%
- 25 – 50%
- 50 – 75%
- 75 – 100%

6. Pleadings and Hearings

6.1 In your experience, following the initial pleadings (such as the request for arbitration, any answer, and any reply to counterclaims), what is the most common order of submission of substantive written submissions (variously called statements of case, memorials, pre-hearing briefs)?

- Sequential exchange
- Simultaneous exchange

6.2 What order of delivery of substantive written submissions do you generally prefer?

- Sequential exchange
- Simultaneous exchange

6.3 In your experience, what is more common:

- Substantive written submissions accompanied by exhibits, witness statements and expert reports
- Substantive written submissions accompanied by exhibits and fact witness statements, but not expert reports (the latter are instead submitted at different times)
- Substantive written submissions not accompanied by exhibits, witness statements and expert reports (the exhibits, witness statements and expert reports are instead submitted at different times)

6.4 Which do you prefer?

- Substantive written submissions accompanied by exhibits, witness statements and expert reports
- Substantive written submissions accompanied by exhibits and fact witness statements, but not expert reports (the latter are instead submitted at different times)
- Substantive written submissions not accompanied by exhibits, witness statements and expert reports (the exhibits, witness statements and expert reports are instead submitted at different times)

6.5 In your experience, what is the most common number of substantive written submissions:

- Two: Statement of Case and Statement of Defence (or Memorial and Counter-Memorial, etc.)
- Three: Statement of Case, Statement of Defence and Reply (or other designations)
- Four: Statement of Case, Statement of Defence, Reply and Rejoinder (or other designations)
- Other (specify): _____

6.6 What number of submissions do you prefer?

- Two: Statement of Case and Statement of Defence
- Three: Statement of Case, Statement of Defence and Reply
- Four: Statement of Case, Statement of Defence, Reply and Rejoinder
- Other (specify): _____

6.7 Do you think the length of substantive written submissions should generally be limited?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

6.8 Over the past 5 years, in what percentage of your arbitrations were merits hearings held outside the seat of arbitration? _____%

6.9 Over the past 5 years, in what percentage of your arbitrations were hearings done primarily by means of telephone conference or video conference?

Procedural hearings: _____%

Merits hearings: _____%

6.10 Over the past 5 years, what has been the average duration of the final merits hearings in your arbitrations?

- 1-2 days
- 3-5 days
- 6-10 days
- 10+ days

6.11 In what percentage of your hearings were specific time limits imposed for oral submissions and/or examination of witnesses:

- (a) Using the “chess clock” method (i.e. parties have an overall allocation of time at the hearing which they may use as they please): _____%
- (b) By allocating time limits for specific stages of the hearing: _____%
- (c) No time limits imposed: _____%

6.12 Which of the above methods do you generally consider to be the most useful?

- The chess clock method
- Allocation of time limits for specific stages of the hearing
- No imposed time limits
- It depends
- Have no view

6.13 Over the past 5 years, in what percentage of your arbitrations were there oral closing submissions? _____%

6.14 Over the past 5 years, in what percentage of your arbitrations were there post-hearing briefs? _____%

6.15 Which do you generally find more effective:

- Oral closing submissions
- Post-hearing briefs
- I like to have both
- Depends on the case
- Have no view

7. Arbitral Awards and Costs

7.1 Over the past 5 years, in what percentage of your arbitrations was a partial or interim award issued? _____%

7.2 Over the past 5 years, in what percentage of your arbitrations was a separate dissenting opinion issued? _____%

7.3 Over the past 5 years, in what percentage of your arbitrations do you consider that a tribunal unnecessarily “split the baby,” where courts in the same dispute would not likely have done so? _____%

7.4 Over the past 5 years, in what percentage of your arbitrations do you consider that the tribunal took unjustifiably long to render the award? _____%

7.5 What do you generally consider to be an appropriate length of time for a sole arbitrator to issue an award after the close of proceedings?

- Within 3 months
- 3 to 6 months
- 6 to 9 months
- 9 to 12 months
- Cannot answer. Depends on the case.

7.6 What do you generally consider to be an appropriate length of time for a three-member tribunal to issue an award after the close of proceedings?

- Within 3 months
- 3 to 6 months
- 6 to 9 months
- 9 to 12 months
- Cannot answer. Depends on the case.

7.7 Over the past 5 years, in what percentage of your arbitrations did the tribunal order costs on the basis of:

- _____ % Costs follow the event (i.e., the unsuccessful party pays)
- _____ % Apportionment of costs by the tribunal
- _____ % Parties bear their own costs and half the arbitration costs (i.e., no costs awarded)
- _____ % Other (specify): _____

7.8 What type of costs allocation do you prefer?

- Costs follow the event
- Apportionment of costs by the tribunal
- Parties bear their own costs and half the arbitration costs
- Unsure
- Other (specify): _____

7.9 Do you consider that improper conduct by a party or its counsel during the arbitral proceedings (e.g., delay, meritless applications) should be taken into account when allocating costs?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

7.10 In your view, should arbitral rules provide guidelines on the factors that the arbitrator(s) should take into account when deciding on costs (e.g. the outcome on the merits, the conduct of the parties/counsel) or should this be left to the discretion of the arbitrators?

- There should be guidelines in the arbitral rules
- This should be left to the discretion of the arbitrators
- I prefer the current system where some arbitral rules provide guidelines and others do not

Thank you for completing this questionnaire

Please feel free to forward this questionnaire to any other potential respondents

Submit by Email