

The Liability of Arbitral Institutions: Legitimacy Challenges and Functional Responses

Barbara Alicja Warwas

The Liability of Arbitral Institutions: Legitimacy Challenges and Functional Responses



ASSER PRESS



Springer

Dr. Barbara Alicja Warwas
International Bachelor of Law
The Hague University of Applied Sciences
The Hague
The Netherlands



This book has been published with a financial subsidy from the EUI.
This publication is based on an EUI Ph.D. thesis defended at the EUI Law Department
on October 7, 2013.

ISBN 978-94-6265-110-4 ISBN 978-94-6265-111-1 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-94-6265-111-1

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016933244

Published by T.M.C. ASSER PRESS, The Hague, The Netherlands www.asserpress.nl
Produced and distributed for T.M.C. ASSER PRESS by Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg

© T.M.C. ASSER PRESS and the author 2017

No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the Publisher, with the exception of any material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work.
The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

Printed on acid-free paper

This Springer imprint is published by Springer Nature
The registered company is Springer Science+Business Media B.V. Dordrecht

Acknowledgments

The solitude of a writer can be compared to the solitude of a long-distance runner. Although I have not (yet) run a marathon, writing this book helped me understand this phenomenon and appreciate the encouragement offered by the many supporters I met along the way. Upon the completion of this project, I would like to express my gratitude to those who inspired me to get started, those who cheered me on in the course of writing, and those who now await me at the finish line.

I would like to thank my Master thesis supervisor at Wrocław University, Professor Krzysztof Wójtowicz, for his support and inspiration at the early stages of my academic path. I am grateful to my colleagues and the Management from The Hague University. I am also indebted to the current and former members of the European University Institute (EUI) Law Department, particularly to Professors Fabrizio Cafaggi, Hans-Wolfgang Micklitz, Giorgio Monti, Ulrich Petersmann and Wojciech Sadurski. Their academic support during the production of my doctoral dissertation—one of the first seeds of this book—is greatly appreciated. I am also grateful to Professor Sandrine Clavel and Emmanuel Jolivet, whose comments and stimulating discussions on the topic of this book enriched my research.

I am indebted to Tony Cole for the opportunity to participate in the fascinating project for the European Parliament, which shed new insights into the practice of arbitration in Europe and as such contributed to my work in this book. I would also like to thank my Italian family from *Studio Legale Calabresi Guadalupi*, especially Roberto Calabresi and Francesca Boffa. Your professional advice, support, and warmth during the time spent at your legal practice facilitated the drafting of this book and also made it more enjoyable.

My great appreciation goes to Michael McIlwrath and Kai-Uwe Karl, who not only helped me understand the practical importance of the topic at hand but also welcomed me to their legal team introducing me to a number of arbitration puzzles to ponder. Their creativity and openness generated new insights into this project, for which I am eternally grateful. Thanks to my informal mentor, Michael McIlwrath, I was also able to benefit from further consultations with regard to the earlier drafts of this book. Here, I would like to especially thank Professor Catherine A. Rogers and Simon Greenberg for their interest in my work and for their valuable feedback.

I would like to acknowledge the support received from the whole team at T.M.C. Asser Press, especially Philip van Tongeren and Kiki van Gurp, and I am grateful for their tremendous work on the production of this book. I am also thankful to Erin Jackson for language editing this book, which was made possible by the financial support of the EUI Law Department.

My dear friends, it is obvious that I owe you all so much. It is impossible to mention you all but I am particularly indebted to Chiara Altafin, Marija Bartl, Ilze Dubava, Keiva Carr, Joris Larik, Alanna O'Malley, Karolina Podstawa, and Philippe Reyniers for being part of my "shadow committee". I would also like to thank all my friends back in Poland and Joanna and Piotr Liszka. *Chapeau bas!*

I am eternally grateful to Matthew Hoyer for his enormous patience and common sense when I felt senseless, and for his moral support and love which I receive every day. Without your help, Matthew, this book would never be finalized. It is my great honour to have you by my side.

Finally, I would like to thank my family: my sister Dagmara Płatek, my grandmother Walentyna Szlufik, my grandfather Władysław Szlufik, and my aunt Grażyna Szlufik. This book has been written in the memory of my grandfather's academic career. I am especially grateful to my parents, Jolanta and Krzysztof Warwas. Without you, my beloved parents, I would not be where I am now. This book is dedicated to you.

Contents

| | | |
|----------|--|-----|
| 1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 | Setting the Scene | 1 |
| 1.2 | Why Would Arbitration Users Sue Arbitral Institutions? | 7 |
| 1.3 | The Two Legitimacy Pressures and Efficiency | 9 |
| 1.4 | How to Respond to the Trend of Increasing Liability Suits? Preliminary Proposals | 13 |
| 1.5 | Methodology | 14 |
| 1.6 | Organization of the Book | 15 |
| | References | 16 |
| 2 | Status and Functions of Modern Arbitral Institutions | 19 |
| 2.1 | Introduction | 19 |
| 2.2 | Arbitral Institutions as Service Providers? The Mainstream Definitions of Institutional Arbitration Condemned. | 20 |
| 2.2.1 | International Legal Textbooks | 20 |
| 2.2.2 | Arbitration Rules and Guides to the Rules. | 27 |
| 2.2.3 | Other Disciplines | 35 |
| 2.3 | Dual Function of Arbitral Institutions in the Contemporary Arbitration System | 37 |
| 2.3.1 | Traditional Commercial Function | 38 |
| 2.3.2 | Emerging Public Function | 67 |
| 2.4 | Conclusion in the Context of Institutional Liability: On the Relationship Between the Emerging Public Function, Efficiency, and Legitimacy of Institutional Regimes. | 108 |
| | References | 110 |
| 3 | The Triad of Modern Functions of Arbitral Institutions—in Search of the Sources and Scope of Institutional Arbitral Liability | 117 |
| 3.1 | Introduction | 117 |
| 3.2 | The Legal Dimension. | 118 |
| 3.2.1 | The Legal Basis for Institutional Liability: Contract or Status or Both? | 119 |

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| 3.2.2 | Theorizing Territoriality of Institutional Arbitration: Courts' Jurisdiction and the Law Applicable in Liability Lawsuits | 146 |
| 3.2.3 | Additional Sources of Institutional Arbitral Liability—Introduction to the Societal and Economic Dimensions of Institutional Functions | 153 |
| 3.3 | The Societal Dimension | 155 |
| 3.3.1 | The Internal Legitimacy | 155 |
| 3.3.2 | The External Legitimacy | 172 |
| 3.3.3 | On How the Need for Public Accountability Diminished Private Accountability: Consequences of the Weakening of the Societal Dimension | 180 |
| 3.4 | The Economic Dimension | 185 |
| 3.4.1 | Bottom-up | 186 |
| 3.4.2 | Top-Down | 188 |
| 3.5 | Conclusion: The Sources and Optimal Scope of Institutional Arbitral Liability | 191 |
| | References | 193 |
| 4 | On How the Current Institutional Regulations of Liability Do Not Respond to the Triad of Institutional Functions . . . | 197 |
| 4.1 | Introduction | 197 |
| 4.2 | Legal Problems with Institutional Contractual Immunity | 199 |
| 4.2.1 | “We Are Contractors but We Do Not Assume Liability:” On Why Absolute Contractual Immunity Appears Paradoxical | 200 |
| 4.2.2 | “Do Not Attack Our Experts:” On Why Contractual Immunity Should Not Apply to All Institutional Arbitration Actors | 202 |
| 4.2.3 | What Happens in Arbitration Stays Behind Closed Doors of Arbitral Institutions: Immunity from Process and Its Consequences | 205 |
| 4.3 | On the Problems with the Societal Dimension | 210 |
| 4.3.1 | Public Rationale Behind Institutional Contractual Immunity | 210 |
| 4.3.2 | Insufficiency of the Modern Mechanisms of Accountability | 220 |
| 4.4 | Imperfect Competition and the Harmonized Contractual Institutional Immunity: On the Problems with the Economic Dimension | 232 |
| 4.5 | Conclusion | 234 |
| | References | 236 |
| 5 | The Legal Dimension of Institutional Arbitration: On the Current National Regulations and “Visions” of Institutional Arbitral Liability | 239 |
| 5.1 | Introduction | 239 |

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| 5.2 | National Regulations | 241 |
| 5.2.1 | “Up in the Air”: Problems with the Legal Theories of Institutional Arbitration | 241 |
| 5.2.2 | “The Jury Is Still Out!” Practical Problems with Institutional Arbitral Liability | 272 |
| 5.3 | Philosophical Approach to the International Institutional Function: On “Visions” | 281 |
| 5.3.1 | International Institutional Function v. the National Visions of Arbitral Liability | 282 |
| 5.3.2 | International Institutional Function v. the National Visions of Delocalization of Arbitration | 284 |
| 5.3.3 | Divergent National Visions of Institutional Arbitral Liability and Forum Shopping | 286 |
| 5.4 | Conclusion | 288 |
| | References | 290 |
| 6 | Cutting the Gordian Knot: Proposals for the Institutional Reform of Arbitral Liability | 295 |
| 6.1 | Introduction | 295 |
| 6.2 | The Weaknesses of the Current Proposals | 297 |
| 6.2.1 | Qualified Immunity, Contractual Liability and the “Surrogate Theory” | 297 |
| 6.2.2 | Further Surrogacy as a Doctrine of Liability? | 298 |
| 6.2.3 | Rutledge’s Market-Based Approach to Contractual Liability | 299 |
| 6.3 | Institutional Liability Models: Possible Alternatives | 300 |
| 6.3.1 | Essential Variables | 301 |
| 6.3.2 | Content of the Contractual Obligations of Arbitral Institutions | 301 |
| 6.3.3 | Possible Models | 302 |
| 6.3.4 | Analysis | 306 |
| 6.3.5 | Additional Assumptions of the Proposed Model | 311 |
| 6.4 | On How the Proposed Model Responds to the Three Dimensions of Institutional Functions | 315 |
| 6.4.1 | The Legal Dimension | 316 |
| 6.4.2 | The Societal Dimension | 320 |
| 6.4.3 | The Economic Dimension | 329 |
| 6.4.4 | Functions of Liability in the Proposed Model | 338 |
| 6.5 | Conclusion | 339 |
| | References | 340 |
| 7 | The Level and Scope of the Public Regulations on Institutional Arbitral Liability: Proposals | 343 |
| 7.1 | Introduction | 343 |
| 7.2 | Which Level for the Public Regulation? | 344 |
| 7.2.1 | Public Incentives to Support Institutional Arbitral Liability | 346 |

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| 7.2.2 | Why Does Public Support Matter? | 349 |
| 7.3 | The Scope of National Reforms | 355 |
| 7.3.1 | Public Regulations of Arbitrability. | 355 |
| 7.3.2 | Public Regulations of Institutional Contracts. | 356 |
| 7.3.3 | Public Regulations of the Scope of Institutional and Arbitrators' Liability | 357 |
| 7.3.4 | Remedies Available to Institutional Arbitration Actors | 357 |
| 7.3.5 | Damages Awarded as a Result of Institutional Liability Claims and Their Further Implications for the Integrity and Finality of the Institutional Arbitration Processes | 363 |
| 7.4 | Conclusion | 368 |
| | References | 369 |
| 8 | Conclusion. Risk Acceptance Versus Risk Avoidance: On Why Arbitral Institutions Should Eventually Reform Their Liability | 371 |
| 8.1 | Institutional Arbitral Liability as a Recurrent Issue | 371 |
| 8.2 | Proposals in a Nutshell. | 372 |
| 8.3 | Institutional Arbitral Liability and the Need for Self-Regulation | 374 |
| 8.4 | Arbitral Institutional Liability Advances the Legal, Societal, and Economic Facets of Arbitral Institutions. | 375 |
| 8.5 | Institutional Arbitral Liability as a Response to the Dual Legitimacy Challenges | 380 |
| | References | 383 |
| | Index | 385 |

Abbreviations

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| AAA | American Arbitration Association |
| ADR | Alternative Dispute Resolution |
| B2B | Business to business |
| B2C | Business to consumer |
| BCDR | Bahrain Chamber of Dispute Resolution |
| CAM | Milan Chamber of Arbitration |
| CANACO | Chamber of Commerce of the City of Mexico |
| CBOE | Chicago Board Options Exchange |
| CEPANI | Belgian Centre for Arbitration and Mediation |
| CIArb | Chartered Institute of Arbitrators |
| CICA | Court of International Commercial Arbitration |
| CIETAC | China International Economic and Trade Arbitration Commission |
| COMECON | Council for Mutual Economic Assistance |
| DIA | Danish Institute of Arbitration |
| DIFC | Dubai International Financial Centre |
| DIS | German Institution of Arbitration |
| FAA | Federal Arbitration Act |
| IACAC | Inter-American Commercial Arbitration Commission |
| IBA | International Bar Association |
| ICANN | Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers |
| ICC | International Chamber of Commerce |
| ICDR | International Centre for Dispute Resolution |
| ICSID | International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes |
| LCIA | London Court of International Arbitration |
| MAC | Maritime Arbitration Commission |
| NASD | National Association of Securities Dealers |
| ODR | Online Dispute Resolution |
| PCA | Permanent Court of Arbitration |
| P.R.I.M.E. Finance | Panel of Recognized International Market Experts in Finance |

| | |
|----------|--|
| RICO | Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act |
| SCC | Stockholm Chamber of Commerce |
| SIAC | Singapore International Arbitration Centre |
| TTIP | Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership |
| UNCITRAL | United Nations Commission on International Trade Law |
| VIAC | Vienna International Arbitral Centre |