

# Asian Dispute Review

Since 1999

July 2017



SPONSORED BY

■ HONG KONG INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION CENTRE

■ CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF ARBITRATORS (EAST ASIA BRANCH)

■ HONG KONG INSTITUTE OF ARBITRATORS

■ HONG KONG MEDIATION COUNCIL



General Editors



Romesh Weeramantry



John Choong

Consulting and Technical Editor



Robert Morgan

Editorial Advisory Board

Cao Lijun  
Henry Chen  
Michael Hwang SC  
Neil Kaplan CBE QC SBS  
Gabrielle Kaufmann-Kohler  
Julian Lew QC  
Michael Moser  
Yoshimi Ohara  
Hi-Taek Shin

Supervisory Board

Paul Barrett (*Chartered Institute of Arbitrators, East Asia Branch*)  
Chiann Bao (*Hong Kong International Arbitration Centre*)  
Vod K S Chan (*Hong Kong Mediation Council*)  
Paul Varty (*Hong Kong Institute of Arbitrators*)

Editorial Assistants

Colin Ballantine  
Navin G Ahuja

Copy Assistant

Janet Hammond

All enquiries to the *Asian Dispute Review's* Editors should be sent to  
asiandr-editor@hkiac.org

PUBLISHER



香港國際仲裁中心  
Hong Kong International  
Arbitration Centre

Hong Kong International Arbitration Centre

38/F, Two Exchange Square  
8 Connaught Place, Central  
Hong Kong  
www.hkiac.org

Design

KAC Design

Advertising Contacts

Kirti Ladharam: kirti@hkiac.org  
Karen Tan: karen@hkiac.org  
Tel: (852) 2525 2381

Sponsoring Organisations

Hong Kong International Arbitration Centre  
Chartered Institute of Arbitrators, East Asia Branch  
Hong Kong Institute of Arbitrators  
Hong Kong Mediation Council

www.asiandr.com

Copyright in all material published in the *Asian Dispute Review* is retained by the Hong Kong International Arbitration Centre (HKIAC) on behalf of the sponsoring organisations. No part of this journal may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, including recording and photocopying without the written permission of HKIAC, application for which should be addressed to HKIAC. Written permission must also be obtained before any part of this publication is stored in a retrieval system of any nature. The journal does not accept liability for any views, opinions, or advice given in it. Further, the contents of the journal do not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of the publisher, the editors, members of the Editorial Advisory Board or the Supervisory Board, HKIAC or the other sponsoring organisations and no liability is accepted in relation thereto.

103 EDITORIAL

INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION

- 104 Arbitration – Elastic or Arthritic?  
*Peter Rees QC*

INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES

- 112 Rising Protectionism Threatens Global Trade:  
WTO Law and Dispute Settlement in Asia  
*Julien Chaisse*

ARBITRATION IN ASIA

- 119 Practical and Strategic Decisions in Arbitration  
*Chan Leng Sun SC*

- 125 The Hong Kong Court's Approach to the Enforcement of  
Foreign Arbitral Awards  
*Alfred Wu & Daniel Ng*

IN-HOUSE COUNSEL FOCUS

- 131 Guerrilla Tactics in International Arbitration  
*Günther J Horvath & Amanda Neil*

JURISDICTION FOCUS

- 138 China Country Update  
*Cao Lijun*

BOOK REVIEW

- 144 International Arbitration in Korea  
*Reviewed by Benjamin Hughes*

146 NEWS

Past issues of the *Asian Dispute Review* are also available at  
www.kluwerarbitration.com.



# EDITORIAL

We commence this issue of *Asian Dispute Review* with an article in which **Peter Rees QC** discusses the disclosure of documents, expert evidence in arbitration and the need for increased procedural flexibility. **Julien Chaisse** then provides insights into the relevance of the law of the World Trade Organization in controlling trade protectionism in the aftermath of the US presidential election, Brexit and increased trade protectionism in Asia. This is followed by an article by **Chan Leng Sun QC** which looks at potential problems that newly accredited arbitrators may encounter in the context of existing arbitration laws and institutional rules, as well as a piece by **Alfred Wu** and **Daniel Ng** on Hong Kong's stance on the controversial topic of the enforcement of foreign arbitral awards that have been set aside or refused enforcement by a supervisory court.

Our 'In-House Counsel Focus' article by **Günther J Horvath** and **Amanda Neil** considers the nature of 'guerrilla tactics' in, and techniques that are used to undermine the integrity of, the arbitral process, and ways to combat these ploys.

Recent developments in arbitration in the People's Republic of China are discussed in our 'Jurisdiction Focus' section by **Cao Lijun**. Finally, **Ben Hughes** reviews Professor Joongi Kim's new book, *International Arbitration in Korea*.

We would also like to acknowledge with considerable thanks the excellent support that Colin Ballantine has provided to us over the last two years. This will be his last issue as an Editorial Assistant. It has been a pleasure to work with him and we wish him well.

General Editors



# CONTRIBUTORS



**Cao Lijun**  
*Zhong Lun Law Firm*  
China



**Amanda Neil**  
*Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer*  
Vienna



**Julien Chaisse**  
*Faculty of Law, Chinese University of Hong Kong*  
Hong Kong



**Daniel Ng**  
*Norton Rose Fulbright*  
Hong Kong



**Chan Leng Sun SC**  
*Baker & McKenzie, Wong & Leow*  
Singapore



**Peter Rees QC**  
*Barrister, 39 Essex Chambers*  
London



**Dr Günther J Horvath**  
*Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer*  
Vienna



**Alfred Wu**  
*Norton Rose Fulbright*  
Hong Kong



**Benjamin Hughes**  
*Arbitrator*  
Seoul



## Arbitration – Elastic or Arthritic?

Peter Rees QC

In this both serious and humorous contribution, the author discusses a number of ways in which arbitration has failed to live up to its promises of, in particular, speed, flexibility and low cost. With specific reference to disclosure of documents and expert evidence, he argues for greater procedural ‘elasticity’ to overcome ‘arthritic’ arbitration. This article is a version of a Keynote Address delivered at a dinner organised by Harbour Litigation Funding for leading global firms in Hong Kong on 28 March 2017.<sup>1</sup>

### Introduction

When I was a student, I financed my way through college by working as a barman for 18 months. I was lucky enough to work in Kendal in the English Lake District. I was even luckier to work in a place called the Brewery Arts Centre. As you can gather from the name, it was a brewery converted into an arts centre, with live music each evening in the bar.

My favourite was Sunday lunchtime, when the guy who ran the place, Bob Dawbarn, held a jazz jam session. He had been a very well-known music journalist with *Melody Maker* magazine as well as a jazz trombonist. Very well connected in the music business, we saw some of the greats of jazz play or sing – George Melly, Chris Barber and Humphrey Lyttleton, to name but a few.

Because we never knew who was going to turn up and how many, the sign at the Brewery Arts Centre read: “Sunday Lunchtime Jazz with Bob Dawbarn’s Elastic Band”. I thought then – and still do – what a great play on words!

Even more importantly, you could always be sure, no matter how many musicians there were on stage, no matter how stretched the elastic band was, that the quality was always there. The Elastic Band could accommodate any number of musicians playing whatever instruments. It would adapt its style, change its focus and still deliver.

When I became a lawyer, and being at the Bar took on a different meaning, I came across this thing called ‘arbitration’

early on. In those days, you learned nothing of arbitration at university or law school. The partner I was working for told me to do some background reading on arbitration. I clearly remember the list of the advantages of arbitration over court proceedings everyone quoted at the time: speed, flexibility, confidentiality, cost, enforceability, expertise and informality.

Those seven ‘advantages’ were the promise of what arbitration would deliver and, in many cases in those days, arbitration did deliver most, if not all of them. As we all know, things changed.

The arbitration community is familiar with the story that Professor Rusty Park tells of the sign in the window of a shoe repairer’s shop in Boston: “Fast Service, High Quality, Low Price – pick any two”. Rusty uses that sign as a metaphor for the problems we appear to have in arbitration. We don’t seem to be able to provide all three advantages – fast service, high quality and low price. Certainly, speed and cost are almost ever present topics in arbitration conferences.

“I clearly remember the list of the advantages of arbitration over court proceedings everyone quoted at the time: speed, flexibility, confidentiality, cost, enforceability, expertise and informality. Those seven ‘advantages’ were the promise of what arbitration would deliver and, in many cases in those days, arbitration did deliver most, if not all of them.”

I want to focus on one of the other ‘advantages’: flexibility. It may be that we are losing sight of the need for flexibility in

arbitration, and that may be causing some of the problems we regularly encounter with speed and cost.

If we can be more flexible, more elastic, like Bob Dawbarn’s Elastic Band, we may just confound the Boston shoe repairer and provide fast service, high quality and low price.

Let me add a third to the signs in windows mentioned so far, one I saw in the window of a jeweller’s shop in Dublin. It said, “Ears Pierced While You Wait”. Upon analysis, it may be an even better metaphor for arbitration today than the Boston shoemaker’s sign, especially when it comes to flexibility.

Whilst the sign gives the impression of flexibility, it doesn’t offer much flexibility at all. “While you wait” alludes to quick, immediate service, but it gives no clue as to how long you will have to wait. All it says is, in effect: “If you want your ears pierced, you are going to have to come in and wait, in person, for the service to be performed.” How long is not specified and the longer you need to wait, the more dissatisfied you will be, especially if what lured you into the shop in the first place was the expectation of fast and flexible service.

Two of the promises that have, in the past, lured users into the arbitration shop have been speed and flexibility, but users of arbitration have now seen behind the promise of the sign and understand the reality.

### Arthritis and arbitration

Moving slowly, stiffness, lack of flexibility, difficulty in grasping things firmly, trouble in changing direction and altogether a painful experience. These are some of the things that users of arbitration and sufferers of arthritis have in common. Elasticity has gone and everything takes much longer to achieve and involves severe pain in getting there.

We are all familiar with the ‘standard’ approach to an arbitration and how long it takes. The tribunal is established, which in itself usually takes at least two to three months in an institutional arbitration.



Then the chair of the tribunal takes out his or her tried and trusted Procedural Order No 1 and directions are made for service of submissions – sometimes simultaneous, with attached witness statements and expert reports, and sometimes consecutive – in more English style. However, there are still directions as to witness statements and expert reports which usually say no more than ‘they shall be submitted’ and a time for doing so.

Then there is document disclosure and the default position – “the tribunal will be guided by Article 3 of the IBA Rules on the Taking of Evidence in International Commercial Arbitration” – and so we get Redfern Schedules, document production requests, objections to produce and, almost inevitably, decisions are sought from the tribunal as to whether documents should be produced.

It is all standard stuff. There is no flexibility. It is very arthritic.

Albert Einstein is thought to have said, “Insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results.” Isn’t that what we do time and time again in arbitration?

I will not detail every aspect of arbitration but simply touch on two areas where, if users, counsel and arbitrators were to be willing to abandon their formulaic approach, adopt

new ideas and be more flexible – ie, more elastic and less arthritic – it could result in saved time and cost. I will focus on document disclosure and the use of experts.

“Moving slowly, stiffness, lack of flexibility, difficulty in grasping things firmly, trouble in changing direction and altogether a painful experience. These are some of the things that users of arbitration and sufferers of arthritis have in common. Elasticity has gone and everything takes much longer to achieve and involves severe pain in getting there.”

## Document disclosure

Imagine you are the General Counsel of a French company and you are about to commence court proceedings against a German company. You will get little or no document disclosure ordered by the court. Does that, somehow, invalidate the German or French court process? Have cases been wrongly decided in German or French courts for centuries? Have the General Counsel of Total, Alstom, Siemens or Bosch been heard to say, “I wish we had disclosure of documents in our legal systems”?

And yet, the moment a case goes to arbitration, disclosure of documents is assumed. The Anglo-Saxon common lawyers have foisted onto a previously quick and flexible system the whole paraphernalia of document disclosure. Why?

Have you ever considered the illogicality of document disclosure, especially in arbitration, and especially when it is a common law – and, particularly, when it is an English law – arbitration?

By definition, arbitration involves a contractual dispute. With some minor exceptions, there has to be a contract for there to be an arbitration and, in the vast majority of cases, the arbitration is all about construction of the contract. What do its provisions mean? Was it breached?

In most civil law systems, the documents created prior to the contract being entered into are viewed as relevant. Previous drafts of the contract can be used, in civil law systems, to help interpret what those subjective intentions were, and how the contract should, in consequence, be interpreted.

Further, post-contractual actions of a party can be used in most civil law systems as an aid to interpretation. If a party acted as if the contract meant this, then that is evidence that can be used to support a claim that that is what the contract actually meant.

You would have thought that having access to those documents, both pre- and post-contractual, would be vital in civil law systems. They are necessary for proper contract interpretation – and yet disclosure of documents is not a feature of most civil law systems. Crazy isn't it? And yet they have managed for centuries without it. Even crazier yet is our obsession with disclosure of documents.

In English law at least – and there are variations of this in most common law systems – the individual subjective intentions of the parties are irrelevant to contract interpretation. Contracts are interpreted objectively. What the parties thought they were entering into, as evidenced in all those internal e-mails (which are always asked for on disclosure), is entirely irrelevant to the interpretation of the contract.

Of course, we have the pre-contractual factual matrix as an aid to contract interpretation, but to qualify as an aid in contractual interpretation, something in the matrix has to be known to both sides; so, both sides are likely, already, to have the documents which show that they both had that knowledge anyway.

“Looking at things logically, it seems to me that if disclosure of documents is needed at all in arbitration, there is a strong case for severely restricting it in common law arbitrations and, perversely, being more expansive in civil law arbitrations.”

Equally, post-contractual behaviour is, subject to a few exceptions, irrelevant to contractual interpretation under English law – so, again, what is the relevance of all the internal correspondence which the other side have, and which took place after the contract was entered into, saying what they thought the contract was all about? Yet, document requests ask for it constantly.

What documentation, particularly internal correspondence, is truly going to be relevant to the interpretation of the contract that is the subject of the arbitration?

Looking at things logically, it seems to me that if disclosure of documents is needed at all in arbitration, there is a strong case for severely restricting it in common law arbitrations and, perversely, being more expansive in civil law arbitrations.

## No disclosure

Am I really suggesting no document disclosure in arbitrations? Yes, I am. Not in every arbitration, of course. I wouldn't want to be accused of being inelastic, but I believe there are a large number of disputes where – on proper analysis of the law and what is needed to establish each side's case – each side has all the documents it needs and document disclosure is a time-consuming and expensive luxury.

Of course, agreeing no disclosure of documents is never going to happen once a dispute has started. Human nature being



what it is, each will assume there is something that the other side has that they will keep hidden, because it will irrevocably harm their case.

But what about when the arbitration clause is being prepared?

Entities based in civil law jurisdictions are used to having no, or relatively limited, disclosure in their court cases, and it is not too much of a cultural leap to have no disclosure in their arbitration cases. Sophisticated in-house counsel in many common law jurisdictions may be willing to consider it for certain types of contract – especially where sums in dispute are likely to be relatively low.

From the client's perspective, particularly that of the in-house lawyer, having the discussion about whether (or not) disclosure of documents should be included in any future arbitration at the time the contract is being drawn up, is exactly the right time to have it. At that stage, the in-house lawyer can explain to his business colleague who will be performing the contract the impact (both positive and negative) of having such a provision and the risks (again both upside and downside) that having no disclosure would entail.

Businessmen, and their in-house counsel, are used to evaluating and taking risks, and it is at the time of entry into the contract when they do that. The risks can be considered, weighed and a view taken on whether the possible downside – not being able to obtain documents from the other side if there is a dispute – is justified by the upside benefits, in the form of significant savings in time and cost.

We all know that carefully considered and bespoke arbitration clauses are a relative rarity. Often, they are simply cut and pasted by the transactional lawyers into the contract from another agreement, without proper consideration of the appropriateness of that dispute resolution provision to that contract.

It seems to me that the best way of including a 'no disclosure' provision in an arbitration clause is to include it in the institutional rules to which that clause refers.

Let's not be too inelastic about this. Let's have institutional rules that allow the parties to choose between having disclosure of documents and having no disclosure. If an institution is going to be brave enough to have such a rule, let it be an 'opt in' to disclosure rule, not an 'opt out'. In other words, if the arbitration clause simply provides that the arbitration will be conducted in accordance with the rules of that institution, the default position is 'no disclosure' and it is for the sophisticated contract draftsman to refine the arbitration clause so that, notwithstanding the rule of the institution providing for no disclosure of documents, the parties agree that there will be.

Is there an institution brave enough to have such a 'no disclosure' provision in its rules? I doubt it at present, but it is worth looking at. It could be a game changer.

“Let's have institutional rules that allow the parties to choose between having disclosure of documents and having no disclosure. If an institution is going to be brave enough to have such a rule, let it be an 'opt in' to disclosure rule, not an 'opt out'.”

## Expert evidence

How many times have we seen expert reports from each side addressing different issues, using different terminology and different methodology, while spending a huge amount of time setting out things that both experts agree upon? What a waste of time and money.



I am not suggesting arbitration without expert reports, but I am suggesting that techniques be adopted to make those expert reports as relevant and efficient as possible, thus saving time and money.

Unlike my suggestion about document disclosure, this should not be controversial. It is tried and tested, at least in parts of the English court system – especially in the English Technology and Construction Court – but large parts of the international arbitration community still seem to view it as radical. It is one of those rare areas where civil lawyers and US lawyers seem to be on the same side in resisting any change to the way in which experts are handled.

How can this be achieved? The answer is simple: you get the experts to meet first – before they have put anything in writing, before any report has been drafted, before they have committed to specific terminology or a particular methodology.

“ I am suggesting that techniques be adopted to make those expert reports as relevant and efficient as possible, thus saving time and money. ... The answer is simple: you get the experts to meet first – before they have put anything in writing, before any report has been drafted, before they have committed to specific terminology or a particular methodology. ”

They have the meeting without prejudice and without lawyers present, and as early as possible in the proceedings. Certainly before any expert reports are written and in some cases – but again not all, as we don’t want to be inelastic – ideally, before detailed submissions have been filed by the parties. At



such a meeting the experts need to achieve several tasks, but principally:

- (1) agreeing what terminology they are going to use – pounds or kilogrammes, miles or kilometres, Fahrenheit or Celsius, €/MWh<sup>2</sup> or \$/BTU<sup>3</sup> or whatever is needed for the particular case;
- (2) agreeing methodology – whether it is accounting methodology or the methodology for carrying out experiments, conducting analyses or making calculations; and
- (3) agreeing those issues upon which they can agree and those upon which they cannot.

Having discussed all those things without prejudice, and without lawyers, they then produce a list of the agreed terminology, methodology and issues, as well as a list of what has been agreed and what has not been agreed. Having done that, they can then write their reports only on the things on which they disagree.

Applying this approach, a huge amount of time and costs has already been saved and everyone knows from an early stage what the experts really disagree about.

Sadly, this is still viewed as a radical approach in parts of the international arbitration world but, perhaps as a sign of improving elasticity in arbitration, it is slowly gaining some traction – though it usually has to be seen in action first by sceptical counsel.

As with document disclosure, we need to be careful not to fall into the arthritic trap of saying this procedure should be applied to all cases regardless, but arbitration practitioners should, equally, not dismiss it just because they have not seen it used before.

Not all arbitration practitioners are arthritic when it comes to experts. Many have adopted this approach, which is set out in much more detail in a protocol produced by the Chartered Institute of Arbitrators which goes under the snappy title of the *Protocol for the Use of Party-Appointed Experts in International Arbitration* (2007).<sup>4</sup>

## Elastic experts

Some have gone further, and it is especially the developments dealing with expert witnesses that give me hope that arbitration can still be elastic and not arthritic.

Most are familiar with the concept of witness conferencing of experts: the experts of the same discipline from each side, sit together in front of the tribunal and answer/discuss questions put to them by the tribunal. The process dubbed by the Americans as ‘hot-tubbing’ is not only a less delicate description of the process, but also creates a particularly unpleasant mental picture!

“Even with ... [the concept of hot-tubbing], there is a risk of getting arthritic. The convention has grown up that hot-tubbing should only take place after both experts have been cross-examined. Why should that be? Is there not some benefit, in some cases, in being more elastic? In adopting a different approach?”

Even with this concept, there is a risk of getting arthritic. The convention has grown up that hot-tubbing should only take place after both experts have been cross-examined. Why should that be? Is there not some benefit, in some cases, in being more elastic? In adopting a different approach?

Having complained of arthritis and inelasticity, I end by quoting two recent examples of elasticity that I have experienced in the approach to the examination of experts. I take no credit for either of these examples; they were suggested by one of the other arbitrators.

In the first case, the tribunal had already tried at the case management stage to persuade the parties’ counsel to adopt the first procedure described above related to expert reports, but they resolutely refused to allow their experts to meet in advance and insisted on expert reports being exchanged simultaneously.

Somewhat predictably, reports arrived from experts of different disciplines, addressing different issues and putting forward completely different theories as to what had caused the problem that had led to the arbitration. Furthermore, their rebuttal reports, also exchanged simultaneously, could not address the theory put forward by the other side because it depended upon expert knowledge that they didn’t have.

Rather than permit counsel to launch straight into cross-examination of the experts, the tribunal decided to put the experts together in the hot tub right from the start, and as counsel finished a particular topic of cross-examination – and before he went onto the next – the tribunal intervened and asked questions of the expert on that topic and, following his answers, then turned to the other side’s expert, who had been sitting alongside the expert being cross-examined, and asked, “so, what do you think?”

In this way, the tribunal received the experts’ views on each topic at the same time, and encouraged dialogue between them. It made the experts focus on what they had to say and helped the tribunal enormously as there was no time gap



between receiving one expert's view on a topic and receiving the view of the other. It also identified, up front, whether an expert actually had the expertise to comment upon what the other was saying on a particular issue.

The second case did have experts of like discipline, and agreement existed in advance as to the issues to be covered by them. This enabled a different approach. Again, the experts were put together in the hot tub right at the beginning of the expert testimony, and each gave a 20-minute presentation of his expert opinion, one straight after the other.

The experts were then invited to ask each other questions to clarify or obtain further explanation opinions, after which the tribunal also asked questions of each expert and asked the other expert to comment on what had just been said in response to the tribunal's questions. Counsel then cross-examined the experts in the usual way, with the tribunal again intervening with questions at any stage.

This process worked extremely well. The tribunal was able to get the answers to its questions from both experts, and context was given to the subsequent cross-examination of the experts that took place. It was also clear that it actually saved a lot of cross-examination from counsel, as particular areas of enquiry that they were going to pursue in cross-examination had already been dealt with.

Importantly, it encouraged the experts to be open about what they did agree upon and to highlight, specifically,

what they didn't. Although provision had been made for a traditional hot-tubbing of the experts, in the end it proved unnecessary.

Each of the approaches I have just described worked well in the context of the particular case and it was reassuring to see that in this area of arbitration which, in many cases, can be totally arthritic, elasticity could still be found and applied.

## Conclusion

It is probably fair to say that the impartial and objective observer could assume that arthritis is prevalent in arbitration simply by looking at the age and physical fitness of many arbitrators. As with all things, however, appearances can be deceptive.

Take Bob Dawbarn's Elastic Band. What looked like a wraggle-taggle bunch of disparate musicians at first sight amazed and inspired their audience once they started to play. It was the quality of the product that shone through. The band were elastic enough to be adaptable and to cope with whatever circumstances threw at them.

Arbitration needs similar elasticity. We may struggle with physical elasticity, but mental elasticity and agility is what is required. All involved – whether arbitrators, counsel, clients or institutions – need to ensure that they don't simply take a standard approach to every case, that they don't become arthritic.

Flexible approaches will produce tailored procedures which, in turn, will ensure that, like good old Bob Dawbarn's Elastic Band, no matter how big or small, no matter what the components, everything can be accommodated and the quality still shines through. ■

1 The author is an Investment Committee member at Harbour Litigation Funding.

2 *Editorial note:* Initialism for megawatt hour.

3 *Editorial note:* Initialism for British Thermal Unit.

4 *Editorial note:* Available at <http://www.ciarb.org/docs/default-source/ciarbdocuments/international-arbitration-protocols/partypointedexpertsinternationalarbitration.pdf?sfvrsn=8>.