

Table of Contents

| | |
|-------------------------------|------|
| Introduction | III |
| Overview | V |
| The Editors and Authors | XVII |

Chapter I The Arbitration Agreement and Arbitrability 1

Stavros Brekoulakis/Jonas von Goeler

It's All About The Money: The Impact Of Third-Party Funding On Costs Awards And Security For Costs In International Arbitration 3

| | |
|--|----|
| I. Introduction | 3 |
| II. Awarding Of Costs | 4 |
| A. Should A Prevailing Funded Party Be Able To Recover Party Costs At All Where These Costs Have Been Funded By A Third Party? | 6 |
| B. What Amount And Type Of Recoverable Can A Prevailing Funded Party Recover? | 7 |
| C. Can Arbitral Tribunals Render Costs Orders Directly Against Third-Party Funders? | 8 |
| III. Security For Costs | 9 |
| A. Financial Situation Of The Claimant | 10 |
| B. Investment Arbitration | 10 |
| 1. Additional Criteria | 10 |
| 2. Third-Party Funding As Abuse Or Bad Faith? | 12 |
| C. Commercial Arbitration | 14 |
| 1. Additional Criteria | 14 |
| 2. Application To Third-Party Funding Scenarios | 15 |
| a) Conclusion Of Funding Agreement As Material Change Of Circumstances? | 15 |
| b) Broader Fairness Concerns | 16 |
| IV. Outlook: Increasing Interest For Regulation | 17 |

Eliane Fischer/Michael Walbert

Efficient And Expedious Dispute Resolution In M&A Transactions 21

| | |
|---|----|
| I. Introduction | 21 |
| II. Pre-Signing Disputes | 22 |
| A. Typical Disputes | 22 |
| B. Dispute Resolution Methods | 23 |
| 1. Litigation v. Arbitration | 23 |
| 2. Fast-Track Arbitration | 24 |
| a) A Need For Speed? | 24 |
| b) What Is Fast-Track Arbitration? | 24 |
| c) Too Much Speed May Kill The Process | 25 |
| d) Institutional Rules For Fast-Track Arbitration | 26 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 3. Emergency Arbitrator | 27 |
| a) Urgency v. Speed | 27 |
| b) Interim Relief In International Arbitration | 27 |
| c) Institutional Emergency Arbitrator Rules | 28 |
| d) ICC Rules | 28 |
| C. Drafting Considerations | 29 |
| 1. Fast-Track Arbitration | 29 |
| 2. Emergency Arbitrator Proceedings | 30 |
| III. Pre-Closing Disputes | 30 |
| A. Typical Disputes | 30 |
| B. Dispute Resolution Methods | 33 |
| 1. Fast-Track Arbitration | 33 |
| 2. Dispute Boards | 33 |
| 3. Emergency Arbitrator | 36 |
| C. Drafting Considerations | 36 |
| 1. Fast-Track Arbitration | 36 |
| 2. Dispute Boards | 38 |
| IV. Post-Closing Disputes | 38 |
| A. Typical Disputes | 38 |
| 1. Validity And Rescission Of The Transaction Documentation | 39 |
| 2. Purchase Price Adjustments | 39 |
| 3. Representations, Warranties & Indemnities | 40 |
| B. Dispute Resolution Methods | 40 |
| 1. Expert Determination | 40 |
| a) Distinction Between Arbitration And Expert Determination | 40 |
| b) Expert Determination Procedure | 42 |
| c) Binding Nature And Enforceability Of Expert Determinations | 43 |
| 2. Fast-Track Arbitration | 44 |
| 3. Arbitration | 45 |
| C. Drafting Considerations | 45 |
| 1. Fast-Track Arbitration | 45 |
| 2. Expert Determination | 45 |
| 3. Arbitration | 46 |
| V. Conclusion | 47 |
| | |
| <i>Dietmar Czernich</i> | |
| The Theory Of Seperability In Austrian Arbitration Law – Is It On Stable Pillars? ... | 49 |
| I. Introduction | 49 |
| II. The Theory Of Seperability In International Arbitration Law | 50 |
| A. Notion and Concept | 50 |
| B. The Rule In The Uncitral Model Law | 51 |
| III. The Theory Of Seperability In Austrian Arbitration Law | 51 |
| A. Rejection Of Art 16 Of The Uncitral Model Law | 51 |
| B. Jurisprudence Of The Austrian Supreme Court | 53 |
| C. Drawbacks On Relying On The Parties Intentions | 55 |
| IV. Practical Concerns | 56 |
| V. Conclusion | 57 |

Ezequiel H. Vetulli/Emmanuel E. Kaufman

| | |
|--|----|
| Deciding Who Decides: Issues Arising Out Of The Failure To Fulfill Pre-Arbitration Requirements | 59 |
| I. Introduction | 59 |
| II. The Questions Before The Arbitrators | 60 |
| A. What Is The Nature Of Pre-Arbitration Requirements? | 60 |
| 1. The Difference Between “Admissibility” And “Jurisdiction” | 60 |
| 2. In Which Category Do Pre-Arbitration Requirements Fall? | 62 |
| 3. How Should The Parties’ Consent Be Interpreted? | 63 |
| 4. Is There Any Solution When The Parties’ Intention Remains Unclear? | 65 |
| B. May Pre-Arbitration Requirements Be Bypassed? | 65 |
| 1. Does The Nature Of Pre-Arbitration Requirements Impact The Possibility To Bypass Them? | 65 |
| 2. When May Pre-Arbitration Requirements Be Bypassed? | 66 |
| 3. What Have Arbitral Tribunals Ruled So Far? | 67 |
| III. Are The Arbitrators’ Decisions “final”? | 68 |
| IV. Questions Before The State Courts | 69 |
| A. What Is The Standard Of Court Review? | 70 |
| B. Should The Arbitrators’ Categorization Of Pre-Arbitration Requirements Be Reviewed? | 72 |
| V. Concluding Remarks | 73 |

Chapter II The Arbitrator and the Arbitration Procedure

Stephan Wilske/Chloë Edworthy

| | |
|--|----|
| The Predictable Arbitrator: A Blessing Or A Curse? | 77 |
| I. Introduction | 77 |
| II. The Dangers Of Arbitrators’ Predispositions | 79 |
| A. No Doctrine Of Binding Precedents | 80 |
| B. Varying Levels Of Adherence To (Outdated) Substantive Law In Issue | 81 |
| C. Does The Outcome Follow The Legal Reasoning Or Vice Versa? | 82 |
| D. The Chemistry And Exercise Of Influence Within The Arbitral Tribunal | 83 |
| E. When A Beneficial Predisposition Is Not Beneficial Anymore | 83 |
| III. The “Auto-Pilot” Arbitrator v. The “Tailor-Made” Arbitrator | 84 |
| A. The Arbitrator’s Predictable Ability To Be Case-Specific: Not Necessarily A Contradiction In Itself | 85 |
| B. The Arbitrator’s Unprecedented, But Tailor-Made Approach To The Specifics Of A New Case | 86 |
| IV. Predictably Good Not Predictably Bad | 86 |
| A. Predictable Honesty | 87 |
| B. Predictable Diligence And Transparency | 88 |
| C. Predictable Exercise Of Time And Cost Consciousness | 89 |
| V. Conclusion And Outlook | 90 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| <i>Wolfgang Hahnkamper</i> | |
| Bias, Conflict and Challenge Of Arbitrators, And Their Duty To Disclose: Austrian Supreme Court Decisions In The Period 2006–2016 | 91 |
| I. Update – Procedural Aspects | 93 |
| II. Update – Deadlines And Other Aspects Of Time | 94 |
| III. Cases | 95 |
| IV. When Must Arbitrators Disclose Potential Grounds For Challenge, And How Long Can Circumstances Be Used As Grounds For Challenge? | 100 |
| V. Overview And Summary | 101 |
| VI. Resume And Outlook | 103 |
| <i>Reza Mohtashami</i> | |
| Towards Procedural Predictability In International Arbitration: Confronting Guerrilla Tactics | 105 |
| I. Introduction | 105 |
| II. Adducing New Evidence Or Pleading A New Case Late In The Game | 107 |
| III. Tactical Or Deliberate Unavailability | 110 |
| IV. The Burden Of Unnecessarily Lengthy Submissions | 111 |
| V. Conclusion | 113 |
| <i>Nikolaus Pitkowitz and the 26 contributors</i> | |
| The Vienna Predictability Propositions: Paving The Road To Predictability In International Arbitration | 115 |
| I. Introduction | 115 |
| II. The Seven Predictability Propositions | 116 |
| III. World Café Reports | 120 |
| A. Arbitration Agreement | 120 |
| B. Applicable Law | 122 |
| 1. The Chosen Approach | 122 |
| 2. Discussion Summary | 122 |
| a) Importance Of The Applicable Law | 122 |
| b) Application Of The Law | 123 |
| c) How To Identify The Applicable Law? | 123 |
| d) The Importance Of The Applicable Law For Construing The Contract | 123 |
| e) Limitations to The Parties' Choice | 124 |
| 3. Conclusion | 124 |
| C. Arbitrator Information And Expectation | 124 |
| 1. Factual Findings | 125 |
| a) Participants predominantly rely on personal experience and hear-say as sources of arbitrator information. | 125 |
| b) Participants disagree on the relative importance of specific items of information. | 125 |
| c) Participants disagree on how arbitrators should deal with parties' expectations. | 125 |
| 2. Recommendations | 126 |
| a) If parties have specific expectations, they should communicate them to the arbitrator(s) as early in the arbitration as possible. | 126 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| b) Arbitral institutions, counsel and parties should encourage arbitrators to disclose information about their procedural preferences, <i>e.g.</i> by way of a standardized Questionnaire. | 126 |
| c) Parties should consider giving feedback to arbitrators, although when and how to do this may be challenging in the absence of formal procedures. | 127 |
| 3. Idea: Arbitrator Debriefing Of Post-awards | 128 |
| D. On The Road To Predictability, What Becomes Of Flexibility? | 128 |
| 1. Introduction | 128 |
| 2. What Is Predictability? | 129 |
| 3. What Is Flexibility? | 130 |
| 4. How Do “Predictability” And “Flexibility” Influence The Drafting Of Arbitration Agreements? | 132 |
| 5. Do “Predictability” And “Flexibility” Play A Role In The Constitution Of Arbitral Tribunals? | 133 |
| 6. Conclusion | 133 |
| E. Procedural Order No. 1 | 134 |
| 1. Cut-Off Dates | 135 |
| 2. Decision On Costs | 137 |
| 3. Conclusions | 138 |
| F. Guidelines And Protocols | 138 |
| 1. Objective | 138 |
| 2. Discussion | 139 |
| 3. Outcome/Recommendation | 139 |
| G. Case Management Conference | 140 |
| H. Streamlining Of The Proceedings And Early Evaluation | 141 |
| 1. Core Policy Considerations | 142 |
| a) Transparency | 142 |
| b) Proactivity | 143 |
| c) Interactivity | 145 |
| d) Proportionality | 146 |
| 2. Recommendations | 146 |
| I. Settlement | 146 |
| 1. Interests And Roles Of The “Stakeholders” In The Proceedings | 147 |
| a) Parties | 147 |
| b) Arbitrators | 147 |
| c) Counsel | 147 |
| 2. Suggestions | 147 |
| J. Time And Cost Management | 148 |
| K. Secretaries | 151 |
| 1. Proposition: Arbitral institutions should take a proactive role with respect to the use of administrative secretaries and encourage transparency. | 151 |
| 2. Proposition: Arbitral tribunals should adopt a transparent approach towards assistance they receive by others. | 152 |
| 3. Proposition: Administrative secretaries should be mindful about their responsibilities and act within the limits of their role. | 153 |
| L. Experts | 153 |
| 1. Focus | 153 |
| 2. Propositions | 154 |
| a) Know your parties and your tribunal. | 154 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| b) Encourage the tribunal to appoint one or more experts itself or to get involved with party-appointed experts at an early stage. | 155 |
| M. Ethics And Guerilla Tactics/Cross-Examination | 156 |
| 1. Late Filing Of Submissions And/Or New Evidence | 157 |
| 2. Unavailability Of Parties/Counsel | 158 |
| 3. Extensive Submissions | 158 |
| 4. Cross-Examination | 159 |
| 5. Conclusion | 159 |
| <i>Irene Welser/Alexandra Stoffl</i> | |
| The Use And Usefulness Of Scott Schedules In International Arbitration | 161 |
| I. Introduction | 161 |
| II. Scott Schedule – What To Expect | 162 |
| A. “Spreadsheets” In Arbitration | 162 |
| B. What Is A Scott Schedule? | 163 |
| C. Formal Requirements | 163 |
| D. The Basic Idea Behind The Scott Schedule | 164 |
| 1. Presentation Of Key Issues/Quantum Issues By The Parties | 165 |
| 2. Presentation Of Corresponding/Deviating Opinions Of Party-Appointed Experts | 167 |
| III. The Strengths And Weaknesses Of Scott Schedules – All That Glitters Is (Not) Gold | 168 |
| A. Advantages Of Scott Schedules | 168 |
| B. Disadvantages Of Scott Schedules | 170 |
| IV. Conclusion | 172 |
| <i>Silvia Petruzzino</i> | |
| Relevance And Applicability Of Trade Usages In International Arbitration | 175 |
| I. Introduction | 175 |
| II. The Categories And Sources Of Trade Usages | 176 |
| A. Uniform Law And Codified Principles | 177 |
| B. Trade Practices | 179 |
| C. General Principles Of Laws | 179 |
| D. The Lex Mercatoria | 179 |
| III. Trade Usages As Implicit Or Implied Parts Of International Agreements | 181 |
| A. Trade Usages Applied Via Lex Causae | 181 |
| B. Trade Usages Applied Via Arbitration Rules | 182 |
| IV. Trade Usages As The Lex Causae Of International Agreements | 184 |
| A. Trade Usages As The Lex Causae In International Commercial Arbitration In Light Of The Principle On Party Autonomy | 184 |
| B. The Applicability Of Trade Usages In Arbitration Proceedings When There Is No Parties’ Choice Of Applicable Law | 187 |
| V. Conclusions | 190 |
| <i>Wolfgang Kühn</i> | |
| Procedural Tools In Support Of Predictability In International Arbitration | 191 |
| I. Predictability In International Arbitration | 191 |
| II. The Importance Of Predictability In Practice | 191 |
| III. Procedural Predictability Is At Stake | 192 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| A. Establishing The Case | 192 |
| B. Adverse Documents | 193 |
| C. Consequences For Predictability | 193 |
| D. The IBA Rules On The Taking Of Evidence In International Arbitration | 194 |
| IV. The Loss Of Predictability In International Arbitration | 194 |
| V. The Necessity To Take Action In Support Of Predictability | 195 |
| | |
| Chapter III The Award and the Courts | 197 |
| <i>Helmut Ortner/Yoanna Schuch</i> | |
| How To Apply The Applicable Law In International Arbitration | 199 |
| I. Introduction | 199 |
| II. Arbitral Awards: Wrong But Bulletproof? | 200 |
| A. Violations Of (International) Public Policy | 201 |
| B. Excess Of Authority | 202 |
| C. Manifest Disregard Of Law | 202 |
| III. A Blessing Or A Curse? | 204 |
| A. Empowering The Arbitrator: The Goal To Render The “Best” Decision | 205 |
| B. Reining In The Arbitrator: The Goal Of Strictly Applying The Law | 208 |
| IV. The Guiding Star For The “Good Arbitrator”: Extreme Caution | 211 |
| V. Grabbing The Steering Wheel | 215 |
| VI. Conclusion | 217 |
| | |
| <i>Mathias Wittinghofer</i> | |
| The Race Towards Predictability: Does It Threaten The Effectiveness Of Modern Arbitration? | 219 |
| I. Users Of Arbitration Look For Flexibility | 219 |
| II. Flexibility And Predictability Are Mutually Exclusive | 220 |
| III. Users Still Also Want Predictability | 220 |
| IV. Arbitrators Today Offer Neither Predictability Nor Flexibility | 221 |
| V. Arbitrators Curtail Party Autonomy | 222 |
| VI. How To Solve The Dilemma: Concentrate On The Strengths Of Arbitration – Flexibility, Not Predictability | 223 |
| | |
| <i>Markus Schifferl/Venus Valentina Wong</i> | |
| Decisions Of The Austrian Supreme Court On Arbitration In 2015 And 2016 | 225 |
| I. Form Of the Arbitration Agreement | 226 |
| A. Facts Of The Case | 226 |
| B. Decision Of The Supreme Court | 226 |
| C. Additional Remarks | 227 |
| II. Right to Be Heard | 228 |
| A. Facts of the Case | 228 |
| B. Decision of the Supreme Court | 229 |
| C. Additional Remarks | 230 |
| III. Right To Be Heard | 231 |
| A. Facts Of The Case | 231 |
| B. Decision Of The Supreme Court | 232 |
| C. Additional Remarks | 232 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| IV. Enforcement Of A Foreign Arbitral Award | 233 |
| A. Facts Of The Case | 233 |
| B. Decision Of The Supreme Court | 233 |
| C. Additional Remarks | 235 |
| V. Arbitrator's Liability | 235 |
| A. The Facts Of The Case | 235 |
| B. Decision Of The Supreme Court | 237 |
| C. Additional Remarks | 238 |
| VI. Challenge Of An Arbitrator | 239 |
| A. The Facts Of The Case | 239 |
| B. Decision Of The Supreme Court | 240 |
| C. Additional Remarks | 242 |
| Chapter IV Investment Arbitration | 245 |
| <i>Diego Brian Gosis</i> | |
| Remedies In Investment Arbitration: How To Redress Expropriation Claims | 247 |
| I. Introduction | 247 |
| II. The Treaty Standard | 248 |
| III. Lawful and Unlawful Wrongful Expropriation? | 250 |
| IV. The Issue Under Treaty Interpretation Rules | 252 |
| V. Conclusion | 254 |
| Index 2007–2017 | 255 |