

COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION:
CASES AND PROBLEMS
Third Edition

2018 Update

By

Christopher R. Drahozal
John M. Rounds Professor of Law
University of Kansas School of Law

Copyright © 2018
by Christopher R. Drahozal

July 17, 2018

Carolina Academic Press

700 Kent Street

Durham, North Carolina 27701

Telephone (919) 489-7486

Fax (919) 493-5668

E-mail: cap@cap-press.com www.cap-press.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Chapter 1 Introduction to Commercial Arbitration	1
Chapter 2 Enforcing Domestic Agreements to Arbitrate	9
Chapter 3 Federal Law Restrictions on the Enforceability of Arbitration Agreements	27
Chapter 4 The Federal Arbitration Act and State Law	67
Chapter 5 Enforcing International Agreements to Arbitrate	77
Chapter 6 The Arbitration Proceeding	81
Chapter 7 Enforcing Arbitral Awards.....	113
Chapter 8 Drafting Arbitration Clauses.....	133
Documentary Supplement.....	135
New York Convention – New Ratifications	135
Amendment to 48 C.F.R. § 222.7404(c)	136
CFPB, Final Rule: Arbitration Agreements (2017)	137
H.R. 1374, Arbitration Fairness Act of 2017	148
H.R. 4570, Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Harassment Act.....	153
Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 1281.96 (effective Jan. 1, 2015).....	156
Judicial Council of California, Amendments to the Standards for Neutral Arbitrators in Contractual Arbitration (2014)	159
American Arbitration Association, Commercial Arbitration Rules (2013)	177
American Arbitration Association, Consumer Arbitration Rules (2014)	214
JAMS Employment Arbitration Rules and Procedures (2014)	242
Amendment to UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2013).....	264
UNCITRAL Rules on Transparency in Treaty-based Investor-State Arbitration (2013).....	265
American Arbitration Association/ICDR, International Arbitration Rules (2014)	273
ICC Arbitration Rules (2017)	304
LCIA Arbitration Rules (2014)	337
International Bar Association, IBA Guidelines on Conflicts of Interest in International Arbitration (2014)	374

International Bar Association, IBA Guidelines on Party Representation in International Arbitration (2013)	394
American Arbitration Association, Drafting Dispute Resolution Clauses—A Practical Guide (2013)	395

Chapter 1 Introduction to Commercial Arbitration

Add the following as new note 5 after the Tullock excerpt on page 8 and renumber the existing notes accordingly:

5. In March 2015, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau issued its Final Report to Congress on the use of pre-dispute arbitration clauses in consumer financial services contracts. *See* CFPB, Arbitration Study: Report to Congress, pursuant to Dodd–Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act § 1028(a) (Mar. 2015), http://files.consumerfinance.gov/f/201503_cfpb_arbitration-study-report-to-congress-2015.pdf [hereinafter CFPB Final Report]. The study was required by Section 1028(a) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, Pub. L. No. 111-203 (2010). Among the study’s many findings about AAA arbitration proceedings were the following:

- “From 2010 through 2012, an average of 616 individual AAA cases were filed per year for six product markets combined: credit card; checking account/debit cards; payday loans; prepaid cards; private student loans; and auto loans.”
- “Forty percent of the arbitration filings involved a dispute over the amount of debt a consumer allegedly owed to a company, with no additional affirmative claim by either party. In another 29% of the filings, consumers disputed alleged debts, but also brought affirmative claims against companies.”
- “The average consumer affirmative claim amount in arbitration filings with affirmative consumer claims was around \$27,000. The median was around \$11,500. Across all six product markets, about 25 disputes a year involved affirmative consumer claims of \$1,000 or less.”
- “Almost all of the arbitration proceedings involved companies with repeat experience in the forum. And when consumers had counsel, counsel was generally a repeat player in arbitration.”

- “Of the 1,060 arbitration cases filed in 2010 and 2011, so far as we could determine, arbitrators issued decisions in just under 33%. In approximately 25%, the record reflects that the parties reached a settlement. The remaining cases ended in an unknown manner or were technically pending but dormant as of early 2013.”
- “Of the 341 cases filed in 2010 and 2011 that were resolved by an arbitrator and where we were able to ascertain the outcome, consumers obtained relief regarding their affirmative claims in 32 disputes. Consumers obtained debt forbearance in 46 cases (in five of which the consumers also obtained affirmative relief). The total amount of affirmative relief awarded was \$172,433 and total debt forbearance was \$189,107.”
- “Of the 244 cases in which companies made claims or counterclaims that were resolved by arbitrators in a manner that we were able to determine, companies obtained relief in 227 disputes. The total amount of such relief was \$2,806,662.”

CFPB Final Report, *supra*, at 11-12.

Add the following to the end of note 1 after *Smith v. AAA* on page 18:

; *Roberts v. AT&T Mobility LLC*, 877 F.3d 833, 837 (9th Cir. 2017) (“There is no state action here.... The FAA merely gives AT&T the private choice to arbitrate, and does not ‘encourage’ arbitration such that AT&T’s conduct is attributable to the state.”); *Everett v. Paul Davis Restoration, Inc.*, 771 F.3d 380, 386 (7th Cir. 2014) (“Ms. Everett also alleges that the arbitration agreement violated Ms. Everett’s due process rights. We find this argument wholly unavailing, as this argument fails at the most basic level—none of the parties involved are state actors.”); *Mave Enterprises, Inc. v. Travelers Indem. Co.*, 162 Cal. Rptr. 3d 671, 695 (Cal. App. 2013) (“Nor does the confirmation of an arbitration award constitute state action.”). *Cf. Wellness Int’l Network, Ltd. v. Sharif*, 135 S. Ct. 1932, 1949 (2015) (Alito, J., concurring) (“No one believes that an arbitrator exercises ‘[t]he judicial Power of the United States,’ Art. III, § 1, in an ordinary, run-of-the mill arbitration.”).

Add the following to the end of note 1 after *AMF Brunswick* on page 22:

See Druco Restaurants, Inc. v. Steak n Shake Enterprises, Inc., 2013 U.S. Dist. WL 5779646, at *6 (S.D. Ind. Oct. 9, 2013) (citing “split amongst the Circuit Courts of Appeals as to whether or not non-binding arbitration is subject to the FAA”), *aff’d on other grounds*, 765 F.3d 776 (7th Cir. 2014).

Add the following after the citation to *Lynn* in note 2 after *AMF Brunswick* on page 23:

; Trujillo v. Gomez, 2015 WL 1757870, at *9 (S.D. Cal. Apr. 17, 2015) (“Absent authority for compelling mediation in an action brought by Plaintiffs, the Court declines to do so.”) (following *Advanced Bodycare*).

Add the following as new note 3 after *AMF Brunswick* on page 23:

3. Should a court look to state law or federal common law for the definition of arbitration under the FAA? Noting that the circuits are split on the issue, the Second Circuit has held that federal common law provides the definition, explaining as follows:

“Congress sometimes intends that a statutory term be given content by the application of state law,” but absent “a plain indication to the contrary” we presume that “the application of the federal act [is not] dependent on state law.” Unless “uniform nationwide application ... clearly was not intended,” we apply a federal standard without reference to state law.

The other Courts of Appeals that have considered this question have reached differing conclusions.... The circuits that apply federal common law have relied on congressional intent to create a uniform national arbitration policy.... By contrast, the circuits that apply state law have “articulated few reasons for doing so.” ...

We agree with the compelling analysis of the circuits that have followed federal law in defining the scope of “arbitration” under the FAA. Applying state law would create “a patchwork in which the FAA will mean one thing in one state and something else in another,” and there is no indication that Congress intended that result. Consequently, we hold that the District Court correctly applied federal common law in determining that the third-physician clause is an “arbitration” agreement under the FAA.

Bakoss v. Certain Underwriters at Lloyd’s, 707 F.3d 140, 143-44 (2d Cir.), *cert. denied*, 571 U.S. 825 (2013).

Replace the first two paragraphs of note 2 after the Ware excerpt on page 60 with the following:

2. As discussed in Chapter 3, in recent years Congress has enacted a number of statutes limiting the enforceability of pre-dispute arbitration agreements in particular types of contracts and types of claims. It also has considered but not enacted bills that would restrict the use of arbitration clauses in nursing home contracts and consumer lending agreements, among others. In addition, the proposed Arbitration Fairness Act provides more broadly that “no predispute arbitration agreement shall be valid or enforceable if it requires arbitration of an employment dispute, consumer dispute, antitrust dispute, or civil rights dispute.” H.R. 1374, 115th Cong., § 3 (2013) (adding 9 U.S.C. § 402(a)). Congress has held several hearings on the Arbitration Fairness Act, but has not passed it.

The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, Pub. L. No. 111-203 (2010), gives both the SEC and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) authority to prohibit or impose conditions on the use of pre-dispute arbitration agreements in contracts they regulate, *id.* §§ 921 & 1028. On July 10, 2017, the CFPB issued a final rule regulating the use of arbitration clauses in consumer financial services contracts. *See* Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, Final Rule: Arbitration Agreements (July 2017), reprinted at pages 137-147 of this Update. On November 1, 2017, President Trump signed into law Public Law No. 115-74, 131 Stat. 1243 (2017), disapproving the CFPB rule under the Congressional Review Act. For further discussion of the CFPB Rule and rules proposed or adopted by other federal agencies, see § 3.02, *infra* at pages 33-37.

Chapter 2 Enforcing Domestic Agreements to Arbitrate

Add the following as new note 5 after *First Options* on page 76:

5. In *BG Group PLC v. Republic of Argentina*, the Supreme Court addressed the question whether, “[i]n disputes involving a multi-staged dispute resolution process, does a court or instead the arbitrator determine whether a precondition to arbitration has been satisfied?” Petn. for Certiorari, at i, *BG Group PLC v. Republic of Argentina* (No. 12-138) (July 27, 2012). Multi-step dispute resolution clauses — which require parties to negotiate or mediate before they can go to arbitration — are increasingly common. *BG* group involved a less common form of “multi-staged dispute resolution process”: a bilateral investment treaty (BIT) that required a party to litigate for 18 months before proceeding to arbitration. The D.C. Circuit had held that a court, rather than the arbitrators, should determine whether the condition precedent in the treaty had been satisfied. *Republic of Argentina v. BG Group PLC*, 665 F.3d 1363, 1373 (D.C. Cir. 2012). The Supreme Court reversed, finding “the local litigation requirement [to be] highly analogous to procedural provisions that ... this Court ha[s] found are for arbitrators, not courts, primarily to interpret and to apply” and concluding that the fact that the case involved an investment arbitration did not change that usual result. *BG Group PLC v. Republic of Argentina*, 134 S. Ct. 1198, 1207-08 (2014) (citing *Howsam*).

Add the following citation to the end of note 2 after *Buckeye* on page 80:

See also Rowan v. Brookdale Senior Living Cmtys., Inc., 2015 WL 9906264, at *4 (W.D. Mich. June 1, 2015) (“This Court joins with the majority of courts to consider this issue and agrees with the reasoning in *Spahr* and *In re Morgan Stanley*. As a defense to a contract containing an arbitration clause, the question whether the signor had the mental capacity to enter into a contract necessarily addresses whether any agreement to arbitrate was made, an issue reserved for the court not the arbitrator.”), *aff’d*, 647 F. Appx. 607 (2016).

Add the following citation to the end of note 5 after *Buckeye* on page 81:

; *see also* Nitro-Lift Techs., L.L.C. v. Howard, 568 U.S. 17, 22 (2012) (per curiam) (summarily reversing Oklahoma Supreme Court and holding that arbitrator must decide whether noncompetition agreement that included arbitration clause is illegal).

Add the following citations to the end of note 3 after *Rent-A-Center* on page 87:

; *Tiri v. Lucky Chances, Inc.*, 226 Cal. App. 4th 231, 246 (2014) (“Although we conclude that the delegation clause is a contract of adhesion and procedurally unconscionable, we conclude that it is nonetheless valid because it is not substantively unconscionable. The delegation clause is not overly harsh, and does not sanction one-sided results.”); *Mohamed v. Uber Tech., Inc.*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 75288 (N.D. Cal. June 9, 2015) (holding delegation clause substantively unconscionable because plaintiff “would be unable to access the arbitral forum to even litigate delegation issues if the fee-splitting clause is enforced”), *rev’d in part*, 848 F.3d 1201, 1211 (9th Cir. 2016) (holding delegation clause not procedurally unconscionable because of opt-out right in contract; therefore no need to address substantive unconscionability).

Insert the following as note 4 on page 87 and renumber previous note 4 as note 5:

4. Should the court consider the strength of a contract defense before sending it to the arbitrators pursuant to a delegation clause? The courts of appeals are divided on whether a court still must send the matter to the arbitrators if the defense is “wholly groundless.” *See, e.g., Jones v. Waffle House, Inc.*, 866 F.3d 1257, 1268-69 (11th Cir. 2017) (recognizing circuit split). In *Henry Schein, Inc. v. Archer & White Sales, Inc.*, the U.S. Supreme Court granted certiorari to resolve the circuit split. No. 17-1272, *cert. granted*, 2018 WL 1280843 (June 25, 2018). The case will be argued sometime during October Term 2018, and the Court likely will issue its decision by the end of June 2019.

Revise the quoted language from Rule R-7(a) of the AAA Commercial Arbitration Rules in the first sentence of former note 4 after *Rent-A-Center* on page 87 to read as follows:

“[t]he arbitrator shall have the power to rule on his or her own jurisdiction, including any objections with respect to the existence, scope or validity of the arbitration agreement or to the arbitrability of any claim or counterclaim”

Replace the first paragraph of note 3 *Perry Homes* on page 96 with the following:

3. The court in *Perry Homes* held that prejudice was required to find waiver. As the court noted, not all courts require a finding of prejudice. *See, e.g.,* *Cabinetree of Wisconsin, Inc. v. Kraftmaid Cabinetry, Inc.*, 50 F.3d 388, 390-91 (7th Cir. 1995); *Madison Foods, Inc. v. Fleming Cos.*, 325 B.R. 687, 692 (Bankr. D. Del. 2005) (describing Seventh Circuit’s approach as the “minority view”). For a recent decision holding that prejudice is not required, see *Parsons v. Halliburton Energy Services, Inc.*, 785 S.E.2d 844 (W. Va. 2016), which reasoned as follows:

[O]n the question of prejudice or detrimental reliance, the distinction between the common law doctrines of estoppel and waiver is simple: estoppel requires proof of prejudice or detrimental reliance; waiver does not. We therefore hold that the common-law doctrine of waiver focuses on the conduct of the party against whom waiver is sought, and requires that party to have intentionally relinquished a known right. A waiver may be express or may be inferred from actions or conduct, but all of the attendant facts, taken together, must amount to an intentional relinquishment of a known right. There is no requirement of prejudice or detrimental reliance by the party asserting waiver.

...

[W]e apply the general state law of contracts pertaining to waiver and reach an ineluctable conclusion: The right to arbitration, like any other contract right, can be waived. To establish waiver of a contractual right to arbitrate, the party asserting waiver must show that the waiving party knew of the right to arbitrate and either expressly waived the right, or, based on the totality of the circumstances, acted inconsistently with the right to arbitrate through acts or language. There is no requirement that the party asserting waiver show prejudice or detrimental reliance.

Id. at 851-53.

Revise the citations to the AAA Commercial Arbitration Rules in Chapter 2 as follows:

p.97, n.5: Update the citation from AAA Rule R-48(a) to AAA Rule R-52(a)

p.99, Problem 2.5(f): Update the citation from AAA Rule R-48(a) to AAA Rule R-52(a)

Add the following citation before the phrase “By comparison” in note 4 after *Specht* on page 112:

See also Sgouros v. TransUnion Corp., 817 F.3d 1029, 1035 (7th Cir. 2016) (“But what cinches the case for Sgouros is the fact that TransUnion's site actively misleads the customer. The block of bold text below the scroll box told the user that clicking on the box constituted his authorization for TransUnion to obtain his personal information. It says nothing about contractual terms. No reasonable person would think that hidden within that disclosure was also the message that the same click constituted acceptance of the Service Agreement.”). *Compare* Meyer v. Uber Techs., Inc., 868 F.3d 66, 79 (2d Cir. 2017) (concluding that “the Uber App provided reasonably conspicuous notice of the Terms of Service as a matter of California law”) with Cullinane v. Uber Techs., Inc., No. 16-2023, 2018 WL 3099388, at *8 (1st Cir. June 25, 2018) (concluding that “the terms of the [Uber] Agreement were not reasonably communicated to the Plaintiffs”).

Add the following citation to the end of note 3 after *Gateway* on page 124:

See generally Howard v. Ferrellgas Partners, L.P., 748 F.3d 975, 982 (10th Cir. 2014) (“The problem is Ferrellgas’s rolling contract formation theory may be about as controversial an idea as exists today in the staid world of contract law. Some states endorse the theory, but others reject it—holding that a seller’s later-arriving written contract constitutes at most only a proposal to modify a preexisting oral contract, and that a buyer’s assent to the proposed modification won’t be inferred simply from the buyer’s continuing the preexisting oral contract.”).

Replace *Gibson* on pages 125-128 with the following:

BAKER v. BRISTOL CARE, INC.

Supreme Court of Missouri

450 S.W.3d 770 (2014)

Richard B. Teitelman, Judge

Bristol Care Inc. and David Furnell (Appellants) appeal an order overruling their motion to compel arbitration. They contend that the circuit court erred by not compelling arbitration because the arbitration agreement between Bristol and its employee, Carla Baker, is valid and enforceable.

This Court affirms the circuit court’s order because there was no consideration to create a valid arbitration agreement. First, Baker’s continued at-will employment does not provide consideration for the arbitration agreement. Second, the fact that Bristol retroactively could modify, amend or revoke the agreement means that Bristol’s promise to arbitrate is illusory and does not constitute consideration for Baker’s agreement to arbitrate.

FACTS

Bristol promoted Baker from her position as an hourly employee to a salaried managerial position at one of Bristol’s long-term care facilities. Bristol drafted an employment agreement and arbitration agreement for Baker to sign. The parties signed the agreements contemporaneously at the time of Baker’s promotion.

The employment agreement provided that Baker’s employment would “continue indefinitely” unless Baker gave 60 days notice or Bristol elected to terminate her employment in one of four ways: (1) with five days’ written notice “at [Bristol’s] sole option;” (2) without notice if Bristol paid Baker five days’ compensation; (3) without notice if, in Bristol’s “sole opinion,” Baker violates the employment agreement in a way that “jeopardizes the general operation of the facility or the care, comfort or security of its residents;” or (4) without notice for “dishonesty, insubordination, moral turpitude or incompetence.” The employment agreement also provided that Baker would receive increased pay and employment benefits, including a license to live in the facility rent-free.

The arbitration agreement provides that all legal claims the parties may have against one another will be resolved by binding arbitration. The arbitration agreement provides that consideration consists of Baker’s continued employment and mutual promises to resolve claims through arbitration. Section 3 of the arbitration agreement, titled “Employment–At–Will,” provides:

This Agreement is not, and shall not be construed to create, a contract of employment, express or implied, and does not alter Employee's status as an at-will employee.

Notwithstanding this Agreement, either Employee or Company can terminate the employment ... at any time, for any reason, with or without cause at the option of the Employee or the Company.

Finally, the arbitration agreement provides that Bristol specifically "reserves the right to amend, modify or revoke this agreement upon thirty (30) days' prior written notice to the Employee."

Bristol terminated Baker from her position as administrator of the long-term care facility. Baker filed a class action lawsuit against Appellants seeking compensation for allegedly unpaid overtime hours. Appellants filed a motion to compel arbitration. The circuit court overruled the motion. This appeal followed.

ANALYSIS

... *II. Validity of Arbitration Agreement*

... "The essential elements of any contract, including one for arbitration, are "offer, acceptance, and bargained for consideration." Consideration "consists either of a promise (to do or refrain from doing something) or the transfer or giving up of something of value to the other party."

Appellants argue that there are two sources of consideration for the arbitration agreement: (1) Baker's promotion, continued employment and attendant benefits; and (2) Bristol's promise to arbitrate its claims arising out of the employment relationship between it and Baker and to assume the costs of arbitration....

A. Continued Employment

Bristol argues that Baker's acceptance of continued employment, with the attendant increase in salary and benefits, plus the limits on Bristol's right to terminate her employment, constitute consideration to support the arbitration agreement. Baker argues that her employment remained at-will and that continued at-will employment does not constitute valid consideration to support the arbitration agreement.

The Missouri Court of Appeals has held that continued at-will employment is not valid consideration to support an agreement requiring the employee to arbitrate

his or her claims against the employer. [See, e.g., *Morrow v. Hallmark Cards, Inc.*, 273 S.W.3d 15, 25 (Mo.App.2008).] An offer of continued at-will employment is not valid consideration because the employer makes no legally enforceable promise to do or refrain from doing anything it is not already entitled to do. The employer still can terminate the employee immediately for any reason. While the federal courts have reached a different result, this Court rejects that approach and, instead, adopts the analysis employed [in the] court of appeals cases, which hold that continued at-will employment is not valid consideration to create an enforceable contract.¹ The issue becomes whether the employment and arbitration agreements altered Baker's status as an at-will employee.

...

The employment agreement provides that Baker's employment will "continue indefinitely" unless Bristol elected to terminate Baker by giving her five days' written notice "at [Bristol's] sole option" or terminating her without notice and paying Baker five days' compensation. The employment agreement permits Bristol to terminate Baker immediately without notice for any reason by paying her what amounts to a severance package worth five days' pay. There is no guaranteed duration of employment. The lack of a defined duration of employment is consistent with at-will employment.

The arbitration agreement drafted by Bristol confirms that the parties understood that Baker was an at-will employee. Section 3 of the arbitration agreement provides that the agreement "does not alter Employee's status as an at-will employee." The agreement then provides that "[n]otwithstanding this Agreement, either Employee or Company can terminate the employment ... at any time, for any reason, with or without cause at the option of the Employee or the Company." These provisions amount to an unequivocal, positive representation by Bristol that Baker's status is that of "an at-will employee." Under these facts, Baker is an at-will employee. The various promises that the parties exchanged were all incidents of Baker's continued at-will employment. Neither Baker's continued at-will employment nor the incidents of that employment provide consideration supporting an obligation to arbitrate disputes with Bristol.

...

B. Mutual Promises to Arbitrate

Appellants contend that the arbitration agreement also is supported by mutual promises to arbitrate. As the dissent explains at length, bilateral contracts are supported by consideration and enforceable when each party promises to undertake some legal duty or liability. These promises, however, must be binding,

¹ The principal federal case is *Berkley v. Dillard's Inc.*, 450 F.3d 775, 777 (8th Cir. 2006). In *Berkley*, the Eighth Circuit held that continued employment constitutes consideration and acceptance sufficient to create an enforceable contract. Subsequent federal district court cases have followed *Berkley*.

not illusory. A promise is illusory when one party retains the unilateral right to amend the agreement and avoid its obligations.

In this case, Bristol's alleged mutual promise to arbitrate is conditioned on Bristol's unilateral "right to amend, modify or revoke this agreement upon thirty (30) days' prior written notice to the Employee." The quoted language does not limit Bristol's authority to modify the arbitration agreement unilaterally and retroactively. If Bristol retains unilateral authority to amend the agreement retroactively, its promise to arbitrate is illusory and is not consideration.²

Bristol asserts that the requirement of prior written notice means that any modifications must apply prospectively only. The fact that Bristol must give prior written notice of an amendment to the arbitration agreement does not preclude Bristol from giving Baker prior written notice that, effective in thirty days, Bristol retroactively is disclaiming a promise made in the arbitration agreement. For instance, if in the course of an ongoing arbitration process, Bristol concluded that the process was not favorable, Bristol could provide Baker notice that, effective in 30 days, it no longer would consider itself bound by the results of the arbitration. While the dissent concludes summarily that no court would adopt a construction of the agreement allowing Bristol to disclaim or modify its arbitration promises unilaterally at any time for its own benefit, the fact remains that the language of the agreement would permit Bristol to do just that.

...

Conclusion

Baker's continued at-will employment and Bristol's promise to resolve claims through arbitration do not provide consideration to form a valid arbitration agreement. The judgment overruling appellant's motion to compel arbitration is affirmed.

PAUL C. WILSON, Judge.

...

Where I part company with the majority opinion ... is its conclusion that no contract was formed between Ms. Baker and Bristol Care because there was no consideration to make their respective promises legally binding. I disagree on this point and, therefore, respectfully dissent.

...

² The dissent lists the various arbitration promises that both parties made. The list is accurate. The list overlooks the fact that each of these arbitration-related promises is subject to unilateral modification or abrogation by Bristol. Just as adding several zeros equals zero, adding several illusory promises equals an illusory promise.

II. Consideration as an Element of Contract Formation

...
 There have been numerous opinions from this Court and others on the subject of consideration, and scholars have filled countless pages in their efforts to explain what those opinions mean. The subtle nuances in the application of this doctrine at the outer edges are as complex as any in the common law. But no matter how much these nuances may thrill scholars, haunt courts, and torture first-year law students, they are unnecessary to the decision of this case. This case requires only the straightforward application of three basic principles of consideration that have been stated and applied by Missouri courts without hesitation or qualification for generations.

...
 The first relevant principle of consideration is that it is a bargained-for exchange. In other words, when a promise is given in exchange for a benefit to the promisor, or in exchange for a detriment to the promisee, this bargain supplies the consideration needed to form a contract. In this way, consideration demonstrates the seriousness of the parties' bargain and provides assurance that they intended a promise to be enforceable in a court of law.

...
 The second relevant principle regarding consideration is that it requires no qualitative analysis. Consideration either is present (and a contract is formed), or it is not. Courts have no authority to attempt to value the bargained-for consideration in an effort to determine whether the promisor is—or is not—receiving “adequate” return for the promise given.

...
 The third relevant principle is that all contemporaneous promises by one party are deemed to have been given in exchange for the aggregate benefit to that party or the aggregate detriment to the other party. Courts are not allowed to unravel the parties' bargain in hindsight, i.e., to allocate the consideration between and among some—but not all—of the promisor's undertakings, and then use the results of this exercise as a basis for refusing to enforce the entirety of the parties' bargain. Accordingly, there does not have to be separate consideration for each promise when a collection of promises is given in exchange for a collection of promises.

III. There was Consideration for the Parties' Exchange of Promises

Prior to her promotion as facility administrator, Ms. Baker worked as an hourly (i.e., “non-exempt”) employee pursuant to a simple unilateral contract. Bristol Care promised to pay a specified wage if Ms. Baker worked—not promised to work—in Bristol Care's facilities. That contract was terminable at any time by either party. The agreement with respect to Ms. Baker's promotion to facility administrator, however, was quite different. As Ms. Baker concedes, she was “required to sign the employment document and the arbitration document as a

condition of her employment” as facility administrator. The following is a list of some, though not all, of the promises each party made to the other at the outset of their new arrangement.

Bristol Care promised:

- To employ Ms Baker as the Administrator of its facility for an indefinite term, subject to its right to terminate her employment: (a) without notice for certain specified grounds, and (b) with either five days’ notice or five days’ pay in all other circumstances
- To pay Ms. Baker a monthly salary for her services
- To advance, without interest, \$350 to Ms. Baker in the middle of each month against her salary, which was to be paid at the end of each month
- To pay Ms. Baker a bonus if specified financial targets are met, the amount of which would be increased or decreased based on Ms. Baker’s performance, though Bristol Care retained the right to eliminate the bonus program without notice
- To allow Ms. Baker a specific number of paid vacation days during her first three and a half years of service and, thereafter, in accordance with company policy
- To provide Ms. Baker (and one approved co-habitant) with living accommodations in the company’s facility during her employment and subject to stated limitations
- To provide all utilities, including basic cable television, for Ms. Baker’s living accommodations
- To arbitrate, with specified exceptions, all claims or controversies Ms. Baker may have against the company arising out of, relating to, or in association with her employment
- To arbitrate, with specified exceptions, all claims or controversies the company may have against Ms. Baker arising out of, relating to, or in association with her employment
- To initiate and conduct the arbitration of such claims before a single arbitrator using the procedures (including the arbitrator selection procedures) in the American Arbitration Association’s Rules for the Resolution of Employment Disputes in effect at the time the claim is filed
- To pay all arbitration fees, including the arbitrator’s fees and expenses, except for the filing fee for claims initiated by Ms. Baker or the fees and expenses of Ms. Baker, her attorney, and her witnesses
- To maintain the confidentiality of the existence, subject, and results of any arbitration with Ms. Baker

Ms. Baker promised:

- To serve as Administrator in Bristol Care's facility for an indefinite period, subject to her right to terminate this employment with 60 days prior notice
- To operate the facility in accordance with state rules and regulations governing residential care facilities, as well as the Bristol Care's Administrative Guide and other policies, and to manage facility staff in accordance with the Bristol Care Employee Handbook
- To refrain, during her employment and for a period of two years thereafter, from disseminating any of Bristol Care's confidential information to individuals outside the company
- To refrain, during her employment and for a period of two years thereafter, from soliciting or rendering residential care services to persons who were (a) residents of the facility during the last year of Ms. Baker's employment, or (b) solicited to become residents by Ms. Baker during the last six months of her employment
- To refrain, during her employment and for a period of two years thereafter, from disrupting or interfering with contractual or other relationships between Bristol Care and its residents, managers or vendors
- To abide by the policies of Bristol Care and the State of Missouri concerning residents' rights and the handling of residents' funds, and to refrain (and ensure that all hourly employees at the facility and all of Ms. Baker's relatives residing with her at the facility refrain) from engaging in specified transactions with residents
- To arbitrate, with specified exceptions, all claims or controversies Bristol Care may have against her arising out of, relating to, or in association with her employment
- To arbitrate, with specified exceptions, all claims or controversies she may have against Bristol Care arising out of, relating to, or in association with her employment
- To initiate and conduct the arbitration of such claims before a single arbitrator using the procedures (including the arbitrator selection procedures) in the American Arbitration Association's Rules for the Resolution of Employment Disputes in effect at the time the claim is filed
- To maintain the confidentiality of the existence, subject, and results of any arbitration with Bristol Care

Applying the principles set forth above, the exchange of promises in this bilateral contract supplies consideration to make all of the parties' promises binding. Ms. Baker concedes that she signed the two agreements—and thus made each of the promises memorialized in those agreements—in order to receive the collection of promises Bristol Care was making to her (e.g., the promotion and related benefits). By the same token, Bristol Care made its collection of promises in exchange for the collection of promises Ms. Baker made. The amount of consideration is immaterial

because any bargained-for exchange of benefits or detriments, no matter how small, supplies the consideration needed to make these promises binding.

...

Ms. Baker argues that none of Bristol Care's promises in the "Mandatory Arbitration Agreement," nor the combined effect of all of those promises, supplies consideration for the promises she made in that agreement. Because Ms. Baker agreed to give Bristol Care the right to "amend, modify or revoke this agreement upon thirty (30) days' prior written notice to the Employee," she now insists that right renders all of Bristol Care's promises illusory.

Bristol Care counters that, because it is bound to give written notice 30 days before any change, it agreed to be bound by the "Mandatory Arbitration Agreement" for at least 30 days. In addition, Bristol Care emphasizes that both parties agreed to be bound by the AAA rules in effect at the time a claim was filed and, therefore, Bristol Care had no right to alter the agreement as to any claim pending at the time of—or filed within 30 days after—any notice from Bristol Care that it was intending to change the agreement.

There is no question that the construction of this provision that Bristol Care offers is the one this Court would adopt if Bristol Care were trying to realize a retrospective advantage from some unilateral alteration to the agreement. Nor is there any question that the construction volunteered by Bristol Care now is the one that any court would adopt in the future should Bristol Care try to alter its obligations to Ms. Baker under this agreement with respect to the claims she has already asserted. Accordingly, there is no justification for refusing to adopt this construction here, especially when the consequences of that refusal is that *none* of the promises made by either party—not just in the "Mandatory Arbitration Agreement" but on any aspect of her promotion to facility administrator—will be enforceable.

...

For the reasons set forth above, I would hold that Ms. Baker's arbitration promise was supported by consideration and, therefore, should be enforced pursuant to Bristol Care's motion and the FAA. Because the majority opinion allows Ms. Baker to litigate her claim in state court despite her having promised not to do so, I respectfully dissent.

Chapter 3 Federal Law Restrictions on the Enforceability of Arbitration Agreements

Number the note on page 184 after *Cox* as note 1 and add the following as note 2:

2. As illustrated by *Cox*, when first implemented by the Department of Defense, the Military Lending Act applied to a relatively narrow group of consumer credit products: certain payday loans, auto title loans, and tax refund anticipation loans. By final rule dated July 22, 2015, the Department of Defense expanded the definition of consumer credit so that it now reaches much more broadly, as explained by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (responsible, in part, for enforcing the MLA):

The final rule announced today amends the definition of “consumer credit” covered by the regulation to more closely align with the broad, traditional definition of credit covered by the Truth in Lending Act. The rule generally covers consumer credit offered or extended to active-duty servicemembers or their dependents, as long as the credit is subject to a finance charge or payable by written agreement in more than four installments. In accordance with the statute, the MLA regulation would continue to exclude residential mortgages and credit extended to finance the purchase of, and secured by, personal property, such as vehicle purchase loans.

CFPB, *CFPB Statement on Department of Defense Military Lending Act Final Rule* (July 21, 2015), available at <http://www.consumerfinance.gov/newsroom/cfpb-statement-on-department-of-defense-military-lending-act-final-rule/>; see 32 C.F.R. § 232.3(f)(1) (“*Consumer credit* means credit offered or extended to a covered borrower primarily for personal, family, or household purposes, and that is: (i) Subject to a finance charge; or (ii) Payable by a written agreement in more than four installments.”).

Replace *Holmes* and the notes after *Holmes* on pages 184-188 with the following:

SANTORO v. ACCENTURE FEDERAL SERVICES, LLC

United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit

748 F.3d 217 (2014)

Shedd, Circuit Judge:

Dr. Armand Santoro appeals the district court's order granting the motion by Accenture Federal Services, LLC (Accenture) to compel arbitration. Because we agree with the district court that the Dodd–Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010 (Dodd–Frank) does not invalidate the arbitration agreement between Accenture and Santoro, we affirm.

I.

Santoro began his employment with Accenture in 1997 as a senior manager. From 1998 until 2007, Santoro served as the program manager for the Internal Revenue Service's website, IRS.gov. From 2007 until September 2011, Santoro served as the account lead for Accenture's Department of the Treasury account. In August 2005, Santoro entered into an employment contract with Accenture. The contract indicated that it would renew on September 1 of each subsequent year unless either party provided timely notice that the contract would not be extended. The contract, among other provisions, included an arbitration clause

In 2010, Santoro was given a new supervisor, who, according to Santoro's complaint, "instantly disliked" him. In September 2011, Santoro was terminated from his employment as an account executive as part of a cost-cutting measure. Santoro, who was 66 years old at the time, was replaced by a younger male employee.

In response to his termination, Santoro filed a complaint against Accenture in the Superior Court for the District of Columbia, alleging claims for age discrimination under the District of Columbia Human Rights Act. Accenture moved to compel arbitration; Santoro opposed Accenture's motion, contending that the clause was void under three whistleblower provisions of Dodd–Frank: 7 U.S.C. § 26(n)(2), 18 U.S.C. § 1514A(e)(2), and 12 U.S.C. § 5567(d)(2). The Superior Court rejected Santoro's argument and granted the motion. The court also stayed the case pending arbitration.

While that motion to compel arbitration was pending with the Superior Court, Santoro received a right-to-sue letter from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and filed an action in the Eastern District of Virginia,

alleging claims under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA), the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA). Accenture moved in the district court to compel arbitration of these federal claims as well. Following a hearing, the district court granted the motion. Ruling from the bench, the district court concluded that Dodd–Frank “only applies to certain situations when whistleblowers are involved.” That is, Dodd–Frank’s provisions “appl[y] only in the situations that [are] set out by the statute,” and the statute only “applies to whistleblowers.” Thus, because Santoro did not bring a Dodd–Frank whistleblower claim, he could not use Dodd–Frank to invalidate an otherwise valid arbitration agreement. Santoro noted a timely appeal.

II.

On appeal, Santoro contends that the district court erred in compelling arbitration....

...

Here, it is undisputed that (1) Santoro’s employment contract had an arbitration agreement; and (2) Santoro’s federal claims fall within the broad “all disputes” language of that agreement. Santoro, however, seeks to avoid arbitration by pointing to recent limitations on arbitration made by Dodd–Frank. In Santoro’s view, Dodd–Frank represents a “contrary congressional command” that overrides the otherwise valid arbitration clause in his employment contract.

C.

As relevant here, one of the goals of Dodd–Frank was to strengthen whistleblower protections for employees reporting illegal or fraudulent activity by their employer. To this end, Congress enacted 7 U.S.C. § 26, which amended the Commodities Exchange Act by adding a provision prohibiting retaliation by a covered employer against a “whistleblower.” 7 U.S.C. § 26(h)(1)(A). The statute creates a cause of action for whistleblowers, § 26(h)(1)(B)(i), and then protects the cause of action through § 26(n), which provides:

(n) Nonenforceability of certain provisions waiving rights and remedies or requiring arbitration of disputes

(1) Waiver of rights and remedies

The rights and remedies provided for in this section may not be waived by any agreement, policy form, or condition of employment including by a predispute arbitration agreement.

(2) Predispute arbitration agreements

No predispute arbitration agreement shall be valid or enforceable, if the agreement requires arbitration of a dispute arising under this section.

7 U.S.C. § 26(n).

In addition to this amendment to the Commodities Exchange Act, Dodd–Frank amended 18 U.S.C. § 1514A, which was first enacted as part of the Sarbanes–Oxley Act of 2002. This provision is titled “Civil Action to protect against retaliation in fraud cases,” and the first subsection is expressly labeled “Whistleblower protection for employees of publicly traded companies.” Subsections (b) and (c) create a cause of action and remedies for violations of the substantive whistleblower provision. The final subsection, § 1514A(e), then mirrors the language of 7 U.S.C. § 26(n)

Santoro contends that these provisions invalidate *all* predispute arbitration agreements lacking a Dodd–Frank carve-out, even for plaintiffs who are not pursuing any whistleblower claims. Under Santoro’s reading of the statute, because his contract with Accenture does not carve out Dodd–Frank claims from arbitration and thus “requires arbitration” of such claims, the entire arbitration agreement is not “valid or enforceable.”

D.

Initially, it is clear that Dodd–Frank prohibits predispute agreements to arbitrate whistleblower claims. The Supreme Court in dicta has pointed to Congress’s language in Dodd–Frank as a model of “clarity” for limiting arbitration, and we agree. Dodd–Frank works to render “nonenforceabl[e]” “certain provisions” that require “arbitration of disputes” “under this section.” Thus, an agreement to arbitrate whistleblower claims is not “valid or enforceable.” This language represents a clear Congressional command that Dodd–Frank whistleblower claims are not subject to predispute arbitration. It does not follow, however, that Dodd–Frank likewise prohibits the arbitration of non-whistleblower claims simply because an arbitration agreement does not carve out Dodd–Frank whistleblower claims. Instead, we think the language, context, and enactment of the statute lead to the opposite conclusion.

To begin, the statute’s language does not support Santoro’s reading. Subsections (1) and (2) both focus on the rights and remedies “in this” and “under this” “section,” i.e., whistleblower claims, and the prohibition of any provision that would waive or limit judicial resolution of *those* claims, not of the many variety of claims that may arise during an employment relationship. Subsection (1) specifies that the rights under the statute—the whistleblower cause of action—cannot be “waived” by predispute arbitration. Subsection (2) simply reiterates that

whistleblowers cannot waive their right to a civil action in a judicial forum by agreeing to arbitrate. Accenture is not requiring Santoro to arbitrate a claim “arising under this section”; rather, it is requiring him to arbitrate claims arising under other federal statutes pursuant to an otherwise valid arbitration agreement. Under Dodd–Frank, Congress has protected the right to bring a whistleblower cause of action in a judicial forum, nothing more.

Santoro seeks to unmoor subsection (2) from its placement in Dodd–Frank and instead apply it as a broad, free-standing right, creating a windfall for non-whistleblowing employees. By doing so, he overlooks both the limiting language within subsection (2) and the broader context of the statute, in violation of the “cardinal rule” that the “statute is to be read as a whole since the meaning of statutory language, plain or not, depends on context.” To that end, even if we assume that the “ordinary meaning” of the phrase “[n]o predispute arbitration agreement shall be valid” is “expansive,” “its application is limited by the ‘broader context’ of [§ 1514A] as a whole.”

Dodd–Frank created causes of action for whistleblowers and then protected those causes of action by barring their *waiver* in “predispute arbitration agreements.” Nothing in Dodd–Frank suggests that Congress sought to bar arbitration of every claim if the arbitration agreement in question did not exempt Dodd–Frank claims.⁵ Nothing in Dodd–Frank even refers to arbitration apart from this limited reference in these statutory provisions that are otherwise concerned solely with the creation of a cause of action for whistleblowing employees. To conclude otherwise would be to forget that “Congress ... does not alter the fundamental details of a regulatory scheme in vague terms or ancillary provisions—it does not one might say, hide elephants in mouseholes.” But that is exactly what Santoro requests—concluding that in this mousehole, Congress essentially grafted a new section onto the FAA by requiring every employer’s arbitration agreement to carve out an exception for whistleblowers. Given the statute’s language and context, Santoro cannot meet his burden of showing that Dodd–Frank represents a contrary congressional command overriding the validity of arbitration clauses as to non-whistleblower claims.

⁵ Santoro notes that Congress has used more circumscribed language in other statutes that bar claims from being arbitrated to support his reading of Dodd–Frank. *See, e.g.*, 12 U.S.C. § 5567(d)(2) (provision of the Consumer Financial Protection Act that prohibits arbitration agreements only “to the extent that [they require] arbitration of a dispute arising under this section”). The fact that Congress used alternate language in another statutory context does not persuade us that Congress intended Dodd–Frank to be as expansive as Santoro suggests, nor does it mean that Congress cannot make the same point using different language.

Our conclusion is further buttressed by the context surrounding the enactment of Dodd–Frank. At the time Congress enacted these provisions of Dodd–Frank it was legislating against two background pieces of information. First, courts had consistently held that whistleblower claims under Sarbanes–Oxley were subject to arbitration. In addition, the Supreme Court had noted in dicta that “non-waiver of rights” provisions—like § 26(n)(1) and § 1514A(e)(1)—“did not explicitly preclude arbitration or other nonjudicial resolution of claims.”

“Congress is presumed to act with awareness of a judicial interpretation of a statute.” Thus, in enacting Dodd–Frank, Congress would have been aware that Sarbanes–Oxley whistleblower claims were subject to arbitration and that non-waiver of rights provisions like § 26(n)(1) and § 1514A(e)(1) may not, standing alone, override the FAA. This background further supports the conclusion that Dodd–Frank simply overrules [that prior caselaw] and makes clear—by supporting the non-waiver of rights language of subsection (1) with the explicit language of subsection (2)—that whistleblower claims cannot be subject to predispute agreements to arbitrate.

Accordingly, we hold that, where the plaintiff is not pursuing Dodd–Frank whistleblower claims, neither 7 U.S.C. § 26(n)(2), nor 18 U.S.C. § 1514A(e)(2) overrides the FAA’s mandate that arbitration agreements are enforceable.⁸ Because Santoro is not pursuing a “dispute under this section” Dodd Frank does not bar arbitration of Santoro’s federal claims.

III.

For the foregoing reasons, we affirm the district court’s order compelling arbitration of Santoro’s federal claims.

AFFIRMED

⁸ In reaching this conclusion, we find ourselves in accord with the Fifth Circuit. See *Holmes v. Air Liquide USA, LLC*, 498 Fed. App’x 405, 407 (5th Cir. 2012) (enforcing arbitration agreement where “[plaintiff] brings no Dodd–Frank claims,” and the “Agreement does not ‘require arbitration of a dispute arising under’” Dodd–Frank). Our conclusion likewise comports with several district courts to have considered the issue, see *Yegin v. BBVA Compass*, 2013 WL 622565, *2 (N.D. Ala. Feb. 19, 2013); *Rodriguez v. Charles Schwab Corp.*, 2013 WL 911959, *5 (W.D. Tenn. Jan. 29, 2013), and is consistent with those decisions concluding that Dodd–Frank does bar arbitration of covered whistleblower claims, see *Wong v. CKX, Inc.*, 890 F. Supp. 2d 411, 421 (S.D.N.Y. 2012) (noting “whistleblower claims are no longer arbitrable”); *Pezza v. Investors Capital Corp.*, 767 F. Supp. 2d 225, 227 (D. Mass. 2011) (noting “Dodd–Frank Act enacted a bar to predispute arbitration agreements for whistleblower claims”).

Notes

1. The provisions of Dodd-Frank at issue in *Santoro* are different from the other federal statutes restricting the enforcement of arbitration agreements we have looked at. The Dodd-Frank provisions make the enforceability of the arbitration agreement turn on the type of federal statutory claim at issue. By comparison, the other statutes we have looked at (as well as another provision of Dodd-Frank, dealing with consumer mortgage agreements) make arbitration agreements unenforceable in certain types of contracts. Which approach is better?

2. What do you think of *Santoro*'s interpretation of the Dodd-Frank nonarbitrability provisions? Do you think Congress intended to invalidate all arbitration clauses that do not expressly exclude Dodd-Frank claims from their scope, even if no such claim could plausibly be brought in the case?

3. *Santoro* does identify an important distinction among the Dodd-Frank nonarbitrability provisions: whether they invalidate the entire arbitration agreement or whether they make the agreement unenforceable only as to the particular federal statutory claim. Under the former type of statute, the entire case will proceed in court (because the arbitration agreement is unenforceable in its entirety), while under the later type of statute, only the federal statutory claim will be adjudicated in court while the rest of the case will proceed in arbitration. Keep this distinction in mind while working through the materials in the rest of this Chapter.

4. As noted earlier, in addition to making arbitration agreements unenforceable in consumer mortgage loans and making certain claims nonarbitrable, the Dodd-Frank Act also expressly authorizes the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) to regulate arbitration agreements—after conducting a study of the use of arbitration clauses in consumer financial services contracts. Dodd-Frank Act § 1028(b), codified at 12 U.S.C. § 5518(b). The CFPB released the results of its study in March 2015, issued a notice of proposed rulemaking in May 2016, and published its final arbitration rule in July 2017. *See* Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, Final Rule: Arbitration Agreements (July 2017), reprinted at pages 137-147 of this Update.

The CFPB's arbitration rule does not prohibit the use of arbitration clauses in consumer financial services contracts. Instead, it does two things. First, it precludes providers of consumer financial services from “rely[ing] in any way on a pre-dispute arbitration agreement . . . with respect to any aspect of a class action . . . , including to seek a stay or dismissal of particular claims or the entire action.” *Id.* (12 C.F.R. § 1040.4(a)). Second, it requires consumer financial services companies to provide various records from arbitration proceedings (including claims

and awards) as well as court filings relying on a pre-dispute arbitration agreement “to seek dismissal, deferral, or stay of any aspect of a case.” *Id.* (12 C.F.R. § 1040.4(b)). The rule was to take effect 60 days after publication in the Federal Register, and would have applied only to arbitration agreements entered into 180 days after its effective date—i.e., existing arbitration agreements are not affected. *Id.* (12 C.F.R. § 1040.5(a)). But on November 1, 2017, President Trump signed Public Law No. 115-74, 131 Stat. 1243 (2017), into law, disapproving the CFPB Rule under the Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. §§ 801-802. Accordingly, the CFPB rule “has no force or effect.” *See* CFPB, Arbitration Agreements Rule, 82 Fed. Reg. 55500, 55500 (Nov. 22, 2017).

5. Other federal agencies also have proposed or issued rules that would restrict the use of arbitration clauses in certain types of contracts, albeit without the express authority to do so that Dodd-Frank provides to the CFPB. With the change of presidential administrations, the current status of those rules is very much in flux:

Workplaces Executive Order and Federal Contractor Rule. On July 31, 2014, President Obama issued Executive Order No. 13673—Fair Play and Safe Workplaces. *See* <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2014/07/31/executive-order-fair-pay-and-safe-workplaces>. Among other things, the Workplaces Executive Order provided that federal contracts over \$1 million “shall provide that contractors agree that the decision to arbitrate claims arising under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or any tort related to or arising out of sexual assault or harassment may only be made with the voluntary consent of employees or independent contractors after such disputes arise.” *Id.* § 6(a). The federal government issued regulations implementing the Workplaces Executive Order in August 2016. *See* Federal Acquisition Regulation; Fair Play and Safe Workplaces, 81 Fed. Reg. 58562, 58651 (Aug. 25, 2016) (adding § 52.222-61). On October 24, 2016, a federal district court issued a preliminary injunction against the arbitration provision of the regulations as contrary to the FAA. *See* Associated Builders & Contractors of S.E. Tex. v. Rung, 2016 WL 8188655, at *14 (E.D. Tex. Oct. 24, 2016) (“Contrary to Defendants’ attempt to distinguish a rule prohibiting new arbitration agreements from a rule prohibiting enforcement of existing agreements, neither type of rule is authorized by the FAA in the absence of any congressional command that would override the requirement that arbitration agreements be enforced in accordance with their terms. . . . Such overstepping of authority in the guise of enhancing federal procurement practices is unwarranted.”). Thereafter, on March 27, 2017, President Trump revoked the Workplaces Executive Order, *see* <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/03/27/presidential-executive-order-revocation-federal-contracting-executive>, and signed a congressional resolution under the Congressional Review Act invalidating the implementing regulations, *see* Pub. L. No. 115-11, 131 Stat. 175 (Mar. 27, 2017).

Department of Health and Human Services: Long-Term Care Facilities. On October 4, 2016, the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) issued a final rule prohibiting the use of pre-dispute arbitration agreements in contracts between long-term care facilities and residents. *See* Dep’t of Health & Human Services, Reform of Requirements for Long-Term Care Facilities: Arbitration Agreements, 81 Fed. Reg. 68688, 68867 (October 4, 2016) (42 C.F.R. § 483.70(n)(1)). An industry trade association challenged the rule in court, and the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi entered a preliminary injunction against its enforcement on November 11, 2016, reasoning as follows:

This case places this court in the undesirable position of preliminarily enjoining a Rule which it believes to be based upon sound public policy. As discussed in section I of this order, this court believes that nursing home arbitration litigation suffers from fundamental defects originating in the mental competency issue, rendering it an inefficient and wasteful form of litigation. . . . As sympathetic as this court may be to the public policy considerations which motivated the Rule, it is unwilling to play a role in countenancing the incremental “creep” of federal agency authority beyond that envisioned by the U.S. Constitution. While this court does not exclude the possibility that CMS could, in the future, make a sufficiently strong showing that it had the authority to enact the Rule it did, it seems unlikely, based on the administrative record in this case, that it will be held to have done so here.

Am. Health Care Ass’n v. Burwell, 217 F. Supp. 3d 921, 946 (N.D. Miss. 2016). Subsequently, in June 2017, HHS proposed a revised rule that would remove the prohibition on pre-dispute arbitration clauses but would include various disclosure and transparency requirements. *See* Dep’t of Health & Human Services, Revision of Requirements for Long-Term Care Facilities: Arbitration Agreements, 82 Fed. Reg. 26649, 26653 (June 8, 2017). The proposed rule is still pending.

Department of Education: Higher Education Institutions. The Department of Education issued a final rule on November 1, 2016 prohibiting the use of pre-dispute arbitration agreements and class action waivers as applied to borrower defense claims against schools participating in the federal student loan program. Dep’t of Education, Student Assistance General Provisions, 81 Fed. Reg. 75926, 76087-76089 (Nov. 1, 2016) (34 C.F.R. § 685.300(e) & (f)). The California Ass’n of Private Postsecondary Schools (CAPPS) filed suit challenging the rule on May 24, 2017, and filed a motion for a preliminary injunction on June 2, 2017. *See* CAPPS v. DeVos, No. 17-999 (D.D.C. 2017). On June 16, 2017, the Department of Education issued a rule partially delaying the effective date of its rule because of the pending litigation. Dep’t of Education, Final Rule, Notification of Partial Delay of Effective

Dates, 82 Fed. Reg. 27,621 (June 16, 2017). CAPPS thereafter withdrew its motion for a preliminary injunction and the case currently is stayed. On July 6, 2017, Public Citizen, on behalf of two student loan borrowers, filed suit seeking an injunction against the delay in implementation of the original rule. *Bauer v. DeVos*, No. 17-1330 (D.D.C. 2017). Cross-motions for summary judgment in the case currently are pending. From November 2017 through February 2018, the Department of Education held a series of negotiated rulemaking sessions that addressed a number of issues, including arbitration. An issue paper for the final session included a proposal requiring schools that used arbitration clauses and class waivers to explain them to students, but did not prohibit their use. Dep't of Education, *Borrower Defenses and Financial Responsibility Negotiated Rulemaking, Issue Paper 4* (Session 3: Feb. 12-15, 2018), at 5, available at <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/highered/reg/hearulemaking/2017/issuepaper4.pdf>. No Notice of Proposed Rulemaking has been issued.

Department of Labor: Fiduciary Rule. The Department of Labor limited exemptions from its expanded definition of “fiduciaries,” subject to conflict of interest rules, to financial institutions and investment advisors who meet certain requirements, including that they:

do not in any contract, instrument, or communication . . . purport to waive or qualify the right of the Retirement Investor to bring or participate in a class action or other representative action in court in a dispute with the Advisor or Financial Institution, or require arbitration or mediation of individual claims in locations that are distant or that otherwise unreasonably limit the ability of the Retirement Investors to assert the claims safeguarded by this exemption.

See Dep't of Labor, *Best Interest Contract Exemption*, § II(g)(5), 81 Fed. Reg. 21002, 21079 (Apr. 8, 2016). Among the challenges brought by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in a broad ranging challenge to the Fiduciary Rule, the Chamber argued that the FAA barred the Department of Labor from precluding the use of arbitration clauses with class arbitration waivers. (Evidently no challenge was made to the prohibition on distant forums in arbitration or mediation.) The district court rejected the Chamber's argument, concluding that “the exemptions’ contract requirements do not render arbitration agreements between a financial institution and investor invalid, revocable, or unenforceable” because “[i]nstitutions and advisers may invoke and enforce arbitration agreements, including terms that waive or qualify the right to bring a class action or any representative action; such contracts remain enforceable, but do not ‘meet the conditions for relief from the prohibited transaction provisions of ERISA and the Code.’” *See* Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A. v. Hugler, 2017 WL 514424, at *42 (N.D. Tex. Feb. 8, 2017). With the change of presidential administration, however, the Department of Labor

is no longer defending the class action provision of its rule on appeal. Nick Thornton, *Labor Drops its Defense of Fiduciary Rule's Class-Action Provision*, Benefits Pro (July 7, 2017), www.benefitspro.com/2017/07/07/labor-drops-its-defense-of-fiduciary-rules-class-a?slreturn=1499819650&page=3. The Fifth Circuit thereafter concluded that the rule was “unsustainable” and “violates the Federal Arbitration Act,” stating that the fact “[t]hat DOL has retreated from its overreach (although not yet by formal rule amendment) does not detract from the impermissible nature of the provisions in the first place.” *Chamber of Commerce of United States of Am. v. United States Dep’t of Labor*, 885 F.3d 360, 385 (5th Cir. 2018).

Federal Communications Commission. In October 2016, then-FCC Chair Tom Wheeler announced that the FCC had “begun an internal process designed to produce a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on [mandatory arbitration in communications services contracts] by February, 2017. *See* Federal Communications Comm’n, Protecting the Privacy of Customers of Broadband and Other Telecommunications Services, WC Docket No. 16-106, at 14114 (Oct. 27, 2016) (statement of Chairman Tom Wheeler). With the change of presidential administrations, however, and a new FCC chair, the FCC has now “put[] off those plans.” *See* Perry Cooper, *Arbitration Update: CFPB Rule Uncertain, Mixed Fates for Others*, Bloomberg BNA News (June 1, 2017), www.bna.com/arbitration-update-cfpb-n73014451803/.

Add the following after Problem 3.6 on page 213:

EPIC SYSTEMS CORP. v. LEWIS

Supreme Court of the United States

138 S. Ct. 1612 (2018)

Justice GORSUCH delivered the opinion of the Court.

Should employees and employers be allowed to agree that any disputes between them will be resolved through one-on-one arbitration? Or should employees always be permitted to bring their claims in class or collective actions, no matter what they agreed with their employers?

As a matter of policy these questions are surely debatable. But as a matter of law the answer is clear. In the Federal Arbitration Act, Congress has instructed federal courts to enforce arbitration agreements according to their terms—including terms providing for individualized proceedings. Nor can we agree with the employees’ suggestion that the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) offers a conflicting command. It is this Court’s duty to interpret Congress’s statutes as a harmonious whole rather than at war with one another. And abiding that duty here leads to an unmistakable conclusion. The NLRA secures to employees rights to organize unions and bargain collectively, but it says nothing about how judges and arbitrators must try legal disputes that leave the workplace and enter the courtroom or arbitral forum. This Court has never read a right to class actions into the NLRA—and for three quarters of a century neither did the National Labor Relations Board. Far from conflicting, the Arbitration Act and the NLRA have long enjoyed separate spheres of influence and neither permits this Court to declare the parties’ agreements unlawful.

I

The three cases before us differ in detail but not in substance. Take *Ernst & Young LLP v. Morris*. There Ernst & Young and one of its junior accountants, Stephen Morris, entered into an agreement providing that they would arbitrate any disputes that might arise between them. The agreement stated that the employee could choose the arbitration provider and that the arbitrator could “grant any relief that could be granted by ... a court” in the relevant jurisdiction. The agreement also specified individualized arbitration, with claims “pertaining to different [e]mployees [to] be heard in separate proceedings.”

After his employment ended, and despite having agreed to arbitrate claims against the firm, Mr. Morris sued Ernst & Young in federal court. He alleged that the firm had misclassified its junior accountants as professional employees and violated the federal Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) and California law by paying

them salaries without overtime pay. Although the arbitration agreement provided for individualized proceedings, Mr. Morris sought to litigate the federal claim on behalf of a nationwide class under the FLSA's collective action provision, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b). He sought to pursue the state law claim as a class action under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23.

Ernst & Young replied with a motion to compel arbitration. The district court granted the request, but the Ninth Circuit reversed this judgment. The Ninth Circuit recognized that the Arbitration Act generally requires courts to enforce arbitration agreements as written. But the court reasoned that the statute's "saving clause" removes this obligation if an arbitration agreement violates some other federal law. And the court concluded that an agreement requiring individualized arbitration proceedings violates the NLRA by barring employees from engaging in the "concerted activit[y]," 29 U.S.C. § 157, of pursuing claims as a class or collective action.

...

Although the Arbitration Act and the NLRA have long coexisted—they date from 1925 and 1935, respectively—the suggestion they might conflict is something quite new. Until a couple of years ago, courts more or less agreed that arbitration agreements like those before us must be enforced according to their terms.

The National Labor Relations Board's general counsel expressed much the same view in 2010. Remarking that employees and employers "can benefit from the relative simplicity and informality of resolving claims before arbitrators," the general counsel opined that the validity of such agreements "does not involve consideration of the policies of the National Labor Relations Act." Memorandum GC 10–06, pp. 2, 5 (June 16, 2010).

But recently things have shifted. In 2012, the Board—for the first time in the 77 years since the NLRA's adoption—asserted that the NLRA effectively nullifies the Arbitration Act in cases like ours. *D.R. Horton, Inc.*, 357 N.L.R.B. 2277. Initially, this agency decision received a cool reception in court. In the last two years, though, some circuits have either agreed with the Board's conclusion or thought themselves obliged to defer to it under *Chevron U.S.A. Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.*, 467 U.S. 837 (1984). More recently still, the disagreement has grown as the Executive has disavowed the Board's (most recent) position, and the Solicitor General and the Board have offered us battling briefs about the law's meaning. We granted certiorari to clear the confusion.

II

We begin with the Arbitration Act and the question of its saving clause.

Congress adopted the Arbitration Act in 1925 in response to a perception that courts were unduly hostile to arbitration....

Not only did Congress require courts to respect and enforce agreements to arbitrate; it also specifically directed them to respect and enforce the parties' chosen arbitration procedures. See § 3 (providing for a stay of litigation pending arbitration "in accordance with the terms of the agreement"); § 4 (providing for "an order directing that ... arbitration proceed in the manner provided for in such agreement"). Indeed, we have often observed that the Arbitration Act requires courts "rigorously" to "enforce arbitration agreements according to their terms, including terms that specify *with whom* the parties choose to arbitrate their disputes and *the rules* under which that arbitration will be conducted." *Italian Colors Restaurant* (some emphasis added; citations, internal quotation marks, and brackets omitted).

On first blush, these emphatic directions would seem to resolve any argument under the Arbitration Act. The parties before us contracted for arbitration. They proceeded to specify the rules that would govern their arbitrations, indicating their intention to use individualized rather than class or collective action procedures. And this much the Arbitration Act seems to protect pretty absolutely. You might wonder if the balance Congress struck in 1925 between arbitration and litigation should be revisited in light of more contemporary developments. You might even ask if the Act was good policy when enacted. But all the same you might find it difficult to see how to avoid the statute's application.

Still, the employees suggest the Arbitration Act's saving clause creates an exception for cases like theirs.... That provision applies here, the employees tell us, because the NLRA renders their particular class and collective action waivers illegal. In their view, illegality under the NLRA is a "ground" that "exists at law ... for the revocation" of their arbitration agreements, at least to the extent those agreements prohibit class or collective action proceedings.

The problem with this line of argument is fundamental. Put to the side the question whether the saving clause was designed to save not only state law defenses but also defenses allegedly arising from federal statutes. Put to the side the question of what it takes to qualify as a ground for "revocation" of a contract. Put to the side for the moment, too, even the question whether the NLRA actually renders class and collective action waivers illegal. Assuming (but not granting) the employees could satisfactorily answer all those questions, the saving clause still can't save their cause.

It can't because the saving clause recognizes only defenses that apply to "any" contract. In this way the clause establishes a sort of "equal-treatment" rule for arbitration contracts. The clause "permits agreements to arbitrate to be

invalidated by ‘generally applicable contract defenses, such as fraud, duress, or unconscionability.’” *Concepcion*. At the same time, the clause offers no refuge for “defenses that apply only to arbitration or that derive their meaning from the fact that an agreement to arbitrate is at issue.” Under our precedent, this means the saving clause does not save defenses that target arbitration either by name or by more subtle methods, such as by “interfer[ing] with fundamental attributes of arbitration.”

This is where the employees’ argument stumbles. They don’t suggest that their arbitration agreements were extracted, say, by an act of fraud or duress or in some other unconscionable way that would render *any* contract unenforceable. Instead, they object to their agreements precisely because they require individualized arbitration proceedings instead of class or collective ones. And by attacking (only) the individualized nature of the arbitration proceedings, the employees’ argument seeks to interfere with one of arbitration’s fundamental attributes.

We know this much because of *Concepcion*. There this Court faced a state law defense that prohibited as unconscionable class action waivers in consumer contracts. The Court readily acknowledged that the defense formally applied in both the litigation and the arbitration context. But, the Court held, the defense failed to qualify for protection under the saving clause because it interfered with a fundamental attribute of arbitration all the same.... In the Court’s judgment, the virtues Congress originally saw in arbitration, its speed and simplicity and inexpensiveness, would be shorn away and arbitration would wind up looking like the litigation it was meant to displace.

Of course, *Concepcion* has its limits. The Court recognized that parties remain free to alter arbitration procedures to suit their tastes, and in recent years some parties have sometimes chosen to arbitrate on a classwide basis. But *Concepcion*’s essential insight remains: courts may not allow a contract defense to reshape traditional individualized arbitration by mandating classwide arbitration procedures without the parties’ consent. Just as judicial antagonism toward arbitration before the Arbitration Act’s enactment “manifested itself in a great variety of devices and formulas declaring arbitration against public policy,” *Concepcion* teaches that we must be alert to new devices and formulas that would achieve much the same result today. And a rule seeking to declare individualized arbitration proceedings off limits is, the Court held, just such a device.

The employees’ efforts to distinguish *Concepcion* fall short. They note that their putative NLRA defense would render an agreement “illegal” as a matter of federal statutory law rather than “unconscionable” as a matter of state common law. But we don’t see how that distinction makes any difference in light of *Concepcion*’s rationale and rule. Illegality, like unconscionability, may be a

traditional, generally applicable contract defense in many cases, including arbitration cases. But an argument that a contract is unenforceable *just because it requires bilateral arbitration* is a different creature. A defense of that kind, *Concepcion* tells us, is one that impermissibly disfavors arbitration whether it sounds in illegality or unconscionability. The law of precedent teaches that like cases should generally be treated alike, and appropriate respect for that principle means the Arbitration Act's saving clause can no more save the defense at issue in these cases than it did the defense at issue in *Concepcion*. At the end of our encounter with the Arbitration Act, then, it appears just as it did at the beginning: a congressional command requiring us to enforce, not override, the terms of the arbitration agreements before us.

III

But that's not the end of it. Even if the Arbitration Act normally requires us to enforce arbitration agreements like theirs, the employees reply that the NLRA overrides that guidance in these cases and commands us to hold their agreements unlawful yet.

This argument faces a stout uphill climb. When confronted with two Acts of Congress allegedly touching on the same topic, this Court is not at "liberty to pick and choose among congressional enactments" and must instead strive "to give effect to both." A party seeking to suggest that two statutes cannot be harmonized, and that one displaces the other, bears the heavy burden of showing "a clearly expressed congressional intention" that such a result should follow. The intention must be "clear and manifest." And in approaching a claimed conflict, we come armed with the "stron[g] presum[ption]" that repeals by implication are "disfavored" and that "Congress will specifically address" preexisting law when it wishes to suspend its normal operations in a later statute.

These rules exist for good reasons. Respect for Congress as drafter counsels against too easily finding irreconcilable conflicts in its work. More than that, respect for the separation of powers counsels restraint. Allowing judges to pick and choose between statutes risks transforming them from expounders of what the law *is* into policymakers choosing what the law *should be*. Our rules aiming for harmony over conflict in statutory interpretation grow from an appreciation that it's the job of Congress by legislation, not this Court by supposition, both to write the laws and to repeal them.

Seeking to demonstrate an irreconcilable statutory conflict even in light of these demanding standards, the employees point to Section 7 of the NLRA. That provision guarantees workers

“the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.” 29 U.S.C. § 157.

From this language, the employees ask us to infer a clear and manifest congressional command to displace the Arbitration Act and outlaw agreements like theirs.

But that much inference is more than this Court may make. Section 7 focuses on the right to organize unions and bargain collectively. It may permit unions to bargain to prohibit arbitration. But it does not express approval or disapproval of arbitration. It does not mention class or collective action procedures. It does not even hint at a wish to displace the Arbitration Act—let alone accomplish that much clearly and manifestly, as our precedents demand.

Neither should any of this come as a surprise. The notion that Section 7 confers a right to class or collective actions seems pretty unlikely when you recall that procedures like that were hardly known when the NLRA was adopted in 1935. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 didn’t create the modern class action until 1966; class arbitration didn’t emerge until later still; and even the Fair Labor Standards Act’s collective action provision postdated Section 7 by years. And while some forms of group litigation existed even in 1935, Section 7’s failure to mention them only reinforces that the statute doesn’t speak to such procedures.

...

The NLRA’s broader structure underscores the point. After speaking of various “concerted activities” in Section 7, Congress proceeded to establish a regulatory regime applicable to each of them.... But missing entirely from this careful regime is any hint about what rules should govern the adjudication of class or collective actions in court or arbitration. Without some comparably specific guidance, it’s not at all obvious what procedures Section 7 might protect. Would opt-out class action procedures suffice? Or would opt-in procedures be necessary? What notice might be owed to absent class members? What standards would govern class certification? Should the same rules always apply or should they vary based on the nature of the suit? Nothing in the NLRA even whispers to us on any of these essential questions. And it is hard to fathom why Congress would take such care to regulate all the other matters mentioned in Section 7 yet remain mute about this matter alone—unless, of course, Section 7 doesn’t speak to class and collective action procedures in the first place.

...

What all these textual and contextual clues indicate, our precedents confirm. In many cases over many years, this Court has heard and rejected efforts to conjure conflicts between the Arbitration Act and other federal statutes. In fact, this Court

has rejected *every* such effort to date (save one temporary exception since overruled), with statutes ranging from the Sherman and Clayton Acts to the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, the Credit Repair Organizations Act, the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act.... Given so much precedent pointing so strongly in one direction, we do not see how we might faithfully turn the other way here.

Consider a few examples. In *Italian Colors*, this Court refused to find a conflict between the Arbitration Act and the Sherman Act because the Sherman Act (just like the NLRA) made “no mention of class actions” and was adopted before Rule 23 introduced its exception to the “usual rule” of “individual” dispute resolution. In *Gilmer*, this Court “had no qualms in enforcing a class waiver in an arbitration agreement even though” the Age Discrimination in Employment Act “expressly permitted collective legal actions.” And in *CompuCredit*, this Court refused to find a conflict even though the Credit Repair Organizations Act expressly provided a “right to sue,” “repeated[ly]” used the words “action” and “court” and “class action,” and even declared “[a]ny waiver” of the rights it provided to be “void.” If all the statutes in all those cases did not provide a congressional command sufficient to displace the Arbitration Act, we cannot imagine how we might hold that the NLRA alone and for the first time does so today.

The employees rejoin that our precedential story is complicated by some of this Court’s cases interpreting Section 7 itself. But, as it turns out, this Court’s Section 7 cases have usually involved just what you would expect from the statute’s plain language: efforts by employees related to organizing and collective bargaining in the workplace, not the treatment of class or collective actions in court or arbitration proceedings.... Nothing in our cases indicates that the NLRA guarantees class and collective action procedures, let alone for claims arising under different statutes and despite the express (and entirely unmentioned) teachings of the Arbitration Act.

...

With so much against them in the statute and our precedent, the employees end by seeking shelter in *Chevron*. Even if this Court doesn’t see what they see in Section 7, the employees say we must rule for them anyway because of the deference this Court owes to an administrative agency’s interpretation of the law. To be sure, the employees do not wish us to defer to the general counsel’s judgment in 2010 that the NLRA and the Arbitration Act coexist peaceably; they wish us to defer instead to the Board’s 2012 opinion suggesting the NLRA displaces the Arbitration Act. No party to these cases has asked us to reconsider *Chevron* deference. But even under *Chevron*’s terms, no deference is due. To show why, it suffices to outline just a few of the most obvious reasons.

The *Chevron* Court justified deference on the premise that a statutory ambiguity represents an “implicit” delegation to an agency to interpret a “statute which it administers.” Here, though, the Board hasn’t just sought to interpret its statute, the NLRA, in isolation; it has sought to interpret this statute in a way that limits the work of a second statute, the Arbitration Act. And on no account might we agree that Congress implicitly delegated to an agency authority to address the meaning of a second statute it does not administer. One of *Chevron*’s essential premises is simply missing here.

It’s easy, too, to see why the “reconciliation” of distinct statutory regimes “is a matter for the courts,” not agencies. An agency eager to advance its statutory mission, but without any particular interest in or expertise with a second statute, might (as here) seek to diminish the second statute’s scope in favor of a more expansive interpretation of its own—effectively “bootstrap[ping] itself into an area in which it has no jurisdiction.” All of which threatens to undo rather than honor legislative intentions. To preserve the balance Congress struck in its statutes, courts must exercise independent interpretive judgment.

Another justification the *Chevron* Court offered for deference is that “policy choices” should be left to Executive Branch officials “directly accountable to the people.” But here the Executive seems of two minds, for we have received competing briefs from the Board and from the United States (through the Solicitor General) disputing the meaning of the NLRA. And whatever argument might be mustered for deferring to the Executive on grounds of political accountability, surely it becomes a garble when the Executive speaks from both sides of its mouth, articulating no single position on which it might be held accountable. In these circumstances, we will not defer.

Finally, the *Chevron* Court explained that deference is not due unless a “court, employing traditional tools of statutory construction,” is left with an unresolved ambiguity. And that too is missing: the canon against reading conflicts into statutes is a traditional tool of statutory construction and it, along with the other traditional canons we have discussed, is more than up to the job of solving today’s interpretive puzzle. Where, as here, the canons supply an answer, “*Chevron* leaves the stage.”

IV

The dissent sees things a little bit differently. In its view, today’s decision ushers us back to the *Lochner* era when this Court regularly overrode legislative policy judgments. The dissent even suggests we have resurrected the long-dead “yellow dog” contract. But like most apocalyptic warnings, this one proves a false alarm.

Our decision does nothing to override Congress’s policy judgments. As the dissent recognizes, the legislative policy embodied in the NLRA is aimed at “safeguard[ing], first and foremost, workers’ rights to join unions and to engage in collective bargaining.” Those rights stand every bit as strong today as they did yesterday. And rather than revive “yellow dog” contracts against union organizing that the NLRA outlawed back in 1935, today’s decision merely declines to read into the NLRA a novel right to class action procedures that the Board’s own general counsel disclaimed as recently as 2010.

Instead of overriding Congress’s policy judgments, today’s decision seeks to honor them. This much the dissent surely knows.... [T]he dissent’s real complaint lies with the mountain of [this Court’s arbitration] precedent itself ... that no party has asked us to revisit.

When at last it reaches the question of applying our precedent, the dissent offers little, and understandably so. Our precedent clearly teaches that a contract defense “conditioning the enforceability of certain arbitration agreements on the availability of classwide arbitration procedures” is inconsistent with the Arbitration Act and its saving clause. *Concepcion*. And that, of course, is exactly what the employees’ proffered defense seeks to do.

Nor is the dissent’s reading of the NLRA any more available to us than its reading of the Arbitration Act. The dissent imposes a vast construction on Section 7’s language. But a statute’s meaning does not always “turn solely” on the broadest imaginable “definitions of its component words.” Linguistic and statutory context also matter. We have offered an extensive explanation why those clues support our reading today. By contrast, the dissent rests its interpretation on legislative history. But legislative history is not the law....

...

Ultimately, the dissent retreats to policy arguments.... The respective merits of class actions and private arbitration as means of enforcing the law are questions constitutionally entrusted not to the courts to decide but to the policymakers in the political branches where those questions remain hotly contested. Just recently, for example, one federal agency banned individualized arbitration agreements it blamed for underenforcement of certain laws, only to see Congress respond by immediately repealing that rule. See 82 Fed.Reg. 33210 (2017); Pub.L. 115–74, 131 Stat. 1243. This Court is not free to substitute its preferred economic policies for those chosen by the people’s representatives. *That*, we had always understood, was *Lochner*’s sin.

*

The policy may be debatable but the law is clear: Congress has instructed that arbitration agreements like those before us must be enforced as written. While Congress is of course always free to amend this judgment, we see nothing suggesting it did so in the NLRA—much less that it manifested a clear intention to

displace the Arbitration Act. Because we can easily read Congress’s statutes to work in harmony, that is where our duty lies. The judgments in *Epic*, No. 16–285, and *Ernst & Young*, No. 16–300, are reversed, and the cases are remanded for further proceedings consistent with this opinion. The judgment in *Murphy Oil*, No. 16–307, is affirmed.

So ordered.

Justice THOMAS, concurring.

I join the Court’s opinion in full. I write separately to add that the employees also cannot prevail under the plain meaning of the Federal Arbitration Act.... As I have previously explained, grounds for revocation of a contract are those that concern “the formation of the arbitration agreement.” *Italian Colors Restaurant* (concurring opinion) (quoting *Concepcion* (THOMAS, J., concurring)). The employees argue, among other things, that the class waivers in their arbitration agreements are unenforceable because the National Labor Relations Act makes those waivers illegal. But illegality is a public-policy defense. Because “[r]efusal to enforce a contract for public-policy reasons does not concern whether the contract was properly made,” the saving clause does not apply here. For this reason, and the reasons in the Court’s opinion, the employees’ arbitration agreements must be enforced according to their terms.

Justice GINSBURG, with whom Justice BREYER, Justice SOTOMAYOR, and Justice KAGAN join, dissenting.

The employees in these cases complain that their employers have underpaid them in violation of the wage and hours prescriptions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (FLSA), 29 U.S.C. § 201 *et seq.*, and analogous state laws. Individually, their claims are small, scarcely of a size warranting the expense of seeking redress alone. But by joining together with others similarly circumstanced, employees can gain effective redress for wage underpayment commonly experienced. To block such concerted action, their employers required them to sign, as a condition of employment, arbitration agreements banning collective judicial and arbitral proceedings of any kind. The question presented: Does the Federal Arbitration Act (Arbitration Act or FAA) permit employers to insist that their employees, whenever seeking redress for commonly experienced wage loss, go it alone, never mind the right secured to employees by the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) “to engage in ... concerted activities” for their “mutual aid or protection”? The answer should be a resounding “No.”

...

I

...

Although the NLRA safeguards, first and foremost, workers' rights to join unions and to engage in collective bargaining, the statute speaks more embracively. In addition to protecting employees' rights "to form, join, or assist labor organizations" and "to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing," the Act protects employees' rights "to engage in *other* concerted activities for the purpose of ... mutual aid or protection." 29 U.S.C. § 157 (emphasis added).

Suits to enforce workplace rights collectively fit comfortably under the umbrella "concerted activities for the purpose of ... mutual aid or protection." 29 U.S.C. § 157. "Concerted" means "[p]lanned or accomplished together; combined." American Heritage Dictionary 381 (5th ed. 2011). "Mutual" means "reciprocal." *Id.*, at 1163. When employees meet the requirements for litigation of shared legal claims in joint, collective, and class proceedings, the litigation of their claims is undoubtedly "accomplished together." By joining hands in litigation, workers can spread the costs of litigation and reduce the risk of employer retaliation.

...

Since the Act's earliest days, the Board and federal courts have understood § 7's "concerted activities" clause to protect myriad ways in which employees may join together to advance their shared interests. For example, the Board and federal courts have affirmed that the Act shields employees from employer interference when they participate in concerted appeals to the media, legislative bodies, and government agencies....

Crucially important here, for over 75 years, the Board has held that the NLRA safeguards employees from employer interference when they pursue joint, collective, and class suits related to the terms and conditions of their employment. For decades, federal courts have endorsed the Board's view, comprehending that "the filing of a labor related civil action by a group of employees is ordinarily a concerted activity protected by § 7." The Court pays scant heed to this longstanding line of decisions.

...

Because I would hold that employees' § 7 rights include the right to pursue collective litigation regarding their wages and hours, I would further hold that the employer-dictated collective-litigation stoppers, *i.e.*, "waivers," are unlawful.... § 8(a)(1) makes it an "unfair labor practice" for an employer to "interfere with, restrain, or coerce" employees in the exercise of their § 7 rights. 29 U.S.C. § 158(a)(1). Beyond genuine dispute, an employer "interfere[s] with" and "restrain[s]" employees in the exercise of their § 7 rights by mandating that they prospectively renounce those rights in individual employment agreements. The law could hardly be otherwise: Employees' rights to band together to meet their employers' superior strength would be worth precious little if employers could condition employment on workers signing away those rights. Properly assessed,

then, the “waivers” rank as unfair labor practices outlawed by the NLRA, and therefore unenforceable in court.

II

Today’s decision rests largely on the Court’s finding in the Arbitration Act “emphatic directions” to enforce arbitration agreements according to their terms, including collective-litigation prohibitions. Nothing in the FAA or this Court’s case law, however, requires subordination of the NLRA’s protections....

...

As I see it, in relatively recent years, the Court’s Arbitration Act decisions have taken many wrong turns. Yet, even accepting the Court’s decisions as they are, nothing compels the destructive result the Court reaches today.

...

Through the Arbitration Act, Congress sought “to make arbitration agreements as enforceable as other contracts, but not more so.” *Prima Paint*. Congress thus provided in § 2 of the FAA that the terms of a written arbitration agreement “shall be valid, irrevocable, and enforceable, *save upon such grounds as exist at law or in equity for the revocation of any contract.*” 9 U.S.C. § 2 (emphasis added). Pursuant to this “saving clause,” arbitration agreements and terms may be invalidated based on “generally applicable contract defenses, such as fraud, duress, or unconscionability.” *Doctor’s Associates, Inc. v. Casarotto*.

Illegality is a traditional, generally applicable contract defense. See 5 R. Lord, *Williston on Contracts* § 12.1 (4th ed. 2009). “[A]uthorities from the earliest time to the present unanimously hold that no court will lend its assistance in any way towards carrying out the terms of an illegal contract.” For the reasons stated [above], I would hold that the arbitration agreements’ employer-dictated collective-litigation waivers are unlawful. By declining to enforce those adhesive waivers, courts would place them on the same footing as any other contract provision incompatible with controlling federal law. The FAA’s saving clause can thus achieve harmonization of the FAA and the NLRA without undermining federal labor policy.

Here, ...the Court is not asked to apply a generally applicable contract defense to generate a rule discriminating against arbitration. At issue is application of the ordinarily superseding rule that “illegal promises will not be enforced” to invalidate arbitration provisions at odds with the NLRA, a pathmarking federal statute. That statute neither discriminates against arbitration on its face, nor by covert operation. It requires invalidation of *all* employer-imposed contractual provisions prospectively waiving employees’ § 7 rights....

III

The inevitable result of today's decision will be the underenforcement of federal and state statutes designed to advance the well-being of vulnerable workers.

...

If these untoward consequences stemmed from legislative choices, I would be obliged to accede to them. But the edict that employees with wage and hours claims may seek relief only one-by-one does not come from Congress. It is the result of take-it-or-leave-it labor contracts harking back to the type called “yellow dog,” and of the readiness of this Court to enforce those unbargained-for agreements. The FAA demands no such suppression of the right of workers to take concerted action for their “mutual aid or protection.” Accordingly, I would reverse the judgment of the Fifth Circuit in No. 16–307 and affirm the judgments of the Seventh and Ninth Circuits in Nos. 16–285 and 16–300.

Notes

1. A study released shortly before oral argument in *Epic Systems* found that an estimated 53.9% of private-sector nonunion employers in the United States used arbitration clauses for their employees, and 30.1% of those employers also included class arbitration waivers. See Alexander J.S. Colvin, The Growing Use of Mandatory Arbitration 1-2 (Sept. 27, 2017), *available at* <https://www.epi.org/publication/the-growing-use-of-mandatory-arbitration/>. Would you expect those numbers to change after *Epic Systems*? Why or why not?

2. Did the Court properly rule on the merits of the employees' illegality defense? Or was that a matter for the arbitrators under *Buckeye Check Cashing*?

3. The employees in *Epic Systems* argued that the arbitration clause was illegal as a matter of federal law. What if the defense was based on state law instead—i.e., what if a state adopted a law making arbitration clauses in employment contracts illegal when they preclude class relief? The majority assumes without deciding that federal and state law defenses should be treated the same under the FAA § 2 savings clause. Is the same true for the dissent? Under the dissent's interpretation of the savings clause, would such a state statute conflict with the FAA?

4. The majority relies heavily on the Court's earlier decisions in *Concepcion* and, to a lesser degree, in *Italian Colors*. As the majority opinion indicates, *Concepcion* involved federal preemption of state law rather than a conflict between two federal statutes. That topic is addressed in Chapter 4. *Italian Colors*, reprinted at pp. 53-60 of this Update, appears later in this Chapter. As you read those opinions, decide for yourself whether either of them requires the result in *Epic Systems*.

5. Given that the majority concluded that an arbitration clause with a class waiver was not illegal under the NLRA, did it even need to address the scope of the § 2 savings clause?

6. Which side offers the more persuasive interpretation of § 7 of the NLRA?

7. *Epic Systems* is the Supreme Court's first discussion of *Chevron* deference in the arbitration context. Lower courts, however, have considered *Chevron* deference in connection with the arbitrability of claims under the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act, an issue considered in the next section. How does *Epic Systems* apply in that context, do you think?

Add the following to the end of note 1 after *American Homestar* on page 219:

In a recent review of its interpretations of the Magnuson-Moss Act, the FTC “reaffirm[ed] its long-held view that the MMWA disfavors, and authorizes the Commission to prohibit, mandatory binding arbitration in warranties.” Federal Trade Comm’n, Final Action Concerning Review of Interpretations of Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act, 80 Fed. Reg. 42710, 42719 (July 20, 2015) (with one Commissioner dissenting).

Insert the following after note 4 following *Green Tree* on page 234:

**AMERICAN EXPRESS CO. v. ITALIAN COLORS
RESTAURANT
Supreme Court of the United States
133 S. Ct. 2304 (2013)**

JUSTICE SCALIA delivered the opinion of the Court.

We consider whether a contractual waiver of class arbitration is enforceable under the Federal Arbitration Act when the plaintiff’s cost of individually arbitrating a federal statutory claim exceeds the potential recovery.

I

Respondents are merchants who accept American Express cards. Their agreement with petitioners — American Express and a wholly owned subsidiary — contains a clause that requires all disputes between the parties to be resolved by arbitration. The agreement also provides that “[t]here shall be no right or authority for any Claims to be arbitrated on a class action basis.”

Respondents brought a class action against petitioners for violations of the federal antitrust laws. According to respondents, American Express used its monopoly power in the market for charge cards to force merchants to accept credit cards at rates approximately 30% higher than the fees for competing credit cards. This tying arrangement, respondents said, violated § 1 of the Sherman Act. They sought treble damages for the class under § 4 of the Clayton Act.

Petitioners moved to compel individual arbitration under the Federal Arbitration Act (FAA). In resisting the motion, respondents submitted a declaration from an economist who estimated that the cost of an expert analysis necessary to prove the antitrust claims would be “at least several hundred thousand dollars, and might exceed \$1 million,” while the maximum recovery for an individual plaintiff would be \$12,850, or \$38,549 when trebled. The District Court granted the motion and dismissed the lawsuits. The Court of Appeals reversed and remanded for further proceedings. It held that because respondents had established that “they would incur prohibitive costs if compelled to arbitrate under the class action waiver,” the waiver was unenforceable and the arbitration could not proceed.

We granted certiorari, vacated the judgment, and remanded for further consideration in light of *Stolt-Nielsen S.A. v. AnimalFeeds Int’l Corp.* The Court of Appeals stood by its reversal, stating that its earlier ruling did not compel class arbitration. It then *sua sponte* reconsidered its ruling in light of *AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion* Finding *AT&T Mobility* inapplicable because it addressed

pre-emption, the Court of Appeals reversed for the third time. It then denied rehearing en banc with five judges dissenting. We granted certiorari to consider the question “[w]hether the Federal Arbitration Act permits courts . . . to invalidate arbitration agreements on the ground that they do not permit class arbitration of a federal-law claim.”

II

Congress enacted the FAA in response to widespread judicial hostility to arbitration. Th[e] text [of the Act] reflects the overarching principle that arbitration is a matter of contract. And consistent with that text, courts must “rigorously enforce” arbitration agreements according to their terms, including terms that “specify *with whom* [the parties] choose to arbitrate their disputes” and “the rules under which that arbitration will be conducted.” That holds true for claims that allege a violation of a federal statute, unless the FAA’s mandate has been “overridden by a contrary congressional command.”

III

No contrary congressional command requires us to reject the waiver of class arbitration here. Respondents argue that requiring them to litigate their claims individually — as they contracted to do — would contravene the policies of the antitrust laws. But the antitrust laws do not guarantee an affordable procedural path to the vindication of every claim. Congress has taken some measures to facilitate the litigation of antitrust claims — for example, it enacted a multiplied-damages remedy. See 15 U. S. C. § 15 (treble damages). In enacting such measures, Congress has told us that it is willing to go, in certain respects, beyond the normal limits of law in advancing its goals of deterring and remedying unlawful trade practice. But to say that Congress must have intended whatever departures from those normal limits advance antitrust goals is simply irrational. “[N]o legislation pursues its purposes at all costs.”

The antitrust laws do not “evin[c]e an intention to preclude a waiver” of class-action procedure. *Mitsubishi Motors*. The Sherman and Clayton Acts make no mention of class actions. In fact, they were enacted decades before the advent of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, which was “designed to allow an exception to the usual rule that litigation is conducted by and on behalf of the individual named parties only.” The parties here agreed to arbitrate pursuant to that “usual rule,” and it would be remarkable for a court to erase that expectation.

Nor does congressional approval of Rule 23 establish an entitlement to class proceedings for the vindication of statutory rights. To begin with, it is likely that such an entitlement, invalidating private arbitration agreements denying class adjudication, would be an “abridg[ment]” or modif[ication]” of a “substantive right”

forbidden to the Rules, see 28 U. S. C. § 2072(b). But there is no evidence of such an entitlement in any event. The Rule imposes stringent requirements for certification that in practice exclude most claims. And we have specifically rejected the assertion that one of those requirements (the class-notice requirement) must be dispensed with because the “prohibitively high cost” of compliance would “frustrate [plaintiff’s] attempt to vindicate the policies underlying the antitrust” laws. *Eisen v. Carlisle & Jacquelin*, 417 U. S. 156, 166-168, 175-176 (1974). One might respond, perhaps, that federal law secures a nonwaivable *opportunity* to vindicate federal policies by satisfying the procedural strictures of Rule 23 or invoking some other informal class mechanism in arbitration. But we have already rejected that proposition in *AT&T Mobility*.

IV

Our finding of no “contrary congressional command” does not end the case. Respondents invoke a judge-made exception to the FAA which, they say, serves to harmonize competing federal policies by allowing courts to invalidate agreements that prevent the “effective vindication” of a federal statutory right. Enforcing the waiver of class arbitration bars effective vindication, respondents contend, because they have no economic incentive to pursue their antitrust claims individually in arbitration.

The “effective vindication” exception to which respondents allude originated as dictum in *Mitsubishi Motors*, where we expressed a willingness to invalidate, on “public policy” grounds, arbitration agreements that “operat[e] . . . as a prospective waiver of a party’s *right to pursue* statutory remedies.” (emphasis added). Dismissing concerns that the arbitral forum was inadequate, we said that “so long as the prospective litigant effectively may vindicate its statutory cause of action in the arbitral forum, the statute will continue to serve both its remedial and deterrent function.” Subsequent cases have similarly asserted the existence of an “effective vindication” exception, see, *e.g.*, *Gilmer*, but have similarly declined to apply it to invalidate the arbitration agreement at issue.

And we do so again here. As we have described, the exception finds its origin in the desire to prevent “prospective waiver of a party’s *right to pursue* statutory remedies,” *Mitsubishi Motors* (emphasis added). That would certainly cover a provision in an arbitration agreement forbidding the assertion of certain statutory rights. And it would perhaps cover filing and administrative fees attached to arbitration that are so high as to make access to the forum impracticable. See *Green Tree Financial Corp.-Ala. v. Randolph*. But the fact that it is not worth the expense involved in *proving* a statutory remedy does not constitute the elimination of the

right to pursue that remedy.³ The class-action waiver merely limits arbitration to the two contracting parties. It no more eliminates those parties' right to pursue their statutory remedy than did federal law before its adoption of the class action for legal relief in 1938. Or, to put it differently, the individual suit that was considered adequate to assure "effective vindication" of a federal right before adoption of class-action procedures did not suddenly become "ineffective vindication" upon their adoption.⁴

...
Truth to tell, our decision in *AT&T Mobility* all but resolves this case. There we invalidated a law conditioning enforcement of arbitration on the availability of class procedure because that law "interfere[d] with fundamental attributes of arbitration." "[T]he switch from bilateral to class arbitration," we said, "sacrifices the principal advantage of arbitration — its informality — and makes the process slower, more costly, and more likely to generate procedural morass than final judgment." We specifically rejected the argument that class arbitration was necessary to prosecute claims "that might otherwise slip through the legal system."⁵

* * *

³ The dissent contends that a class-action waiver may deny a party's right to pursue statutory remedies in the same way as a clause that bars a party from presenting economic testimony. That is a false comparison for several reasons: To begin with, it is not a given that such a clause would constitute an impermissible waiver; we have never considered the point. But more importantly, such a clause, assuming it makes vindication of the claim impossible, makes it impossible not just as a class action but even as an individual claim.

⁴ ... The dissent ... says that the agreement bars other forms of cost sharing — existing before the Sherman Act — that could provide effective vindication. Petitioners denied that, and that is not what the Court of Appeals decision under review here held. It held that, because other forms of cost sharing were not economically feasible ("the *only economically feasible* means for . . . enforcing [respondents'] statutory rights is *via a class action*"), the class-action waiver was unenforceable. (emphasis added). (The dissent's assertion to the contrary cites not the opinion on appeal here, but an earlier opinion that was vacated.) That is the conclusion we reject.

⁵ In dismissing *AT&T Mobility* as a case involving pre-emption and not the effective-vindication exception, the dissent ignores what that case established — that the FAA's command to enforce arbitration agreements trumps any interest in ensuring the prosecution of low-value claims. The latter interest, we said, is "unrelated" to the FAA. Accordingly, the FAA does, contrary to the dissent's assertion, favor the absence of litigation when that is the consequence of a class-action waiver, since its "principal purpose" is the enforcement of arbitration agreements according to their terms.

The regime established by the Court of Appeals’ decision would require — before a plaintiff can be held to contractually agreed bilateral arbitration — that a federal court determine (and the parties litigate) the legal requirements for success on the merits claim-by-claim and theory-by-theory, the evidence necessary to meet those requirements, the cost of developing that evidence, and the damages that would be recovered in the event of success. Such a preliminary litigating hurdle would undoubtedly destroy the prospect of speedy resolution that arbitration in general and bilateral arbitration in particular was meant to secure. The FAA does not sanction such a judicially created superstructure.

The judgment of the Court of Appeals is reversed.

It is so ordered.

JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

[Concurring opinion by JUSTICE THOMAS omitted.]

JUSTICE KAGAN, with whom JUSTICE GINSBURG and JUSTICE BREYER join, dissenting.

Here is the nutshell version of this case, unfortunately obscured in the Court’s decision. The owner of a small restaurant (Italian Colors) thinks that American Express (Amex) has used its monopoly power to force merchants to accept a form contract violating the antitrust laws. The restaurateur wants to challenge the allegedly unlawful provision (imposing a tying arrangement), but the same contract’s arbitration clause prevents him from doing so. That term imposes a variety of procedural bars that would make pursuit of the antitrust claim a fool’s errand. So if the arbitration clause is enforceable, Amex has insulated itself from antitrust liability — even if it has in fact violated the law. The monopolist gets to use its monopoly power to insist on a contract effectively depriving its victims of all legal recourse.

And here is the nutshell version of today’s opinion, admirably flaunted rather than camouflaged: Too darn bad.

...

Start with an uncontroversial proposition: We would refuse to enforce an exculpatory clause insulating a company from antitrust liability — say, “Merchants may bring no Sherman Act claims” — even if that clause were contained in an arbitration agreement. Congress created the Sherman Act’s private cause of action not solely to compensate individuals, but to promote “the public interest in vigilant enforcement of the antitrust laws.” Accordingly, courts will not enforce a prospective waiver of the right to gain redress for an antitrust injury, whether in an arbitration agreement or any other contract.

...

If the rule were limited to baldly exculpatory provisions, however, a monopolist could devise numerous ways around it. Consider several alternatives that a party drafting an arbitration agreement could adopt to avoid antitrust liability, each of which would have the identical effect. On the front end: The agreement might set outlandish filing fees or establish an absurd (*e.g.*, one-day) statute of limitations, thus preventing a claimant from gaining access to the arbitral forum. On the back end: The agreement might remove the arbitrator's authority to grant meaningful relief, so that a judgment gets the claimant nothing worthwhile. And in the middle: The agreement might block the claimant from presenting the kind of proof that is necessary to establish the defendant's liability — say, by prohibiting any economic testimony (good luck proving an antitrust claim without that!). Or else the agreement might appoint as an arbitrator an obviously biased person — say, the CEO of Amex. The possibilities are endless — all less direct than an express exculpatory clause, but no less fatal. So the rule against prospective waivers of federal rights can work only if it applies not just to a contract clause explicitly barring a claim, but to others that operate to do so.

And sure enough, our cases establish this proposition: An arbitration clause will not be enforced if it prevents the effective vindication of federal statutory rights, however it achieves that result....

Applied as our precedents direct, the effective-vindication rule furthers the purposes not just of laws like the Sherman Act, but of the FAA itself.... What the FAA prefers to litigation is arbitration, not *de facto* immunity. The effective-vindication rule furthers the statute's goals by ensuring that arbitration remains a real, not faux, method of dispute resolution....

...

And this is just the kind of case the rule was meant to address.... As this case comes to us, the evidence shows that Italian Colors cannot prevail in arbitration without an economic analysis defining the relevant markets, establishing Amex's monopoly power, showing anticompetitive effects, and measuring damages. And that expert report would cost between several hundred thousand and one million dollars. So the expense involved in proving the claim in arbitration is ten times what Italian Colors could hope to gain, even in a best-case scenario. That counts as a "prohibitive" cost, in *Randolph's* terminology, if anything does. No rational actor would bring a claim worth tens of thousands of dollars if doing so meant incurring costs in the hundreds of thousands.

An arbitration agreement could manage such a mismatch in many ways, but Amex's disdains them all. As the Court makes clear, the contract expressly prohibits class arbitration. But that is only part of the problem. The agreement also disallows any kind of joinder or consolidation of claims or parties. And more: Its confidentiality provision prevents Italian Colors from informally arranging with

other merchants to produce a common expert report. And still more: The agreement precludes any shifting of costs to Amex, even if Italian Colors prevails. And beyond all that: Amex refused to enter into any stipulations that would obviate or mitigate the need for the economic analysis. In short, the agreement as applied in this case cuts off not just class arbitration, but any avenue for sharing, shifting, or shrinking necessary costs. Amex has put Italian Colors to this choice: Spend way, way, way more money than your claim is worth, or relinquish your Sherman Act rights.

...
The [third] paragraph [of Part IV] of the Court's decision ... is the key: It contains almost the whole of the majority's effort to explain why the effective-vindication rule does not stop Amex from compelling arbitration. The majority's first move is to describe *Mitsubishi* and *Randolph* as covering only discrete situations Those cases are not this case, the majority says: Here, the agreement's provisions went to the possibility of "*proving* a statutory remedy."

But the distinction the majority proffers, which excludes problems of proof, is one *Mitsubishi* and *Randolph* (and our decisions reaffirming them) foreclose. Those decisions establish what in some quarters is known as a principle: When an arbitration agreement prevents the effective vindication of federal rights, a party may go to court. That principle, by its nature, operates in diverse circumstances — not just the ones that happened to come before the Court.... The variations matter not at all. Whatever the precise mechanism, each "operate[s] ... as a prospective waiver of a party's [federal] right[s]" — and so confers immunity on a wrongdoer. And that is what counts under our decisions.

...
That leaves the three last sentences in the majority's core paragraph. Here, the majority conjures a special reason to exclude "class-action waiver[s]" from the effective-vindication rule's compass. Rule 23, the majority notes, became law only in 1938 — decades after the Sherman Act. The majority's conclusion: If federal law in the interim decades did not eliminate a plaintiff's rights under that Act, then neither does this agreement.

But that notion, first of all, rests on a false premise: that this case is only about a class-action waiver. It is not, and indeed could not sensibly be. The effective-vindication rule asks whether an arbitration agreement *as a whole* precludes a claimant from enforcing federal statutory rights....

In any event, the age of the relevant procedural mechanisms (whether class actions or any other) does not matter, because the effective-vindication rule asks about the world today, not the world as it might have looked when Congress passed a given statute. Whether a particular procedural device preceded or post-dated a particular statute, the question remains the same: Does the arbitration agreement foreclose a party—right now—from effectively vindicating the substantive rights the statute provides?...

Still, the majority takes one last stab: “Truth to tell,” it claims, *AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion*, “all but resolves this case.”... [J]ust as this case is not about class actions, *AT&T Mobility* was not — and could not have been — about the effective-vindication rule. Here is a tip-off: *AT&T Mobility* nowhere cited our effective-vindication precedents....

... *AT&T Mobility* involved a *state* law, and therefore could not possibly implicate the effective-vindication rule. When a state rule allegedly conflicts with the FAA, we apply standard preemption principles, asking whether the state law frustrates the FAA’s purposes and objectives. If the state rule does so — as the Court found in *AT&T Mobility* — the Supremacy Clause requires its invalidation. We have no earthly interest (quite the contrary) in vindicating that law. Our effective-vindication rule comes into play only when the FAA is alleged to conflict with another *federal* law, like the Sherman Act here. In that all-federal context, one law does not automatically bow to the other, and the effective-vindication rule serves as a way to reconcile any tension between them. Again, then, *AT&T Mobility* had no occasion to address the issue in this case. The relevant decisions are instead *Mitsubishi* and *Randolph*.

* * *

The Court today mistakes what this case is about. To a hammer, everything looks like a nail. And to a Court bent on diminishing the usefulness of Rule 23, everything looks like a class action, ready to be dismantled....

As a result, Amex’s contract will succeed in depriving Italian Colors of any effective opportunity to challenge monopolistic conduct allegedly in violation of the Sherman Act. The FAA, the majority says, so requires. Do not be fooled. Only the Court so requires; the FAA was never meant to produce this outcome. The FAA conceived of arbitration as a “method of *resolving* disputes” — a way of using tailored and streamlined procedures to facilitate redress of injuries. (emphasis added). In the hands of today’s majority, arbitration threatens to become more nearly the opposite — a mechanism easily made to block the vindication of meritorious federal claims and insulate wrongdoers from liability. The Court thus undermines the FAA no less than it does the Sherman Act and other federal statutes providing rights of action. I respectfully dissent.

Replace the notes and Problem 3.10 after *Graham Oil* on pages 239-242 with the following:

Notes

1. The “effective vindication” doctrine discussed in *Green Tree* and *Amex*, and applied in *Graham Oil*, often overlaps with unconscionability as a basis for challenging the enforceability of arbitration agreements. How do the theories differ? In one sense, the effective vindication doctrine is narrower because it requires the challenge to the arbitration agreement to be based on an inconsistency with a particular federal statute. Unconscionability has no such limitation. But after the Supreme Court’s decision in *Concepcion* (discussed in § 4.04) — holding that the FAA preempts at least some unconscionability challenges to arbitration agreements — the effective vindication doctrine gained increased prominence, culminating in the Supreme Court’s decision in *Amex*.

2. What is the status of the effective vindication doctrine after *Amex*? Under what circumstances can a party rely on the doctrine to challenge the enforceability of an arbitration clause? Is the decision in *Graham Oil* still good law after *Amex*?

3. Are there any circumstances in which a party can challenge a class arbitration waiver using the effective vindication doctrine after *Amex*? What if the federal statute expressly authorized class actions? Addressed how damages were to be calculated in a class action? Was enacted after the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure were adopted? Was enacted after the current version of Federal Rule 23 was adopted?

4. What if the parties’ contract, in addition to waiving class relief, also obliged them to keep the existence of any dispute confidential and precluded them from cooperating with other similarly situated parties in bringing a claim? The majority and dissent disagree about whether other provisions in the contract in *Amex* also interfered with the plaintiffs’ federal statutory rights. If they did, would that have changed the outcome of the case?

5. Is the reasoning of *Amex* limited to arbitration clauses? What if the parties waive class relief in a contract that does not include an arbitration clause? Would the Court have come out the same way it did in *Amex*?

6. Assuming that some sort of effective vindication doctrine remains available after *Amex*, additional questions arise. First, what if the provision of the arbitration clause alleged to interfere with the effective vindication of statutory rights is ambiguous?

Consider, for example, the punitive damages provision of the arbitration agreement in *Graham Oil*, which provided that “[t]he arbitrator(s) may not assess punitive or exemplary damages.” Does that language constitute a waiver of the right to recover punitive damages, or does it merely define the scope of the arbitrator’s authority, permitting a court later to award punitive damages if appropriate? Compare Stephen J. Ware, *Punitive Damages in Arbitration: Contracting Out of the Government’s Role in Punishment and Federal Preemption of State Law*, 63 *FORDHAM L. REV.* 529, 540–42 (1994) (arguing that language denying arbitrator authority to award punitive damages waives altogether claim for punitive damages) with Thomas J. Stipanowich, *Punitive Damages and the Consumerization of Arbitration*, 92 *NW. U. L. REV.* 1, 35 (1997) (arguing that punitive damages remain available in court after arbitration proceeding is completed).

In *PacifiCare Health Systems, Inc. v. Book*, 538 U.S. 401 (2003), the Supreme Court held that resolving such an ambiguity was a matter for the arbitrator, not the court. The district court in *PacifiCare* had refused to compel arbitration of a claim under the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO) because of a provision in the arbitration agreement that precluded the award of “punitive damages.” The district court concluded that the provision would prevent the arbitrator from awarding treble damages as provided for under RICO, and so might deny the claimant “meaningful relief for allegations of statutory violations in an arbitration forum.” The Supreme Court reversed, explaining that the language in the arbitration agreement was ambiguous and that “we should not, on the basis of ‘mere speculation’ that an arbitrator might interpret these ambiguous agreements in a manner that casts their enforceability into doubt, take upon ourselves the authority to decide the antecedent question of how the ambiguity is to be resolved.” *Id.* at 406-07. The Court explained that “the preliminary question whether the remedial limitations at issue here prohibit an award of RICO treble damages is not a question of arbitrability” that a court could decide.” *Id.* at 407 n.2. “[S]ince we do not know how the arbitrator will construe the remedial limitations,” the Court concluded, “the proper course is to compel arbitration.” *Id.* at 407.

7. Second, what if the statutory rights derive from state law rather than federal law? In *Feeney v. Dell Inc.*, 989 N.E.2d 439 (Mass. 2013), the Massachusetts Supreme Court invalidated an arbitration clause with a class arbitration waiver on the ground that it precluded the plaintiffs from vindicating their rights under Massachusetts consumer protection statutes, and expressly refused to limit the effective vindication doctrine to federal statutory rights. The dissent in *Amex*, however, rejected the application of the doctrine to state statutory rights, suggesting that even the dissent would conclude that *Feeney* was wrongly decided. The Massachusetts Supreme Court thereafter reversed itself and concluded that “the analysis the Court set forth in *Concepcion* (and reinforced in *Amex*) applies

without regard to whether the claim sought to be vindicated arises under Federal or State law.” *Feeney v. Dell Inc.*, 993 N.E.2d 329, 331 (Mass. 2013).

8. Third, assume that the court, as in *Graham Oil*, concludes that several provisions of the arbitration clause are unenforceable under the effective vindication doctrine. Should the court invalidate the entire arbitration clause or sever the unenforceable provisions and enforce the rest of the clause? The majority and the dissent in *Graham Oil* disagreed about the proper approach in that case, with the majority holding the provisions nonseverable and invalidating the entire clause. Was that approach proper?

Severability was the subject of an opinion by now-Chief Justice John Roberts while serving on the D.C. Circuit. In *Booker v. Robert Half Int’l, Inc.*, 413 F.3d 77 (D.C. Cir. 2005), the court of appeals held that the district court had properly severed a provision precluding the award of punitive damages, which the parties agreed was unenforceable. In so doing, the court surveyed the law on severability and distinguished *Graham Oil*:

Booker next argues that enforcing the remainder of the arbitration clause contravenes the federal policy interest in ensuring the effective vindication of statutory rights. He contends that responding to illegal provisions in arbitration agreements by judicially pruning them out leaves employers with every incentive to “overreach” when drafting such agreements. If judges merely sever illegal provisions and compel arbitration, employers would be no worse off for trying to include illegal provisions than if they had followed the law in drafting their agreements in the first place. On the other hand, because not every claimant will challenge the illegal provisions, some employees will go to the arbitral table without all their statutory rights.

We have never addressed this issue, but Booker’s argument — bolstered by support from the EEOC — has helped persuade some circuits to strike arbitration clauses in their entirety, rather than simply sever offending provisions. Other circuits, however, have invoked the federal policy in favor of enforcing agreements to arbitrate to reject policy arguments like Booker’s and uphold severance of illegal provisions. The differing results may well reflect not so much a split among the circuits as variety among different arbitration agreements. Decisions striking an arbitration clause entirely often involved agreements without a severability clause, or agreements that did not contain merely one readily severable illegal provision, but were instead pervasively infected with illegality. Decisions severing an illegal provision and compelling arbitration, on the other hand, typically

considered agreements with a severability clause and discrete unenforceable provisions.

...

We agree with the district court that severing the punitive damages bar and enforcing the arbitration clause was proper here. Not only does the agreement contain a severability clause, but Booker identifies only one discrete illegal provision in the agreement. . . . This one unenforceable provision does not infect the arbitration clause as a whole. The district court did not unravel “a highly integrated” complex of interlocking illegal provisions, but rather removed a punitive damages bar that appears to have been grafted onto an intact and functioning framework, for the AAA commercial rules — incorporated by reference in the clause — already contain provisions on remedies that do not prohibit punitive damages. Indeed, by severing a remedial component of the arbitration clause, the district court removed a provision generally understood as not being essential to a contract’s consideration, and thus more readily severable.

The *Graham Oil* decision, on which Booker relies, struck the entire arbitration agreement after noting that “the offensive provisions clearly represent an attempt . . . to achieve through arbitration what Congress has expressly forbidden.” There is no evidence of that here. At the time the parties signed the agreement . . . the law of this circuit was unclear as to whether bars on punitive damages in arbitration clauses were enforceable in this context. Moreover, the AAA did not promulgate the employment arbitration rules favored by Booker — and assented to by RHI in pre-litigation negotiations — until after the parties signed the employment agreement.

By invoking the severability clause to remove a discrete remedial provision, the district court honored the intent of the parties reflected in the employment agreement, which included not only the punitive damages bar but the explicit severability clause as well. In doing so, the court was also faithful to the federal policy which “requires that we rigorously enforce agreements to arbitrate.”

Id. at 84-86.

9. In response to *Amex*, the congressional sponsors of the Arbitration Fairness Act introduced a new version of the Act, which would make pre-dispute arbitration agreements unenforceable to the extent they required arbitration of an “antitrust dispute.” See Arbitration Fairness Act of 2017, *reprinted at* pages 148-152 of this Update; *see also* Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Harassment Act of

2017, *reprinted at* pages 153-155 of this Update. The new version of the Arbitration Fairness Act defines an “antitrust dispute” as a dispute:

‘(A) involving a claim for damages allegedly caused by a violation of the antitrust laws (as defined in subsection (a) of the first section of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12)) or State antitrust laws; and

‘(B) in which the plaintiffs seek certification as a class under rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or a comparable rule or provision of State law.

Id. The bill would not make all antitrust claims nonarbitrable, but would make predispute arbitration agreements unenforceable in any case in which an antitrust plaintiff brings a class action, apparently without regard to whether the class action could properly be certified under Rule 23 and without regard to whether the case could economically be brought on an individual basis.

Problem 3.10

In addition to providing for binding arbitration, the Send-A-Wreck franchise agreement (see Problem 3.5) also provides that (1) the arbitration shall be conducted under the Commercial Arbitration Rules of the American Arbitration Association; (2) the arbitrator shall have no authority to award punitive damages; (3) each party shall bear its own attorney’s fees; (4) any claim not filed within one year shall be barred as untimely; and (5) all claims must proceed only on an individual basis; class relief of any sort is barred.

Patricia Cairns now files a class action alleging an unlawful tying arrangement in violation of the federal antitrust laws and claiming actual damages on behalf of the class of \$15,000,000. (Her individual damages, and the damages of each individual class member, are only \$5,000, however.) Cairns seeks recovery of treble damages (three times actual damages) and of her attorney’s fees, both of which are statutorily authorized for successful antitrust plaintiffs. Her suit is filed more than a year after the claim arose, but within the time permitted by the statute of limitations under the federal antitrust laws. In opposing Send-A-Wreck’s petition to compel arbitration, Cairns’ attorney also submits (1) an affidavit from Cairns asserting that she cannot afford to arbitrate the dispute because her annual income is only \$20,000; (2) biographies of prospective arbitrators showing that they charge a minimum of \$1,000 per day to serve as arbitrator; and (3) an affidavit from an expert witness stating that it would cost at least \$100,000 to do the sort of economic study necessary to establish an unlawful tying arrangement on the facts of the case.

Should a court order Cairns to arbitrate her antitrust claim? Would your answer differ if her claim was based solely on state law rather than federal law?

Chapter 4 The Federal Arbitration Act and State Law

Add the following citation to end of note 2 after *Alafabco* on page 269:

; *Jeffers v. Babera Mgmt. Corp.*, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 79645, at 3-4 (C.D. Cal. June 3, 2014) (“Defendant has offered no argument regarding this transaction's effect on interstate commerce. The Court finds that this residential lease agreement for California property, entered into by California residents, did not affect interstate commerce. As such, the agreement is not subject to Section 2 of the Federal Arbitration Act.”); *Genger v. Genger*, 2017 WL 2239551, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. May 9, 2017) (holding that arbitration of a dispute arising out of allocation of assets in divorce settlement “does not involve commerce”).

Renumber the current note after *Circuit City* on page 277 as note 1, and add the following as note 2:

2. How does the employment exception in FAA § 1 apply to disputes about whether a person is an employee or an independent contractor? On October 3, 2018, the U.S. Supreme Court is scheduled to hearing oral argument in *New Prime Inc. v. Oliveira* (No. 17-340), *cert. granted*, 138 S. Ct. 1164 (Feb. 26, 2018). The Questions Presented in that case are:

1. Whether a dispute over applicability of the FAA’s Section 1 exemption is an arbitrability issue that must be resolved in arbitration pursuant to a valid delegation clause.
2. Whether the FAA’s Section 1 exemption, which applies on its face only to “contracts of employment,” is inapplicable to independent contractor agreements.

The Court likely will issue its decision in *New Prime* by the end of June 2019.

Replace notes 5, 6, and 9 after *Concepcion* on pages 286-87 with the following:

5. What if the case involves a federal statutory claim? Can a court refuse to enforce an arbitration clause with a class arbitration waiver on the ground that the clause would prevent consumers from vindicating their federal statutory rights? The Supreme Court rejected such a contention in *American Express Co. v. Italian Colors Restaurant*, reprinted at pages 53-60 of this Update.

6. Other possible limits on *Concepcion* might come from state statutes such as:

(1) California’s Private Attorneys General Act; see *Iskanian v. CLS Transport. L.A., LLC*, 59 Cal. 4th 348, 360 (Cal. 2014) (holding that “the FAA’s goal of promoting arbitration as a means of private dispute resolution does not preclude our legislature from deputizing employees to prosecute Labor Code violations on the state’s behalf. Therefore the FAA does not preempt a state law that prohibits waiver of [Private Attorneys General Act] representative actions in an employment contract.”) and *Sakkab v. Luxottica Retail N. Am., Inc.*, 803 F.3d 425, 429 (9th Cir. 2015) (“After considering the history of the PAGA statute and the Supreme Court’s FAA preemption cases, we hold that the FAA does not preempt the *Iskanian* rule.”); and

(2) California statutes providing for public injunctive relief; see *McGill v. Citibank, N.A.*, 393 P.3d 85 (Cal. 2017) (“[A] provision in *any* contract—even a contract that has no arbitration provision—that purports to waive, in all fora, the statutory right to seek public injunctive relief under the UCL, the CLRA, or the false advertising law is invalid and unenforceable under California law. The FAA does not require enforcement of such a provision, in derogation of this generally applicable contract defense, merely because the provision has been inserted into an arbitration agreement.”). But see *Ferguson v. Corinthian Colleges, Inc.*, 733 F.3d 928, 934 (9th Cir. 2013) (“By exempting from arbitration claims for public injunctive relief ..., the *Broughton-Cruz* rule similarly prohibits outright arbitration of a particular type of claim” and is preempted by the FAA”).

...

9. In response to *Concepcion*, Representative Hank Johnson and Senator Al Franken reintroduced into Congress the Arbitration Fairness Act, the most recent version of which is reprinted at pages 148-152 of this Update. Given the current composition of Congress, however, passage of the AFA or similar bills is unlikely.

Insert the following after note 4 following *Keystone* on page 296:

KINDRED NURSING CENTERS L.P. v. CLARK
Supreme Court of the United States
137 S. Ct. 1421 (May 15, 2017)

Justice KAGAN delivered the opinion of the Court.

The Federal Arbitration Act (FAA or Act) requires courts to place arbitration agreements “on equal footing with all other contracts.” *DIRECTV, Inc. v. Imburgia*. In the decision below, the Kentucky Supreme Court declined to give effect to two arbitration agreements executed by individuals holding “powers of attorney”—that is, authorizations to act on behalf of others. According to the court, a general grant of power (even if seemingly comprehensive) does not permit a legal representative to enter into an arbitration agreement for someone else; to form such a contract, the representative must possess specific authority to “waive his principal’s fundamental constitutional rights to access the courts [and] to trial by jury.” *Extendicare Homes, Inc. v. Whisman*, 478 S.W.3d 306, 327 (2015). Because that rule singles out arbitration agreements for disfavored treatment, we hold that it violates the FAA.

I

Petitioner Kindred Nursing Centers L.P. operates nursing homes and rehabilitation centers. Respondents Beverly Wellner and Janis Clark are the wife and daughter, respectively, of Joe Wellner and Olive Clark, two now-deceased residents of a Kindred nursing home called the Winchester Centre.

At all times relevant to this case, Beverly and Janis each held a power of attorney, designating her as an “attorney-in-fact” (the one for Joe, the other for Olive) and affording her broad authority to manage her family member’s affairs. In the Wellner power of attorney, Joe gave Beverly the authority, “in my name, place and stead,” to (among other things) “institute legal proceedings” and make “contracts of every nature in relation to both real and personal property.” In the Clark power of attorney, Olive provided Janis with “full power ... to transact, handle, and dispose of all matters affecting me and/or my estate in any possible way,” including the power to “draw, make, and sign in my name any and all ... contracts, deeds, or agreements.”

Joe and Olive moved into the Winchester Centre in 2008, with Beverly and Janis using their powers of attorney to complete all necessary paperwork. As part of that process, Beverly and Janis each signed an arbitration agreement with Kindred on behalf of her relative. The two contracts, worded identically, provided that “[a]ny and all claims or controversies arising out of or in any way relating to ... the

Resident's stay at the Facility" would be resolved through "binding arbitration" rather than a lawsuit.

When Joe and Olive died the next year, their estates (represented again by Beverly and Janis) brought separate suits against Kindred in Kentucky state court. The complaints alleged that Kindred had delivered substandard care to Joe and Olive, causing their deaths. Kindred moved to dismiss the cases, arguing that the arbitration agreements Beverly and Janis had signed prohibited bringing their disputes to court. But the trial court denied Kindred's motions, and the Kentucky Court of Appeals agreed that the estates' suits could go forward.

The Kentucky Supreme Court, after consolidating the cases, affirmed those decisions by a divided vote. The court began with the language of the two powers of attorney. The Wellner document, the court stated, did not permit Beverly to enter into an arbitration agreement on Joe's behalf. In the court's view, neither the provision authorizing her to bring legal proceedings nor the one enabling her to make property-related contracts reached quite that distance. By contrast, the court thought, the Clark power of attorney extended that far and beyond. Under that document, after all, Janis had the capacity to "dispose of all matters" affecting Olive. "Given this extremely broad, universal delegation of authority," the court acknowledged, "it would be impossible to say that entering into [an] arbitration agreement was not covered."

And yet, the court went on, both arbitration agreements—Janis's no less than Beverly's—were invalid. That was because a power of attorney could not entitle a representative to enter into an arbitration agreement without *specifically* saying so. The Kentucky Constitution, the court explained, protects the rights of access to the courts and trial by jury; indeed, the jury guarantee is the sole right the Constitution declares "sacred" and "inviolable." Accordingly, the court held, an agent could deprive her principal of an "adjudication by judge or jury" only if the power of attorney "expressly so provide[d]." And that clear-statement rule—so said the court—complied with the FAA's demands. True enough that the Act precludes "singl[ing] out arbitration agreements." But that was no problem, the court asserted, because its rule would apply not just to those agreements, but also to some other contracts implicating "fundamental constitutional rights." In the future, for example, the court would bar the holder of a "non-specific" power of attorney from entering into a contract "bind[ing] the principal to personal servitude."

Justice Abramson dissented, in an opinion joined by two of her colleagues. In their view, the Kentucky Supreme Court's new clear-statement rule was "clearly not ... applicable to 'any contract' but [instead] single[d] out arbitration agreements for disfavored treatment." Accordingly, the dissent concluded, the rule "r[a]n afoul of the FAA."

We granted certiorari.

II

A

The FAA makes arbitration agreements “valid, irrevocable, and enforceable, save upon such grounds as exist at law or in equity for the revocation of any contract.” 9 U.S.C. § 2. That statutory provision establishes an equal-treatment principle: A court may invalidate an arbitration agreement based on “generally applicable contract defenses” like fraud or unconscionability, but not on legal rules that “apply only to arbitration or that derive their meaning from the fact that an agreement to arbitrate is at issue.” *AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion*. The FAA thus preempts any state rule discriminating on its face against arbitration—for example, a “law prohibit[ing] outright the arbitration of a particular type of claim.” And not only that: The Act also displaces any rule that covertly accomplishes the same objective by disfavoring contracts that (oh so coincidentally) have the defining features of arbitration agreements. In *Concepcion*, for example, we described a hypothetical state law declaring unenforceable any contract that “disallow[ed] an ultimate disposition [of a dispute] by a jury.” Such a law might avoid referring to arbitration by name; but still, we explained, it would “rely on the uniqueness of an agreement to arbitrate as [its] basis”—and thereby violate the FAA.

The Kentucky Supreme Court’s clear-statement rule, in just that way, fails to put arbitration agreements on an equal plane with other contracts. By the court’s own account, that rule (like the one *Concepcion* posited) serves to safeguard a person’s “right to access the courts and to trial by jury.” In ringing terms, the court affirmed the jury right’s unsurpassed standing in the State Constitution: The framers, the court explained, recognized “that right and that right alone as a divine God-given right” when they made it “the *only* thing” that must be “held sacred” and “inviolable.” So it was that the court required an explicit statement before an attorney-in-fact, even if possessing broad delegated powers, could relinquish that right on another’s behalf. And so it was that the court did exactly what *Concepcion* barred: adopt a legal rule hinging on the primary characteristic of an arbitration agreement—namely, a waiver of the right to go to court and receive a jury trial. Such a rule is too tailor-made to arbitration agreements—subjecting them, by virtue of their defining trait, to uncommon barriers—to survive the FAA’s edict against singling out those contracts for disfavored treatment.¹

¹ Making matters worse, the Kentucky Supreme Court’s clear-statement rule appears not to apply to other kinds of agreements relinquishing the right to go to court or obtain a jury trial. Nothing in the decision below (or elsewhere in Kentucky law) suggests that explicit authorization is needed before an attorney-in-fact can sign a settlement agreement or consent to a bench trial on her principal’s behalf. Mark that as yet another indication that the court’s demand for specificity in

And the state court's sometime-attempt to cast the rule in broader terms cannot salvage its decision. The clear-statement requirement, the court suggested, could also apply when an agent endeavored to waive other "fundamental constitutional rights" held by a principal. But what other rights, really? No Kentucky court, so far as we know, has ever before demanded that a power of attorney explicitly confer authority to enter into contracts implicating constitutional guarantees. Nor did the opinion below indicate that such a grant would be needed for the many routine contracts—executed day in and day out by legal representatives—meeting that description. For example, the Kentucky Constitution protects the "inherent and inalienable" rights to "acquir[e] and protect[] property" and to "freely communicat[e] thoughts and opinions." Ky. Const. § 1. But the state court nowhere cautioned that an attorney-in-fact would now need a specific authorization to, say, sell her principal's furniture or commit her principal to a non-disclosure agreement. (And were we in the business of giving legal advice, we would tell the agent not to worry.) Rather, the court hypothesized a slim set of both patently objectionable and utterly fanciful contracts that would be subject to its rule: No longer could a representative lacking explicit authorization waive her "principal's right to worship freely" or "consent to an arranged marriage" or "bind [her] principal to personal servitude." Placing arbitration agreements within that class reveals the kind of "hostility to arbitration" that led Congress to enact the FAA. And doing so only makes clear the arbitration-specific character of the rule, much as if it were made applicable to arbitration agreements and black swans.²

B

The respondents, Janis and Beverly, primarily advance a different argument—based on the distinction between contract formation and contract enforcement—to support the decision below. Kentucky's clear-statement rule, they begin, affects only contract formation, because it bars agents without explicit authority from entering into arbitration agreements. And in their view, the FAA has "no application" to "contract formation issues." The Act, to be sure, requires a State to enforce all arbitration agreements (save on generally applicable grounds) once they have come into being. But, the respondents claim, States have free rein to decide—irrespective of the FAA's equal-footing principle—whether such contracts are validly created in the first instance.

powers of attorney arises from the suspect status of arbitration rather than the sacred status of jury trials.

² We do not suggest that a state court is precluded from announcing a new, generally applicable rule of law in an arbitration case. We simply reiterate here what we have said many times before—that the rule must in fact apply generally, rather than single out arbitration.

Both the FAA's text and our case law interpreting it say otherwise. The Act's key provision, once again, states that an arbitration agreement must ordinarily be treated as "valid, irrevocable, and enforceable." 9 U.S.C. § 2. By its terms, then, the Act cares not only about the "enforce[ment]" of arbitration agreements, but also about their initial "valid[ity]"—that is, about what it takes to enter into them. Or said otherwise: A rule selectively finding arbitration contracts invalid because improperly formed fares no better under the Act than a rule selectively refusing to enforce those agreements once properly made. Precedent confirms that point. In *Concepcion*, we noted the impermissibility of applying a contract defense like duress "in a fashion that disfavors arbitration." But the doctrine of duress, as we have elsewhere explained, involves "unfair dealing at the contract formation stage." Our discussion of duress would have made no sense if the FAA, as the respondents contend, had nothing to say about contract formation.

And still more: Adopting the respondents' view would make it trivially easy for States to undermine the Act—indeed, to wholly defeat it. As the respondents have acknowledged, their reasoning would allow States to pronounce *any* attorney-in-fact incapable of signing an arbitration agreement—even if a power of attorney specifically authorized her to do so. And why stop there? If the respondents were right, States could just as easily declare *everyone* incompetent to sign arbitration agreements. (That rule too would address only formation.) The FAA would then mean nothing at all—its provisions rendered helpless to prevent even the most blatant discrimination against arbitration.

III

As we did just last Term, we once again "reach a conclusion that . . . falls well within the confines of (and goes no further than) present well-established law." *DIRECTV*. The Kentucky Supreme Court specially impeded the ability of attorneys-in-fact to enter into arbitration agreements. The court thus flouted the FAA's command to place those agreements on an equal footing with all other contracts.

Our decision requires reversing the Kentucky Supreme Court's judgment in favor of the Clark estate. As noted earlier, the state court held that the Clark power of attorney was sufficiently broad to cover executing an arbitration agreement. The court invalidated the agreement with Kindred only because the power of attorney did not specifically authorize Janis to enter into it on Olive's behalf. In other words, the decision below was based exclusively on the clear-statement rule that we have held violates the FAA. So the court must now enforce the Clark–Kindred arbitration agreement.

By contrast, our decision might not require such a result in the Wellner case. The Kentucky Supreme Court began its opinion by stating that the Wellner power

of attorney was insufficiently broad to give Beverly the authority to execute an arbitration agreement for Joe. If that interpretation of the document is wholly independent of the court's clear-statement rule, then nothing we have said disturbs it. But if that rule at all influenced the construction of the Wellner power of attorney, then the court must evaluate the document's meaning anew. The court's opinion leaves us uncertain as to whether such an impermissible taint occurred. We therefore vacate the judgment below and return the case to the state court for further consideration. On remand, the court should determine whether it adheres, in the absence of its clear-statement rule, to its prior reading of the Wellner power of attorney.

For these reasons, we reverse in part and vacate in part the judgment of the Kentucky Supreme Court, and we remand the case for further proceedings not inconsistent with this opinion.

It is so ordered.

Justice GORSUCH took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Justice THOMAS, dissenting.

I continue to adhere to the view that the Federal Arbitration Act (FAA), 9 U.S.C. § 1 *et seq.*, does not apply to proceedings in state courts. In state-court proceedings, therefore, the FAA does not displace a rule that requires express authorization from a principal before an agent may waive the principal's right to a jury trial. Accordingly, I would affirm the judgment of the Kentucky Supreme Court.

Notes

1. What does *Kindred Nursing Centers* add to the analysis of FAA preemption? Does it break new ground? Or is it simply a straightforward application of well settled principles of FAA preemption, as the Court states?

2. Is *Keystone* good law after *Kindred Nursing Centers*? How about the Louisiana Supreme Court's decision in *Hodges v. Reasonover* in § 2.05[D]? Is it preempted by the FAA under *Kindred Nursing Centers*?

Add the following as new note 3 after *Mastrobuono* on page 310:

3. The Supreme Court returned to the effect of the FAA on state contract interpretation in *DIRECTV v. Imburgia*, 136 S. Ct. 463 (2015). At issue in *Imburgia* was a provision in DIRECTV's arbitration clause, which provided that "[i]f, however, the law of your state would find this agreement to dispense with class arbitration procedures unenforceable, then this entire Section 9 is unenforceable." *Imburgia v. DIRECTV, Inc.*, 225 Cal. App. 4th 338, 341 (Cal. App. 2014). The California Court of Appeal, in decision that conflicted with one by the Ninth Circuit, held that the "law of your state" referred to California law (as stated in *Discover Bank*) to the exclusion of preemptive federal law (as stated in *Concepcion*). *See id.* at 343-44. In an opinion by Justice Breyer, the U.S. Supreme Court reversed, holding that the California court's interpretation was preempted by the FAA. The Court explained:

[T]he underlying question of contract law at the time the Court of Appeal made its decision was whether the "law of your state" included *invalid* California law. We must now decide whether answering *that* question in the affirmative is consistent with the Federal Arbitration Act. After examining the grounds upon which the Court of Appeal rested its decision, we conclude that California courts would not interpret contracts other than arbitration contracts the same way.

DIRECTV v. Imburgia, 136 S. Ct. at 469. As a result, according to the Court, "California's interpretation of the phrase 'law of your state' does not place arbitration contracts 'on equal footing with all other contracts,'" and so "is preempted by the Federal Arbitration Act." *Id.* at 471 (quoting *Buckeye Check Cashing, Inc. v. Cardegna*, 546 U.S. 440, 443 (2006)).

Is *Imburgia* consistent with *Volt* and *Mastrobuono*? Is the outcome in *Imburgia* required by those cases?

Chapter 5 Enforcing International Agreements to Arbitrate

Add the following citation after the citation to *Standard Bent Glass* in note 1 following *Kahn Lucas* at page 334:

; *Yang v. Majestic Blue Fisheries, LLC*, 876 F.3d 996, 1000 (9th Cir. 2017) (same) (noting that “every circuit to consider *Kahn Lucas*’s cogent analysis has adhered to it).

Replace Problem 5.4 on page 350 with the following:

Problem 5.4

International Trading, Inc., located in the United States, enters into a written signed contract with Epervier Manufacturing, Ltd., a company located in Togo, a small, west African country. The contract was for the purchase of clothing manufactured in Togo, and provided for arbitration in India. Does the New York Convention apply? What if International Trading entered a contract with Delhi Manufacturing, located in India, and the contract provided for arbitration in Togo? Does the New York Convention apply?

Revise the citation to the AAA/ICDR International Arbitration Rules on page 358 as follows:

Update the citation from AAA/ICDR Rule art. 15 to AAA/ICDR Rule art. 19.

Replace the citation in Problem 5.10(f) on page 402 with the following:

AAA International Arbitration Rules, art. 17.

Chapter 6 The Arbitration Proceeding

Revise the citations to the AAA Commercial Arbitration Rules in Chapter 6 as follows (some additional changes are explained in more detail at the appropriate place in the Chapter):

- p.406:** Update the citation from AAA Rule R-4(b) to AAA Rules R-5(a) & R-5(b)
- p.407:** Update the citation from AAA Rule R-4(c) to AAA Rule R-5(a)
- p.407:** Update the citation from AAA Rule R-29 to AAA Rule R-31
- p.412:** Update the citation from AAA Rule R-24 to AAA Rule R-26 and change “other authorized representative” to “any other representative of the party’s choosing”
- p.426:** Update the citation from AAA Rule R-15 to AAA Rule R-16(a)
- p.427:** Update the citation from AAA Rule R-11(a) to AAA Rule R-12(a)
- p.427:** Update the citation from AAA Rule R-11(b) to AAA Rule R-12(b)
- p.433:** Update the citation from AAA Rule R-11(b) to AAA Rule R-12(b)
- p.433:** Update the citation from AAA Rule R-13(b) to AAA Rule R-14(b)
- p.436:** Update the citation from AAA Rule R-16(a) to AAA Rule R-17(a)
- p.451:** Update the citation from AAA Rule R-17(a)(iii) to AAA Rule R-18(b)
- p.452:** Update the citation from AAA Rule R-17(b) to AAA Rule R-18(c)
- p.454:** Update the citation from AAA Rule R-34(a) to AAA Rule R-37(a)
- p.460:** Update the citation from AAA Rule R-48(a) to AAA Rule R-52(a)
- p.503:** Update the citation from AAA Rule R-23 to AAA Rule R-25
- p.516:** Update the citation from AAA Rule R-22 to AAA Rule R-24
- p.516:** Update the citation from AAA Rule R-30(a), (c) to AAA Rule R-32(a), (d)
- p.516:** Update the citation from AAA Rule R-30(a) to AAA Rule R-32(a)
- p.516:** Update the citation from AAA Rule R-31(a) to AAA Rule R-34(a)
- p.516:** Update the citation from AAA Rule R-31(b) to AAA Rule R-34(b)
- p.533:** Update the citation from AAA Rule R-40 to AAA Rule R-44(a)
- p.533:** Update the citation from AAA Rule R-42(a) to AAA Rule R-46(a)
- p.533:** Update the citation from AAA Rule R-42(b) to AAA Rule R-46(b)
- p.533:** Update the citation from AAA Rule R-41 to AAA Rule R-45 (and insert “calendar” between “30” and “days”)

p.533: In the parenthetical description of AAA Rule E-9, insert “calendar” between “14” and “days”

p.536, n.1: Update the citation from AAA Rule R-35 to AAA Rule R-35(b)

p.536, n.1: Update the citation from AAA Rule R-35 to AAA Rule R-35(c)

p.537, n.3: Update the citation from AAA Rule R-43(a) to AAA Rule R-47(a)

p.544, n.5: Update the citation from AAA Rule R-43(c) to AAA Rule R-47(c)

Revise the citations to the AAA/ICDR International Arbitration Rules in Chapter 6 as follows:

p.426: Update the citation from AAA/ICDR Rule art. 5 to AAA/ICDR Rule art. 11 (and revise the parenthetical so that it reads “because of the size, complexity, or other circumstances of the case”)

p.451: Update the citation from AAA/ICDR Rule art. 7(2) to AAA/ICDR Rule art. 13(6) (and replace “third arbitrator” with “presiding arbitrator”)

p.484: Update the citation from AAA/ICDR Rule arts. 19(2) & (3) to AAA/ICDR Rule art. 21(10) (and add the following parenthetical: (“Depositions, interrogatories, and requests to admit as developed for use in U.S. court procedures generally are not appropriate procedures for obtaining information in an arbitration under these Rules.”))

p.510: Update the citation from AAA/ICDR Rule art. 16(2) to AAA/ICDR Rule art. 20(2)

pp.543-544: Update the citation from AAA/ICDR Rule art. 28(5) to AAA/ICDR Rule art. 31(5) (and replace “a statute” with “any applicable law(s)”)

Replace the sentence with the quotation from AAA Rule 4(a) at the bottom of page 406 with the following:

Under the AAA Commercial Arbitration Rules, the demand shall include the name, address, and contact information for each party and any known representative for a party; “a statement setting forth the nature of the claim including the relief sought and the amount involved”; and “the locale requested if the arbitration agreement does not specify one.” AAA Rule 4(e).

Replace notes 1 and 2 after *Birbrower* on page 424 with the following:

1. A contrary to view to that of the *Birbrower* court was stated by Judge Jed S. Rakoff of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York:

Although . . . arbitration proceedings have become more protracted and complex, not to mention costly, they still retain in most settings their essential character of private contractual arrangements for the relatively informal resolution of disputes. Indeed, the Court notes that the rules of the New York Stock Exchange, where the . . . arbitration [at issue here] was held, do not require members of the arbitration panel to be lawyers at all. *See* N.Y. Stock Exch. Rule 607. It would be incongruous to apply a state's unauthorized practice rules in such an informal setting. Whatever beneficent purposes New York's prohibition against the unauthorized practice of law may serve in protecting clients and regulating lawyers' conduct, it is not designed as a trap for the unwary or as a basis on which New York lawyers can extend a monopoly over every private contractual dispute-resolving mechanism.

Prudential Equity Group, LLC v. Ajamie, 538 F. Supp. 2d 605, 608 (S.D.N.Y. 2008); *see also* *Superadio Ltd. P'ship v. Winstar Radio Prods., L.L.C.*, 844 N.E.2d 246, 252 (Mass. 2006); *Donald J. Williamson, P.A. v. John D. Quinn Constr. Corp.*, 537 F. Supp. 613, 615-16 (S.D.N.Y. 1982). *But see* *Fought & Co. v. Steel Eng. & Erection, Inc.*, 951 P.2d 487, 498 (Hawaii 1998) (following *Birbrower* in connection with representation in mediation, but holding fees recoverable because Oregon attorney retained local counsel who was "at all times 'in charge' of . . . representation within the jurisdiction").

2. The California legislature responded to the *Birbrower* case by amending the state arbitration statute to permit "an attorney admitted to the bar of any other state" to represent a party "in the course of, or in connection with, an arbitration proceeding in this state," but only if the non-California attorney retains local counsel and the arbitrators approve. CAL. CIV. PROC. CODE § 1282.4(b), (c). The out-of-state attorney also has to agree "to be subject to the jurisdiction of the courts of this state with respect to the law of this state governing the conduct of attorneys to the same extent as a member of the State Bar of California." *Id.* § 1282.4(c)(9).

But the statutory response did not address foreign (i.e., non-U.S. lawyers). As the court notes in *Birbrower*, the California international arbitration statute already provided that the parties may "be represented or assisted by any person of their choice" who "need not be a member of the legal profession or licensed to practice law in California." *Id.* § 1297.351. But that provision appears in the section of the statute dealing only with conciliation, not arbitration. Thus, the majority in

Birbrower describes the statute as applicable to a “a commercial conciliation in California involving international commercial disputes.”

Perhaps because of uncertainty about the ability of foreign lawyers to appear in international arbitrations in the state, California has been perceived as being a less attractive arbitral seat than other U.S. jurisdictions. To address such concerns, in July 2018 the California legislature approved legislation that would permit lawyers not licensed in California “to provide legal services in an international commercial arbitration ... if any of the following conditions is satisfied:

(1) The services are undertaken in association with an attorney who is admitted to practice in this state and who actively participates in the matter.

(2) The services arise out of or are reasonably related to the attorney’s practice in a jurisdiction in which the attorney is admitted to practice.

(3) The services are performed for a client who resides in or has an office in the jurisdiction in which the attorney is admitted or otherwise authorized to practice.

(4) The services arise out of or are reasonably related to a matter that has a substantial connection to a jurisdiction in which the attorney is admitted or otherwise authorized to practice.

(5) The services arise out of a dispute governed primarily by international law or the law of a foreign or out-of-state jurisdiction.”

Id. § 1297.186(a); *see also id.* § 1297.186(b) (excluding consumer, employment, or health care disputes from its application). The bill adds that an attorney “rendering legal services pursuant to this article is subject to the jurisdiction of the courts and disciplinary authority of this state with respect to the California Rules of Professional Conduct and the laws governing the conduct of attorneys to the same extent as a member of the State Bar of California.” *Id.* § 1297.188(a).

At the time this Supplement was completed, the bill was awaiting action by the Governor of California.

Add the following to the first paragraph on the top of page 428 (after the cite to the UNCITRAL Model Law):

; *see also* AAA/ICDR Int'l Rules, art. 12(6) (ICDR “list method” unless parties have agreed otherwise)

Add the following to note 5 after *Khan v. Dell, Inc.* on page 434:

; *Schuling v. Harris*, 747 S.E.2d 833, 838 (Va. 2013) (“[R]elying on the intention of the parties as expressed in the language of the Agreement, we conclude that the NAF’s designation as arbitrator is not integral and is severable in order to give effect to the arbitration agreement”)

Replace the second paragraph of note 1 after *Janvey* on page 459 with the following:

The American Arbitration Association, like other arbitration providers, has responded to this difficulty by maintaining an emergency panel that can rapidly rule on requests for provisional remedies before the parties have appointed their arbitrators. In its revised Commercial Arbitration Rules effective October 1, 2013, the AAA makes its procedures for emergency measures of protection applicable unless the parties agree otherwise (the previous version of the rules required parties to opt in to the procedures, and evidently few parties did). AAA Commercial Arbitration Rules, Rule R-38; *see also* AAA/ICDR Int'l Rules, art. 6. Given that few parties opted in to the procedures, is it appropriate to change the default? Does the limited opt in under the old rules indicate that few parties want such procedures? Or does it indicate that it is more difficult to change default rules than sometimes believed?

For a recent, highly publicized use of emergency arbitrator rules, see the Temporary Restraining Order in EC LLC v. Peterson, ADRS Case No. 18-1118-JAC (Feb. 27, 2018), *available at* <https://www.nytimes.com/files/stormy-Daniels-restraining-order.pdf> (prohibiting Peggy Peterson, a.k.a. Stormy Daniels, “from disclosing or inducing, promoting or actively inspiring anyone to disclose Confidential Information” as defined in her “Confidential Settlement Agreement and Mutual Release” with David Dennison, allegedly a.k.a. Donald Trump).

Add the following after *Stolt-Nielsen* on page 476:

Oxford Health Plans LLC v. Sutter
Supreme Court of the United States
569 U.S. 564 (2013)

JUSTICE KAGAN delivered the opinion of the Court.

Class arbitration is a matter of consent: An arbitrator may employ class procedures only if the parties have authorized them. See *Stolt-Nielsen*. In this case, an arbitrator found that the parties’ contract provided for class arbitration. The question presented is whether in doing so he “exceeded [his] powers” under § 10(a)(4) of the Federal Arbitration Act. We conclude that the arbitrator’s decision survives the limited judicial review § 10(a)(4) allows.

I

Respondent John Sutter, a pediatrician, entered into a contract with petitioner Oxford Health Plans, a health insurance company. Sutter agreed to provide medical care to members of Oxford’s network, and Oxford agreed to pay for those services at prescribed rates. Several years later, Sutter filed suit against Oxford in New Jersey Superior Court on behalf of himself and a proposed class of other New Jersey physicians under contract with Oxford. The complaint alleged that Oxford had failed to make full and prompt payment to the doctors, in violation of their agreements and various state laws.

Oxford moved to compel arbitration of Sutter’s claims, relying on the following clause in their contract:

“No civil action concerning any dispute arising under this Agreement shall be instituted before any court, and all such disputes shall be submitted to final and binding arbitration in New Jersey, pursuant to the rules of the American Arbitration Association with one arbitrator.”

The state court granted Oxford’s motion, thus referring the suit to arbitration.

The parties agreed that the arbitrator should decide whether their contract authorized class arbitration, and he determined that it did. Noting that the question turned on “construction of the parties’ agreement,” the arbitrator focused on the text of the arbitration clause quoted above. He reasoned that the clause sent to arbitration “the same universal class of disputes” that it barred the parties from bringing “as civil actions” in court: The “intent of the clause” was “to vest in the arbitration process everything that is prohibited from the court process.” And a

class action, the arbitrator continued, “is plainly one of the possible forms of civil action that could be brought in a court” absent the agreement. Accordingly, he concluded that “on its face, the arbitration clause ... expresses the parties’ intent that class arbitration can be maintained.”

Oxford filed a motion in federal court to vacate the arbitrator’s decision on the ground that he had “exceeded [his] powers” under § 10(a)(4) of the FAA. The District Court denied the motion, and the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit affirmed.

While the arbitration proceeded, this Court held in *Stolt-Nielsen* that “a party may not be compelled under the FAA to submit to class arbitration unless there is a contractual basis for concluding that the party *agreed* to do so.” The parties in *Stolt-Nielsen* had stipulated that they had never reached an agreement on class arbitration. Relying on § 10(a)(4), we vacated the arbitrators’ decision approving class proceedings because, in the absence of such an agreement, the arbitrators had “simply ... imposed [their] own view of sound policy.”

Oxford immediately asked the arbitrator to reconsider his decision on class arbitration in light of *Stolt-Nielsen*. The arbitrator issued a new opinion holding that *Stolt-Nielsen* had no effect on the case because this agreement authorized class arbitration. Unlike in *Stolt-Nielsen*, the arbitrator explained, the parties here disputed the meaning of their contract; he had therefore been required “to construe the arbitration clause in the ordinary way to glean the parties’ intent.” And in performing that task, the arbitrator continued, he had “found that the arbitration clause unambiguously evinced an intention to allow class arbitration.” The arbitrator concluded by reconfirming his reasons for so construing the clause.

Oxford then returned to federal court, renewing its effort to vacate the arbitrator’s decision under § 10(a)(4). Once again, the District Court denied the motion, and the Third Circuit affirmed....

We granted certiorari to address a circuit split on whether § 10(a)(4) allows a court to vacate an arbitral award in similar circumstances. Holding that it does not, we affirm the Court of Appeals.

II

Under the FAA, courts may vacate an arbitrator’s decision “only in very unusual circumstances.” That limited judicial review, we have explained, “maintain[s] arbitration’s essential virtue of resolving disputes straightaway.” If parties could take “full-bore legal and evidentiary appeals,” arbitration would become “merely a prelude to a more cumbersome and time-consuming judicial review process.”

Here, Oxford invokes § 10(a)(4) of the Act, which authorizes a federal court to set aside an arbitral award “where the arbitrator[] exceeded [his] powers.” A party seeking relief under that provision bears a heavy burden. “It is not enough ... to show that the [arbitrator] committed an error — or even a serious error.” Because the parties “bargained for the arbitrator’s construction of their agreement,” an arbitral decision “even arguably construing or applying the contract” must stand, regardless of a court’s view of its (de)merits. *Eastern Associated Coal Corp. v. Mine Workers*, 531 U. S. 57, 62 (2000) (quoting *Steelworkers v. Enterprise Wheel & Car Corp.*, 363 U. S. 593, 599 (1960); *Paperworkers v. Misco, Inc.*, 484 U. S. 29, 38 (1987); internal quotation marks omitted). Only if “the arbitrator act[s] outside the scope of his contractually delegated authority” — issuing an award that “simply reflect[s] [his] own notions of [economic] justice” rather than “draw[ing] its essence from the contract” — may a court overturn his determination. *Eastern Associated Coal* (quoting *Misco*). So the sole question for us is whether the arbitrator (even arguably) interpreted the parties’ contract, not whether he got its meaning right or wrong.²

And we have already all but answered that question just by summarizing the arbitrator’s decisions; they are, through and through, interpretations of the parties’ agreement. The arbitrator’s first ruling recited the “question of construction” the parties had submitted to him: “whether [their] Agreement allows for class action arbitration.” To resolve that matter, the arbitrator focused on the arbitration clause’s text, analyzing (whether correctly or not makes no difference) the scope of both what it barred from court and what it sent to arbitration. The arbitrator concluded, based on that textual exegesis, that the clause “on its face ... expresses the parties’ intent that class action arbitration can be maintained.” When Oxford requested reconsideration in light of *Stolt-Nielsen*, the arbitrator explained that his

² We would face a different issue if Oxford had argued below that the availability of class arbitration is a so-called “question of arbitrability.” Those questions — which “include certain gateway matters, such as whether parties have a valid arbitration agreement at all or whether a concededly binding arbitration clause applies to a certain type of controversy” — are presumptively for courts to decide. *Bazze* (plurality opinion). A court may therefore review an arbitrator’s determination of such a matter *de novo* absent “clear[] and unmistakabl[e]” evidence that the parties wanted an arbitrator to resolve the dispute. *AT&T Technologies, Inc. v. Communications Workers*, 475 U. S. 643, 649 (1986). *Stolt-Nielsen* made clear that this Court has not yet decided whether the availability of class arbitration is a question of arbitrability. But this case gives us no opportunity to do so because Oxford agreed that the arbitrator should determine whether its contract with Sutter authorized class procedures. Indeed, Oxford submitted that issue to the arbitrator not once, but twice — and the second time after *Stolt-Nielsen* flagged that it might be a question of arbitrability.

prior decision was “concerned solely with the parties’ intent as evidenced by the words of the arbitration clause itself.” He then ran through his textual analysis again, and reiterated his conclusion: “[T]he text of the clause itself authorizes” class arbitration. Twice, then, the arbitrator did what the parties had asked: He considered their contract and decided whether it reflected an agreement to permit class proceedings. That suffices to show that the arbitrator did not “exceed[] [his] powers.” § 10(a)(4).

Oxford’s contrary view relies principally on *Stolt-Nielsen*.... Oxford takes that decision to mean that “even the ‘high hurdle’ of Section 10(a)(4) review is overcome when an arbitrator imposes class arbitration without a sufficient contractual basis.” Under *Stolt-Nielsen*, Oxford asserts, a court may thus vacate “as *ultra vires*” an arbitral decision like this one for misconstruing a contract to approve class proceedings.

But Oxford misreads *Stolt-Nielsen*: We overturned the arbitral decision there because it lacked *any* contractual basis for ordering class procedures, not because it lacked, in Oxford’s terminology, a “sufficient” one. The parties in *Stolt-Nielsen* had entered into an unusual stipulation that they had never reached an agreement on class arbitration. In that circumstance, we noted, the panel’s decision was not — indeed, could not have been — “based on a determination regarding the parties’ intent.” Nor, we continued, did the panel attempt to ascertain whether federal or state law established a “default rule” to take effect absent an agreement. Instead, “the panel simply imposed its own conception of sound policy” when it ordered class proceedings. But “the task of an arbitrator,” we stated, “is to interpret and enforce a contract, not to make public policy.” In “impos[ing] its own policy choice,” the panel “thus exceeded its powers.”

The contrast with this case is stark. In *Stolt-Nielsen*, the arbitrators did not construe the parties’ contract, and did not identify any agreement authorizing class proceedings. So in setting aside the arbitrators’ decision, we found not that they had misinterpreted the contract, but that they had abandoned their interpretive role. Here, the arbitrator did construe the contract (focusing, per usual, on its language), and did find an agreement to permit class arbitration. So to overturn his decision, we would have to rely on a finding that he misapprehended the parties’ intent. But § 10(a)(4) bars that course: It permits courts to vacate an arbitral decision only when the arbitrator strayed from his delegated task of interpreting a contract, not when he performed that task poorly. *Stolt-Nielsen* and this case thus fall on opposite sides of the line that § 10(a)(4) draws to delimit judicial review of arbitral decisions.

The remainder of Oxford’s argument addresses merely the merits: ... At bottom, Oxford maintains, this is a garden-variety arbitration clause, lacking any of the terms or features that would indicate an agreement to use class procedures.

We reject this argument because, and only because, it is not properly addressed to a court. Nothing we say in this opinion should be taken to reflect any agreement with the arbitrator's contract interpretation, or any quarrel with Oxford's contrary reading. All we say is that convincing a court of an arbitrator's error — even his grave error — is not enough. So long as the arbitrator was “arguably construing” the contract — which this one was — a court may not correct his mistakes under § 10(a)(4). The potential for those mistakes is the price of agreeing to arbitration. As we have held before, we hold again: “It is the arbitrator's construction [of the contract] which was bargained for; and so far as the arbitrator's decision concerns construction of the contract, the courts have no business overruling him because their interpretation of the contract is different from his.” *Enterprise Wheel*, 363 U. S. at 599. The arbitrator's construction holds, however good, bad, or ugly.

In sum, Oxford chose arbitration, and it must now live with that choice.... Under § 10(a)(4), the question for a judge is not whether the arbitrator construed the parties' contract correctly, but whether he construed it at all. Because he did, and therefore did not “exceed his powers,” we cannot give Oxford the relief it wants. We accordingly affirm the judgment of the Court of Appeals.

It is so ordered.

JUSTICE ALITO, with whom JUSTICE THOMAS joins, concurring.

... [U]nlike petitioner, absent members of the plaintiff class never conceded that the contract authorizes the arbitrator to decide whether to conduct class arbitration. It doesn't. If we were reviewing the arbitrator's interpretation of the contract *de novo*, we would have little trouble concluding that he improperly inferred “[a]n implicit agreement to authorize class-action arbitration ... from the fact of the parties' agreement to arbitrate.” *Stolt-Nielsen*.

With no reason to think that the absent class members ever agreed to class arbitration, it is far from clear that they will be bound by the arbitrator's ultimate resolution of this dispute. Arbitration “is a matter of consent, not coercion,” and the absent members of the plaintiff class have not submitted themselves to this arbitrator's authority in any way. It is true that they signed contracts with arbitration clauses materially identical to those signed by the plaintiff who brought this suit. But an arbitrator's erroneous interpretation of contracts that do not authorize class arbitration cannot bind someone who has not authorized the arbitrator to make that determination....

The distribution of opt-out notices does not cure this fundamental flaw in the class arbitration proceeding in this case. “[A]rbitration is simply a matter of

contract between the parties,” and an offeree’s silence does not normally modify the terms of a contract. Accordingly, at least where absent class members have not been required to opt *in*, it is difficult to see how an arbitrator’s decision to conduct class proceedings could bind absent class members who have not authorized the arbitrator to decide on a classwide basis which arbitration procedures are to be used.

Class arbitrations that are vulnerable to collateral attack allow absent class members to unfairly claim the “benefit from a favorable judgment without subjecting themselves to the binding effect of an unfavorable one.” In the absence of concessions like Oxford’s, this possibility should give courts pause before concluding that the availability of class arbitration is a question the arbitrator should decide. But because that argument was not available to petitioner in light of its concession below, I join the opinion of the Court.

Replace note 2 after *Stolt-Nielsen* on page 477 with the following:

2. Institutional arbitration rules typically have not addressed the authority of arbitrators to order consolidated arbitration proceedings involving multiple parties. Increasingly, however, institutions are revising their rules to permit consolidation. An example is Article 10 of the 2017 ICC Rules, which provides as follows:

The Court may, at the request of a party, consolidate two or more arbitrations pending under the Rules into a single arbitration, where:

- a) the parties have agreed to consolidation; or
- b) all of the claims in the arbitrations are made under the same arbitration agreement; or
- c) where the claims in the arbitrations are made under more than one arbitration agreement, the arbitrations are between the same parties, the disputes in the arbitrations arise in connection with the same legal relationship, and the Court finds the arbitration agreements to be compatible.

In deciding whether to consolidate, the Court may take into account any circumstances it considers to be relevant, including whether one or more arbitrators have been confirmed or appointed in more than one of the arbitrations and, if so, whether the same or different persons have been confirmed or appointed. When arbitrations are consolidated, they shall be consolidated into the arbitration that commenced first, unless otherwise agreed by all parties.

See also AAA/ICDR Int'l Rules, arts. 7 (joinder), 8 (consolidation) (effective June 1, 2014). In addition, occasionally an arbitration clause will authorize some degree of consolidation of related proceedings.

Replace notes 9-11 after *Stolt-Nielsen* on pages 481-482 with the following:

9. One important question that the Court does not address in *Stolt-Nielsen* is what sort of evidence would be sufficient to show that the parties had agreed to class arbitration (see footnote 10 of the opinion). One would think that if the contract included a class arbitration waiver, that would be pretty good evidence the parties had not agreed to arbitrate on a class basis — perhaps even if the waiver is held unconscionable. Conversely, only very rarely do parties expressly agree to class arbitration. In addition, *Stolt-Nielsen* itself dealt with a maritime arbitration case. Will courts be more likely to find agreement on class arbitration in consumer and employment contracts? What sort of evidence of agreement would suffice in those types of cases? Interestingly, in five of the eight AAA clause construction awards (62.5%) issued since *Stolt-Nielsen* and available on the AAA web site, the arbitrator construed the arbitration agreement as permitting class arbitration — despite the decision in *Stolt-Nielsen*. Christopher R. Drahozal & Peter B. Rutledge, *Contract and Procedure*, 94 MARQUETTE L. REV. 1103, 1157-58 (2011). While that percentage is significantly lower than the percentage before *Stolt-Nielsen*, more life appears to remain in the class arbitration mechanism than some predicted.

At the same time, an increasing number of courts are deciding whether parties have agreed to class arbitration. In *Lamps Plus, Inc. v. Varela*, the Supreme Court granted certiorari to address “[w]hether the Federal Arbitration Act forecloses a state-law interpretation of an arbitration agreement that would authorize class arbitration based solely on general language commonly used in arbitration agreements.” No. 17-988, *cert. granted*, 138 S. Ct. 1697 (Apr. 30, 2018). The case will be argued sometime during October Term 2018, and the Court likely will issue its opinion by the end of June 2019.

10. After *Stolt-Nielsen*, the circuits split over whether to vacate awards that construed silent agreements as permitting class arbitration. The Supreme Court resolved that split in *Sutter*, deferring to the arbitrators’ interpretations of the parties’ contract. What is left of *Stolt-Nielsen* after *Sutter*? Will *Sutter* lead to a revival of class arbitration? Or merely slow its inevitable decline? For a decision applying *Sutter* to uphold an award construing an arbitration clause to authorize class arbitration, see *Southern Communs. Servs. v. Thomas*, 720 F.3d 1352, 1360 (11th Cir. 2013), *cert. denied*, 571 U.S. 1163 (2014).

11. Who decides whether an arbitration agreement authorizes class arbitration after *Stolt-Nielsen* and *Sutter*? In both of those cases, the parties had agreed to have the arbitrator decide the issue so the “who decides” question was not before the Court. Indeed, in footnote 2 in *Sutter* the Court makes clear that it is not deciding the issue and that the issue remains open.

As noted above, courts have consistently held that determining whether an arbitration agreement permits consolidation is an issue for the arbitrators, and have distinguished class arbitration from consolidation in so deciding. Moreover, “numerous courts have continued to apply the plurality’s ruling in *Bazzle* even after *Stolt-Nielsen* was decided.” *Brookdale Senior Living, Inc. v. Dempsey*, 2012 WL 1430402, at * 3 (M.D. Tenn. Apr. 25, 2012). That said, the trend in the circuits is very much the opposite: the courts of appeals have regularly been rejecting the *Bazzle* position and holding that whether an arbitration clause authorizes class arbitration is a gateway issue for the courts finally to resolve. See *Del Webb Communities, Inc. v. Carlson*, 817 F.3d 867, 873 (4th Cir.) (“We ... hold that whether an arbitration clause permits class arbitration is a gateway question of arbitrability for the court.”), *cert. denied*, 137 S. Ct. 567 (2016); *Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC v. Scout Petroleum, LLC*, 809 F.3d 746, 753 (3d Cir.) (same), *cert. denied*, 137 U.S. 40 (2016); *Opalinski v. Robert Half Int’l Inc.*, 677 F. App’x 738, 741 (3d Cir.), *cert. denied*, 138 S. Ct. 378 (2017) (same); *Opalinski v. Robert Half Int’l Inc.*, 761 F.3d 326, 335 (3d Cir. 2014) (same), *cert. denied*, 135 S. Ct. 1530 (2015); *Reed Elsevier v. Crockett*, 734 F.3d 594, 598 (6th Cir. 2013) (same), *cert. denied*, 134 S. Ct. 2291 (2014). *But see* *Sandquist v. Lebo Auto., Inc.*, 376 P.3d 506, 514 (2016) (“conclud[ing], as a matter of state contract law, [that] the parties’ arbitration provisions allocate the decision on the availability of class arbitration to the arbitrator, rather than reserving it for a court”).

12. *American Express Co. v. Italian Colors*, reprinted at pages 53-60 of this Update, and *AT&T Mobility, LLC v. Concepcion* in § 4.04 also address the relationship between individual arbitrations and class arbitrations. Are those decisions consistent with *Stolt-Nielsen*? With *Sutter*? What do they add?

Replace the paragraph at the bottom of page 483 and the top of page 484 (through the description of the AAA Rules) with the following:

The limited discovery available in domestic arbitration is reflected in institutional arbitration rules. Rule R-22 of the revised AAA Commercial Arbitration Rules, effective October 1, 2013, provides that “[t]he arbitrator shall manage any necessary exchange of information among the parties with a view to achieving an efficient and economical resolution of the dispute, while at the same time promoting equality of treatment and safeguarding each party’s opportunity to fairly present its claims and defenses.” Rule R-22(a). The rule specifically addresses document production in arbitration, providing that:

The arbitrator may, on application of a party or on the arbitrator’s own initiative:

i. require the parties to exchange documents in their possession or custody on which they intend to rely;

ii. require the parties to update their exchanges of the documents on which they intend to rely as such documents become known to them;

iii. require the parties, in response to reasonable document requests, to make available to the other party documents, in the responding party’s possession or custody, not otherwise readily available to the party seeking the documents, reasonably believed by the party seeking the documents to exist and to be relevant and material to the outcome of disputed issues; and

iv. require the parties, when documents to be exchanged or produced are maintained in electronic form, to make such documents available in the form most convenient and economical for the party in possession of such documents, unless the arbitrator determines that there is good cause for requiring the documents to be produced in a different form. The parties should attempt to agree in advance upon, and the arbitrator may determine, reasonable search parameters to balance the need for production of electronically stored documents relevant and material to the outcome of disputed issues against the cost of locating and producing them.

Rule R-22(b). The AAA Commercial Arbitration Rules do not address the availability of depositions, but the AAA’s Procedures for Large, Complex Commercial Disputes provide that “[i]n exceptional cases, at the discretion of the arbitrator, upon good cause shown and consistent with the expedited nature of

arbitration, the arbitrator may order depositions to obtain the testimony of a person who may possess information determined by the arbitrator to be relevant and material to the outcome of the case.” Rule L-3(f).

Add the following citation at the end of note 1 after *Hay Group* on page 489:

; see also *CVS Health Corp. v. Vividus, LLC*, 878 F.3d 703, 708 (9th Cir. 2017) (“Given the clear statutory language, we reject the proposition that section 7 grants arbitrators implicit powers to order document discovery from third parties prior to a hearing. Further, we decline HMC’s invitation to create additional discovery powers for arbitrators beyond those granted in section 7.”).

Add the following citation after the citation to the JAMS Employment Arbitration Rules in note 4 after *Hay Group* on page 489:

AAA Commercial Arbitration Rules, Rule R-58;

Replace *JAS Forwarding* and note 3 after *JAS Forwarding* on pages 495-502 with the following:

In re Dubey

United States District Court for the Central District of California
949 F. Supp. 2d 990 (2013)

JAMES V. SELNA, District Judge.

Before the Court is Prabhat K. Dubey's ("Petitioner's") Application for an Order Directing MTI Laboratory ("MTI") to Produce Documents For Use in an International Tribunal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1782. MTI opposes the application. Petitioner filed a reply. For the following reasons, the Court DENIES the Application for Order.

I. Background

On November 26, 2012, Microelectronics Technology, Inc., a Taiwan Corporation, and its El Segundo, California-based subsidiary MTI, filed an arbitration against Petitioner and several other Respondents. The arbitration involves a sale of assets to MTI, which closed on June 1, 2009, pursuant to an Asset Purchase Agreement ("Agreement"). MTI was sued by Powerwave Technologies, Inc. for patent infringement in federal court. MTI seeks indemnification from Petitioner and Respondents for the costs of defending the lawsuit in accordance with certain provisions in the Agreement. The Agreement provides that any dispute arising out of the Agreement would be resolved by confidential binding arbitration under the American Arbitration Association ("AAA") International Dispute Resolution Procedures, to be held in Los Angeles, California.

On March 28, 2013, the AAA administrator provided the parties with a list of AAA arbitrators for purposes of selecting the arbitration panel. On March 25, 2013, the parties submitted their selections for arbitrators. On April 29, 2013, the arbitration administrator provided the parties the opportunity to challenge one of the arbitrators selected by Respondents by May 14, 2013. As of this date, the arbitration panel has not yet been assembled to set the case schedule and hear the case.

Petitioner now seeks various documents relevant to the arbitration dispute.

II. Discussion

A. Statutory Requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 1782

Petitioner submits this application pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1782. The federal statute provides, in relevant part, that “[t]he district court of the district in which a person resides or is found may order him to give his testimony or statement or to produce a document or other thing for use in a proceeding in a foreign or international tribunal.” 28 U.S.C. § 1782. The primary purpose of § 1782 is to provide federal-court judicial assistance in gathering evidence for use in a proceeding in a foreign or international tribunal. *Intel Corp. v. Advanced Micro Devices, Inc.*, 542 U.S. 241, 247 (2004). A district court may order a person to produce discovery if three requirements are satisfied: (1) the application is made by a foreign or international tribunal or “any interested person”; (2) the discovery is “for use in a proceeding in a foreign or international tribunal”; and (3) the person or entity from whom the discovery is sought is a resident of or found in the district in which the application is filed.

Only the second requirement is at issue here. Petitioner contends that the arbitration here is a “international tribunal” within the meaning of § 1782 because the arbitration is pending under the International Dispute Resolution Procedures of the AAA, and those rules allow the arbitral panel to hear and weigh evidence while reaching its final decision. MTI argues that the arbitration proceeding does not meet the definition under § 1782.

The crux of the dispute is whether a “proceeding in a foreign or international tribunal” applies to private arbitrations established by contract, such as the arbitration at issue here. The case law is unclear on this. MTI points out that both the Second and Fifth Circuits have directly held that § 1782 does not apply to private contractual arbitrations. In *National Broadcasting Co. v. Bear Stearns & Co.*, 165 F.3d 184, 188-91 (2d Cir. 1999), the Second Circuit explored the legislative history behind § 1782 to determine whether private arbitral panels are included in the term “foreign or international tribunals.” It concluded that “there is no indication that Congress intended for the [statute] to reach private international tribunals,” and this “silence with respect to private tribunals is especially telling because ... a significant congressional expansion of American judicial assistance to international arbitral panels created exclusively by private parties would not have been lightly undertaken by Congress without at least a mention of this legislative intention.” *Id.* at 190 (citing H.R. Rep. No. 88–1052, at 9 (1963); S. Rep. No. 88–1580, at 3788–89 (1964)). The court explained that, while Congress expanded the scope of the statute in 1964 with the language “foreign or international tribunal,” it did not contemplate that this extended beyond governmental adjudicatory bodies. *Id.* at 189. Moreover, the Second Circuit reasoned that policy considerations reinforced its conclusion because “broad discovery in proceedings before ‘foreign or

international’ private arbitrators would stand in stark contrast to the limited evidence gathering provided in [Section 7 of the Federal Arbitration Act] for proceedings before domestic arbitration panels.” *Id.* at 191. In *Republic of Kazakhstan v. Biedermann Int’l*, 168 F.3d 880, 883 (5th Cir. 1999), the Fifth Circuit affirmed this conclusion, noting that “[e]mpowering arbitrators, or worse, the parties, in private international disputes to seek ancillary discovery through the federal courts does not benefit the arbitration process. Arbitration is intended as a speedy, economical, and effective means of dispute resolution.”

Subsequent to these two decisions, in 2004, the Supreme Court in *Intel* held that the Directorate–General for Competition of the European Commission, the “European Union’s primary antitrust law enforcer,” was a tribunal within the meaning of § 1782. 542 U.S. at 250. *Intel* examined the function and procedures of the European Commission, finding that its role as a first-instance decisionmaker, its authority to determine liability and impose penalties, its ability make a final disposition, and the judicial reviewability of the final decisions were key factors in holding that it had “no warrant to exclude the European Commission ... from § 1782(a)’s ambit.” *Id.* at 258. The Supreme Court also clarified certain areas of § 1782, holding that (1) there is no “foreign discoverability requirement” that must be satisfied before obtaining discovery pursuant to § 1782; and (2) there is no requirement that the foreign proceeding be “pending or imminent” as long as the proceeding is “within reasonable contemplation.” *Id.* at 253-54.

Since *Intel*, courts have split as to whether § 1782 applies to purely private arbitrations. Petitioner cites several post-*Intel* district court decisions to show that an international arbitral body qualifies as a “foreign or international tribunal” within the meaning of § 1782. *See In re Babcock Borsig AG*, 583 F. Supp. 2d 233, 240 (D. Mass. 2008); *In re Hallmark Capital Corp.*, 534 F. Supp. 2d 951, 952 (D. Minn. 2007); *In re Roz Trading Ltd.*, 469 F. Supp. 2d 1221, 1222 (N.D. Ga. 2006). Those holdings are based on a broad interpretation of the *Intel* case and a citation within *Intel* to Smit, *International Litigation* 1026–27 & nn. 71, 73, quoting “[t]he term ‘tribunal’ ... includes investigating magistrates, administrative and arbitral tribunals, and quasi-judicial agencies, as well as conventional, civil, commercial, criminal, and administrative courts.” *See Intel*, 542 U.S. at 258. Petitioner asks the Court to consider these “more complete reasoned” authorities.

On the other hand, MTI argues that the Court should follow post-*Intel* district courts that have rejected applying § 1782 to private commercial arbitrations. *See In re Arbitration in London, England*, 626 F. Supp. 2d 882, 886 (N.D. Ill. 2009); *In re Operadora DB Mex., S.A. de C.V.*, 2009 WL 2423138, at *12 (M.D. Fla. Aug. 4, 2009); *La Comision Ejecutiva Hidroelectrica Del Rio v. El Paso Corp.*, 617 F. Supp. 2d 481, 485 (S.D. Tex. 2008). The Ninth Circuit has not addressed the issue, and there appears to be a division among circuits post-*Intel*. *Compare El Paso Corp. v. La Comision Ejecutiva Hidroelectrica Del Rio Lempa*, 341

Fed. Appx. 31, 34 (5th Cir. 2009) (affirming its holding in *Biedermann* and finding that none of the concerns regarding the application of § 1782 to private international arbitrations were at issue or considered in *Intel*), with *Consortio Ecuatoriano de Telecomunicaciones S.A. v. JAS Forwarding (USA), Inc.*, 685 F.3d 987, 996–97 (11th Cir. 2012) (although *Intel* did not specifically decide whether a private arbitral tribunal falls under the statute, pending Ecuador arbitration fell within *Intel*’s broad functional construction of “tribunal”).

After reviewing *Intel* and the relevant cases, the Court finds that private arbitrations do not fall within the meaning of “foreign or international tribunal” under § 1782. First, the Court follows the district court decisions finding that *Intel* did not intend to expand the meaning of “foreign or international tribunal” to include private arbitrations. The *Intel* court never addressed this issue and instead focused its discussion on whether a “tribunal” includes “quasi-judicial agencies” such as the European Commission. Moreover, the Court is convinced that a “reasoned distinction” can be made between purely private arbitrations established by private contract and state-sponsored arbitral bodies, and the *Intel* court’s reasoning is more appropriate in the context of state or governmental adjudicatory bodies. For these reasons, the Court finds the arguments for a broad interpretation of *Intel*, as laid out in *Babcock*, *Hallmark*, and *Roz Trading*, unconvincing.

Second, the Court instead finds the reasoning in *National Broadcasting* and *Biedermann* directly on point and persuasive. Both the Second Circuit and Fifth Circuit “tackled the issue squarely,” considered both legislative history and policy reasons, and resolved the ambiguity against including private arbitrations in § 1782. The Court is convinced by the legislative history and policy arguments. Construing § 1782 to apply to private contractual arbitrations would defeat the timeliness and cost-effectiveness of arbitration, and would place a heavy burden on the federal courts to determine discovery requests. Accordingly, because the proceeding here is a private arbitration contractually agreed upon by the parties, it does not fall within the meaning of § 1782.

The parties also dispute whether the arbitration here is “international” for purposes of § 1782. MTI argues that § 1782 does not apply to arbitrations taking place in the United States, and the arbitration here largely consists of U.S. parties and will be conducted under the AAA. Petitioner contends that the arbitration is international in nature and conducted pursuant to the International Dispute Resolution Procedures, and thus falls under § 1782’s “international” prong. Because the Court finds that a private arbitration is not considered a “tribunal” under § 1782, it is not necessary to address whether the private arbitration here is “international” within the meaning of § 1782. However, it notes that all of the cases discussed—even those finding against including private arbitration under § 1782—address arbitration held in a foreign country. Because all of these proceedings were held in foreign countries, the courts did not consider the meaning of the term

“international” under § 1782. Nor have either of the parties provided case law in which a petitioner applied for § 1782 in relation to an arbitration proceeding held in the United States. Regardless, the Court makes no finding on that issue at this time.

In sum, Petitioner has not shown that his application meets the statutory requirements of § 1782.

B. Discretionary Factors

Even if Petitioner had met the statutory requirements, the Court would exercise its discretion and deny his § 1782 discovery application. In *Intel*, the Supreme Court laid out discretionary factors for considering whether a district court should exercise its discretion and grant a § 1782 application. 542 U.S. at 264. These factors include (1) whether the person from whom discovery is sought is a participant in the foreign proceeding so that the foreign tribunal can order the participant to produce evidence; (2) the nature of the foreign tribunal, the character of the proceedings underway abroad, and the receptivity of the foreign government or court or agency abroad to U.S.-federal court judicial assistance; and (3) unduly intrusive or burdensome requests. *Id.* at 264–65.

Under the circumstances of this case, it is unclear what the arbitrator’s position is regarding the parties’ need for documents because the panel has not been fully assembled. In light of this, the Court would decline to exercise its discretion. Moreover, there is currently no evidence about the arbitral panel’s receptivity to the requested materials. Although the Court may permit discovery even in the face of uncertainty about the panel’s position, “the receptivity of the foreign tribunal is particularly important in light of the purposes of § 1782(a).” Accordingly, even if the statutory requirements were met, the Court would not exercise its authority to grant Petitioner’s application.

III. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the Court DENIES Petitioner’s Application for Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

3. The district court in *Dubey* cites the Eleventh Circuit’s decision in *JAS Forwarding* as creating a circuit split over the applicability of section 1782 to international arbitration proceedings. See *Consortio Ecuatoriano de Telecomunicaciones S.A. v. JAS Forwarding (USA), Inc.*, 685 F.3d 987, 996–97

(11th Cir. 2012). After the district court's decision, the Eleventh Circuit sua sponte vacated its decision in *JAS Forwarding* and issued a substitute opinion removing any discussion of the applicability of section 1782 to arbitration tribunals. Instead, the court of appeals held that discovery was available under section 1782 "for use in contemplated civil and criminal proceedings in Ecuador against its former employees," effectively avoiding a circuit split. See *Consortio Ecuatoriano de Telecomunicaciones S.A. v. JAS Forwarding (USA), Inc.*, 747 F.3d 1262, 1270 (11th Cir. 2014).

Replace the second paragraph of note 6 after *Parilla* on pages 509-10 with the following:

Investment treaty arbitrations have been at the forefront of the move toward transparency. UNCITRAL has promulgated new rules on the subject, *see* United Nations Commission on International Trade Law, Rules on Transparency in Treaty-based Investor-State Arbitration (2013), *reprinted at* pages 265-272 of this Update, and some investment arbitration tribunals allow third parties to participate as amici curiae and permitting the public to attend hearings, *see* Statement by the OECD Investment Committee, *Transparency and Third Party Participation in Investor-State Dispute Settlement Procedures* ¶¶ 22-35 (June 2005). On the domestic front, arbitration remains largely a private process, although a clear exception is the AAA's class arbitration docket. Rule 9(a) of the AAA's Supplementary Rules for Class Arbitrations provides that "[t]he presumption of privacy and confidentiality in arbitration proceedings shall not apply in class arbitrations" and that "all class arbitration hearings and filings may be made public, subject to the authority of the arbitrator to provide otherwise in special circumstances." As noted in § 6.06, the AAA's class arbitration docket, including case filings, is available on the AAA web site (although the web page is not always current).

Replace the last half of the paragraph at the bottom of page 510 with the following:

In particular, many arbitration rules authorize or require arbitrators to conduct a pre-hearing conference “to discuss and establish a procedure for the conduct of the arbitration that is appropriate to achieve a fair, efficient, and economical resolution of the dispute.” AAA Commercial Arbitration Rules, Rule R-21(b), (a) (“[a]t the discretion of the arbitrator, and depending on the size and complexity of the arbitration”); Rule P-1(b) (“Care must be taken to avoid importing procedures from court systems, as such procedures may not be appropriate to the conduct of arbitrations as an alternative form of dispute resolution that is designed to be simpler, less expensive and more expeditious.”); Rule P-2 (setting out “subjects that the parties and the arbitrator should address at the preliminary hearing, in addition to any others that the parties or the arbitrator believe to be appropriate to the particular case”); Rule L-3(b) (for complex commercial disputes, “a preliminary hearing shall be scheduled in accordance with sections P-1 and P-2 of these rules”); AAA/ICDR Int’l Rules, art. 16(2).

Replace the paragraph at the bottom of page 511 and the top of page 512 with the following:

Another way courts can control the course of proceedings is by ruling on dispositive motions. Motions practice is not as common in arbitration as it is in court litigation. Neither the FAA, the UAA, nor the UNCITRAL Model Law addresses dispositive motions. The Revised Uniform Arbitration Act, by contrast, provides that “[a]n arbitrator may decide a request for summary disposition of a claim or particular issue” if all parties agree, or on the request of one party on notice and an opportunity to respond. RUAA § 15(b). The revised AAA Commercial Arbitration Rules, effective October 1, 2013, now provide that “[t]he arbitrator may allow the filing of and make rulings upon a dispositive motion,” but “only if the arbitrator determines that the moving party has shown that the motion is likely to succeed and dispose of or narrow the issues in the case.” Rule R-33. Previous versions of the AAA rules did not expressly authorize the arbitrator to rule on dispositive motions.

In the absence of an express provision of an arbitration statute or rule, do arbitrators have the authority to consider and decide dispositive motions?

Replace the sentence with the quotation from the AAA Consumer-Related Disputes Supplementary Procedures near the bottom of page 543 with the following:

Interestingly, Rule R-44(a) of the AAA Consumer Arbitration Rules provides that “[t]he arbitrator may grant any remedy, relief, or outcome that the parties could have received in court, including awards of attorney’s fees and costs, in accordance with the law(s) that applies to the case.”

Chapter 7 Enforcing Arbitral Awards

Revise the citations to the AAA Commercial Arbitration Rules in Chapter 7 as follows:

p.553: Update the citation from AAA Rule R-46 to AAA Rule R-50

p.593: Update the citation from AAA Rule R-48(c) to AAA Rule R-52(c)

Add the following to note 2 after *Colonial Penn* on page 562:

But see Savers Property & Cas. Ins Co. v. National Union Fire Ins. Co., 748 F.3d 708, 719 (6th Cir. 2014) (“Here, the arbitration panel issued an interim award resolving only the matter of liability; the panel retained jurisdiction to compute National Union’s damages. Under these circumstances, the arbitration was not complete because there was no ‘final’ award.”).

Add the following after the third sentence of note 3 after *Colonial Penn* on page 562:

Similarly, the American Arbitration Association has issued Optional Appellate Arbitration Rules effective November 1, 2013. *See*
<https://www.adr.org/aaa/ShowProperty?nodeId=/UCM/ADRSTAGE2016218>

Add the following to note 4 after *Comprehensive Accounting* on page 578:

Compare *Stolt-Nielsen* to the following description of the standard for vacating awards under § 10(a)(4) from *Oxford Health Plans v. Sutter*, reprinted at pages 90-95 of this Update:

Here, Oxford invokes § 10(a)(4) of the Act, which authorizes a federal court to set aside an arbitral award “where the arbitrator[] exceeded [his] powers.” A party seeking relief under that provision bears a heavy burden. “It is not enough ... to show that the [arbitrator] committed an error — or even a serious error.” Because the parties “bargained for the arbitrator’s construction of their agreement,” an arbitral decision “even arguably construing or applying the contract” must stand, regardless of a court’s view of its (de)merits. Only if “the arbitrator act[s] outside the scope of his contractually delegated authority” — issuing an award that “simply reflect[s] [his] own notions of [economic] justice” rather than “draw[ing] its essence from the contract” — may a court overturn his determination. So the sole question for us is whether the arbitrator (even arguably) interpreted the parties’ contract, not whether he got its meaning right or wrong.

133 S. Ct. at 2068 (citations omitted). Is *Sutter* consistent with *Stolt-Nielsen*? How does § 10(a)(4) apply when the contract is silent on the question before the arbitrators — i.e., when the arbitrators are filling gaps in the contract? Or when the issue before the arbitrators involves a federal statutory claim rather than a matter of contract interpretation? Does *Sutter* provide the standard? *Stolt-Nielsen*? Or neither?

Replace *Siegel v. Prudential Insurance Co.* on pages 591-593 with the following:

FINN v. BALLENTINE PARTNERS, LLC
Supreme Court of New Hampshire
143 A.3d 859 (2016)

LYNN, J.

The plaintiff, Alice Finn, appeals an order of the Superior Court ... denying her motion to affirm and granting the motion of the defendants, Ballentine Partners, LLC (BPLLC), Ballentine & Company, Inc., Roy C. Ballentine, [and four others], to vacate a final arbitration award in part pursuant to RSA 542:8. Because we conclude that the trial court did not err in ruling that RSA 542:8 is not preempted by the Federal Arbitration Act (FAA), and in ruling, pursuant to RSA 542:8, that the arbitration panel committed a plain mistake of law by concluding that *res judicata* did not bar Finn's claim, we affirm.

I

The record supports the following facts. Ballentine and Finn founded Ballentine Finn & Company, Inc. (BFI), a New Hampshire subchapter S corporation, in 1997. Each owned one half of the company's stock, and Finn served as the Chief Executive Officer. Later, four other individuals became shareholders of BFI. In 2008, Ballentine and the other shareholders forced Finn out of the corporation and terminated her employment....

Pursuant to the Agreement, Finn challenged her termination before an arbitration panel in 2009. This first arbitration panel found that Finn's termination was unlawful and awarded her \$5,721,756 for the stock that BFI forced her to sell and \$720,000 in lost wages. The panel recognized that BFI likely did not have sufficient liquidity to pay the award immediately, so it authorized BFI to make periodic payments through December 31, 2012.

After the first panel award, BFI formed BPLLC, contributed all of its assets and some of its liabilities to BPLLC, and became its sole member. BFI then changed its name to Ballentine & Company (Ballentine & Co.). After the reorganization, Ballentine & Co. sold 4,000 preferred units, a 40% membership interest in BPLLC, to Perspecta Investments, LLC (Perspecta). Perspecta paid \$7,000,000 to Ballentine & Co. and made a \$280,000 capital contribution to BPLLC. The defendants asserted that the membership interest had to be sold in order to raise funds to pay the arbitration award to Finn.

In 2013, Finn filed a complaint and a motion to compel arbitration in superior court, alleging that she was entitled to relief under the “Claw Back” provision of the Agreement. That provision provides, in essence, that if a founding shareholder of BFI sells shares back to the corporation and those shares are resold at a higher price within eight years, the founder is entitled to recover a portion of the additional price paid for the shares. The defendants moved to dismiss Finn’s complaint, arguing that it was barred by *res judicata*.

The trial court did not rule on the motion to dismiss; instead, it stayed the court proceedings and granted Finn’s motion to compel arbitration, concluding that the issue of *res judicata* must be decided by arbitration in the first instance.

A second arbitration panel held a five-day hearing to decide Finn’s new claims, which included breach of contract and unjust enrichment. It ruled that “[t]he findings of the first panel essentially resolve[d] Finn’s contract claim for ‘Claw Back’ benefits because the predicate facts needed to support a contractual ‘Claw Back’ claim were found against Finn by that panel.” The second panel concluded, however, that Finn was entitled to an award based upon her unjust enrichment claim. Although it agreed with the defendants’ argument that a party cannot be awarded relief under a theory of unjust enrichment when “there is an available contract remedy identified,” the panel stated that this “legal principle cannot equitably pertain where the breaching party has, because of its wrongdoing, effectively eliminated the opposing party’s contractual remedy, as happened here.” Therefore, the panel concluded that the defendants had been unjustly enriched by the sale of shares to Perspecta. Using the “Claw Back” provision in the Agreement as a guide only, the second panel awarded Finn \$600,000 in equitable relief.

Returning to court, Finn moved to affirm, and the defendants moved to vacate in part, the second arbitration award. Applying the plain mistake standard of review found in RSA 542:8, the trial court ruled that the second panel’s award of additional damages to Finn on her unjust enrichment claim was barred, under settled principles of *res judicata*, by the award of damages she received from the first panel.

Finn moved for reconsideration, arguing that ... the trial court should have applied the more deferential FAA standard in reviewing the arbitration award because the FAA preempts state law. The trial court denied the motion, and this appeal followed.

II

On appeal, Finn asserts that the trial court erred in applying RSA 542:8 to review the second arbitration panel’s award because state law is preempted by the FAA. Alternatively, she argues that, even if RSA 542:8 applies, the trial court erred

because it did not afford sufficient deference to the panel’s findings of fact and rulings of law.... We examine her arguments in turn.

A

Finn argues that the trial court erred in reviewing the second panel’s award under RSA 542:8 instead of §§ 9 and 10 of the FAA. Relying primarily upon the decision of the United States Supreme Court in *Hall Street Associates, L.L.C. v. Mattel, Inc.*, she asserts that RSA 542:8 is impliedly preempted by the FAA because the Agreement is a contract affecting interstate commerce to which the FAA applies, and that failing to employ the more deferential federal standard of judicial review of arbitration awards “foils the objective Congress seeks to advance with the FAA.” ...

...
The trial court reviewed the second panel’s award pursuant to RSA 542:8, which creates a procedure for parties to seek confirmation, modification, or vacatur of an arbitral award:

At any time within one year after the award is made any party to the arbitration may apply to the superior court for an order confirming the award, correcting or modifying the award for plain mistake, or vacating the award for fraud, corruption, or misconduct by the parties or by the arbitrators, or on the ground that the arbitrators have exceeded their powers....

We have construed this statute to grant a court the authority to vacate an award for plain mistake if it “determine[s] that an arbitrator misapplied the law to the facts.”...

...
Finn’s argument relies upon §§ 9, 10 and 11 of the FAA. In *Hall Street*, the Supreme Court held that the listed grounds for vacation, correction or modification of an arbitral award by a federal court, as set forth in §§ 10 and 11 of the FAA, may not be supplemented by the terms of the arbitration agreement entered into by the parties. These provisions provide much more limited grounds for review of an arbitration award than does “plain mistake” review under RSA 542:8.

We do not agree with Finn’s first argument that the FAA is the exclusive method by which to review the second panel’s award because we conclude that §§ 9–11 of the FAA apply only to arbitration review proceedings commenced in federal courts.... [T]he FAA creates some substantive rules that apply to arbitration agreements in both federal and state courts when the contract to arbitrate affects commerce. Section 2 of the act applies in state courts to prevent anti-arbitration laws from invalidating otherwise lawful arbitration agreements. However, it does not follow that the FAA applies to state courts in its entirety. In fact, the Supreme Court has suggested that some of the statute’s provisions apply only in federal

courts. *See Volt*. In considering whether other sections of the FAA apply in state courts, the Court noted that it has “never held that §§ 3 and 4, which by their terms appear to apply only to proceedings in federal court, ... are nonetheless applicable in state court.” This comment clearly contemplates that the Court considers the application to the states of each section individually, rather than the application of the Act as a whole. Therefore, we consider whether §§ 9–11 of the FAA also use language that limits their application to federal courts.

The sections at issue in *Volt* made reference to either “the courts of the United States” or “any United States district court.” Likewise, §§ 10 and 11, the sections that establish the limited grounds upon which arbitration awards may be upset, reference only the federal courts. 9 U.S.C. §§ 10, 11. Although § 9 of the FAA could be read to encompass state courts as well as federal courts, and to contemplate that state courts reviewing covered arbitration awards (*i.e.*, those involving contracts affecting interstate commerce) must utilize exclusively the standards set forth in §§ 10 and 11, the Court has not interpreted the FAA in this fashion. In *Hall Street*, the Court not only acknowledged the potential for review of arbitration awards under state law, but even noted the possibility of a federal court reviewing an arbitration award under its “case management authority independent of the FAA.” If the FAA were, in all circumstances, the exclusive grounds for review of arbitration awards subject to the FAA, these possible alternative paradigms of judicial review that the Court described would have been completely foreclosed....

Here, the FAA applied to the extent that it required the parties to arbitrate their dispute, as the trial court noted when it referred Finn’s claim to the second arbitration panel. That does not mean that all aspects of the FAA are applicable to this proceeding. Based upon our review of the pertinent case law, we conclude that neither *Hall Street*, nor any other precedents by which we are bound, requires that we accept plaintiff’s position that §§ 10 and 11 provide the exclusive grounds for state court review of arbitration awards subject to the FAA.

We next consider Finn’s argument that so-called “obstacle preemption” supports her assertion that RSA 542:8 is invalidated by the FAA. The “obstacle” branch of conflict preemption requires more than a showing that some tension between the state and federal laws exists. A party must show that “the repugnance or conflict is so direct and positive that the two acts cannot be reconciled or consistently stand together.”...

The Supreme Court has provided guidance regarding the purpose of the FAA. It has described the primary purpose of the FAA as “foreclos[ing] state legislative attempts to undercut the enforceability of arbitration agreements.” This purpose is rooted in § 2 of the FAA.... For example, the Court held preempted a state law that required notice of an arbitration clause upon the first page of the contract, *Doctor’s Associates, Inc. v. Casarotto*, and a law that required administrative procedures

before a case could proceed to arbitration, *Preston v. Ferrer*. Thus, at the heart of the Court's FAA preemption doctrine is its effort to enforce Congressional intent by thwarting the recurring refusal of state courts to enforce an otherwise valid contract because it embodied the parties' agreement to arbitrate. In short, preemption under the FAA is at its apex when parties cannot get to arbitration because state law attempts to force them to resolve their dispute in court.

In *AT & T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion*, the Court considered California's application of the doctrine of unconscionability to an arbitration agreement.... It concluded that, by requiring that class actions be available in a particular subset of arbitration agreements, California courts had "sacrifice[d] the principal advantage of arbitration—its informality." Class arbitrations take more time to reach a final award on the merits than bilateral arbitration and require procedural formality to make the award binding upon absent parties. These complications, the Court determined, departed significantly from arbitration as envisioned by the FAA and, therefore, were a thinly veiled refusal to enforce arbitration agreements. The California rule was therefore preempted because it required drastic procedural changes before the court would enforce the agreement to arbitrate.

In contrast, state rules that slow or change procedures without the potential consequence of invalidating an arbitration agreement are not preempted. In *Volt*, the Court considered whether the FAA preempted a state court from interpreting a choice-of-law provision as applying state procedural rules. The state procedure that the trial court applied stayed the arbitration when the FAA would not, thus delaying the arbitration.... Although the Court had held preempted state laws that required judicial resolution of claims despite parties contracting to resolve them by arbitration, it distinguished the FAA's procedural rules: "There is no federal policy favoring arbitration under a certain set of procedural rules; the federal policy is simply to ensure the enforceability, according to their terms, of private agreements to arbitrate."

The fact that a state law affecting arbitration is less deferential to an arbitrator's decision than the FAA does not create an obstacle so insurmountable as to preempt state law. *Volt* demonstrates that not all obstacles to arbitration are repugnant to the FAA. The procedural rule in *Volt* delayed arbitration, and simplified it, by staying the proceedings until non-arbitral issues had been resolved. On the other hand, the state rule at issue in *AT & T Mobility* contemplated an extreme alteration of arbitration procedure, risks, and efficiency, and failure to comply with its requirement would make the agreement to arbitrate unenforceable. It thus had such a profound effect upon arbitration as to effectively deter parties from choosing arbitration.

RSA 542:8 is more like the rule at issue in *Volt* than that at issue in *AT & T Mobility*.... RSA 542:8's more rigorous standard of judicial review of arbitral

decisions is not an impediment to enforcement of the parties' *agreement to arbitrate* as per the terms of the Agreement. In fact, it does not even slow the enforcement of an agreement to arbitrate, but instead applies *after* an agreement to arbitrate has already been enforced, arbitration conducted, and a final award issued. It allows the trial court to ensure that no plain mistakes made by the arbitrators will go uncorrected.

In this case, the trial court did not refuse to enforce the parties' agreement to arbitrate. Instead it applied RSA 542:8 to review the second panel's award, which was produced because the trial court had complied with the FAA and enforced their agreement to arbitrate. RSA 542:8 does not interfere with the FAA's principal purpose of protecting arbitration agreements from perceived judicial hostility. Because our state standard of review does not impede the enforcement of an arbitration agreement nor mandate drastic changes to the procedures by which arbitration is to be conducted, it is not preempted by the FAA.

Finn nonetheless insists that the Court's discussion in *Hall Street* about the dangers of "full-bore legal and evidentiary appeals that can render informal arbitration merely a prelude to a more cumbersome and time-consuming judicial review process," thus "bring[ing] arbitration theory to grief in postarbitration process," demands that we hold RSA 542:8 preempted by the FAA. She argues that, although the Court acknowledged that parties may seek review of arbitral decisions through other avenues of enforcement, these "are only permissible where they are *more restrictive* than federal standards of review."...

... *Hall Street* does not support Finn's contention that the Court has held preempted state standards of review that are more rigorous than the FAA.... *Hall Street* was a question of statutory interpretation, not preemption. It considered only federal law as it applied to a federal court. Although it based its conclusions upon a "national policy," it did not do so in the context of a state law. Not only did the Court recognize that other statutes existed that would conflict with the Court's interpretation of the FAA, it suggested that such avenues remained open to parties, even after its decision. Thus, it implied that although "more searching review," was in conflict with the "national policy favoring arbitration with just limited review," the conflict may not effectively preempt such avenues of review.

The California Supreme Court reached a similar conclusion when it considered whether its rule allowing parties to expand judicial review by contract was preempted in the aftermath of *Hall Street* *Cable Connection, Inc. v. DIRECTV, Inc.*, 190 P.3d 586, 599 (Cal.2008). We agree with the California court. To conclude from *Hall Street* that the Court intended to establish a new policy with preemptive effect is unreasonable given both the context and express limitation of the case's holding, as well as the federalism concerns that would be implicated by such a broad reading of the case.

Here, the Agreement included a choice-of-law clause, and Finn and the other shareholders selected New Hampshire law as the governing law: “This Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the internal laws of the State of New Hampshire, without regard to conflict of laws principles.” Their choice to govern their agreement by New Hampshire law includes the agreement to arbitrate; the arbitration clause does not reference the use of any other governing law. The parties opted for judicial review through a mechanism other than the FAA, an avenue left undisturbed by the Court in *Hall Street*. By applying RSA 542:8 to the arbitral award, the trial court was faithful to the parties’ intent. Not only does *Hall Street* contemplate the possibility of such an outcome, enforcing parties’ agreements according to their terms remains at the heart of the FAA. We therefore conclude that the FAA does not preempt RSA 542:8, and that the trial court did not err by applying it to the second arbitral award.

B

Finn next argues that the trial court erred because it did not give deference to the second panel’s findings of fact and rulings of law.... We are not persuaded

We have construed RSA 542:8 to grant the trial court the power to vacate an arbitration award for a “plain mistake” of law or fact.... In past cases we have defined a “plain mistake” as “an error that is apparent on the face of the record and which would have been corrected had it been called to the arbitrators’ attention.”...

...
The second panel should have applied res judicata to bar Finn’s second action. The panel acknowledged that the denial of benefits was based upon the same injury to Finn that was the subject of the first arbitration. Given its findings, it should have concluded that the action arose from the same factual occurrence and merely sought additional damages for the same injury. The record cannot support any other determination than that res judicata barred Finn’s unjust enrichment claim. The second panel therefore committed a plain mistake, and the trial court did not err when it vacated the second panel’s final award.

III

For the reasons stated above, the judgment of the superior court is hereby affirmed.

Affirmed.

Replace *Greenberg* and the notes after *Greenberg* on pages 598-602 with the following:

Liu v. Mar

**United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois
2013 WL 1499179 (April 10, 2013)**

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Plaintiffs I-Wen Chang Liu and Thomas S. Campbell seek to confirm an arbitration award of \$125,000 in their favor, while defendant Genevieve Mar petitions to vacate the award. Finding that there is no federal subject matter jurisdiction over either the motion to confirm or the petition to vacate, the Court grants Mar's motion to dismiss the plaintiffs' motion without prejudice, and remands Mar's petition to state court.

BACKGROUND

Mar was employed by Brewer Financial Services, LLC ("Brewer Financial"), and she served as the plaintiffs' broker and investment advisor. According to the plaintiffs, in 2009 an entity called FPA Limited offered three year, asset-backed promissory notes with an 8% yield to be paid every six months. Unbeknownst to the plaintiffs, FPA Limited was actually a shell company of Brewer Financial with virtually no assets. Mar (who represents in her pleadings that she invested in the notes herself and also advised family members to do so) assured the plaintiffs that the notes were safe investments, and advised the plaintiffs to invest in them. Upon Mar's advice and recommendation, the plaintiffs purchased FPA Limited promissory notes in the amount of \$125,000. Shortly after the plaintiffs purchased the promissory notes, the SEC filed a complaint against Brewer Financial alleging that the notes constituted a fraudulent offering. The SEC subsequently discovered that more than 90% of the proceeds from the offering were diverted by Brewer Financial. The plaintiffs lost their entire investment in the promissory notes.

The plaintiffs claimed that Mar committed fraud and negligence, that she breached her fiduciary duty, and that she violated federal and state securities laws as well as FINRA rules. The parties arbitrated their dispute, as required by FINRA rules, before a three-arbitrator panel seated by FINRA Dispute Resolution. The arbitrators ultimately awarded the plaintiffs \$125,000 in actual damages to compensate them for their investment losses.

The plaintiffs moved in federal court to confirm the arbitration award under the terms of the Federal Arbitration Act, 9 U.S.C. § 9. Mar then filed a petition in state court to vacate the award under the Illinois state Uniform Arbitration Act. The plaintiffs removed Mar's petition to federal court, and this Court consolidated

the two actions. Mar now moves pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P 12(b)(1) to dismiss the plaintiffs' motion for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and to remand the petition to vacate for the same reason.

DISCUSSION

Mar argues that neither the plaintiffs' motion to confirm the arbitration award nor her own petition to vacate the arbitration award is within the Court's subject matter jurisdiction. She correctly notes that the FAA, under which the plaintiffs seek to confirm the arbitration award, does not on its own create federal jurisdiction. *Vaden v. Discover Bank*....

The plaintiffs argue that the Court has federal question jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 over both their motion to confirm and Mar's motion to vacate. They argue that the underlying arbitration involved their allegation that Mar violated Section 10(b)(5) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and therefore that their claims presented a federal question. But just because an arbitration involved a federal question does not mean that the Court has federal question jurisdiction to confirm or vacate the arbitration award; rather, the parties' motions to confirm and vacate, respectively, must themselves implicate federal questions.

Therefore, we examine both the plaintiffs' motion to confirm the arbitration award and Mar's petition to vacate the award to determine whether either contains an independent basis for federal jurisdiction.

I. The Court Lacks Subject Matter Jurisdiction Over the Plaintiffs' Motion to Confirm.

The plaintiffs' motion to confirm does not identify any federal question on its face. The motion notes that the plaintiffs alleged federal securities violations against Mar in the arbitration, but the motion itself does not raise any federal question that the Court would need to decide or any federal law (other than the FAA) that the Court would need to interpret in order to confirm the arbitration award. Rather, the motion simply asserts that the arbitration was held, that the arbitrators ruled in favor of the plaintiffs, and that Section 9 of the FAA permits confirmation of the award. As such, it fails to identify a basis for federal jurisdiction other than the FAA and the Court therefore lacks jurisdiction to adjudicate the motion.

The Seventh Circuit's opinion in *Minor* [*v. Prudential Sec., Inc.*, 94 F.3d 1103 (7th Cir. 1996),] plainly controls this issue, but the plaintiffs argue that the case is distinguishable because it involved not a motion to confirm an arbitration award under § 9 of the FAA, but a motion to vacate an arbitration award, under § 10 of the FAA. The plaintiffs provide no rationale for distinguishing the Court's jurisdictional

predicate in these two contexts, however, and there is none. The Seventh Circuit's holding in *Minor* was that the motion under consideration (there, the motion to vacate; here, the motion to confirm) must supply the jurisdictional basis, not the underlying arbitration.

Instead, the plaintiffs rely on the premise that it would be “illogical that this Court would have jurisdiction over a motion to compel arbitration under Section 4 of the FAA based on the subject matter of the underlying dispute, but not subject matter jurisdiction over an action to enforce that arbitration award under the FAA.” But the anomaly the plaintiffs identify is the product of a false premise.... Motions to confirm, or vacate, an arbitration award do not go to the underlying merits of the claims considered in the arbitration, but rather implicate the integrity of the arbitral process.... That question, by itself, does not present a federal claim Claims ... that implicate the integrity of the arbitration process ... cannot properly be brought in federal court unless they present a substantial question of federal law or there is complete diversity between the parties.

Moreover, in positing a jurisdictional anomaly, the plaintiffs ignore the key textual distinction between Section 4, on the one hand, and Sections 9 and 10, on the other. Section 4 specifically states that “a party ... may petition any United States district court which, *save for such agreement*, would have jurisdiction under Title 28 ... for an order directing that such arbitration proceed in the manner provided for in such agreement.” (Emphasis added.) As the Supreme Court held in *Vaden*, “[t]he phrase ‘save for [the arbitration] agreement’ indicates that the district court should assume the absence of the arbitration agreement and determine whether it ‘would have jurisdiction under title 28’ without it.” But ... there is no similar provision in either of Sections 9 or 10, and the [Seventh Circuit in *Minor*] expressly declined to import this provision from Section 4 in order to cure the very same anomaly that the plaintiffs have posited in this case.

Because the plaintiffs’ motion to confirm presents no independent basis for federal jurisdiction, the motion is dismissed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1).

II. The Court Also Lacks Subject Matter Jurisdiction Over Mar’s Motion to Vacate.

The plaintiffs also argue that the Court has independent jurisdiction over Mar’s motion to vacate, which the plaintiffs removed to federal court. Unlike the plaintiffs’ motion to confirm, Mar’s motion to vacate does allege one possible federal question: whether the arbitrators manifestly disregarded federal law by finding a violation of § 10(b)(5) of the Securities and Exchange Act....

The plaintiffs are correct that generally where a “petitioner complains principally and in good faith that the award was rendered in manifest disregard of

federal law, a substantial federal question is presented and the federal courts have jurisdiction to entertain the petition.” *Greenberg v. Bear, Stearns & Co.*, 220 F.3d 22, 27 (2d Cir. 2000)]. This is so because in order to determine whether the arbitrators disregarded federal law, a district court must first analyze and construe the federal law. “However, mere incantation of a federal statute does not confer jurisdiction,” even where a party claims that the arbitrators manifestly disregarded a federal statute. “[R]ather, the dispute must actually involve a ‘substantial question of federal law.’”

... Where an allegation of manifest disregard is so untenable as to be patently meritless, it cannot form the basis for federal question jurisdiction. Here, Mar’s allegation that the arbitrators manifestly disregarded federal law is patently meritless, at least as the Seventh Circuit construes that term. The Seventh Circuit has held that “an arbitral decision is in manifest disregard of the law only when the arbitrator’s award actually orders the parties to violate the law.” Mar does not allege that the arbitrators’ order directs the parties to violate the law; rather, she alleges that “Claimants did not meet their burden of proof with regard to any of the claims alleged in their Statement of Claim.” “Absence of evidence” does not satisfy the Seventh Circuit’s “narrow concept of ‘manifest disregard,’” and therefore does not suffice as a basis for exercise of jurisdiction over the motion to vacate the arbitration award.

For the reasons set forth above, the plaintiffs’ motion to confirm the arbitration award is dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, and Mar’s petition to vacate the arbitration award is remanded to state court. Both cases are terminated.

Notes

1. Does the court in *Liu v. Mar* properly distinguish the Supreme Court’s decision in *Vaden v. Discover Bank* (in § 4.07)? As the court notes, the language of Sections 9 and 10 of the FAA is different from the language of Section 4 relied on in *Vaden*. But the FAA certainly contemplates that a party that brings a petition to compel arbitration in a federal court can go back to that court to seek confirmation of the award — effectively extending the look-through approach to such actions. Why should the result be different if no petition to compel arbitration was filed in the first place?

2. If the Supreme Court were to reject manifest disregard of the law as a ground for vacating awards under the FAA, what bases for subject matter jurisdiction over petitions to vacate are available under *Liu v. Mar*?

3. The circuits are split on whether the *Vaden* approach applies under sections 9 and 10 of the FAA—i.e., on whether *Liu v. Mar* is correctly decided:

The Supreme Court has determined that the FAA adopted the “look-through” approach with respect to petitions to compel arbitration under 9 U.S.C. § 4. *See Vaden v. Discover Bank*, 556 U.S. 49, 62 (2009). However, the Supreme Court has not decided whether the same jurisdictional “look-through” approach applies to petitions to confirm or vacate. *See* 9 U.S.C. §§ 9–10. Subsequent to *Vaden*, a split has emerged among the circuits on this question The First and Second Circuits have held that the “look-through” approach applies to § 10 petitions. *See Ortiz-Espinosa v. BBVA Sec. of Puerto Rico, Inc.*, 852 F.3d 36, 40 (1st Cir. 2017); *Doscher v. Sea Port Group Sec., LLC*, 832 F.3d 372, 388 (2d Cir. 2016). By contrast, the Third and Seventh Circuits have held otherwise. *See Goldman v. Citigroup Global Markets, Inc.*, 834 F.3d 242, 254–55 (3d Cir. 2016); *Magruder v. Fidelity Brokerage Servs., LLC*, 818 F.3d 285, 288 (7th Cir. 2016).

Janus Distrib. LLC v. Roberts, 2017 WL 1788374, at *3 n.7 (D. Colo. May 5, 2017). How will the Supreme Court decide, do you think, if and when it addresses the issue?

4. In many cases, actions to confirm or to vacate arbitration awards will be brought in federal court on the basis of diversity rather than federal question jurisdiction. In those cases, how should a court determine whether the amount in controversy exceeds the \$75,000 jurisdictional minimum? Courts have taken various approaches to the question:

Courts that have confronted this issue generally follow one of two approaches—the award approach or the demand approach. *Karsner v. Lothian*, 532 F.3d 876, 882 (D.C. Cir. 2008). “[U]nder the award approach, the amount in controversy is determined by the amount of the underlying arbitration award regardless of the amount sought.” *Id.*; *Baltin v. Alaron Trading Corp.*, 128 F.3d 1466, 1472 (11th Cir. 1997); *Ford v. Hamilton Invs., Inc.*, 29 F.3d 255, 260 (6th Cir. 1994). In contrast, “[under] the demand approach, the amount in controversy is the amount sought in the underlying arbitration rather than the amount awarded.” *Id.*; *Bull HN Info. Sys., Inc. v. Hutson*, 229 F.3d 321, 329 (1st Cir. 2000); *Am. Guar. Co. v. Caldwell*, 72 F.2d 209, 211 (9th Cir. 1934).

In its order denying Appellants’ motion to dismiss, the district court concluded that the demand approach was the correct one: “[e]ach approach has strengths and weaknesses, and the issue is one that will be resolved by the Fifth Circuit. However, having considered . . . [the cited authority] the Court finds that the demand approach is more appropriate.”

We agree. Based on Appellants' arbitration demand of \$80 million, the district court correctly concluded that the \$75,000 amount in controversy requirement was met. First, the demand approach recognizes the true scope of the controversy between the parties. The only logical assumption about Appellants' efforts to prevent confirmation of this arbitration award is that they want a second chance to pursue their claims. The \$10,000 award "is but the last stage of litigation" that began with an \$80 million controversy. Therefore, the amount at stake is the \$80 million that Appellants initially sought in arbitration, not the minimal award for arbitration-related costs.

Pershing, L.L.C. v. Kiebach, 819 F.3d 179, 182 (5th Cir. 2016). Which approach is the best?

Add the following to note 1 after *Chromalloy* on page 656:

Compare Corporación Mexicana de Mantenimiento Integral, S. de R.L. de C.V. v. Pemex-Exploración y Producción, 832 F.3d 642 (2d Cir. 2016) (holding district court did not abuse its discretion in enforcing award vacated in Mexico; district court found that Mexican decision “violated basic notions of justice” because decision “appli[ed] a law and policy that were not in existence at the time of the parties’ contract”), *cert. dismissed*, 137 S. Ct. 1622 (2017) *with* Thai-Lao Lignite (Thailand) Co., Ltd. v. Gov’t of Lao People’s Democratic Republic, 997 F. Supp. 2d 214, 227 (S.D.N.Y. 2014) (refusing to enforce award vacated in Malaysia, distinguishing *Pemex* because “[t]his is not a case in which the Respondent is an entity of Malaysia’s government, which might raise a suspicion of the Malaysian courts’ partiality; rather, Malaysia is a neutral, third country that the parties mutually chose as the seat of the arbitration”).

Add the following to the second paragraph of the introductory material in § 7.05 on page 658:

; In re Wal-Mart Wage & Hour Employment Practices Litig., 737 F.3d 1262, 1267-68 (9th Cir. 2013) (“Just as the text of the FAA compels the conclusion that the grounds for vacatur of an arbitration award may not be supplemented, it also compels the conclusion that these grounds are not waivable, or subject to elimination by contract.”).

Add the following to the end of note 6 after *Vandenberg* on page 675:

But see In re Houng, 499 B.R. 751, 760-62 (C.D. Cal. 2013) (“The Supreme Court and Ninth Circuit have consistently held that, under federal law, an unreviewed arbitration decision does not have preclusive effect in a federal court action.”), *aff’d*, 636 F. App’x 396 (9th Cir. 2016).

Chapter 8 Drafting Arbitration Clauses

Update the citation to the Rutledge and Drahozal excerpt on page 683 to the following:

2013 B.Y.U. L. REV. 1

Update the citation to the AAA's *Drafting Dispute Resolution Clauses* in note 2 after the Townsend article on page 712 to the following:

American Arbitration Association, *Drafting Dispute Resolution Clauses—A Practical Guide* (2013), *available at*
https://www.adr.org/sites/default/files/document_repository/Drafting%20Dispute%20Resolution%20Clauses%20A%20Practical%20Guide.pdf

Documentary Supplement

Add the following to the list of countries that have ratified the New York Convention on pages 5-6 of the Documentary Supplement:

Andorra, Angola, Bhutan, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Comoros, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Guyana, Myanmar, Sao Tome and Principe, State of Palestine, Sudan

Add the following to the end of 48 C.F.R. § 222.7404(c) on page 32 of the Documentary Supplement:

and PGI 222.7404(c)

Insert the following after the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act on page 38 of the Documentary Supplement:

**FINAL RULE: ARBITRATION AGREEMENTS
CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU
(July 2017)**

**Disapproved under the Congressional Review Act by Public
Law No. 115-74, 131 Stat. 1243 (2017)**

Authority and Issuance

For the reasons set forth above, the Bureau adds 12 CFR part 1040 to Chapter X in Title 12 of the Code of Federal Regulations, as set forth below:

PART 1040—ARBITRATION AGREEMENTS

Sec.

1040.1 Authority and purpose.

1040.2 Definitions.

1040.3 Coverage and exclusions from coverage.

1040.4 Limitations on the use of pre-dispute arbitration agreements.

1040.5 Compliance date and temporary exception.

Supplement I to Part 1040—Official Interpretations.

Authority: 12 U.S.C. 5512(b) and (c) and 5518(b).

§ 1040.1 Authority and purpose.

(a) *Authority.* The regulation in this part is issued by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection (Bureau) pursuant to sections 1022(b)(1) and (c) and 1028(b) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Dodd-Frank Act) (12 U.S.C. 5512(b)(1) and (c) and 5518(b)).

(b) *Purpose.* The purposes of this part are the furtherance of the public interest and the protection of consumers regarding the use of agreements for consumer financial products and services providing for arbitration of any future dispute, and also to monitor for risks to consumers in the offering or provision of consumer financial products or services, including developments in markets for such products or services.

§ 1040.2 Definitions.

(a) *Class action* means a lawsuit in which one or more parties seek or obtain class treatment pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 or any State process analogous to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23.

(b) *Consumer* means an individual or an agent, trustee, or representative acting on behalf of an individual.

(c) *Pre-dispute arbitration agreement* means an agreement between a covered person as defined by 12 U.S.C. 5481(6) and a consumer providing for arbitration of any future dispute concerning a consumer financial product or service covered by § 1040.3(a).

(d) *Provider* means:

(1) A person as defined by 12 U.S.C. 5481(19) that engages in an activity covered by § 1040.3(a) to the extent that the person is not excluded under § 1040.3(b); or

(2) An affiliate of a provider as defined in paragraph (d)(1) of this section when that affiliate is acting as a service provider to the provider with which the service provider is affiliated consistent with 12 U.S.C. 5481(6)(B).

§ 1040.3 Coverage and exclusions from coverage.

(a) *Covered products and services.* Except for persons when excluded from coverage pursuant to paragraph (b) of this section, this part applies to the offering or provision of the following products or services when such offering or provision is a consumer financial product or service as defined by 12 U.S.C. 5481(5):

(1)(i) Providing an “extension of credit” that is “consumer credit” when performed by a “creditor” as those terms are defined in Regulation B, 12 CFR 1002.2;

(ii) “Participat[ing] in [] credit decision[s]” within the meaning of 12 CFR 1002.2(l) when performed by a “creditor” with regard to “consumer credit” as those terms are defined in 12 CFR 1002.2;

(iii)(A) Referring applicants or prospective applicants for “consumer credit” to creditors when performed by a “creditor” as those terms are defined in 12 CFR 1002.2; or

DOCUMENTARY SUPPLEMENT

(B) Selecting or offering to select creditors to whom requests for “consumer credit” may be made when done by a “creditor” as those terms are defined in 12 CFR 1002.2;

(C) Except that this paragraph (a)(1)(iii) does not apply when the referral or selection activity by the creditor described in paragraphs (a)(1)(iii)(A) or (B) of this section is incidental to a business activity of that creditor that is not covered by this section;

(iv) Acquiring, purchasing, or selling an extension of consumer credit covered by paragraph (a)(1)(i) of this section; or

(v) Servicing an extension of consumer credit covered by paragraph (a)(1)(i) of this section;

(2) Extending automobile leases as defined by 12 CFR 1090.108 or brokering such leases;

(3)(i) Providing services to assist with debt management or debt settlement, modify the terms of any extension of consumer credit covered by paragraph (a)(1)(i) of this section, or avoid foreclosure;

(ii) Providing products or services represented to remove derogatory information from, or improve, a person’s credit history, credit record, or credit rating;

(4) Providing directly to a consumer a consumer report, as defined by the Fair Credit Reporting Act, 15 U.S.C. 1681a(d), a credit score, as defined by 15 U.S.C. 1681g(f)(2)(A), or other information specific to a consumer derived from a consumer file, as defined by 15 U.S.C. 1681a(g), in each case except for a consumer report provided solely in connection with an adverse action as defined in 15 U.S.C. 1681a(k) with respect to a product or service that is not covered by this section;

(5) Providing accounts subject to the Truth in Savings Act, 12 U.S.C. 4301 et seq., as implemented by 12 CFR part 707 and Regulation DD, 12 CFR part 1030;

(6) Providing accounts or remittance transfers subject to the Electronic Fund Transfer Act, 15 U.S.C. 1693 et seq., as implemented by Regulation E, 12 CFR part 1005;

(7) Transmitting or exchanging funds as defined by 12 U.S.C. 5481(29) except when necessary to another product or service if that product or service:

(i) Is offered or provided by the person transmitting or exchanging funds; and

(ii) Is not covered by this section;

(8) Accepting financial or banking data or providing a product or service to accept such data directly from a consumer for the purpose of initiating a payment by a consumer via any payment instrument as defined by 12 U.S.C. 5481(18) or initiating a credit card or charge card transaction for the consumer, except by a person selling or marketing a good or service that is not covered by this section, for which the payment or credit card or charge card transaction is being made;

(9) Providing check cashing, check collection, or check guaranty services; or

(10) Collecting debt arising from any of the consumer financial products or services described in paragraphs (a)(1) through (9) of this section when performed by:

(i) A person offering or providing the product or service giving rise to the debt being collected, an affiliate of such person, or a person acting on behalf of such person or affiliate;

(ii) A person purchasing or acquiring an extension of consumer credit covered by paragraph (a)(1)(i) of this section, an affiliate of such person, or a person acting on behalf of such person or affiliate; or

(iii) A debt collector as defined by 15 U.S.C. 1692a(6).

(b) *Excluded persons.* This part does not apply to the following persons in the following circumstances:

(1)(i) A person regulated by the Securities and Exchange Commission as defined by 12 U.S.C. 5481(21); or

(ii) A person to the extent regulated by a State securities commission as described in 12 U.S.C. 5517(h) as either:

(A) A broker dealer; or

DOCUMENTARY SUPPLEMENT

(B) An investment adviser; or

(iii) A person regulated by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission as defined by 12 U.S.C. 5481(20) or a person with respect to any account, contract, agreement, or transaction to the extent subject to the jurisdiction of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission under the Commodity Exchange Act, 7 U.S.C. 1 et seq.

(2)(i) A Federal agency as defined in 28 U.S.C. 2671;

(ii) Any State, Tribe, or other person to the extent such person qualifies as an “arm” of a State or Tribe under Federal sovereign immunity law and the person’s immunities have not been abrogated by the U.S. Congress;

(3) Any person with respect to a product or service described in paragraph (a) of this section that the person and any of its affiliates collectively provide to no more than 25 consumers in the current calendar year and to no more than 25 consumers in the preceding calendar year;

(4) A merchant, retailer, or other seller of nonfinancial goods or services to the extent such person:

(i) Offers or provides an extension of consumer credit covered by paragraph (a)(1)(i) of this section that is of the type described in 12 U.S.C. 5517(a)(2)(A)(i); and

(A) Is not subject to the Bureau’s rulemaking authority under 12 U.S.C. 5517(a)(2)(B); or

(B) Is subject to the Bureau’s rulemaking authority only under 12 U.S.C. 5517(a)(2)(B)(i) but not 12 U.S.C. 5517(a)(2)(B)(ii) or (iii); or

(ii) Purchases or acquires an extension of consumer credit excluded by paragraph (b)(4)(i) of this section.

(5) Any “employer” as defined in the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. 203(d), to the extent it is offering or providing a product or service described in paragraph (a) of this section to its employee as an employee benefit; or

(6) A person to the extent providing a product or service in circumstances where they are excluded from the Bureau's rulemaking authority including pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 5517 or 5519.

§ 1040.4 Limitations on the use of pre-dispute arbitration agreements.

(a) *Use of pre-dispute arbitration agreements in class actions—*

(1) *General rule.* A provider shall not rely in any way on a pre-dispute arbitration agreement entered into after the date set forth in § 1040.5(a) with respect to any aspect of a class action that concerns any of the consumer financial products or services covered by § 1040.3, including to seek a stay or dismissal of particular claims or the entire action, unless and until the presiding court has ruled that the case may not proceed as a class action and, if that ruling may be subject to appellate review on an interlocutory basis, the time to seek such review has elapsed or such review has been resolved such that the case cannot proceed as a class action.

(2) *Provision required in covered pre-dispute arbitration agreements.* Upon entering into a pre-dispute arbitration agreement for a consumer financial product or service covered by § 1040.3 after the date set forth in § 1040.5(a):

(i) Except as provided elsewhere in this paragraph (a)(2) or in § 1040.5(b), a provider shall ensure that any such pre-dispute arbitration agreement contains the following provision: “We agree that neither we nor anyone else will rely on this agreement to stop you from being part of a class action case in court. You may file a class action in court or you may be a member of a class action filed by someone else.”

(ii) When the pre-dispute arbitration agreement applies to multiple products or services, only some of which are covered by § 1040.3, the provider may include the following alternative provision in place of the one required by paragraph (a)(2)(i) of this section: “We are providing you with more than one product or service, only some of which are covered by the Arbitration Agreements Rule issued by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. The following provision applies only to class action claims concerning the products or services covered by that Rule: We agree that neither we nor anyone else will rely on this agreement to stop you from being part of a class action case in court. You may file a class action in court or you may be a member of a class action filed by someone else.”

DOCUMENTARY SUPPLEMENT

(iii) When the pre-dispute arbitration agreement existed previously between other parties and does not contain either the provision required by paragraph (a)(2)(i) of this section or the alternative permitted by paragraph (a)(2)(ii) of this section:

(A) The provider shall either ensure the pre-dispute arbitration agreement is amended to contain the provision specified in paragraph (a)(2)(i) or (a)(2)(ii) of this section or provide any consumer to whom the agreement applies with the following written notice: “We agree not to rely on any pre-dispute arbitration agreement to stop you from being part of a class action case in court. You may file a class action in court or you may be a member of a class action filed by someone else.” When the pre-dispute arbitration agreement applies to multiple products or services, only some of which are covered by § 1040.3, the provider may, in this written notice, include the following optional additional language: “This notice applies only to class action claims concerning the products or services covered by the Arbitration Agreements Rule issued by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.”

(B) The provider shall ensure the pre-dispute arbitration agreement is amended or provide the notice to consumers within 60 days of entering into the pre-dispute arbitration agreement.

(iv) A provider may add any one or more of the following sentences at the end of the disclosures required by paragraphs (a)(2)(i) and (ii) of this section:

(A)(1) “This provision does not apply to parties that entered into this agreement before [INSERT DATE 60 DAYS AND 181 DAYS AFTER PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER].”

(2) “This provision does not apply to products or services first provided to you before [INSERT DATE 60 DAYS AND 181 DAYS AFTER PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER] that are subject to an arbitration agreement entered into before that date.”

(B) “This provision does not apply to persons that are excluded from the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau’s Arbitration Agreements Rule.”

(C) “This provision also applies to the delegation provision.” A provider using this sentence as part of the disclosure required by paragraph (a)(2)(i) or (ii) of this section in a predispute arbitration agreement is not required to separately insert the disclosure required by paragraph (a)(2)(i) or (ii) of this section into a delegation provision that relates to such a predispute arbitration agreement.

(v) In any provision or notice required by this paragraph (a)(2), if the provider uses a standard term in the rest of the agreement to describe the provider or the consumer, the provider may use that term instead of the term “we” or “you.”

(vi) In any provision or notice required by this paragraph (a)(2), if a person has a genuine belief that sovereign immunity from suit under applicable law may apply to any person that may seek to assert the pre-dispute arbitration agreement, then the provision or notice may include, after the sentence reading “You may file a class action in court or you may be a member of a class action filed by someone else,” the following language: “However, the defendants in the class action may claim they cannot be sued due to their sovereign immunity. This provision does not create or waive any such immunity.” In the preceding sentence, the word “notice” may be substituted for the word “provision” when the included language is in a notice.

(vii) A provider may provide any provision or notice required by this paragraph (a)(2) in a language other than English if the pre-dispute arbitration agreement also is written in that other language.

(b) *Submission of arbitral and court records.* For any pre-dispute arbitration agreement for a consumer financial product or service covered by § 1040.3 entered into after the date set forth in § 1040.5(a), a provider shall comply with the requirements set forth below.

(1) *Records to be submitted.* A provider shall submit a copy of the following records to the Bureau, in the form and manner specified by the Bureau:

(i) In connection with any claim filed in arbitration by or against the provider concerning any of the consumer financial products or services covered by § 1040.3:

(A) The initial claim and any counterclaim;

DOCUMENTARY SUPPLEMENT

(B) The answer to any initial claim and/or counterclaim, if any;

(C) The pre-dispute arbitration agreement filed with the arbitrator or arbitration administrator;

(D) The judgment or award, if any, issued by the arbitrator or arbitration administrator; and

(E) If an arbitrator or arbitration administrator refuses to administer or dismisses a claim due to the provider's failure to pay required filing or administrative fees, any communication the provider receives from the arbitrator or an arbitration administrator related to such a refusal;

(ii) Any communication the provider receives from an arbitrator or an arbitration administrator related to a determination that a pre-dispute arbitration agreement for a consumer financial product or service covered by § 1040.3 does not comply with the administrator's fairness principles, rules, or similar requirements, if such a determination occurs; and

(iii) In connection with any case in court by or against the provider concerning any of the consumer financial products or services covered by § 1040.3:

(A) Any submission to a court that relies on a pre-dispute arbitration agreement in support of the provider's attempt to seek dismissal, deferral, or stay of any aspect of a case; and

(B) The pre-dispute arbitration agreement relied upon in the motion or filing.

(2) *Deadline for submission.* A provider shall submit any record required pursuant to paragraph (b)(1) of this section within 60 days of filing by the provider of any such record with the arbitrator, arbitration administrator, or court, and within 60 days of receipt by the provider of any such record filed or sent by someone other than the provider, such as the arbitration administrator, the court, or the consumer.

(3) *Redaction.* Prior to submission of any records pursuant to paragraph (b)(1) of this section, a provider shall redact the following information:

(i) Names of individuals, except for the name of the provider or the arbitrator where either is an individual;

(ii) Addresses of individuals, excluding city, State, and zip code;

(iii) Email addresses of individuals;

(iv) Telephone numbers of individuals;

(v) Photographs of individuals;

(vi) Account numbers;

(vii) Social Security and tax identification numbers;

(viii) Driver's license and other government identification numbers; and

(ix) Passport numbers.

(4) *Internet posting of arbitral and court records.* The Bureau shall establish and maintain on its publicly available internet site a central repository of the records that providers submit to it pursuant to paragraph (b)(1) of this section, and such records shall be easily accessible and retrievable by the public on its internet site.

(5) *Further redaction prior to internet posting.* Prior to making records identified in paragraph (b)(1) of this section easily accessible and retrievable by the public as required by paragraph (b)(4) of this section, the Bureau shall make such further redactions as are needed to comply with applicable privacy laws.

(6) *Deadline for internet posting of arbitral and court records.* The Bureau shall initially make records submitted to the Bureau by providers under paragraph (b)(1) of this section easily accessible and retrievable by the public on its internet site no later than July 1, 2019. The Bureau will annually make records submitted under paragraph (b)(1) available each year thereafter for documents received by the end of the prior calendar year.

§ 1040.5 Compliance date and temporary exception.

(a) *Compliance date.* Compliance with this part is required for any pre-dispute arbitration agreement entered into on or after [INSERT DATE 60 DAYS AND 181 DAYS AFTER PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER].

(b) *Exception for pre-packaged general-purpose reloadable prepaid card agreements.* Section 1040.4(a)(2) shall not apply to a provider that enters into a pre-dispute arbitration agreement for a general-purpose reloadable prepaid card if the requirements set forth in either paragraphs (b)(1) or (2) of this section are satisfied.

(1) For a provider that does not have the ability to contact the consumer in writing:

(i) The consumer acquires a general-purpose reloadable prepaid card in person at a retail store;

(ii) The pre-dispute arbitration agreement was inside of packaging material when the general-purpose reloadable prepaid card was acquired; and

(iii) The pre-dispute arbitration agreement was packaged prior to the compliance date of the rule.

(2) For a provider that has the ability to contact the consumer in writing:

(i) The requirements set forth in paragraphs (b)(1)(i) through (iii) of this section are satisfied; and

(ii) Within 30 days of obtaining the consumer's contact information, the provider notifies the consumer in writing that the pre-dispute arbitration agreement complies with the requirements of § 1040.4(a)(2) by providing an amended pre-dispute arbitration agreement to the consumer.

Replace the Arbitration Fairness Act of 2011 on pages 39-42 of the Documentary Supplement with the following:

ARBITRATION FAIRNESS ACT OF 2017

H.R. 1374

To amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

March 7, 2017

Mr. JOHNSON ... introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary

A BILL

To amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ‘Arbitration Fairness Act of 2017’.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) The Federal Arbitration Act (now enacted as chapter 1 of title 9 of the United States Code) was intended to apply to disputes between commercial entities of generally similar sophistication and bargaining power.

(2) A series of decisions by the Supreme Court of the United States has interpreted the Act so that it now extends to consumer disputes and employment disputes, contrary to the intent of Congress.

(3) Most consumers and employees have little or no meaningful choice whether to submit their claims to arbitration. Often, consumers and employees are not even aware that they have given up their rights.

(4) Mandatory arbitration undermines the development of public law because there is inadequate transparency and inadequate judicial review of arbitrators' decisions.

(5) Arbitration can be an acceptable alternative when consent to the arbitration is truly voluntary, and occurs after the dispute arises.

SEC. 3. ARBITRATION OF EMPLOYMENT, CONSUMER, ANTITRUST, AND CIVIL RIGHTS DISPUTES.

(a) In General- Title 9 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘CHAPTER 4—ARBITRATION OF EMPLOYMENT, CONSUMER, ANTITRUST, AND CIVIL RIGHTS DISPUTES

‘Sec.

‘401. Definitions.

‘402. Validity and enforceability.

Sec. 401. Definitions

‘In this chapter--

‘(1) the term ‘antitrust dispute’ means a dispute —

‘(A) involving a claim for damages allegedly caused by a violation of the antitrust laws (as defined in subsection (a) of the first section of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12)) or State antitrust laws; and

‘(B) in which the plaintiffs seek certification as a class under rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or a comparable rule or provision of State law;

‘(2) the term ‘civil rights dispute’ means a dispute —

‘(A) arising under —

‘(i) the Constitution of the United States or the constitution of a State; or

‘(ii) a Federal or State statute that prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, sex, disability, religion, national origin, or any invidious basis in

education, employment, credit, housing, public accommodations and facilities, voting, or program funded or conducted by the Federal Government or State government, including any statute enforced by the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice and any statute enumerated in section 62(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to unlawful discrimination); and

‘(B) in which at least 1 party alleging a violation of the Constitution of the United States, a State constitution, or a statute prohibiting discrimination is an individual;

‘(3) the term ‘consumer dispute’ means a dispute between an individual who seeks or acquires real or personal property, services, securities or other investments, money, or credit for personal, family, or household purposes and the seller or provider of such property, services, securities or other investments, money, or credit;

‘(4) the term ‘employment dispute’ means a dispute between an employer and employee arising out of the relationship of employer and employee as defined in section 3 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203); and

‘(5) the term ‘predispute arbitration agreement’ means any agreement to arbitrate a dispute that had not yet arisen at the time of the making of the agreement.

‘Sec. 402. Validity and enforceability

‘(a) In General- Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, no predispute arbitration agreement shall be valid or enforceable if it requires arbitration of an employment dispute, consumer dispute, antitrust dispute, or civil rights dispute.

‘(b) Applicability-

‘(1) IN GENERAL- An issue as to whether this chapter applies to an arbitration agreement shall be determined under Federal law. The applicability of this chapter to an agreement to arbitrate and the validity and enforceability of an agreement to which this chapter applies shall be determined by a court, rather than an arbitrator, irrespective of whether the party resisting arbitration challenges the

arbitration agreement specifically or in conjunction with other terms of the contract containing such agreement.

‘(2) COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS- Nothing in this chapter shall apply to any arbitration provision in a contract between an employer and a labor organization or between labor organizations, except that no such arbitration provision shall have the effect of waiving the right of an employee to seek judicial enforcement of a right arising under a provision of the Constitution of the United States, a State constitution, or a Federal or State statute, or public policy arising therefrom.’.

(b) Technical and Conforming Amendments-

(1) IN GENERAL- Title 9 of the United States Code is amended--

(A) in section 1, by striking ‘of seamen,’ and all that follows through ‘interstate commerce’;

(B) in section 2, by inserting ‘or as otherwise provided in chapter 4’ before the period at the end;

(C) in section 208—

(i) in the section heading, by striking ‘Chapter 1; residual application’ and inserting ‘Application’; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following: ‘This chapter applies to the extent that this chapter is not in conflict with chapter 4.’; and

(D) in section 307—

(i) in the section heading, by striking ‘Chapter 1; residual application’ and inserting ‘Application’; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following: ‘This chapter applies to the extent that this chapter is not in conflict with chapter 4.’.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS-

(A) CHAPTER 2- The table of sections for chapter 2 of title 9, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 208 and inserting the following:

‘208. Application.’

(B) CHAPTER 3- The table of sections for chapter 3 of title 9, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 307 and inserting the following:

‘307. Application.’

(3) TABLE OF CHAPTERS- The table of chapters for title 9, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘4. Arbitration of employment, consumer, antitrust, and civil rights disputes.’

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and shall apply with respect to any dispute or claim that arises on or after such date.

**ENDING FORCED ARBITRATION OF
SEXUAL HARASSMENT ACT**

H.R. 4570

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

December 6, 2017

Mrs. Bustos (for herself, Mr. Jones, Ms. Jayapal, and Ms. Stefanik)
introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary

A BILL

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States
of America in Congress assembled,*

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual
Harassment Act”.

SEC. 2. ARBITRATION OF EMPLOYMENT DISPUTES.

(a) In General.—Title 9 of the United States Code is amended by adding at
the end the following:

“CHAPTER 4—ARBITRATION OF EMPLOYMENT DISPUTES

“SEC. 401. DEFINITIONS.

“In this chapter—

“(1) the term ‘sex discrimination dispute’ means a dispute between an
employer and employee arising out of conduct that would form the basis of a
claim based on sex under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C.
2000e et seq.) if the employment were employment as defined in section
701(b) of that title regardless of whether a violation of title VII is alleged; and

“(2) the term ‘predispute arbitration agreement’ means any agreement
to arbitrate a dispute that had not yet arisen at the time of the making of the
agreement.

“SEC. 402. VALIDITY AND ENFORCEABILITY.

“(a) In General.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, no predispute arbitration agreement shall be valid or enforceable if it requires arbitration of a sex discrimination dispute.

“(b) Applicability.—

“(1) In general.—An issue as to whether this chapter applies to an arbitration agreement shall be determined under Federal law. The applicability of this chapter to an agreement to arbitrate and the validity and enforceability of an agreement to which this chapter applies shall be determined by a court, rather than an arbitrator, irrespective of whether the party resisting arbitration challenges the arbitration agreement specifically or in conjunction with other terms of the contract containing such agreement.

“(2) Collective bargaining agreements.—Nothing in this chapter shall apply to any arbitration provision in a contract between an employer and a labor organization or between labor organizations, except that no such arbitration provision shall have the effect of waiving the right of an employee to seek judicial enforcement of a right arising under a provision of the Constitution of the United States, a State constitution, or a Federal or State statute, or public policy arising therefrom.”.

(b) Technical and Conforming Amendments.—

(1) In general.—Title 9 of the United States Code is amended—

(A) in section 1, by striking “of seamen,” and all that follows through “interstate commerce”;

(B) in section 2, by inserting “or as otherwise provided in chapter 4” before the period at the end;

(C) in section 208—

(i) in the section heading, by striking “CHAPTER 1; RESIDUAL APPLICATION” and inserting “APPLICATION”;

and

DOCUMENTARY SUPPLEMENT

(ii) by adding at the end the following: “This chapter applies to the extent that this chapter is not in conflict with chapter 4.”;
and

(D) in section 307—

(i) in the section heading, by striking “CHAPTER 1; RESIDUAL APPLICATION” and inserting “APPLICATION”;
and

(ii) by adding at the end the following: “This chapter applies to the extent that this chapter is not in conflict with chapter 4.”.

(2) Table of sections.—

(A) Chapter 2.—The table of sections for chapter 2 of title 9, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 208 and inserting the following: “208. Application.”.

(B) Chapter 3.—The table of sections for chapter 3 of title 9, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 307 and inserting the following: “307. Application.”.

(3) Table of chapters.—The table of chapters for title 9, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: “4. Arbitration of employment disputes.”.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and shall apply with respect to any dispute or claim that arises on or after such date.

Replace Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 1281.96 on pages 67-68 of the Documentary Supplement with the following:

§ 1281.96. Private arbitration companies; quarterly or semiannual publication of consumer arbitration information; format and accessibility; costs; liability; legislative intent; application

(a) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of subdivision (c), a private arbitration company that administers or is otherwise involved in a consumer arbitration, shall collect, publish at least quarterly, and make available to the public on the Internet Web site of the private arbitration company, if any, and on paper upon request, a single cumulative report that contains all of the following information regarding each consumer arbitration within the preceding five years:

(1) Whether arbitration was demanded pursuant to a pre-dispute arbitration clause and, if so, whether the pre-dispute arbitration clause designated the administering private arbitration company.

(2) The name of the nonconsumer party, if the nonconsumer party is a corporation or other business entity, and whether the nonconsumer party was the initiating party or the responding party, if known.

(3) The nature of the dispute involved as one of the following: goods; credit; other banking or finance; insurance; health care; construction; real estate; telecommunications, including software and Internet usage; debt collection; personal injury; employment; or other. If the dispute involved employment, the amount of the employee's annual wage divided into the following ranges: less than one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000), one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000) to two hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$250,000), inclusive, and over two hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$250,000). If the employee chooses not to provide wage information, it may be noted.

(4) Whether the consumer or nonconsumer party was the prevailing party. As used in this section, "prevailing party" includes the party with a net monetary recovery or an award of injunctive relief.

(5) The total number of occasions, if any, the nonconsumer party has previously been a party in an arbitration administered by the private arbitration company.

(6) The total number of occasions, if any, the nonconsumer party has previously been a party in a mediation administered by the private arbitration company.

DOCUMENTARY SUPPLEMENT

(7) Whether the consumer party was represented by an attorney and, if so, the name of the attorney and the full name of the law firm that employs the attorney, if any.

(8) The date the private arbitration company received the demand for arbitration, the date the arbitrator was appointed, and the date of disposition by the arbitrator or private arbitration company.

(9) The type of disposition of the dispute, if known, identified as one of the following: withdrawal, abandonment, settlement, award after hearing, award without hearing, default, or dismissal without hearing. If a case was administered in a hearing, indicate whether the hearing was conducted in person, by telephone or video conference, or by documents only.

(10) The amount of the claim, whether equitable relief was requested or awarded, the amount of any monetary award, the amount of any attorney's fees awarded, and any other relief granted, if any.

(11) The name of the arbitrator, his or her total fee for the case, the percentage of the arbitrator's fee allocated to each party, whether a waiver of any fees was granted, and, if so, the amount of the waiver.

(b) The information required by this section shall be made available in a format that allows the public to search and sort the information using readily available software, and shall be directly accessible from a conspicuously displayed link on the Internet Web site of the private arbitration company with the identifying description: "consumer case information."

(c)(1) If the information required by subdivision (a) is provided by the private arbitration company in compliance with subdivision (b) and may be downloaded without a fee, the company may charge the actual cost of copying to any person who requests the information on paper. If the information required by subdivision (a) is not accessible by the Internet in compliance with subdivision (b), the company shall provide that information without charge to any person who requests the information on paper.

(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a private arbitration company that receives funding pursuant to Chapter 8 (commencing with Section 465) of Division 1 of the Business and Professions Code and that administers or conducts fewer than 50 consumer arbitrations per year may collect and publish the information required by subdivision (a) semiannually, provide the information only on paper, and charge the actual cost of copying.

(d) This section shall apply to any consumer arbitration commenced on or after January 1, 2003.

(e) A private arbitration company shall not have any liability for collecting, publishing, or distributing the information required by this section.

(f) It is the intent of the Legislature that private arbitration companies comply with all legal obligations of this section.

(g) The amendments to subdivision (a) made by the act adding this subdivision shall not apply to any consumer arbitration administered by a private arbitration company before January 1, 2015.

Revise the California Ethics Standards on pages 73-93 of the Documentary Supplement to reflect the following changes:

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
AMENDMENTS TO THE
STANDARDS FOR NEUTRAL ARBITRATORS
IN CONTRACTUAL ARBITRATION
Effective July 1, 2014**

Standard 2. Definitions

As used in these standards:

(a) Arbitrator and neutral arbitrator

(1) * * *

(2) Where the context includes events or acts occurring before an appointment is final, “arbitrator” and “neutral arbitrator” include a person who has been served with notice of a proposed nomination or appointment. For purposes of these standards, “proposed nomination” does not include nomination of persons by a court under Code of Civil Procedure section 1281.6 to be considered for possible selection as an arbitrator by the parties or appointment as an arbitrator by the court.

(b)–(n) * * *

(o) “Member of the arbitrator’s extended family” means the parents, grandparents, great-grandparents, children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren, siblings, uncles, aunts, nephews, and nieces of the arbitrator or the arbitrator’s spouse or domestic partner or the spouse or domestic partner of such person.

(p)–(s) * * *

Standard 2 amended effective July 1, 2014.

Standard 3. Application and effective date

(a) * * *

(b) These standards do not apply to:

(1) * * *

(2) Any arbitrator serving in:

(A)–(C) * * *

(D) An automobile warranty dispute resolution process certified under California Code of Regulations title 16, division 33.1 or an informal 1 dispute settlement procedure under Code of Federal Regulations title 16, chapter 1, part 703;

(E)–(F) * * *

(G) An arbitration of a complaint filed against a contractor with the Contractors State License Board under Business and Professions Code sections 7085 through 7085.7; ~~or~~

(H) An arbitration conducted under or arising out of public or private sector labor-relations laws, regulations, charter provisions, ordinances, statutes, or agreements.; or

(I) An arbitration proceeding governed by rules adopted by a securities self-regulatory organization and approved by the United States Securities and Exchange Commission under federal law.

(c) The following persons are not subject to the standards or to specific amendments to the standards in certain arbitrations:

(1) Persons who are serving in arbitrations in which they were appointed to serve as arbitrators before July 1, 2002, are not subject to these standards in those arbitrations.

(2) Persons who are serving in arbitrations in which they were appointed to serve as arbitrators before January 1, 2003, are not subject to standard 8 in those arbitrations.

(3) Persons who are serving in arbitrations in which they were appointed to serve as arbitrators before July 1, 2014, are not subject to the amendments to standards 2, 7, 8, 12, 16, and 17 that took effect July 1, 2014 in those arbitrations.

Standard 3 amended effective July 1, 2014.

Comment to Standard 3

With the exception of standard 8 and the amendments to standards 2, 7, 8, 12, 16, and 17 that took effect July 1, 2014, these standards apply to all neutral arbitrators appointed on or after July 1, 2002, who meet the criteria of subdivision (a). Arbitration provider organizations, although not themselves subject to these standards, should be aware of them when performing administrative functions that involve arbitrators who are subject to these standards. A provider organization's policies and actions should facilitate, not impede, compliance with the standards by arbitrators who are affiliated with the provider organization.

Subdivision (b)(2)(I) is intended to implement the decisions of the California Supreme Court in *Jevne v. Superior Court* ((2005) 35 Cal.4th 935) and of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in *Credit Suisse First Boston Corp. v. Grunwald* ((9th Cir. 2005) 400 F.3d 1119).

Standard 7. Disclosure

(a) * * *

(b) General provisions

For purposes of this standard:

(1) * * *

(2) *Offers of employment or professional relationship*

(A) Except as provided in (B), if an arbitrator has disclosed to the parties in an arbitration that he or she will entertain offers of employment or of professional relationships from a party or lawyer for a party while the arbitration is pending as required by subdivision (b) of standard 12, the arbitrator is not also required under this standard to disclose to the parties in that arbitration any such offer from a party or lawyer for a party that he or she subsequently receives or accepts while that arbitration is pending.

(B) In a consumer arbitration, if an arbitrator has disclosed to the parties that he or she will entertain offers of employment or of professional relationships from a party or lawyer for a party while the arbitration is pending as required by subdivision (b) of standard 12 and has informed the parties in the pending arbitration about any such offer and the acceptance of any such offer as required by

subdivision (d) of standard, the arbitrator is not also required under this standard to disclose that offer or the acceptance of that offer to the parties in that arbitration.

(3) * * *

(c) Time and manner of disclosure

(1) Initial disclosure

Within ~~ten~~ 10 calendar days of service of notice of the proposed nomination or appointment, a proposed arbitrator must disclose to all parties in writing all matters listed in subdivisions (d) and (e) of this standard of which the arbitrator is then aware.

(2) Supplemental disclosure

If an arbitrator subsequently becomes aware of a matter that must be disclosed under either subdivision (d) or (e) of this standard, the arbitrator must disclose that matter to the parties in writing within 10 calendar days after the arbitrator becomes aware of the matter.

(d) Required disclosures

~~A person who is nominated or appointed as an arbitrator~~ A proposed arbitrator or arbitrator must disclose all matters that could cause a person aware of the facts to reasonably entertain a doubt that the ~~proposed~~ arbitrator would be able to be impartial, including, but not limited to, all of the following:

(1) Family relationships with party

The arbitrator or a member of the arbitrator's immediate or extended family is:

(A) A party;

(B) a party's ~~The~~ spouse or domestic partner, of a party; or

(C) An officer, director, or trustee of a party.

DOCUMENTARY SUPPLEMENT

(2) *Family relationships with lawyer in the arbitration*(A) Current relationships

The arbitrator, or the spouse, former spouse, domestic partner, child, sibling, or parent of the arbitrator or the arbitrator's spouse or domestic partner is:

~~(A)(i)~~ * * *

~~(B)(ii)~~ * * *

~~(C)(iii)~~ * * *

(B) Past relationships

The arbitrator or the arbitrator's spouse or domestic partner was associated in the private practice of law with a lawyer in the arbitration within the preceding two years.

(3) * * *

(4) *Service as arbitrator for a party or lawyer for party*

(A) The arbitrator is serving or, within the preceding five years, has served:

(i)-(ii) * * *

(iii) As a neutral arbitrator in another prior or pending noncollective bargaining case in which he or she was selected by a person serving as a party-appointed arbitrator in the current arbitration.

(B)-(C) * * *

(5) *Compensated service as other dispute resolution neutral*

The arbitrator is serving or has served as a dispute resolution neutral other than an arbitrator in another pending or prior noncollective bargaining case involving a party or lawyer for a party and the arbitrator received or expects to receive any form of compensation for serving in this capacity.

(A) Time frame

For purposes of this paragraph (5), “prior case” means any case in which the arbitrator concluded his or her service as a dispute resolution neutral within two years before the date of the arbitrator’s proposed nomination or appointment, ~~but does not include any case in which the arbitrator concluded his or her service before January 1, 2002.~~

(B)-(C) * * *

(6)-(7) * * *

(8) Employee, expert witness, or consultant relationships

The arbitrator or a member of the arbitrator’s immediate family is or, within the preceding two years, was an employee of or an expert witness or a consultant for a party or for a lawyer in the arbitration. -

~~(8)~~(9) *Other professional relationships*

Any other professional relationship not already disclosed under paragraphs (2)-~~(7)~~(8) that the arbitrator or a member of the arbitrator’s immediate family has or has had with a party or lawyer for a party, ~~including the following:~~

~~(A) The arbitrator was associated in the private practice of law with a lawyer in the arbitration within the last two years.~~

~~(B) The arbitrator or a member of the arbitrator’s immediate family is or, within the preceding two years, was an employee of or an expert witness or a consultant for a party; and~~

~~(C) The arbitrator or a member of the arbitrator’s immediate family is or within the preceding two years, was an employee of or an expert witness or a consultant for a lawyer in the arbitration.~~

~~(10)~~ * * *~~(10)~~(11) * * *~~(11)~~(12) * * *~~(12)~~(13) * * *

DOCUMENTARY SUPPLEMENT

~~(13)~~(14) *Membership in organizations practicing discrimination*

The arbitrator's ~~membership in~~ is a member of any organization that practices invidious discrimination on the basis of race, sex, religion, national origin, or sexual orientation. Membership in a religious organization, an official military organization of the United States, or a nonprofit youth organization need not be disclosed unless it would interfere with the arbitrator's proper conduct of the proceeding or would cause a person aware of the fact to reasonably entertain a doubt concerning the arbitrator's ability to act impartially.

~~(14)~~(15) Any other matter that:

(A)-(C) * * *

~~(e) Inability to conduct or timely complete proceedings~~ Other required disclosures

In addition to the matters that must be disclosed under subdivision (d), ~~an~~ a proposed arbitrator or arbitrator must also disclose:

(1) Professional discipline

(A) If the arbitrator has been disbarred or had his or her license to practice a profession or occupation revoked by a professional or occupational disciplinary agency or licensing board, whether in California or elsewhere. The disclosure must specify the date of the revocation, what professional or occupational disciplinary agency or licensing board revoked the license, and the reasons given by that professional or occupational disciplinary agency or licensing board for the revocation.

(B) If the arbitrator has resigned his or her membership in the State Bar or another professional or occupational licensing agency or board, whether in California or elsewhere, while public or private disciplinary charges were pending. The disclosure must specify the date of the resignation, what professional or occupational disciplinary agency or licensing board had charges pending against the arbitrator at the time of the resignation, and what those charges were.

(C) If within the preceding 10 years public discipline other than that covered under (A) has been imposed on the arbitrator by a professional or occupational disciplinary agency or licensing board,

whether in California or elsewhere. “Public discipline” under this provision means any disciplinary action imposed on the arbitrator that the professional or occupational disciplinary agency or licensing board identifies in its publicly available records or in response to a request for information about the arbitrator from a member of the public. The disclosure must specify the date the discipline was imposed, what professional or occupational disciplinary agency or licensing board imposed the discipline, and the reasons given by that professional or occupational disciplinary agency or licensing board for the discipline.

(2) Inability to conduct or timely complete proceedings

~~(1)(A)~~ If the arbitrator is not able to properly perceive the evidence or properly conduct the proceedings because of a permanent or temporary physical impairment; and

~~(2)(B)~~ Any constraints on his or her availability known to the arbitrator that will interfere with his or her ability to commence or complete the arbitration in a timely manner.

(f) * * *

Standard 7 amended effective July 1, 2014.

Comment to Standard 7

This standard requires proposed arbitrators to disclose to all parties, in writing within 10 days of service of notice of their proposed nomination or appointment, all matters they are aware of at that time that could cause a person aware of the facts to reasonably entertain a doubt that the proposed arbitrator would be able to be impartial as well as those matters listed under subdivision (e). ~~and to disclose~~ This standard also requires that if arbitrators subsequently become aware of any additional such matters, they must make supplemental disclosures of these matters within 10 days of becoming aware of them. This latter requirement is intended to address both matters existing at the time of nomination or appointment of which the arbitrator subsequently becomes aware and new matters that arise based on developments during the arbitration, such as the hiring of new counsel by a party.

Timely disclosure to the parties is the primary means of ensuring the impartiality of an arbitrator. It provides the parties with the necessary information to make an informed selection of an arbitrator by disqualifying or ratifying the ~~proposed~~ arbitrator following disclosure. See also standard 12, concerning disclosure and disqualification requirements relating to concurrent and subsequent

employment or professional relationships between an arbitrator and a party or attorney in the arbitration. A party may disqualify an arbitrator for failure to comply with statutory disclosure obligations (see Code Civ. Proc., § 1281.91(a)). Failure to disclose, within the time required for disclosure, a ground for disqualification of which the arbitrator was then aware is a ground for *vacatur* of the arbitrator's award (see Code Civ. Proc., § 1286.2(a)(6)(A)).

The arbitrator's overarching duty under subdivision (d) of this standard, which mirrors the duty set forth in Code of Civil Procedure section 1281.9, is to inform parties about matters that could cause a person aware of the facts to reasonably entertain a doubt that the ~~proposed~~ arbitrator would be able to be impartial. While the remaining subparagraphs of subdivision (d) require the disclosure of specific interests, relationships, or affiliations, these are only examples of common matters that could cause a person aware of the facts to reasonably entertain a doubt that the arbitrator would be able to be impartial. ~~The absence of the particular fact that none of the interests, relationships, or affiliations specifically listed in the subparagraphs of (d) are present in a particular case~~ does not necessarily mean that there is no matter that could reasonably raise a question about the arbitrator's ability to be impartial and that therefore must be disclosed. Similarly, the fact that a particular interest, relationship, or affiliation present in a case is not specifically enumerated in one of the examples given in these subparagraphs does not mean that it must not be disclosed. An arbitrator must make determinations concerning disclosure on a case-by-case basis, applying the general criteria for disclosure under ~~paragraph~~ subdivision (d): is the matter something that could cause a person aware of the facts to reasonably entertain a doubt that the arbitrator would be able to be impartial?

Code of Civil Procedure section 1281.85 specifically requires that the ethics standards adopted by the Judicial Council address the disclosure of interests, relationships, or affiliations that may constitute conflicts of interest, including prior service as an arbitrator or other dispute resolution neutral entity. Section 1281.85 further provides that the standards "shall be consistent with the standards established for arbitrators in the judicial arbitration program and may expand but may not limit the disclosure and disqualification requirements established by this chapter [chapter 2 of title 9 of part III, Code of Civil Procedure, sections 1281-1281.95]."

Code of Civil Procedure section 1281.9 already establishes detailed requirements concerning disclosures by arbitrators, including a specific requirement that arbitrators disclose the existence of any ground specified in Code of Civil Procedure section 170.1 for disqualification of a judge. This standard does not eliminate or otherwise limit those requirements; in large part, it simply consolidates and integrates those existing statutory disclosure requirements by

topic area. This standard does, however, expand upon or clarify the existing statutory disclosure requirements in the following ways:

- Requiring arbitrators to ~~disclose~~ make supplemental disclosures to the parties regarding any matter about which they become aware after the time for making an initial disclosure has expired, within 10 calendar days after the arbitrator becomes aware of the matter (subdivision ~~(f)~~(c)).
- Expanding required disclosures about the relationships or affiliations of an arbitrator's family members to include those of an arbitrator's domestic partner (subdivisions (d)(1) and (2); see also definitions of immediate and extended family in standard 2).
- Requiring arbitrators, in addition to making statutorily required disclosures regarding prior service as an arbitrator for a party or attorney for a party, to disclose both prior services ~~both~~ as a neutral arbitrator selected by a party arbitrator in the current arbitration and prior compensated service as any other type of dispute resolution neutral for a party or attorney in the arbitration (e.g., temporary judge, mediator, or referee) (subdivisions (d)(4)~~(C)~~(A)(iii) and (5)).
- If a disclosure includes information about five or more cases, requiring arbitrators to provide a summary of that information (subdivisions (d)(4)~~(C)~~ and (5)~~(C)~~).
- Requiring the arbitrator to disclose if he or she or a member of his or her immediate family is or, within the preceding two years, was an employee, expert witness, or consultant for a party or a lawyer in the arbitration (subdivisions (d)(8) ~~(A) and (B)~~).
- Requiring the arbitrator to disclose if he or she or a member of his or her immediate family has an interest that could be substantially affected by the outcome of the arbitration (subdivision (d)~~(11)~~(12)).

~~If a disclosure includes information about five or more cases, requiring arbitrators to provide a summary of that information (subdivisions (d)(4) and (5)).~~

- Requiring arbitrators to disclose membership in organizations that practice invidious discrimination on the basis of race, sex, religion, national origin, or sexual orientation (subdivision (d)~~(13)~~(14)).
- Requiring the arbitrator to disclose if he or she was disbarred or had his or her license to practice a profession or occupation revoked by a professional or occupational disciplinary agency or licensing board, resigned membership in

the State Bar or another licensing agency or board while disciplinary charges were pending, or had any other public discipline imposed on him or her by a professional or occupational disciplinary agency or licensing board within the preceding 10 years (subdivision (e)(1)). The standard identifies the information that must be included in such a disclosure; however, arbitrators may want to provide additional information to assist parties in determining whether to disqualify an arbitrator based on such a disclosure.

- Requiring the arbitrator to disclose any constraints on his or her availability known to the arbitrator that will interfere with his or her ability to commence or complete the arbitration in a timely manner (subdivision ~~(d)~~(e)(2)).
- Clarifying that the duty to make disclosures is a continuing obligation, requiring disclosure of matters that were not known at the time of nomination or appointment but that become known afterward (subdivision ~~(e)~~(f)).

It is good practice for an arbitrator to ask each participant to make an effort to disclose any matters that may affect the arbitrator's ability to be impartial.

Standard 8. Additional disclosures in consumer arbitrations administered by a provider organization

(a) General provisions

(1) Reliance on information provided by provider organization

Except as to the information in (c)(1), an arbitrator may rely on information supplied by the administering provider organization in making the disclosures required by this standard only if the provider organization represents that the information the arbitrator is relying on is current through the end of the immediately preceding calendar quarter. If the information that must be disclosed is available on the Internet, the arbitrator may comply with the obligation to disclose this information by providing in the disclosure statement required under standard 7(c)(1) the Internet address of the specific web page at which the information is located and notifying the party that the arbitrator will supply hard copies of this information upon request.

*(2) * * **

(b) Additional disclosures required

In addition to the disclosures required under standard 7, in a consumer arbitration as defined in standard 2 in which a dispute resolution provider organization is coordinating, administering, or providing the arbitration services, a ~~person~~ proposed arbitrator who is nominated or appointed as an arbitrator on or after January 1, 2003 must disclose the following within the time and in the same manner as the disclosures required under standard 7(c)(1):

(1) *Relationships between the provider organization and party or lawyer in arbitration*

Any significant past, present, or currently expected financial or professional relationship or affiliation between the administering dispute resolution provider organization and a party or lawyer in the arbitration. Information that must be disclosed under this standard includes:

(A) The provider organization has a financial interest in a party.

~~(A)~~(B) A party, a lawyer in the arbitration, or a law firm with which a lawyer in the arbitration is currently associated is a member of or has a financial interest in the provider organization.

~~(B)~~(C) Within the preceding two years the provider organization has received a gift, bequest, or favor from a party, a lawyer in the arbitration, or a law firm with which a lawyer in the arbitration is currently associated.

~~(C)~~(D) The provider organization has entered into, or the arbitrator currently expects that the provider organization will enter into, an agreement or relationship with any party or lawyer in the arbitration or a law firm with which a lawyer in the arbitration is currently associated under which the provider organization will administer, coordinate, or provide dispute resolution services in other noncollective bargaining matters or will provide other consulting services for that party, lawyer, or law firm.

~~(D)~~(E) The provider organization is coordinating, administering, or providing dispute resolution services or has coordinated, administered, or provided such services in another pending or prior noncollective bargaining case in which a party or lawyer in the arbitration was a party or a lawyer. For purposes of this paragraph, “prior case” means a case in which the dispute resolution neutral affiliated with the provider organization concluded his or her service

within the two years before the date of the arbitrator's proposed nomination or appointment, but does not include any case in which the dispute resolution neutral concluded his or her service before July 1, 2002.

(2) *Case information*

If the provider organization is acting or has acted in any of the capacities described in paragraph (1)(~~D~~)(E), the arbitrator must disclose:

(A)-(C) * * *

(3) *Summary of case information*

If the total number of cases disclosed under paragraph (1)(~~D~~)(E) is greater than five, the arbitrator must also provide a summary of these cases that states:

(A)-(D) * * *

(c) Relationship between provider organization and arbitrator

If a relationship or affiliation is disclosed under ~~paragraph~~ subdivision (b), the arbitrator must also provide information about the following:

(1)-(4) * * *

(d) * * *

Standard 8 amended effective July 1, 2014.

Comment to Standard 8

This standard only applies in consumer arbitrations in which a dispute resolution provider organization is administering the arbitration. Like standard 7, this standard expands upon the existing statutory disclosure requirements. Code of Civil Procedure section 1281.95 requires arbitrators in certain construction defect arbitrations to make disclosures concerning relationships between their employers or arbitration services and the parties in the arbitration. This standard requires arbitrators in all consumer arbitrations to disclose any financial or professional relationship between the administering provider organization and any party, attorney, or law firm in the arbitration and, if any such relationship exists, then the arbitrator must also disclose his or her relationship with the dispute resolution provider organization. This standard ~~does not~~ requires an arbitrator to disclose if

the provider organization has a financial interest in a party or lawyer in the arbitration or if a party or lawyer in the arbitration has a financial interest in the provider organization ~~because~~ even though provider organizations are prohibited under Code of Civil Procedure section 1281.92 from administering any consumer arbitration where any such relationship exists.

Subdivision (b). Currently expected relationships or affiliations that must be disclosed include all relationships or affiliations that the arbitrator, at the time the disclosure is made, expects will be formed. For example, if the arbitrator knows that the administering provider organization has agreed in concept to enter into a business relationship with a party, but they have not yet signed a written agreement formalizing that relationship, this would be a “currently expected” relationship that the arbitrator would be required to disclose.

Standard 12. Duties and limitations regarding future professional relationships or employment

(a) * * *

(b) Offers for ~~other~~ employment or professional relationships other than as a lawyer, expert witness, or consultant

(1) In addition to the disclosures required by standards 7 and 8, within ten calendar days of service of notice of the proposed nomination or appointment, a proposed arbitrator must disclose to all parties in writing if, while that arbitration is pending, he or she will entertain offers of employment or new professional relationships in any capacity other than as a lawyer, expert witness, or consultant from a party or a lawyer for a party, including offers to serve as a dispute resolution neutral in another case.

(2) If the arbitrator discloses that he or she will entertain such offers of employment or new professional relationships while the arbitration is pending:

(A) In consumer arbitrations, the disclosure must also state that the arbitrator will inform the parties as required under (d) if he or she subsequently receives an offer while that arbitration is pending.

(B) In all other arbitrations, the disclosure must also state that the arbitrator will not inform the parties if he or she subsequently receives an offer while that arbitration is pending.

(3) A party may disqualify the arbitrator based on this disclosure by serving a notice of disqualification in the manner and within the time specified in Code of Civil Procedure section 1281.91(b).

(c) Acceptance of offers under (b) prohibited unless intent disclosed

If an arbitrator fails to make the disclosure required by subdivision (b) of this standard, from the time of appointment until the conclusion of the arbitration the arbitrator must not entertain or accept any such offers of employment or new professional relationships, including offers to serve as a dispute resolution neutral.

(d) Required notice of offers under (b)

If, in the disclosure made under subdivision (b), the arbitrator states that he or she will entertain offers of employment or new professional relationships covered by (b), the arbitrator may entertain such offers. However, in consumer arbitrations, from the time of appointment until the conclusion of the arbitration, the arbitrator must inform all parties to the current arbitration of any such offer and whether it was accepted as provided in this subdivision.

(1) The arbitrator in a consumer arbitration must notify the parties in writing of any such offer within five days of receiving the offer and, if the arbitrator accepts the offer, must notify the parties in writing within five days of that acceptance. The arbitrator's notice must identify the party or attorney who made the offer and provide a general description of the employment or new professional relationship that was offered including, if the offer is to serve as a dispute resolution neutral, whether the offer is to serve in a single case or multiple cases.

(2) If the arbitrator fails to inform the parties of an offer or an acceptance as required under (1), that constitutes a failure to comply with the arbitrator's obligation to make a disclosure required under these ethics standards.

(3) If an arbitrator has informed the parties in a pending arbitration about an offer as required under (1):

(A) Receiving or accepting that offer does not, by itself, constitute corruption in or misconduct by the arbitrator;

(B) The arbitrator is not also required to disclose that offer or its acceptance under standard 7; and

(C) The arbitrator is not subject to disqualification under standard 10(a)(2), (3), or (5) solely on the basis of that offer or the arbitrator's acceptance of that offer.

(4) An arbitrator is not required to inform the parties in a pending arbitration about an offer under this subdivision if:

(A) He or she reasonably believes that the pending arbitration is not a consumer arbitration based on reasonable reliance on a consumer party's representation that the arbitration is not a consumer arbitration;

(B) The offer is to serve as an arbitrator in an arbitration conducted under or arising out of public or private sector labor-relations laws, regulations, charter provisions, ordinances, statutes, or agreements; or

(C) The offer is for uncompensated service as a dispute resolution neutral.

~~(d)~~(e) * * *

Standard 12 amended effective July 1, 2014.

Comment to Standard 12

Subdivision (d)(1). A party may disqualify an arbitrator for failure to make required disclosures, including disclosures required by these ethics standards (see Code Civ. Proc., § 1281.91(a) and standard 10(a)). Failure to disclose, within the time required for disclosure, a ground for disqualification of which the arbitrator was then aware is also a ground for *vacatur* of the arbitrator's award (see Code Civ. Proc., § 1286.2(a)(6)(A)).

Subdivision (d)(4)(B). The arbitrations identified under this provision are only those in which, under Code of Civil Procedure section 1281.85(b) and standard 3(b)(2)(H), the ethics standards do not apply to the arbitrator.

Standard 16. Compensation

(a) * * *

(b) Before accepting appointment, an arbitrator, a dispute resolution provider organization, or another person or entity acting on the arbitrator's behalf must

inform all parties in writing of the terms and conditions of the arbitrator's compensation. This information must include any basis to be used in determining fees; ~~and~~ any special fees for cancellation, research and preparation time, or other purposes; any requirements regarding advance deposit of fees; and any practice concerning situations in which a party fails to timely pay the arbitrator's fees including whether the arbitrator will or may stop the arbitration proceedings.

Standard 16 amended effective July 1, 2014.

Comment to Standard 16

This standard is not intended to affect any authority a court may have to make orders with respect to the enforcement of arbitration agreements or arbitrator fees. It is also not intended to require any arbitrator or arbitration provider organization to establish a particular requirement or practice concerning fees or deposits, but only to inform the parties if such a requirement or practice has been established.

Standard 17. Marketing

(a) An arbitrator must be truthful and accurate in marketing his or her services. An arbitrator may advertise a general willingness to serve as an arbitrator and convey biographical information and commercial terms of employment ~~and~~ but must not make any representation that directly or indirectly implies favoritism or a specific outcome. An arbitrator must ensure that his or her personal marketing activities and any activities carried out on his or her behalf, including any activities of a provider organization with which the arbitrator is affiliated, comply with this requirement.

(b) * * *

(c) An arbitrator must not solicit appointment as an arbitrator in a specific case or specific cases.

(d) As used in this standard, "solicit" means to communicate in person, by telephone, or through real-time electronic contact to any prospective participant in the arbitration concerning the availability for professional employment of the arbitrator in which a significant motive is pecuniary gain. The term solicit does not include:

(1) responding to a request from all parties in a case to submit a proposal to provide arbitration services in that case; or (2) responding to

inquiries concerning the arbitrator's availability, qualifications, experience, or fee arrangements.

Standard 17 amended effective July 1, 2014.

Comment to Standard 17

Subdivision (b) and (c). Arbitrators should keep in mind that, in addition to these restrictions on solicitation, several other standards contain related disclosure requirements. For example, under standard 7(d)(4)-(6), arbitrators must disclose information about their past, current, and prospective service as an arbitrator or other dispute resolution for a party or attorney in the arbitration. Under standard 8(b)(1)(C) and (D), in consumer arbitrations administered by a provider organization, arbitrators must disclose if the provider organization has coordinated, administered, or provided dispute resolution services, is coordinating, administering, or providing such services, or has an agreement to coordinate, administer, or provide such services for a party or attorney in the arbitration. And under standard 12 arbitrators must disclose if, while an arbitration is pending, they will entertain offers from a party or attorney in the arbitration to serve as a dispute resolution neutral in another case.

~~This~~ These provisions ~~is~~ are not intended to prohibit an arbitrator from accepting another arbitration from a party or attorney in the arbitration while the first matter is pending, as long as the arbitrator complies with the provisions of standard 12 and there was no express solicitation of this business by the arbitrator.

Replace the AAA Commercial Arbitration Rules on pages 125-147 of the Documentary Supplement with the following:

**AMERICAN ARBITRATION ASSOCIATION
COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION RULES***

**Amended and Effective October 1, 2013
Fee Schedule Amended and Effective July 1, 2016**

R-1. Agreement of Parties⁺

(a) The parties shall be deemed to have made these rules a part of their arbitration agreement whenever they have provided for arbitration by the American Arbitration Association (hereinafter AAA) under its Commercial Arbitration Rules or for arbitration by the AAA of a domestic commercial dispute without specifying particular rules. These rules and any amendment of them shall apply in the form in effect at the time the administrative requirements are met for a Demand for Arbitration or Submission Agreement received by the AAA. Any disputes regarding which AAA rules shall apply shall be decided by the AAA. The parties, by written agreement, may vary the procedures set forth in these rules. After appointment of the arbitrator, such modifications may be made only with the consent of the arbitrator.

(b) Unless the parties or the AAA determines otherwise, the Expedited Procedures shall apply in any case in which no disclosed claim or counterclaim exceeds \$75,000, exclusive of interest, attorneys' fees, and arbitration fees and costs. Parties may also agree to use these procedures in larger cases. Unless the parties agree otherwise, these procedures will not apply in cases involving more than two parties. The Expedited Procedures shall be applied as described in Sections E-1 through E-10 of these rules, in addition to any other portion of these rules that is not in conflict with the Expedited Procedures.

(c) Unless the parties agree otherwise, the Procedures for Large, Complex Commercial Disputes shall apply to all cases in which the disclosed claim or counterclaim of any party is at least \$500,000 or more, exclusive of claimed interest, attorneys' fees, arbitration fees and costs. Parties may also agree to use the procedures in cases involving claims or counterclaims under \$500,000, or in nonmonetary cases. The Procedures for Large, Complex Commercial Disputes shall be applied as described in Sections L-1 through L-3 of these rules, in addition to any

* Copyright © 2014 by the American Arbitration Association. Reprinted with permission.

⁺ A dispute arising out of an employer promulgated plan will be administered under the AAA's Employment Arbitration Rules and Mediation Procedures.

other portion of these rules that is not in conflict with the Procedures for Large, Complex Commercial Disputes.

(d) Parties may, by agreement, apply the Expedited Procedures, the Procedures for Large, Complex Commercial Disputes, or the Procedures for the Resolution of Disputes through Document Submission (Rule E-6) to any dispute.

(e) All other cases shall be administered in accordance with Sections R-1 through R-58 of these rules.

R-2. AAA and Delegation of Duties

When parties agree to arbitrate under these rules, or when they provide for arbitration by the AAA and an arbitration is initiated under these rules, they thereby authorize the AAA to administer the arbitration. The authority and duties of the AAA are prescribed in the agreement of the parties and in these rules, and may be carried out through such of the AAA's representatives as it may direct. The AAA may, in its discretion, assign the administration of an arbitration to any of its offices. Arbitrations administered under these rules shall only be administered by the AAA or by an individual or organization authorized by the AAA to do so.

R-3. National Roster of Arbitrators

The AAA shall establish and maintain a National Roster of Arbitrators ("National Roster") and shall appoint arbitrators as provided in these rules. The term "arbitrator" in these rules refers to the arbitration panel, constituted for a particular case, whether composed of one or more arbitrators, or to an individual arbitrator, as the context requires.

R-4. Filing Requirements

(a) Arbitration under an arbitration provision in a contract shall be initiated by the initiating party ("claimant") filing with the AAA a Demand for Arbitration, the administrative filing fee, and a copy of the applicable arbitration agreement from the parties' contract which provides for arbitration.

(b) Arbitration pursuant to a court order shall be initiated by the initiating party filing with the AAA a Demand for Arbitration, the administrative filing fee, and a copy of any applicable arbitration agreement from the parties' contract which provides for arbitration.

i. The filing party shall include a copy of the court order.

ii. The filing fee must be paid before a matter is considered properly filed. If the court order directs that a specific party is responsible for the filing fee, it is the responsibility of the filing party to either make such payment to the AAA and seek reimbursement as directed in the court order or to make other such arrangements so that the filing fee is submitted to the AAA with the Demand.

iii. The party filing the Demand with the AAA is the claimant and the opposing party is the respondent regardless of which party initiated the court action. Parties may request that the arbitrator alter the order of proceedings if necessary pursuant to R-32.

(c) It is the responsibility of the filing party to ensure that any conditions precedent to the filing of a case are met prior to filing for an arbitration, as well as any time requirements associated with the filing. Any dispute regarding whether a condition precedent has been met may be raised to the arbitrator for determination.

(d) Parties to any existing dispute who have not previously agreed to use these rules may commence an arbitration under these rules by filing a written submission agreement and the administrative filing fee. To the extent that the parties' submission agreement contains any variances from these rules, such variances should be clearly stated in the Submission Agreement.

(e) Information to be included with any arbitration filing includes:

i. the name of each party;

ii. the address for each party, including telephone and fax numbers and e-mail addresses;

iii. if applicable, the names, addresses, telephone and fax numbers, and e-mail addresses of any known representative for each party;

iv. a statement setting forth the nature of the claim including the relief sought and the amount involved; and

v. the locale requested if the arbitration agreement does not specify one.

(f) The initiating party may file or submit a dispute to the AAA in the following manner:

i. through AAA WebFile, located at www.adr.org; or

ii. by filing the complete Demand or Submission with any AAA office, regardless of the intended locale of hearing.

(g) The filing party shall simultaneously provide a copy of the Demand and any supporting documents to the opposing party.

(h) The AAA shall provide notice to the parties (or their representatives if so named) of the receipt of a Demand or Submission when the administrative filing requirements have been satisfied. The date on which the filing requirements are satisfied shall establish the date of filing the dispute for administration. However, all disputes in connection with the AAA's determination of the date of filing may be decided by the arbitrator.

(i) If the filing does not satisfy the filing requirements set forth above, the AAA shall acknowledge to all named parties receipt of the incomplete filing and inform the parties of the filing deficiencies. If the deficiencies are not cured by the date specified by the AAA, the filing may be returned to the initiating party.

R-5. Answers and Counterclaims

(a) A respondent may file an answering statement with the AAA within 14 calendar days after notice of the filing of the Demand is sent by the AAA. The respondent shall, at the time of any such filing, send a copy of any answering statement to the claimant and to all other parties to the arbitration. If no answering statement is filed within the stated time, the respondent will be deemed to deny the claim. Failure to file an answering statement shall not operate to delay the arbitration.

(b) A respondent may file a counterclaim at any time after notice of the filing of the Demand is sent by the AAA, subject to the limitations set forth in Rule R-6. The respondent shall send a copy of the counterclaim to the claimant and all other parties to the arbitration. If a counterclaim is asserted, it shall include a statement setting forth the nature of the counterclaim including the relief sought and the amount involved. The filing fee as specified in the applicable AAA Fee Schedule must be paid at the time of the filing of any counterclaim.

(c) If the respondent alleges that a different arbitration provision is controlling, the matter will be administered in accordance with the arbitration provision submitted by the initiating party subject to a final determination by the arbitrator.

(d) If the counterclaim does not meet the requirements for filing a claim and the deficiency is not cured by the date specified by the AAA, it may be returned to the filing party.

R-6. Changes of Claim

(a) A party may at any time prior to the close of the hearing or by the date established by the arbitrator increase or decrease the amount of its claim or counterclaim. Written notice of the change of claim amount must be provided to the AAA and all parties. If the change of claim amount results in an increase in administrative fee, the balance of the fee is due before the change of claim amount may be accepted by the arbitrator.

(b) Any new or different claim or counterclaim, as opposed to an increase or decrease in the amount of a pending claim or counterclaim, shall be made in writing and filed with the AAA, and a copy shall be provided to the other party, who shall have a period of 14 calendar days from the date of such transmittal within which to file an answer to the proposed change of claim or counterclaim with the AAA. After the arbitrator is appointed, however, no new or different claim may be submitted except with the arbitrator's consent.

R-7. Jurisdiction

(a) The arbitrator shall have the power to rule on his or her own jurisdiction, including any objections with respect to the existence, scope, or validity of the arbitration agreement or to the arbitrability of any claim or counterclaim.

(b) The arbitrator shall have the power to determine the existence or validity of a contract of which an arbitration clause forms a part. Such an arbitration clause shall be treated as an agreement independent of the other terms of the contract. A decision by the arbitrator that the contract is null and void shall not for that reason alone render invalid the arbitration clause.

(c) A party must object to the jurisdiction of the arbitrator or to the arbitrability of a claim or counterclaim no later than the filing of the answering statement to the claim or counterclaim that gives rise to the objection. The arbitrator may rule on such objections as a preliminary matter or as part of the final award.

R-8. Interpretation and Application of Rules

The arbitrator shall interpret and apply these rules insofar as they relate to the arbitrator's powers and duties. When there is more than one arbitrator and a difference arises among them concerning the meaning or application of these rules, it shall be decided by a majority vote. If that is not possible, either an arbitrator or a party may refer the question to the AAA for final decision. All other rules shall be interpreted and applied by the AAA.

R-9. Mediation

In all cases where a claim or counterclaim exceeds \$75,000, upon the AAA's administration of the arbitration or at any time while the arbitration is pending, the parties shall mediate their dispute pursuant to the applicable provisions of the AAA's Commercial Mediation Procedures, or as otherwise agreed by the parties. Absent an agreement of the parties to the contrary, the mediation shall take place concurrently with the arbitration and shall not serve to delay the arbitration proceedings. However, any party to an arbitration may unilaterally opt out of this rule upon notification to the AAA and the other parties to the arbitration. The parties shall confirm the completion of any mediation or any decision to opt out of this rule to the AAA. Unless agreed to by all parties and the mediator, the mediator shall not be appointed as an arbitrator to the case.

R-10. Administrative Conference

At the request of any party or upon the AAA's own initiative, the AAA may conduct an administrative conference, in person or by telephone, with the parties and/or their representatives. The conference may address such issues as arbitrator selection, mediation of the dispute, potential exchange of information, a timetable for hearings, and any other administrative matters.

R-11. Fixing of Locale

The parties may mutually agree on the locale where the arbitration is to be held. Any disputes regarding the locale that are to be decided by the AAA must be submitted to the AAA and all other parties within 14 calendar days from the date of the AAA's initiation of the case or the date established by the AAA. Disputes regarding locale shall be determined in the following manner:

(a) When the parties' arbitration agreement is silent with respect to locale, and if the parties disagree as to the locale, the AAA may initially determine the place of arbitration, subject to the power of the arbitrator after appointment, to make a final determination on the locale.

(b) When the parties' arbitration agreement requires a specific locale, absent the parties agreement to change it, or a determination by the arbitrator upon appointment that applicable law requires a different locale, the locale shall be that specified in the arbitration agreement.

(c) If the reference to a locale in the arbitration agreement is ambiguous, and the parties are unable to agree to a specific locale, the AAA shall determine the locale, subject to the power of the arbitrator to finally determine the locale.

The arbitrator, at the arbitrator's sole discretion, shall have the authority to conduct special hearings for document production purposes or otherwise at other locations if reasonably necessary and beneficial to the process.

R-12. Appointment from National Roster

If the parties have not appointed an arbitrator and have not provided any other method of appointment, the arbitrator shall be appointed in the following manner:

(a) The AAA shall send simultaneously to each party to the dispute an identical list of 10 (unless the AAA decides that a different number is appropriate) names of persons chosen from the National Roster. The parties are encouraged to agree to an arbitrator from the submitted list and to advise the AAA of their agreement.

(b) If the parties are unable to agree upon an arbitrator, each party to the dispute shall have 14 calendar days from the transmittal date in which to strike names objected to, number the remaining names in order of preference, and return the list to the AAA. The parties are not required to exchange selection lists. If a party does not return the list within the time specified, all persons named therein shall be deemed acceptable to that party. From among the persons who have been approved on both lists, and in accordance with the designated order of mutual preference, the AAA shall invite the acceptance of an arbitrator to serve. If the parties fail to agree on any of the persons named, or if acceptable arbitrators are unable to act, or if for any other reason the appointment cannot be made from the submitted lists, the AAA shall have the power to make the appointment from among other members of the National Roster without the submission of additional lists.

(c) Unless the parties agree otherwise, when there are two or more claimants or two or more respondents, the AAA may appoint all the arbitrators.

R-13. Direct Appointment by a Party

(a) If the agreement of the parties names an arbitrator or specifies a method of appointing an arbitrator, that designation or method shall be followed. The notice of appointment, with the name and address of the arbitrator, shall be filed with the AAA by the appointing party. Upon the request of any appointing party, the AAA shall submit a list of members of the National Roster from which the party may, if it so desires, make the appointment.

(b) Where the parties have agreed that each party is to name one arbitrator, the arbitrators so named must meet the standards of Section R-18 with respect to impartiality and independence unless the parties have specifically agreed pursuant to Section R-18(b) that the party-appointed arbitrators are to be non-neutral and need not meet those standards.

(c) If the agreement specifies a period of time within which an arbitrator shall be appointed and any party fails to make the appointment within that period, the AAA shall make the appointment.

(d) If no period of time is specified in the agreement, the AAA shall notify the party to make the appointment. If within 14 calendar days after such notice has been sent, an arbitrator has not been appointed by a party, the AAA shall make the appointment.

R-14. Appointment of Chairperson by Party-Appointed Arbitrators or Parties

(a) If, pursuant to Section R-13, either the parties have directly appointed arbitrators, or the arbitrators have been appointed by the AAA, and the parties have authorized them to appoint a chairperson within a specified time and no appointment is made within that time or any agreed extension, the AAA may appoint the chairperson.

(b) If no period of time is specified for appointment of the chairperson, and the party-appointed arbitrators or the parties do not make the appointment within 14 calendar days from the date of the appointment of the last party-appointed arbitrator, the AAA may appoint the chairperson.

(c) If the parties have agreed that their party-appointed arbitrators shall appoint the chairperson from the National Roster, the AAA shall furnish to the party-appointed arbitrators, in the manner provided in Section R-12, a list selected from the National Roster, and the appointment of the chairperson shall be made as provided in that Section.

R-15. Nationality of Arbitrator

Where the parties are nationals of different countries, the AAA, at the request of any party or on its own initiative, may appoint as arbitrator a national of a country other than that of any of the parties. The request must be made before the time set for the appointment of the arbitrator as agreed by the parties or set by these rules.

R-16. Number of Arbitrators

(a) If the arbitration agreement does not specify the number of arbitrators, the dispute shall be heard and determined by one arbitrator, unless the AAA, in its discretion, directs that three arbitrators be appointed. A party may request three arbitrators in the Demand or Answer, which request the AAA will consider in exercising its discretion regarding the number of arbitrators appointed to the dispute.

(b) Any request for a change in the number of arbitrators as a result of an increase or decrease in the amount of a claim or a new or different claim must be made to the AAA and other parties to the arbitration no later than seven calendar days after receipt of the R-6 required notice of change of claim amount. If the parties are unable to agree with respect to the request for a change in the number of arbitrators, the AAA shall make that determination.

R-17. Disclosure

(a) Any person appointed or to be appointed as an arbitrator, as well as the parties and their representatives, shall disclose to the AAA any circumstance likely to give rise to justifiable doubt as to the arbitrator's impartiality or independence, including any bias or any financial or personal interest in the result of the arbitration or any past or present relationship with the parties or their representatives. Such obligation shall remain in effect throughout the arbitration. Failure on the part of a party or a representative to comply with the requirements of this rule may result in the waiver of the right to object to an arbitrator in accordance with Rule R-41.

(b) Upon receipt of such information from the arbitrator or another source, the AAA shall communicate the information to the parties and, if it deems it appropriate to do so, to the arbitrator and others.

(c) Disclosure of information pursuant to this Section R-17 is not an indication that the arbitrator considers that the disclosed circumstance is likely to affect impartiality or independence.

R-18. Disqualification of Arbitrator

(a) Any arbitrator shall be impartial and independent and shall perform his or her duties with diligence and in good faith, and shall be subject to disqualification for:

- i. partiality or lack of independence,

ii. inability or refusal to perform his or her duties with diligence and in good faith, and

iii. any grounds for disqualification provided by applicable law.

(b) The parties may agree in writing, however, that arbitrators directly appointed by a party pursuant to Section R-13 shall be non-neutral, in which case such arbitrators need not be impartial or independent and shall not be subject to disqualification for partiality or lack of independence.

(c) Upon objection of a party to the continued service of an arbitrator, or on its own initiative, the AAA shall determine whether the arbitrator should be disqualified under the grounds set out above, and shall inform the parties of its decision, which decision shall be conclusive.

R-19. Communication with Arbitrator

(a) No party and no one acting on behalf of any party shall communicate ex parte with an arbitrator or a candidate for arbitrator concerning the arbitration, except that a party, or someone acting on behalf of a party, may communicate ex parte with a candidate for direct appointment pursuant to R-13 in order to advise the candidate of the general nature of the controversy and of the anticipated proceedings and to discuss the candidate's qualifications, availability, or independence in relation to the parties or to discuss the suitability of candidates for selection as a third arbitrator where the parties or party-designated arbitrators are to participate in that selection.

(b) Section R-19(a) does not apply to arbitrators directly appointed by the parties who, pursuant to Section R-18(b), the parties have agreed in writing are non-neutral. Where the parties have so agreed under Section R-18(b), the AAA shall as an administrative practice suggest to the parties that they agree further that Section R-19(a) should nonetheless apply prospectively.

(c) In the course of administering an arbitration, the AAA may initiate communications with each party or anyone acting on behalf of the parties either jointly or individually.

(d) As set forth in R-43, unless otherwise instructed by the AAA or by the arbitrator, any documents submitted by any party or to the arbitrator shall simultaneously be provided to the other party or parties to the arbitration.

R-20. Vacancies

(a) If for any reason an arbitrator is unable or unwilling to perform the duties of the office, the AAA may, on proof satisfactory to it, declare the office vacant. Vacancies shall be filled in accordance with the applicable provisions of these rules.

(b) In the event of a vacancy in a panel of neutral arbitrators after the hearings have commenced, the remaining arbitrator or arbitrators may continue with the hearing and determination of the controversy, unless the parties agree otherwise.

(c) In the event of the appointment of a substitute arbitrator, the panel of arbitrators shall determine in its sole discretion whether it is necessary to repeat all or part of any prior hearings.

R-21. Preliminary Hearing

(a) At the discretion of the arbitrator, and depending on the size and complexity of the arbitration, a preliminary hearing should be scheduled as soon as practicable after the arbitrator has been appointed. The parties should be invited to attend the preliminary hearing along with their representatives. The preliminary hearing may be conducted in person or by telephone.

(b) At the preliminary hearing, the parties and the arbitrator should be prepared to discuss and establish a procedure for the conduct of the arbitration that is appropriate to achieve a fair, efficient, and economical resolution of the dispute. Sections P-1 and P-2 of these rules address the issues to be considered at the preliminary hearing.

R-22. Pre-Hearing Exchange and Production of Information

(a) Authority of arbitrator. The arbitrator shall manage any necessary exchange of information among the parties with a view to achieving an efficient and economical resolution of the dispute, while at the same time promoting equality of treatment and safeguarding each party's opportunity to fairly present its claims and defenses.

(b) Documents. The arbitrator may, on application of a party or on the arbitrator's own initiative:

- i. require the parties to exchange documents in their possession or custody on which they intend to rely;

ii. require the parties to update their exchanges of the documents on which they intend to rely as such documents become known to them;

iii. require the parties, in response to reasonable document requests, to make available to the other party documents, in the responding party's possession or custody, not otherwise readily available to the party seeking the documents, reasonably believed by the party seeking the documents to exist and to be relevant and material to the outcome of disputed issues; and

iv. require the parties, when documents to be exchanged or produced are maintained in electronic form, to make such documents available in the form most convenient and economical for the party in possession of such documents, unless the arbitrator determines that there is good cause for requiring the documents to be produced in a different form. The parties should attempt to agree in advance upon, and the arbitrator may determine, reasonable search parameters to balance the need for production of electronically stored documents relevant and material to the outcome of disputed issues against the cost of locating and producing them.

R-23. Enforcement Powers of the Arbitrator

The arbitrator shall have the authority to issue any orders necessary to enforce the provisions of rules R-21 and R-22 and to otherwise achieve a fair, efficient and economical resolution of the case, including, without limitation:

(a) conditioning any exchange or production of confidential documents and information, and the admission of confidential evidence at the hearing, on appropriate orders to preserve such confidentiality;

(b) imposing reasonable search parameters for electronic and other documents if the parties are unable to agree;

(c) allocating costs of producing documentation, including electronically stored documentation;

(d) in the case of willful non-compliance with any order issued by the arbitrator, drawing adverse inferences, excluding evidence and other submissions, and/or making special allocations of costs or an interim award of costs arising from such non-compliance; and

(e) issuing any other enforcement orders which the arbitrator is empowered to issue under applicable law.

R-24. Date, Time, and Place of Hearing

The arbitrator shall set the date, time, and place for each hearing. The parties shall respond to requests for hearing dates in a timely manner, be cooperative in scheduling the earliest practicable date, and adhere to the established hearing schedule. The AAA shall send a notice of hearing to the parties at least 10 calendar days in advance of the hearing date, unless otherwise agreed by the parties.

R-25. Attendance at Hearings

The arbitrator and the AAA shall maintain the privacy of the hearings unless the law provides to the contrary. Any person having a direct interest in the arbitration is entitled to attend hearings. The arbitrator shall otherwise have the power to require the exclusion of any witness, other than a party or other essential person, during the testimony of any other witness. It shall be discretionary with the arbitrator to determine the propriety of the attendance of any other person.

R-26. Representation

Any party may participate without representation (pro se), or by counsel or any other representative of the party's choosing, unless such choice is prohibited by applicable law. A party intending to be so represented shall notify the other party and the AAA of the name, telephone number and address, and email address if available, of the representative at least seven calendar days prior to the date set for the hearing at which that person is first to appear. When such a representative initiates an arbitration or responds for a party, notice is deemed to have been given.

R-27. Oaths

Before proceeding with the first hearing, each arbitrator may take an oath of office and, if required by law, shall do so. The arbitrator may require witnesses to testify under oath administered by any duly qualified person and, if it is required by law or requested by any party, shall do so.

R-28. Stenographic Record

(a) Any party desiring a stenographic record shall make arrangements directly with a stenographer and shall notify the other parties of these arrangements at least three calendar days in advance of the hearing. The requesting party or parties shall pay the cost of the record.

(b) No other means of recording the proceedings will be permitted absent the agreement of the parties or per the direction of the arbitrator.

(c) If the transcript or any other recording is agreed by the parties or determined by the arbitrator to be the official record of the proceeding, it must be provided to the arbitrator and made available to the other parties for inspection, at a date, time, and place determined by the arbitrator.

(d) The arbitrator may resolve any disputes with regard to apportionment of the costs of the stenographic record or other recording.

R-29. Interpreters

Any party wishing an interpreter shall make all arrangements directly with the interpreter and shall assume the costs of the service.

R-30. Postponements

The arbitrator may postpone any hearing upon agreement of the parties, upon request of a party for good cause shown, or upon the arbitrator's own initiative.

R-31. Arbitration in the Absence of a Party or Representative

Unless the law provides to the contrary, the arbitration may proceed in the absence of any party or representative who, after due notice, fails to be present or fails to obtain a postponement. An award shall not be made solely on the default of a party. The arbitrator shall require the party who is present to submit such evidence as the arbitrator may require for the making of an award.

R-32. Conduct of Proceedings

(a) The claimant shall present evidence to support its claim. The respondent shall then present evidence to support its defense. Witnesses for each party shall also submit to questions from the arbitrator and the adverse party. The arbitrator has the discretion to vary this procedure, provided that the parties are treated with equality and that each party has the right to be heard and is given a fair opportunity to present its case.

(b) The arbitrator, exercising his or her discretion, shall conduct the proceedings with a view to expediting the resolution of the dispute and may direct the order of proof, bifurcate proceedings and direct the parties to focus their presentations on issues the decision of which could dispose of all or part of the case.

(c) When deemed appropriate, the arbitrator may also allow for the presentation of evidence by alternative means including video conferencing,

internet communication, telephonic conferences and means other than an in-person presentation. Such alternative means must afford a full opportunity for all parties to present any evidence that the arbitrator deems material and relevant to the resolution of the dispute and, when involving witnesses, provide an opportunity for cross-examination.

(d) The parties may agree to waive oral hearings in any case and may also agree to utilize the Procedures for Resolution of Disputes Through Document Submission, found in Rule E-6.

R-33. Dispositive Motions

The arbitrator may allow the filing of and make rulings upon a dispositive motion only if the arbitrator determines that the moving party has shown that the motion is likely to succeed and dispose of or narrow the issues in the case.

R-34. Evidence

(a) The parties may offer such evidence as is relevant and material to the dispute and shall produce such evidence as the arbitrator may deem necessary to an understanding and determination of the dispute. Conformity to legal rules of evidence shall not be necessary. All evidence shall be taken in the presence of all of the arbitrators and all of the parties, except where any of the parties is absent, in default, or has waived the right to be present.

(b) The arbitrator shall determine the admissibility, relevance, and materiality of the evidence offered and may exclude evidence deemed by the arbitrator to be cumulative or irrelevant.

(c) The arbitrator shall take into account applicable principles of legal privilege, such as those involving the confidentiality of communications between a lawyer and client.

(d) An arbitrator or other person authorized by law to subpoena witnesses or documents may do so upon the request of any party or independently.

R-35. Evidence by Written Statements and Post-Hearing Filing of Documents or Other Evidence

(a) At a date agreed upon by the parties or ordered by the arbitrator, the parties shall give written notice for any witness or expert witness who has provided a written witness statement to appear in person at the arbitration hearing for examination. If such notice is given, and the witness fails to appear, the arbitrator

may disregard the written witness statement and/or expert report of the witness or make such other order as the arbitrator may consider to be just and reasonable.

(b) If a witness whose testimony is represented by a party to be essential is unable or unwilling to testify at the hearing, either in person or through electronic or other means, either party may request that the arbitrator order the witness to appear in person for examination before the arbitrator at a time and location where the witness is willing and able to appear voluntarily or can legally be compelled to do so. Any such order may be conditioned upon payment by the requesting party of all reasonable costs associated with such examination.

(c) If the parties agree or the arbitrator directs that documents or other evidence be submitted to the arbitrator after the hearing, the documents or other evidence shall be filed with the AAA for transmission to the arbitrator. All parties shall be afforded an opportunity to examine and respond to such documents or other evidence.

R-36. Inspection or Investigation

An arbitrator finding it necessary to make an inspection or investigation in connection with the arbitration shall direct the AAA to so advise the parties. The arbitrator shall set the date and time and the AAA shall notify the parties. Any party who so desires may be present at such an inspection or investigation. In the event that one or all parties are not present at the inspection or investigation, the arbitrator shall make an oral or written report to the parties and afford them an opportunity to comment.

R-37. Interim Measures

(a) The arbitrator may take whatever interim measures he or she deems necessary, including injunctive relief and measures for the protection or conservation of property and disposition of perishable goods.

(b) Such interim measures may take the form of an interim award, and the arbitrator may require security for the costs of such measures.

(c) A request for interim measures addressed by a party to a judicial authority shall not be deemed incompatible with the agreement to arbitrate or a waiver of the right to arbitrate.

R-38. Emergency Measures of Protection

(a) Unless the parties agree otherwise, the provisions of this rule shall apply to arbitrations conducted under arbitration clauses or agreements entered on or after October 1, 2013.

(b) A party in need of emergency relief prior to the constitution of the panel shall notify the AAA and all other parties in writing of the nature of the relief sought and the reasons why such relief is required on an emergency basis. The application shall also set forth the reasons why the party is entitled to such relief. Such notice may be given by facsimile or e-mail or other reliable means, but must include a statement certifying that all other parties have been notified or an explanation of the steps taken in good faith to notify other parties.

(c) Within one business day of receipt of notice as provided in section (b), the AAA shall appoint a single emergency arbitrator designated to rule on emergency applications. The emergency arbitrator shall immediately disclose any circumstance likely, on the basis of the facts disclosed on the application, to affect such arbitrator's impartiality or independence. Any challenge to the appointment of the emergency arbitrator must be made within one business day of the communication by the AAA to the parties of the appointment of the emergency arbitrator and the circumstances disclosed.

(d) The emergency arbitrator shall as soon as possible, but in any event within two business days of appointment, establish a schedule for consideration of the application for emergency relief. Such a schedule shall provide a reasonable opportunity to all parties to be heard, but may provide for proceeding by telephone or video conference or on written submissions as alternatives to a formal hearing. The emergency arbitrator shall have the authority vested in the tribunal under Rule 7, including the authority to rule on her/his own jurisdiction, and shall resolve any disputes over the applicability of this Rule 38.

(e) If after consideration the emergency arbitrator is satisfied that the party seeking the emergency relief has shown that immediate and irreparable loss or damage shall result in the absence of emergency relief, and that such party is entitled to such relief, the emergency arbitrator may enter an interim order or award granting the relief and stating the reason therefore.

(f) Any application to modify an interim award of emergency relief must be based on changed circumstances and may be made to the emergency arbitrator until the panel is constituted; thereafter such a request shall be addressed to the panel. The emergency arbitrator shall have no further power to act after the panel is constituted unless the parties agree that the emergency arbitrator is named as a member of the panel.

(g) Any interim award of emergency relief may be conditioned on provision by the party seeking such relief for appropriate security.

(h) A request for interim measures addressed by a party to a judicial authority shall not be deemed incompatible with this rule, the agreement to arbitrate or a waiver of the right to arbitrate. If the AAA is directed by a judicial authority to nominate a special master to consider and report on an application for emergency relief, the AAA shall proceed as provided in this rule and the references to the emergency arbitrator shall be read to mean the special master, except that the special master shall issue a report rather than an interim award.

(i) The costs associated with applications for emergency relief shall initially be apportioned by the emergency arbitrator or special master, subject to the power of the tribunal to determine finally the apportionment of such costs.

R-39. Closing of Hearing

(a) The arbitrator shall specifically inquire of all parties whether they have any further proofs to offer or witnesses to be heard. Upon receiving negative replies or if satisfied that the record is complete, the arbitrator shall declare the hearing closed.

(b) If documents or responses are to be filed as provided in Rule R-35, or if briefs are to be filed, the hearing shall be declared closed as of the final date set by the arbitrator for the receipt of briefs. If no documents, responses, or briefs are to be filed, the arbitrator shall declare the hearings closed as of the date of the last hearing (including telephonic hearings). If the case was heard without any oral hearings, the arbitrator shall close the hearings upon the due date established for receipt of the final submission.

(c) The time limit within which the arbitrator is required to make the award shall commence, in the absence of other agreements by the parties, upon the closing of the hearing. The AAA may extend the time limit for rendering of the award only in unusual and extreme circumstances.

R-40. Reopening of Hearing

The hearing may be reopened on the arbitrator's initiative, or by the direction of the arbitrator upon application of a party, at any time before the award is made. If reopening the hearing would prevent the making of the award within the specific time agreed to by the parties in the arbitration agreement, the matter may not be reopened unless the parties agree to an extension of time. When no specific date is fixed by agreement of the parties, the arbitrator shall have 30

calendar days from the closing of the reopened hearing within which to make an award (14 calendar days if the case is governed by the Expedited Procedures).

R-41. Waiver of Rules

Any party who proceeds with the arbitration after knowledge that any provision or requirement of these rules has not been complied with and who fails to state an objection in writing shall be deemed to have waived the right to object.

R-42. Extensions of Time

The parties may modify any period of time by mutual agreement. The AAA or the arbitrator may for good cause extend any period of time established by these rules, except the time for making the award. The AAA shall notify the parties of any extension.

R-43. Serving of Notice and Communications

(a) Any papers, notices, or process necessary or proper for the initiation or continuation of an arbitration under these rules, for any court action in connection therewith, or for the entry of judgment on any award made under these rules may be served on a party by mail addressed to the party or its representative at the last known address or by personal service, in or outside the state where the arbitration is to be held, provided that reasonable opportunity to be heard with regard to the dispute is or has been granted to the party.

(b) The AAA, the arbitrator and the parties may also use overnight delivery or electronic facsimile transmission (fax), or electronic (e-mail) to give the notices required by these rules. Where all parties and the arbitrator agree, notices may be transmitted by e-mail or other methods of communication.

(c) Unless otherwise instructed by the AAA or by the arbitrator, any documents submitted by any party to the AAA or to the arbitrator shall simultaneously be provided to the other party or parties to the arbitration.

(d) Unless otherwise instructed by the AAA or by the arbitrator, all written communications made by any party to the AAA or to the arbitrator shall simultaneously be provided to the other party or parties to the arbitration.

(e) Failure to provide the other party with copies of communications made to the AAA or to the arbitrator may prevent the AAA or the arbitrator from acting on any requests or objections contained therein.

(f) The AAA may direct that any oral or written communications that are sent by a party or their representative shall be sent in a particular manner. The failure of a party or their representative to do so may result in the AAA's refusal to consider the issue raised in the communication.

R-44. Majority Decision

(a) When the panel consists of more than one arbitrator, unless required by law or by the arbitration agreement or section (b) of this rule, a majority of the arbitrators must make all decisions.

(b) Where there is a panel of three arbitrators, absent an objection of a party or another member of the panel, the chairperson of the panel is authorized to resolve any disputes related to the exchange of information or procedural matters without the need to consult the full panel.

R-45. Time of Award

The award shall be made promptly by the arbitrator and, unless otherwise agreed by the parties or specified by law, no later than 30 calendar days from the date of closing the hearing, or, if oral hearings have been waived, from the due date set for receipt of the parties' final statements and proofs.

R-46. Form of Award

(a) Any award shall be in writing and signed by a majority of the arbitrators. It shall be executed in the form and manner required by law.

(b) The arbitrator need not render a reasoned award unless the parties request such an award in writing prior to appointment of the arbitrator or unless the arbitrator determines that a reasoned award is appropriate.

R-47. Scope of Award

(a) The arbitrator may grant any remedy or relief that the arbitrator deems just and equitable and within the scope of the agreement of the parties, including, but not limited to, specific performance of a contract.

(b) In addition to a final award, the arbitrator may make other decisions, including interim, interlocutory, or partial rulings, orders, and awards. In any interim, interlocutory, or partial award, the arbitrator may assess and apportion the fees, expenses, and compensation related to such award as the arbitrator determines is appropriate.

(c) In the final award, the arbitrator shall assess the fees, expenses, and compensation provided in Sections R-53, R-54, and R-55. The arbitrator may apportion such fees, expenses, and compensation among the parties in such amounts as the arbitrator determines is appropriate.

(d) The award of the arbitrator(s) may include:

i. interest at such rate and from such date as the arbitrator(s) may deem appropriate; and

ii. an award of attorneys' fees if all parties have requested such an award or it is authorized by law or their arbitration agreement.

R-48. Award Upon Settlement – Consent Award

(a) If the parties settle their dispute during the course of the arbitration and if the parties so request, the arbitrator may set forth the terms of the settlement in a “consent award.” A consent award must include an allocation of arbitration costs, including administrative fees and expenses as well as arbitrator fees and expenses.

(b) The consent award shall not be released to the parties until all administrative fees and all arbitrator compensation have been paid in full.

R-49. Delivery of Award to Parties

Parties shall accept as notice and delivery of the award the placing of the award or a true copy thereof in the mail addressed to the parties or their representatives at their last known addresses, personal or electronic service of the award, or the filing of the award in any other manner that is permitted by law.

R-50. Modification of Award

Within 20 calendar days after the transmittal of an award, any party, upon notice to the other parties, may request the arbitrator, through the AAA, to correct any clerical, typographical, or computational errors in the award. The arbitrator is not empowered to redetermine the merits of any claim already decided. The other parties shall be given 10 calendar days to respond to the request. The arbitrator shall dispose of the request within 20 calendar days after transmittal by the AAA to the arbitrator of the request and any response thereto.

R-51. Release of Documents for Judicial Proceedings

The AAA shall, upon the written request of a party to the arbitration, furnish to the party, at its expense, copies or certified copies of any papers in the AAA's possession that are not determined by the AAA to be privileged or confidential.

R-52. Applications to Court and Exclusion of Liability

(a) No judicial proceeding by a party relating to the subject matter of the arbitration shall be deemed a waiver of the party's right to arbitrate.

(b) Neither the AAA nor any arbitrator in a proceeding under these rules is a necessary or proper party in judicial proceedings relating to the arbitration.

(c) Parties to an arbitration under these rules shall be deemed to have consented that judgment upon the arbitration award may be entered in any federal or state court having jurisdiction thereof.

(d) Parties to an arbitration under these rules shall be deemed to have consented that neither the AAA nor any arbitrator shall be liable to any party in any action for damages or injunctive relief for any act or omission in connection with any arbitration under these rules.

(e) Parties to an arbitration under these rules may not call the arbitrator, the AAA, or AAA employees as a witness in litigation or any other proceeding relating to the arbitration. The arbitrator, the AAA and AAA employees are not competent to testify as witnesses in any such proceeding.

R-53. Administrative Fees

As a not-for-profit organization, the AAA shall prescribe administrative fees to compensate it for the cost of providing administrative services. The fees in effect when the fee or charge is incurred shall be applicable. The filing fee shall be advanced by the party or parties making a claim or counterclaim, subject to final apportionment by the arbitrator in the award. The AAA may, in the event of extreme hardship on the part of any party, defer or reduce the administrative fees.

R-54. Expenses

The expenses of witnesses for either side shall be paid by the party producing such witnesses. All other expenses of the arbitration, including required travel and other expenses of the arbitrator, AAA representatives, and any witness and the cost of any proof produced at the direct request of the arbitrator, shall be borne equally

by the parties, unless they agree otherwise or unless the arbitrator in the award assesses such expenses or any part thereof against any specified party or parties.

R-55. Neutral Arbitrator's Compensation

(a) Arbitrators shall be compensated at a rate consistent with the arbitrator's stated rate of compensation.

(b) If there is disagreement concerning the terms of compensation, an appropriate rate shall be established with the arbitrator by the AAA and confirmed to the parties.

(c) Any arrangement for the compensation of a neutral arbitrator shall be made through the AAA and not directly between the parties and the arbitrator.

R-56. Deposits

(a) The AAA may require the parties to deposit in advance of any hearings such sums of money as it deems necessary to cover the expense of the arbitration, including the arbitrator's fee, if any, and shall render an accounting to the parties and return any unexpended balance at the conclusion of the case.

(b) Other than in cases where the arbitrator serves for a flat fee, deposit amounts requested will be based on estimates provided by the arbitrator. The arbitrator will determine the estimated amount of deposits using the information provided by the parties with respect to the complexity of each case.

(c) Upon the request of any party, the AAA shall request from the arbitrator an itemization or explanation for the arbitrator's request for deposits.

R-57. Remedies for Nonpayment

If arbitrator compensation or administrative charges have not been paid in full, the AAA may so inform the parties in order that one of them may advance the required payment.

(a) Upon receipt of information from the AAA that payment for administrative charges or deposits for arbitrator compensation have not been paid in full, to the extent the law allows, a party may request that the arbitrator take specific measures relating to a party's non-payment.

(b) Such measures may include, but are not limited to, limiting a party's ability to assert or pursue their claim. In no event, however, shall a party be precluded from defending a claim or counterclaim.

(c) The arbitrator must provide the party opposing a request for such measures with the opportunity to respond prior to making any ruling regarding the same.

(d) In the event that the arbitrator grants any request for relief which limits any party's participation in the arbitration, the arbitrator shall require the party who is making a claim and who has made appropriate payments to submit such evidence as the arbitrator may require for the making of an award.

(e) Upon receipt of information from the AAA that full payments have not been received, the arbitrator, on the arbitrator's own initiative or at the request of the AAA or a party, may order the suspension of the arbitration. If no arbitrator has yet been appointed, the AAA may suspend the proceedings.

(f) If the arbitration has been suspended by either the AAA or the arbitrator and the parties have failed to make the full deposits requested within the time provided after the suspension, the arbitrator, or the AAA if an arbitrator has not been appointed, may terminate the proceedings.

R-58. Sanctions

(a) The arbitrator may, upon a party's request, order appropriate sanctions where a party fails to comply with its obligations under these rules or with an order of the arbitrator. In the event that the arbitrator enters a sanction that limits any party's participation in the arbitration or results in an adverse determination of an issue or issues, the arbitrator shall explain that order in writing and shall require the submission of evidence and legal argument prior to making of an award. The arbitrator may not enter a default award as a sanction.

(b) The arbitrator must provide a party that is subject to a sanction request with the opportunity to respond prior to making any determination regarding the sanctions application.

PRELIMINARY HEARING PROCEDURES

P-1. General

(a) In all but the simplest cases, holding a preliminary hearing as early in the process as possible will help the parties and the arbitrator organize the proceeding in a manner that will maximize efficiency and economy, and will provide each party a fair opportunity to present its case.

(b) Care must be taken to avoid importing procedures from court systems, as such procedures may not be appropriate to the conduct of arbitrations as an alternative form of dispute resolution that is designed to be simpler, less expensive and more expeditious.

P-2. Checklist

(a) The following checklist suggests subjects that the parties and the arbitrator should address at the preliminary hearing, in addition to any others that the parties or the arbitrator believe to be appropriate to the particular case. The items to be addressed in a particular case will depend on the size, subject matter, and complexity of the dispute, and are subject to the discretion of the arbitrator:

(i) the possibility of other non-adjudicative methods of dispute resolution, including mediation pursuant to R-9;

(ii) whether all necessary or appropriate parties are included in the arbitration;

(iii) whether a party will seek a more detailed statement of claims, counterclaims or defenses;

(iv) whether there are any anticipated amendments to the parties' claims, counterclaims, or defenses;

(v) which:

(a) arbitration rules;

(b) procedural law; and

(c) substantive law govern the arbitration;

(vi) whether there are any threshold or dispositive issues that can efficiently be decided without considering the entire case, including without limitation:

(a) any preconditions that must be satisfied before proceeding with the arbitration;

(b) whether any claim or counterclaim falls outside the arbitrator's jurisdiction or is otherwise not arbitrable;

(c) consolidation of the claims or counterclaims with another arbitration; or

(d) bifurcation of the proceeding.

(vii) whether the parties will exchange documents, including electronically stored documents, on which they intend to rely in the arbitration, and/or make written requests for production of documents within defined parameters;

(viii) whether to establish any additional procedures to obtain information that is relevant and material to the outcome of disputed issues;

(ix) how costs of any searches for requested information or documents that would result in substantial costs should be borne;

(x) whether any measures are required to protect confidential information;

(xi) whether the parties intend to present evidence from expert witnesses, and if so, whether to establish a schedule for the parties to identify their experts and exchange expert reports;

(xii) whether, according to a schedule set by the arbitrator, the parties will:

(a) identify all witnesses, the subject matter of their anticipated testimonies, exchange written witness statements, and determine whether written witness statements will replace direct testimony at the hearing;

(b) exchange and pre-mark documents that each party intends to submit; and

(c) exchange pre-hearing submissions, including exhibits;

(xiii) the date, time and place of the arbitration hearing;

(xiv) whether, at the arbitration hearing:

(a) testimony may be presented in person, in writing, by videoconference, via the internet, telephonically, or by other reasonable means;

(b) there will be a stenographic transcript or other record of the proceeding

and, if so, who will make arrangements to provide it;

(xv) whether any procedure needs to be established for the issuance of subpoenas;

(xvi) the identification of any ongoing, related litigation or arbitration;

(xvii) whether post-hearing submissions will be filed;

(xviii) the form of the arbitration award; and

(xix) any other matter the arbitrator considers appropriate or a party wishes to raise.

(b) The arbitrator shall issue a written order memorializing decisions made and agreements reached during or following the preliminary hearing.

EXPEDITED PROCEDURES

E-1. Limitation on Extensions

Except in extraordinary circumstances, the AAA or the arbitrator may grant a party no more than one seven-day extension of time to respond to the Demand for Arbitration or counterclaim as provided in Section R-5.

E-2. Changes of Claim or Counterclaim

A claim or counterclaim may be increased in amount, or a new or different claim or counterclaim added, upon the agreement of the other party, or the consent of the arbitrator. After the arbitrator is appointed, however, no new or different claim or counterclaim may be submitted except with the arbitrator's consent. If an increased claim or counterclaim exceeds \$75,000, the case will be administered under the regular procedures unless all parties and the arbitrator agree that the case may continue to be processed under the Expedited Procedures.

E-3. Serving of Notices

In addition to notice provided by Section R-43, the parties shall also accept notice by telephone. Telephonic notices by the AAA shall subsequently be confirmed in writing to the parties. Should there be a failure to confirm in writing any such

oral notice, the proceeding shall nevertheless be valid if notice has, in fact, been given by telephone.

E-4. Appointment and Qualifications of Arbitrator

(a) The AAA shall simultaneously submit to each party an identical list of five proposed arbitrators drawn from its National Roster from which one arbitrator shall be appointed.

(b) The parties are encouraged to agree to an arbitrator from this list and to advise the AAA of their agreement. If the parties are unable to agree upon an arbitrator, each party may strike two names from the list and return it to the AAA within seven days from the date of the AAA's mailing to the parties. If for any reason the appointment of an arbitrator cannot be made from the list, the AAA may make the appointment from other members of the panel without the submission of additional lists.

(c) The parties will be given notice by the AAA of the appointment of the arbitrator, who shall be subject to disqualification for the reasons specified in Section R-18.

The parties shall notify the AAA within seven calendar days of any objection to the arbitrator appointed. Any such objection shall be for cause and shall be confirmed in writing to the AAA with a copy to the other party or parties.

E-5. Exchange of Exhibits

At least two business days prior to the hearing, the parties shall exchange copies of all exhibits they intend to submit at the hearing. The arbitrator shall resolve disputes concerning the exchange of exhibits.

E-6. Proceedings on Documents and Procedures for the Resolution of Disputes Through Document Submission

Where no party's claim exceeds \$25,000, exclusive of interest, attorneys' fees and arbitration costs, and other cases in which the parties agree, the dispute shall be resolved by submission of documents, unless any party requests an oral hearing, or the arbitrator determines that an oral hearing is necessary. Where cases are resolved by submission of documents, the following procedures may be utilized at the agreement of the parties or the discretion of the arbitrator:

(a) Within 14 calendar days of confirmation of the arbitrator's appointment, the arbitrator may convene a preliminary management hearing, via conference call, video conference, or internet, to establish a fair and equitable procedure for the

submission of documents, and, if the arbitrator deems appropriate, a schedule for one or more telephonic or electronic conferences.

(b) The arbitrator has the discretion to remove the case from the documents-only process if the arbitrator determines that an in-person hearing is necessary.

(c) If the parties agree to in-person hearings after a previous agreement to proceed under this rule, the arbitrator shall conduct such hearings. If a party seeks to have in-person hearings after agreeing to this rule, but there is not agreement among the parties to proceed with in-person hearings, the arbitrator shall resolve the issue after the parties have been given the opportunity to provide their respective positions on the issue.

(d) The arbitrator shall establish the date for either written submissions or a final telephonic or electronic conference. Such date shall operate to close the hearing and the time for the rendering of the award shall commence.

(e) Unless the parties have agreed to a form of award other than that set forth in rule R-45, when the parties have agreed to resolve their dispute by this rule, the arbitrator shall render the award within 14 calendar days from the date the hearing is closed.

(f) If the parties agree to a form of award other than that described in rule R-45, the arbitrator shall have 30 calendar days from the date the hearing is declared closed in which to render the award.

(g) The award is subject to all other provisions of the Regular Track of these rules which pertain to awards.

E-7. Date, Time, and Place of Hearing

In cases in which a hearing is to be held, the arbitrator shall set the date, time, and place of the hearing, to be scheduled to take place within 30 calendar days of confirmation of the arbitrator's appointment. The AAA will notify the parties in advance of the hearing date.

E-8. The Hearing

(a) Generally, the hearing shall not exceed one day. Each party shall have equal opportunity to submit its proofs and complete its case. The arbitrator shall determine the order of the hearing, and may require further submission of documents within two business days after the hearing. For good cause shown, the arbitrator may schedule additional hearings within seven business days after the initial day of hearings.

(b) Generally, there will be no stenographic record. Any party desiring a stenographic record may arrange for one pursuant to the provisions of Section R-28.

E-9. Time of Award

Unless otherwise agreed by the parties, the award shall be rendered not later than 14 calendar days from the date of the closing of the hearing or, if oral hearings have been waived, from the due date established for the receipt of the parties' final statements and proofs.

E-10. Arbitrator's Compensation

Arbitrators will receive compensation at a rate to be suggested by the AAA regional office.

PROCEDURES FOR LARGE, COMPLEX COMMERCIAL DISPUTES

L-1. Administrative Conference

Prior to the dissemination of a list of potential arbitrators, the AAA shall, unless the parties agree otherwise, conduct an administrative conference with the parties and/or their attorneys or other representatives by conference call. The conference will take place within 14 calendar days after the commencement of the arbitration. In the event the parties are unable to agree on a mutually acceptable time for the conference, the AAA may contact the parties individually to discuss the issues contemplated herein. Such administrative conference shall be conducted for the following purposes and for such additional purposes as the parties or the AAA may deem appropriate:

(a) to obtain additional information about the nature and magnitude of the dispute and the anticipated length of hearing and scheduling;

(b) to discuss the views of the parties about the technical and other qualifications of the arbitrators;

(c) to obtain conflicts statements from the parties; and

(d) to consider, with the parties, whether mediation or other non-adjudicative methods of dispute resolution might be appropriate.

L-2. Arbitrators

(a) Large, complex commercial cases shall be heard and determined by either one or three arbitrators, as may be agreed upon by the parties. With the exception in paragraph (b) below, if the parties are unable to agree upon the number of arbitrators and a claim or counterclaim involves at least \$1,000,000, then three arbitrator(s) shall hear and determine the case. If the parties are unable to agree on the number of arbitrators and each claim and counterclaim is less than \$1,000,000, then one arbitrator shall hear and determine the case.

(b) In cases involving the financial hardship of a party or other circumstance, the AAA at its discretion may require that only one arbitrator hear and determine the case, irrespective of the size of the claim involved in the dispute.

(c) The AAA shall appoint arbitrator(s) as agreed by the parties. If they are unable to agree on a method of appointment, the AAA shall appoint arbitrators from the Large, Complex Commercial Case Panel, in the manner provided in the regular Commercial Arbitration Rules. Absent agreement of the parties, the arbitrator(s) shall not have served as the mediator in the mediation phase of the instant proceeding.

L-3. Management of Proceedings

(a) The arbitrator shall take such steps as deemed necessary or desirable to avoid delay and to achieve a fair, speedy and cost-effective resolution of a Large, Complex Commercial Dispute.

(b) As promptly as practicable after the selection of the arbitrator(s), a preliminary hearing shall be scheduled in accordance with sections P-1 and P-2 of these rules.

(c) The parties shall exchange copies of all exhibits they intend to submit at the hearing at least 10 calendar days prior to the hearing unless the arbitrator(s) determines otherwise.

(d) The parties and the arbitrator(s) shall address issues pertaining to the pre-hearing exchange and production of information in accordance with rule R-22 of the AAA Commercial Rules, and the arbitrator's determinations on such issues shall be included within the Scheduling and Procedure Order.

(e) The arbitrator, or any single member of the arbitration tribunal, shall be authorized to resolve any disputes concerning the pre-hearing exchange and production of documents and information by any reasonable means within his

discretion, including, without limitation, the issuance of orders set forth in rules R-22 and R-23 of the AAA Commercial Rules.

(f) In exceptional cases, at the discretion of the arbitrator, upon good cause shown and consistent with the expedited nature of arbitration, the arbitrator may order depositions to obtain the testimony of a person who may possess information determined by the arbitrator to be relevant and material to the outcome of the case. The arbitrator may allocate the cost of taking such a deposition.

(g) Generally, hearings will be scheduled on consecutive days or in blocks of consecutive days in order to maximize efficiency and minimize costs.

Administrative Fees

Administrative Fee Schedules

...

The AAA offers parties two options for the payment of administrative fees.

For both schedules, administrative fees are based on the amount of the claim or counterclaim and are to be paid by the party bringing the claim or counterclaim at the time the demand or claim is filed with the AAA. *Arbitrator compensation is not included in either schedule.* Unless the parties' agreement provides otherwise, arbitrator compensation and administrative fees are subject to allocation by the arbitrator in an award.

Standard Fee Schedule: A two-payment schedule that provides for somewhat higher initial filing fees but lower overall administrative fees for cases that proceed to a hearing.

Flexible Fee Schedule: A three-payment schedule that provides for lower initial filing fee and then spreads subsequent payments out over the course of the arbitration. Total administrative fees will be somewhat higher for cases that proceed to a hearing.

Standard Fee Schedule

Amount of Claim	Initial Filing Fee	Final Fee
Up to \$75,000	\$750	\$800
>\$75,000 to \$150,000	\$1,750	\$1,250
>\$150,000 to \$300,000	\$2,650	\$2,000
>\$300,000 to \$500,000	\$4,000	\$3,500

DOCUMENTARY SUPPLEMENT

>\$500,000 to \$1,000,000	\$5,000	\$6,200
>\$1,000,000 to \$10,000,000	\$7,000	\$7,700
>\$10,000,000	\$10,000 plus .01% of the amount of claim above \$10,000,000 up to \$65,000	\$12,500
Undetermined Monetary Claims	\$7,000	\$7,700
Nonmonetary Claims	\$3,250	\$2,500
Deficient Filing Fee	\$500	
Additional Party Fees	If there are more than two separately represented parties in the arbitration, an additional 10% of each fee contained in these fee schedules will be charged for each additional separately represented party. However, Additional Party Fees will not exceed 50% of the base fees contained in these fee schedules unless there are more than 10 separately represented parties. <i>See below for additional details.</i>	

- The **Initial Filing Fee** is payable in full by a filing party when a claim, counterclaim, or additional claim is filed.
- The **Final Fee** will be incurred for all cases that proceed to their first hearing and is payable in advance at the time the first hearing is scheduled.
- **Fee Modifications:** Fees are subject to increase if the claim or counterclaim is increased after the initial filing date. Fees are subject to decrease if the claim or counterclaim decreases prior to the first hearing.
- **Cases with Three or More Arbitrators** are subject to a minimum Initial Filing Fee of \$4,000 and a Final Fee of \$3,500.

Refunds—Standard Fee Schedule:

Initial Filing Fees: Subject to a \$500 minimum non-refundable Initial Filing Fee for all cases, refunds of Initial Filing Fees for settled or withdrawn cases will be calculated from the date the AAA receives the demand for arbitration as follows:

- within 5 calendar days of filing—100%.
- between 6 and 30 calendar days of filing—50%

- between 31 and 60 calendar days of filing—25%

However, *no refunds will be made once:*

- any arbitrator has been appointed (including one arbitrator on a three-arbitrator panel).
- an award has been rendered.

Final Fees: If a case is settled or withdrawn prior to the first hearing taking place, all Final Fees paid will be refunded. However, if the AAA is not notified of a cancellation at least 24 hours before a scheduled hearing date, the Final fee will remain due and will not be refunded.

Flexible Fee Schedule

Amount of Claim	Initial Filing Fee	Proceed Fee	Final Fee
Up to \$75,000	Only available for claims above \$150,000		
>\$75,00 to \$150,000			
> \$150,000 to \$300,000	\$1,650	\$1,700	\$2,000
>\$300,000 to \$500,000	\$2,000	\$3,000	\$3,500
>\$500,000 to \$1,000,000	\$2,500	\$4,300	\$6,200
>\$1,000,000 to \$10,000,000	\$3,500	\$5,700	\$7,700
>\$10,000,000	\$5,000	\$9,000 plus .01% of the claim amount above \$10,000,000 up to \$65,000	\$12,500
Undetermined Monetary Claims	\$3,500	\$5,700	\$7,700
Nonmonetary Claims	\$2,000	\$2,250	\$2,500

DOCUMENTARY SUPPLEMENT

Deficient Filing Fee	\$500		
Additional Services Party Fees	If there are more than two separately represented parties in the arbitration, an additional 10% of each fee contained in these fee schedules will be charged for each additional separately represented party. However, Additional Party Fees will not exceed 50% of the base fees contained in these fee schedules unless there are more than 10 separately represented parties. <i>See below for additional details.</i>		

- The **Initial Filing Fee** is payable in full by a filing party when a claim, counterclaim, or additional claim is filed.
- The **Proceed Fee** must be paid within 90 days of the filing of the demand for arbitration or a counterclaim before the AAA will proceed with the further administration of the arbitration, including the arbitrator appointment process.
 - If a Proceed Fee is not submitted within 90 days of the filing of the Claimant's Demand for Arbitration, the AAA will administratively close the file and notify all parties.
 - If the Flexible Fee Schedule is being used for the filing of a counterclaim, the counterclaim will not be presented to the arbitrator until the Proceed Fee is paid.
- The **Final Fee** will be incurred for all cases that proceed to their first hearing and is payable in advance at the time the first hearing is scheduled.
- **Fee Modifications:** Fees are subject to increase if the claim or counterclaim is increased after the initial filing date. Fees are subject to decrease if the claim or counterclaim decreases prior to the first hearing.
- **Cases with Three or More Arbitrators** are subject to a minimum Initial Filing Fee of \$2,000, a \$3,000 Proceed Fee and a Final Fee of \$3,500.

Refunds—Flexible Fee Schedule:

Under the Flexible Fee Schedule, **Filing Fees** and **Proceed Fees** are **non-refundable** once incurred.

Final Fees: If a case is settled or withdrawn prior to the first hearing taking place, all Final Fees paid will be refunded. However, if the AAA is not notified of a

cancellation at least 24 hours before a scheduled hearing date, the Final fee will remain due and will not be refunded.

Additional Fees Applicable to the Standard Fee and Flexible Fee Schedules

Additional Party Fees: Additional Party Fees will be charged as described above, and in addition:

- Additional Party Fees are payable by the party, whether a claimant or respondent, that names the additional parties to the arbitration.
- Such fees shall not exceed 50% of the base fees in the fee schedule, except that the AAA reserves the right to assess additional fees where there are more than 10 separately represented parties.
- An example of the Additional Party Fee is as follows: A single claimant represented by one attorney brings an arbitration against two separate respondents, however, both respondents are represented by the same attorney. No Additional Party Fees are due. However, if the respondents are represented by different attorneys, or if one of the respondents is self-represented and the other is represented by an attorney, an additional 10% of the Initial Filing fee is charged to the claimant. If the case moves to the Proceed Fee stage or the Final Fee stage, an additional 10% of those fees will also be charged to the claimant.

Incomplete or Deficient Filings: Where the applicable arbitration agreement does not reference the AAA, the AAA will attempt to obtain the agreement of all parties to have the arbitration administered by the AAA.

- Where the AAA is unable to obtain the parties' agreement to have the AAA administer the arbitration, the AAA will not proceed further and will administratively close the case. The AAA will also return the filing fees to the filing party, less the amount specified in the fee schedule above for deficient filings.
- Parties that file Demands for Arbitration that are incomplete or otherwise do not meet the filing requirements contained in the rules shall also be charged the amount specified above for deficient filings if they fail or are unable to respond to the AAA's request to correct the deficiency.

Arbitrations in Abeyance: Cases held in abeyance by mutual agreement for one year will be assessed an annual abeyance fee of \$500, to be split equally among the

parties. If a party refuses to pay the assessed fee, the other party or parties may pay the entire fee on behalf of all parties, otherwise the arbitration will be administratively closed. All filing requirements, including the payment of filing fees, must be met before a matter will be placed in abeyance.

Fees for Additional Services: The AAA reserves the right to assess additional administrative fees for services performed by the AAA that go beyond those provided for in the AAA's rules, but which are required as a result of the parties' agreement or stipulation.

Hearing Room Rentals: The fees described above do not cover the cost of hearing rooms, which are available on a rental basis. Check with the AAA for availability and rates.

Replace the AAA Consumer-Related Disputes Supplementary Procedures on pages 149-154 of the Documentary Supplement with the following:

**AMERICAN ARBITRATION ASSOCIATION
CONSUMER ARBITRATION RULES***

**Rules Amended and Effective September 1, 2014
Cost of Arbitration Effective January 1, 2016**

Filing a Case and Initial AAA Administrative Steps

R-1. Applicability (When the AAA Applies These Rules)

(a) The parties shall have made these Consumer Arbitration Rules (“Rules”) a part of their arbitration agreement whenever they have provided for arbitration by the American Arbitration Association (“AAA”), and

- 1) have specified that these Consumer Arbitration Rules shall apply;
- 2) have specified that the Supplementary Procedures for Consumer-Related Disputes shall apply, which have been amended and renamed the Consumer Arbitration Rules;
- 3) the arbitration agreement is contained within a consumer agreement, as defined below, that does not specify a particular set of rules; or
- 4) the arbitration agreement is contained within a consumer agreement, as defined below, that specifies a particular set of rules other than the Consumer Arbitration Rules.

When parties have provided for the AAA’s rules or AAA administration as part of their consumer agreement, they shall be deemed to have agreed that the application of the AAA’s rules and AAA administration of the consumer arbitration shall be an essential term of their consumer agreement.

The AAA defines a consumer agreement as an agreement between an individual consumer and a business where the business has a standardized, systematic application of arbitration clauses with customers and where the terms and conditions of the purchase of standardized, consumable goods or services are non-negotiable or primarily non-negotiable in most or all of its terms, conditions, features, or choices. The product or service must be for personal or household use.

* Copyright © 2014 by the American Arbitration Association. Reprinted with permission.

Examples of contracts that typically meet the criteria for application of these Rules, if the contract is for personal or household goods or services and has an arbitration provision, include, but are not limited to the following:

- Credit card agreements
- Telecommunications (cell phone, ISP, cable TV) agreements
- Leases (residential, automobile)
- Automobile and manufactured home purchase contracts
- Finance agreements (car loans, mortgages, bank accounts)
- Home inspection contracts
- Pest control services
- Moving and storage contracts
- Warranties (home, automobile, product)
- Legal funding
- Health and fitness club membership agreements
- Travel services
- Insurance policies
- Private school enrollment agreements

Examples of contracts that typically do not meet the criteria for application of these Rules, should the contract contain an arbitration provision, include, but are not limited to the following:

- Home construction and remodeling contracts
- Real estate purchase and sale agreements
- Condominium or homeowner association by-laws
- Business insurance policies (including crop insurance)
- Commercial loan and lease agreements
- Commercial guaranty agreements

(b) When parties agree to arbitrate under these Rules, or when they provide for arbitration by the AAA and an arbitration is initiated under these Rules, they thereby authorize the AAA to administer the arbitration. The authority and duties of the AAA are prescribed in the agreement of the parties and in these Rules and may be carried out through such of the AAA's representatives as it may direct. The AAA may, in its discretion, assign the administration of an arbitration to any of its offices. Arbitrations administered under these Rules shall only be administered by the AAA or by an individual or organization authorized by the AAA to do so.

(c) The consumer and the business may agree to change these Rules. If they agree to change the Rules, they must agree in writing. If the consumer and the business want to change these Rules after the appointment of the arbitrator, any changes may be made only with the approval of the arbitrator.

(d) The AAA administers consumer disputes that meet the due process standards contained in the Consumer Due Process Protocol and the Consumer Arbitration Rules. The AAA will accept cases after the AAA reviews the parties' arbitration agreement and if the AAA determines the agreement substantially and materially complies with the due process standards of these Rules and the Consumer Due Process Protocol. Should the AAA decline to administer an arbitration, either party may choose to submit its dispute to the appropriate court for resolution.

(e) The AAA has the initial authority to apply or not to apply the Consumer Arbitration Rules. If either the consumer or the business disagrees with the AAA's decision, the objecting party must submit the objection by the due date for filing an answer to the demand for arbitration. If an objection is filed, the arbitrator shall have the authority to make the final decision on which AAA rules will apply.

(f) If, within 30 days after the AAA's commencement of administration, a party seeks judicial intervention with respect to a pending arbitration and provides the AAA with documentation that judicial intervention has been sought, the AAA will suspend administration for 30 days to permit the party to obtain a stay of arbitration from the court.

(g) Where no disclosed claims or counterclaims exceed \$25,000, the dispute shall be resolved by the submission of documents only/desk arbitration (see R-29 and the Procedures for the Resolution of Disputes through Document Submission below). Any party, however, may ask for a hearing. The arbitrator also may decide that a hearing is necessary.

R-2. Starting Arbitration under an Arbitration Agreement in a Contract

(a) Arbitration filed under an arbitration agreement naming the AAA shall be started in the following manner:

(1) The party who starts the arbitration (referred to as the "claimant" throughout the arbitration) must contact, in writing, the party that the case is filed against (referred to as the "respondent" throughout the arbitration) that it wishes to arbitrate a dispute. This written contact is referred to as the Demand for Arbitration ("Demand"). The Demand must do the following:

- Briefly explain the dispute
- List the names and addresses of the consumer and the business, and, if known, the names of any representatives of the consumer and the business
- Specify the amount of money in dispute, if applicable

- Identify the requested location for the hearing if an in-person hearing is requested
- State what the claimant wants

(2) The claimant must also send one copy of the Demand to the AAA at the same time the demand is sent to the respondent. When sending a Demand to the AAA, the claimant must also send the following:

- A copy of the arbitration agreement contained in the contract and/or agreement and/or purchase document
- The proper filing fee; the amount of the filing fee can be found in the Costs of Arbitration section at the end of these Rules.

(3) If the arbitration is pursuant to a court order, the claimant must send one copy of the Demand to the AAA at the same time the Demand is sent to the respondent. When sending a demand to the AAA, the claimant must also send the following:

- A copy of the court order
- A copy of the arbitration agreement contained in the contract and/or agreement and/or purchase document
- The proper filing fee

The filing fee must be paid before a matter is considered properly filed. If the court order directs that a specific party is responsible for the filing fee, it is the responsibility of the filing party either to make such payment to the AAA and seek reimbursement as directed in the court order or to make other such arrangements so that the filing fee is submitted to the AAA with the Demand.

The claimant may file by mail. The mailing address of the AAA's Case Filing Services is:

American Arbitration Association Case Filing Services
1101 Laurel Oak Road, Suite 100
Voorhees, NJ 08043

Or, the claimant may file online using AAA WebFile: <https://www.adr.org>

Or, the claimant may file at any of the AAA's offices.

(b) The AAA will send a written notice letting the consumer and the business know the Demand for Arbitration has been received.

(c) The respondent may submit a written response to the Demand, known as an “answer,” which describes how the respondent responds to the claimant’s claim. The answer must be sent to the AAA within 14 calendar days after the date the AAA notifies the parties that the Demand for Arbitration was received and all filing requirements were met. The answer must be

- in writing,
- sent to the AAA, and
- sent to the claimant at the same time.

(d) The respondent may also file a counterclaim, which is the respondent filing a Demand against the claimant. If the respondent has a counterclaim, the counterclaim must briefly explain the dispute, specify the amount of money involved, and state what the respondent wants.

(e) If no answer is filed within 14 calendar days, the AAA will assume that the respondent does not agree with the claim filed by the claimant. The case will move forward after 14 days regardless of whether an answer is filed.

(f) When sending a Demand or an answer, the consumer and the business are encouraged to provide enough details to make the dispute clear to the arbitrator.

R-3. Agreement to Arbitrate When There is No AAA Arbitration Clause

If the consumer and business do not have an arbitration agreement or their arbitration agreement does not name the AAA, the parties may agree to have the AAA arbitrate their dispute. To start the arbitration, the parties must send the AAA a submission agreement, which is an agreement to arbitrate their case with the AAA, signed by the consumer and the business (email communications between all parties to a dispute reflecting an agreement to arbitrate also is acceptable). The submission agreement must

- be in writing (electronic communication is acceptable);
- be signed by both parties;
- briefly explain the dispute;
- list the names and addresses of the consumer and the business;
- specify the amount of money involved;
- specify the requested location for the hearing if an in-person hearing is requested; and
- state the solution sought.

The parties should send one copy of the submission agreement to the AAA. They must also send the proper filing fees. A fee schedule can be found in the Costs of Arbitration section at the end of these Rules.

R-4. AAA Administrative Fees

As a not-for-profit organization, the AAA charges fees to compensate it for the cost of providing administrative services. The fee schedule in effect when the case is filed shall apply for all fees charged during the administration of the case. The AAA may, in the event of the consumer's extreme hardship, defer or reduce the consumer's administrative fees.

AAA fees shall be paid in accordance with the Costs of Arbitration section found at the end of these Rules.

R-5. Neutral Arbitrator's Compensation

(a) Arbitrators serving under these Rules shall be compensated at a rate established by the AAA.

(b) Any arrangement for the compensation of an arbitrator shall be made through the AAA and not directly between the parties and the arbitrator.

(c) Arbitrator compensation shall be paid in accordance with the Costs of Arbitration section found at the end of these Rules.

R-6. Depositing Neutral Arbitrator's Compensation with the AAA

The AAA may require the parties to deposit in advance of any hearings such sums of money as it decides are necessary to cover the expense of the arbitration, including the arbitrator's fee, and shall render an accounting to the parties and return any unused money at the conclusion of the case.

R-7. Expenses

Unless otherwise agreed by the parties or as provided under applicable law, the expenses of witnesses for either side shall be borne by the party producing such witnesses.

All expenses of the arbitrator, including required travel and other expenses, and any AAA expenses, as well as the costs relating to proof and witnesses produced at the direction of the arbitrator, shall be borne in accordance with the Costs of Arbitration section found at the end of these Rules.

R-8. Changes of Claim

Once a Demand has been filed, any new claims or counterclaims, or changes to the claim or counterclaim, must be made in writing and sent to the AAA. The party making the new or different claim or counterclaim shall send a copy to the opposing party. As with the original Demand or counterclaim, a party shall have 14 calendar days from the date the AAA notifies the parties it received the new or different claim or counterclaim to file an answering statement with the AAA.

If an arbitrator has already been appointed, a new or different claim or counterclaim may only be considered if the arbitrator allows it.

R-9. Small Claims Option for the Parties

If a party's claim is within the jurisdiction of a small claims court, either party may choose to take the claim to that court instead of arbitration as follows:

(a) The parties may take their claims to small claims court without first filing with the AAA.

(b) After a case is filed with the AAA, but before the arbitrator is formally appointed to the case by the AAA, a party can send a written notice to the opposing party and the AAA that it wants the case decided by a small claims court. After receiving this notice, the AAA will administratively close the case.

(c) After the arbitrator is appointed, if a party wants to take the case to small claims court and notifies the opposing party and the AAA, it is up to the arbitrator to determine if the case should be decided in arbitration or if the arbitration case should be closed and the dispute decided in small claims court.

R-10. Administrative Conference with the AAA

At the request of any party or if the AAA should so decide, the AAA may have a telephone conference with the parties and/or their representatives. The conference may address issues such as arbitrator selection, the possibility of a mediated settlement, exchange of information before the hearing, timing of the hearing, the type of hearing that will be held, and other administrative matters.

R-11. Fixing of Locale (the city, county, state, territory and/or country where the arbitration will take place)

If an in-person hearing is to be held and if the parties do not agree to the locale where the hearing is to be held, the AAA initially will determine the locale of the arbitration. If a party does not agree with the AAA's decision, that party can

ask the arbitrator, once appointed, to make a final determination. The locale determination will be made after considering the positions of the parties, the circumstances of the parties and the dispute, and the Consumer Due Process Protocol.

R-12. Business Notification and Publicly-Accessible Consumer Clause Registry

Beginning September 1, 2014, a business that provides for or intends to provide for these Rules or another set of AAA Rules in a consumer contract (as defined in R-1) should

1. notify the AAA of the existence of such a consumer contract or of its intention to do so at least 30 days before the planned effective date of the contract.
2. provide the AAA a copy of the arbitration agreement.

Upon receiving the arbitration agreement, the AAA will review the agreement for material compliance with due process standards contained in the Consumer Due Process Protocol and the Consumer Arbitration Rules (see Rule 1(d)). There is a nonrefundable fee to conduct this initial review and maintain a publicly-available clause registry, which is detailed in the Costs of Arbitration section found at the end of these Rules. Any subsequent changes, additions, deletions, or amendments to a currently-registered arbitration agreement must be resubmitted for review and a review fee will be assessed at that time. The AAA will decline to administer consumer arbitrations arising out of that arbitration agreement where the business fails to pay the review fee.

If a business does not submit its arbitration agreement for review and a consumer arbitration then is filed with the AAA, the AAA will conduct an expedited review at that time. Along with any other filing fees that are owed for that case, the business also will be responsible for paying the nonrefundable review and Registry fee (including any fee for expedited review at the time of filing) for this initial review, which is detailed in the Costs of Arbitration section found at the end of these Rules. The AAA will decline to administer consumer arbitrations arising out of that arbitration agreement if the business declines to pay the review and Registry fee.

After the AAA reviews the submitted consumer clause, receives the annual consumer registry fee, and determines it will administer consumer-related disputes filed pursuant to the consumer clause, the business will be included on the publicly-accessible Consumer Clause Registry. This Consumer Clause Registry maintained by the AAA will contain the name of the business, the address, and the consumer arbitration clause, along with any related documents as deemed necessary by the

AAA. The AAA's review of a consumer arbitration clause and determination whether or not to administer arbitrations pursuant to that clause is only an administrative determination by the AAA and cannot be relied upon or construed as a legal opinion or advice regarding the enforceability of the arbitration clause. Consumer arbitration agreements may be registered at: www.adr.org/consumerclauseregistry or via email at consumerreview@adr.org.

For more information concerning the Consumer Clause Registry, please visit the AAA's website at www.adr.org/consumerclauseregistry.

The Registry fee to initially review a business's agreement and maintain the clause registry list is a yearly, non-refundable fee for the business's arbitration agreement. Any different arbitration agreements submitted by the same business or its subsidiaries must be submitted for review and are subject to the current review fee.

If the AAA declines to administer a case due to the business's non-compliance with this notification requirement, the parties may choose to submit their dispute to the appropriate court.

R-13. AAA and Delegation of Duties

When the consumer and the business agree to arbitrate under these Rules or other AAA rules, or when they provide for arbitration by the AAA and an arbitration is filed under these Rules, the parties also agree that the AAA will administer the arbitration. The AAA's administrative duties are set forth in the parties' arbitration agreement and in these Rules. The AAA will have the final decision on which office and which AAA staff members will administer the case. Arbitrations administered under these Rules shall only be administered by the AAA or by an individual or organization authorized by the AAA to do so.

R-14. Jurisdiction

(a) The arbitrator shall have the power to rule on his or her own jurisdiction, including any objections with respect to the existence, scope, or validity of the arbitration agreement or to the arbitrability of any claim or counterclaim.

(b) The arbitrator shall have the power to determine the existence or validity of a contract of which an arbitration clause forms a part. Such an arbitration clause shall be treated as an agreement independent of the other terms of the contract. A decision by the arbitrator that the contract is null and void shall not for that reason alone render invalid the arbitration clause.

(c) A party must object to the jurisdiction of the arbitrator or to the arbitrability of a claim or counterclaim no later than the filing of the answering statement to the claim or counterclaim that gives rise to the objection. The arbitrator may rule on such objections as a preliminary matter or as part of the final award.

Appointing the Arbitrator

R-15. National Roster of Arbitrators

The AAA maintains a National Roster of Arbitrators (“National Roster”) and shall appoint arbitrators from this National Roster to resolve the parties’ dispute(s).

R-16. Appointment from National Roster

(a) If the parties have not appointed an arbitrator and have not agreed to a process for appointing the arbitrator, immediately after the filing of the submission agreement or the answer, or after the deadline for filing the answer, the AAA will administratively appoint an arbitrator from the National Roster.

(b) If the parties’ arbitration agreement provides for three or more arbitrators and they have not appointed the arbitrators and have not agreed to a process for appointing the arbitrators, immediately after the filing of the submission agreement or the answer, or after the deadline for filing the answer, the AAA will administratively appoint the arbitrators from the National Roster. The AAA will appoint the chairperson.

(c) Arbitrator(s) serving under these Rules will be neutral and must meet the standards of R-19 with respect to being impartial and independent.

R-17. Number of Arbitrators

If the arbitration agreement does not specify the number of arbitrators and the parties do not agree on the number, the dispute shall be heard and decided by one arbitrator.

R-18. Disclosure

(a) Any person appointed or to be appointed as an arbitrator, as well as the parties and their representatives, must provide information to the AAA of any circumstances likely to raise justifiable doubt as to whether the arbitrator can remain impartial or independent. This disclosure of information would include

- (1) any bias;

- (2) any financial interest in the result of the arbitration;
- (3) any personal interest in the result of the arbitration; or
- (4) any past or present relationship with the parties or their representatives.

Such obligation to provide disclosure information remains in effect throughout the arbitration. A failure on the part of a party or a representative to comply with the requirements of this rule may result in the waiver of the right to object to an arbitrator in accordance with Rule R-50.

(b) If the AAA receives such information from the arbitrator or another source, the AAA will communicate the information to the parties. If the AAA decides it is appropriate, it will also communicate the information to the arbitrator and others.

(c) In order to encourage disclosure by arbitrators, disclosing such information does not mean that the arbitrator considers the disclosed information will likely affect his or her ability to be impartial or independent.

R-19. Disqualification of Arbitrator

(a) Any arbitrator shall be impartial and independent and shall perform his or her duties carefully and in good faith. The AAA may disqualify an arbitrator who shows

- (1) partiality or lack of independence;
- (2) inability or refusal to perform his or her duties with diligence and in good faith; or
- (3) any grounds for disqualification provided by applicable law.

(b) If a party objects to the continued service of an arbitrator, or if the AAA should so decide to raise the issue of whether the arbitrator should continue on the case, the AAA will decide if the arbitrator should be disqualified. After gathering the opinions of the parties, the AAA will decide and that decision shall be final and conclusive.

R-20. Vacancies

If for any reason an arbitrator cannot or is unwilling to perform the duties of the office, the AAA may declare the office vacant. Any vacancies shall be filled based on the original procedures used to appoint the arbitrator. If a substitute arbitrator is appointed, the substitute arbitrator will decide if it is necessary to repeat all or part of any prior ruling or hearing.

Pre-Hearing Preparation

R-21. Preliminary Management Hearing with the Arbitrator

(a) If any party asks for, or if the AAA or the arbitrator decides to hold one, the arbitrator will schedule a preliminary management hearing with the parties and/or their representatives as soon as possible. The preliminary management hearing will be conducted by telephone unless the arbitrator decides an in-person preliminary management hearing is necessary.

(b) During the preliminary management hearing, the parties and the arbitrator should discuss the future conduct of the case, including clarification of issues and claims, scheduling of the hearings, and any other preliminary matters.

(c) The arbitrator shall promptly issue written orders that state the arbitrator's decisions made during or as a result of the preliminary management hearing. The arbitrator may also conduct additional preliminary management hearings if the need arises.

R-22. Exchange of Information between the Parties

(a) If any party asks or if the arbitrator decides on his or her own, keeping in mind that arbitration must remain a fast and economical process, the arbitrator may direct

1) specific documents and other information to be shared between the consumer and business, and

2) that the consumer and business identify the witnesses, if any, they plan to have testify at the hearing.

(b) Any exhibits the parties plan to submit at the hearing need to be shared between the parties at least five business days before the hearing, unless the arbitrator sets a different exchange date.

(c) No other exchange of information beyond what is provided for in section (a) above is contemplated under these Rules, unless an arbitrator determines further information exchange is needed to provide for a fundamentally fair process.

(d) The arbitrator has authority to resolve any disputes between the parties about exchanging information.

R-23. Enforcement Powers of the Arbitrator

The arbitrator may issue any orders necessary to enforce the provisions of rules R-21 and R-22 and to otherwise achieve a fair, efficient, and economical resolution of the case, including, but not limited to:

(a) an order setting the conditions for any exchange or production of confidential documents and information, and the admission of confidential evidence at the hearing in order to preserve such confidentiality;

(b) to the extent the exchange of information takes place pursuant to R-22, imposing reasonable search limitations for electronic and other documents if the parties are unable to agree;

(c) allocating costs of producing documentation, including electronically-stored documentation;

(d) in the case of willful non-compliance with any order issued by the arbitrator, drawing adverse inferences, excluding evidence and other submissions, and/or making special allocations of costs or an interim award of costs arising from such non-compliance; and

(e) issuing any other enforcement orders that the arbitrator is empowered to issue under applicable law.

R-24. Written Motions (except for Dispositive Motions—see R-33)

The arbitrator may consider a party's request to file a written motion (except for Dispositive Motions— see R-33) only after the parties and the arbitrator conduct a conference call to attempt to resolve the issue that gives rise to the proposed motion. Only after the parties and the arbitrator hold the call may the arbitrator consider a party's request to file a written motion. The arbitrator has the sole discretion to allow or deny the filing of a written motion and his or her decision is final.

R-25. Representation of a Party

Any party may participate in the arbitration without representation, or may be represented by counsel or other authorized representative, unless such choice is prohibited by applicable law. A party intending to be represented shall give the opposing party and the AAA the name, address, and contact information of the representative at least three business days before the hearing where that representative will first appear in the case. It will be considered proper notice if a representative files the arbitration demand or answer or responds for a party during the course of the arbitration.

While parties do not need an attorney to participate in arbitration, arbitration is a final, legally-binding process that may impact a party's rights. As such, parties may want to consider consulting an attorney.

R-26. Setting the Date, Time, and Place (the physical site of the hearing within the designated locale) of Hearing

The arbitrator will set the date, time, and place for each hearing within the locale as determined in R-11. A hearing may be by telephone or in person. For their part, the parties commit to

(1) respond promptly to the arbitrator when he or she asks what dates the parties are available to have the hearings;

(2) cooperate in the scheduling of the hearing on the earliest possible date; and

(3) follow the hearing schedule set up by the arbitrator.

The AAA will send a notice of the hearing to the parties at least 10 days before the hearing date, unless the parties agree to a different time frame.

R-27. Written Record of Hearing

(a) If a party wants a written record of the hearing, that party must make such arrangement directly with a stenographer (court reporter) and notify the opposing parties, the AAA, and the arbitrator of these arrangements at least three business days before the hearing. The party or parties who request the written record shall pay the cost of the service.

(b) No other type of recording will be allowed unless the parties agree or the arbitrator directs a different form of recording.

(c) The arbitrator may resolve disputes between the parties over who will pay the costs of the written record or other type of recording.

(d) The parties can agree or the arbitrator may decide that the transcript (written record) is the official record of the hearing. If it is the official record of the hearing, the transcript must be given to the arbitrator and made available to all the parties so that it can be reviewed. The date, time, and place of the inspection will be decided by the arbitrator.

R-28. Interpreters

If a party wants an interpreter present for any part of the process, that party must make arrangements directly with the interpreter and shall pay for the costs of the service.

R-29. Documents-Only Procedure

Disputes may be resolved by submission of documents and without in-person or telephonic hearings. For cases being decided by the submission of documents only, the Procedures for the Resolution of Disputes through Document Submission (found at the end of these Rules) shall supplement these Rules. These Procedures will apply where no disclosed claims or counterclaims exceed \$25,000 (see R-1(g)), unless any party requests an in-person or telephonic hearing or the arbitrator decides that a hearing is necessary.

Hearing Procedures

R-30. Attendance at Hearings

The arbitrator and the AAA will keep information about the arbitration private except to the extent that a law provides that such information shall be shared or made public. The parties and their representatives in the arbitration are entitled to attend the hearings. The arbitrator will determine any disputes over whether a non-party may attend the hearing.

R-31. Oaths

Before starting the hearing, each arbitrator may take an oath of office and, if required by law, shall do so. If the arbitrator determines that witnesses shall testify under oath, then the arbitrator will direct the oath be given by a duly-qualified person.

R-32. Conduct of Proceedings

(a) The claimant must present evidence to support its claim. The respondent must then present evidence to support its defense. Witnesses for each party also must answer questions from the arbitrator and the opposing party. The arbitrator may change this procedure, as long as each party has the right to be heard and is given a fair opportunity to present its case.

(b) When the arbitrator decides it is appropriate, the arbitrator may also allow the parties to present evidence in alternative ways, including web conferencing, Internet communication, and telephonic conferences. All procedures must provide the parties with a full and equal opportunity to present any evidence that the arbitrator decides is material and relevant to deciding the dispute. If the alternative ways to present evidence involve witnesses, those ways may include that the witness submit to direct and cross-examination questioning.

(c) The arbitrator will use his or her discretion to resolve the dispute as quickly as possible and may direct the parties to present the evidence in a certain order, or may split the proceedings into multiple parts and direct the parties in the presentation of evidence.

(d) The hearing generally will not exceed one day. However, if a party shows good cause, the arbitrator may schedule additional hearings within seven calendar days after the initial day of hearing.

(e) The parties may agree in writing to waive oral hearings.

R-33. Dispositive Motions

The arbitrator may allow the filing of a dispositive motion if the arbitrator determines that the moving party has shown substantial cause that the motion is likely to succeed and dispose of or narrow the issues in the case.

R-34. Evidence

(a) The parties may offer relevant and material evidence and must produce any evidence the arbitrator decides is necessary to understand and decide the dispute. Following the legal rules of evidence shall not be necessary. All evidence should be taken in the presence of the arbitrator and all of the parties, unless any of the parties is absent, in default, or has waived the right to be present.

(b) The arbitrator shall determine what evidence will be admitted, what evidence is relevant, and what evidence is material to the case. The arbitrator may also exclude evidence that the arbitrator decides is cumulative or not relevant.

(c) The arbitrator shall consider applicable principles of legal privilege, such as those that involve the confidentiality of communications between a lawyer and a client.

(d) An arbitrator or other person authorized by law to subpoena witnesses or documents may do so on the request of any party or on the arbitrator's own determination. If a party requests the arbitrator sign a subpoena, that party shall copy the request to the other parties in the arbitration at the same time it is provided to the arbitrator.

R-35. Evidence by Affidavit and Post-Hearing Filing of Documents or Other Evidence

(a) The arbitrator may receive and consider the evidence of witnesses by declaration or affidavit rather than in-person testimony but will give this evidence only such credence as the arbitrator decides is appropriate. The arbitrator will consider any objection to such evidence made by the opposing party.

(b) If the parties agree or the arbitrator decides that documents or other evidence need to be submitted to the arbitrator after the hearing, those documents or other evidence will be filed with the AAA so that they can be sent to the arbitrator. All parties will be given the opportunity to review and respond to these documents or other evidence.

R-36. Inspection or Investigation

An arbitrator finding it necessary to inspect property or conduct an investigation in connection with the arbitration will request that the AAA inform the parties. The arbitrator will set the date and time of the inspection and investigation, and the AAA will notify the parties. Any party who would like to be present at the inspection or investigation may attend. If one or all parties are not present at the inspection or investigation, the arbitrator will make an oral or written report to the parties and allow them an opportunity to comment.

R-37. Interim Measures (a preliminary decision made by the arbitrator involving part or all of the issue(s) in dispute in the arbitration)

(a) The arbitrator may grant whatever interim measures he or she decides are necessary, including granting an injunction and ordering that property be protected.

(b) Such interim measures may take the form of an interim award, and the arbitrator may require a security payment for the costs of such measures.

(c) When making a decision on an interim measure, the arbitrator may grant any remedy, relief, or outcome that the parties could have received in court.

(d) A party to an arbitration agreement under these Rules may instead file in state or federal court for interim relief. Applying to the court for this type of relief, including temporary restraining orders, is consistent with the agreement to arbitrate and will not be considered a waiver of the right to arbitrate.

R-38. Postponements

The arbitrator may postpone any hearing

(a) if requested by a party, and the party shows good cause for the postponement;

(b) if all parties agree to a postponement;

(c) on his or her own decision.

R-39. Arbitration in the Absence of a Party or Representative

The arbitration may proceed even if any party or representative is absent, so long as proper notice was given and that party or representative fails to appear or obtain a postponement from the arbitrator. An award cannot be made only because of the default of a party. The arbitrator shall require the party who participates in the hearing to submit the evidence needed by the arbitrator to make an award.

Conclusion of the Hearing

R-40. Closing of Hearing

The arbitrator must specifically ask all parties whether they have any further proofs to offer or witnesses to be heard. When the arbitrator receives negative replies or he or she is satisfied that the record is complete, the arbitrator will declare the hearing closed.

If briefs or other written documentation are to be filed by the parties, the hearing shall be declared closed as of the final date set by the arbitrator. Absent agreement of the parties, the time that the arbitrator has to make the award begins upon the closing of the hearing. The AAA may extend the time limit for the rendering of the award only in unusual and extreme circumstances.

R-41. Reopening of Hearing

If a party requests, or if the arbitrator decides to do so, the hearing may be reopened at any time before the award is made. If reopening the hearing would prevent the making of the award within the specific time agreed on by the parties in the contract(s) out of which the controversy has arisen, the matter may not be reopened unless the parties agree on an extension of time. If the arbitrator reopens the hearing, he or she shall have 30 days from the closing of the reopened hearing within which to make an award.

R-42. Time of Award

The award shall be issued promptly by the arbitrator and, unless the parties agree differently or the law indicates a different time frame, no later than 30 calendar days from the date the hearing is closed, or, if the case is a documents-only procedure, 14 calendar days from the date the arbitrator set for his or her receipt of the final statements and proofs. The AAA may extend the time limit for the rendering of the award only in unusual and extreme circumstances.

R-43. Form of Award

(a) Any award shall be in writing and executed in the form and manner required by law.

(b) The award shall provide the concise written reasons for the decision unless the parties all agree otherwise. Any disagreements over the form of the award shall be decided by the arbitrator.

(c) The AAA may choose to publish an award rendered under these Rules; however, the names of the parties and witnesses will be removed from awards that are published, unless a party agrees in writing to have its name included in the award.

R-44. Scope of Award

(a) The arbitrator may grant any remedy, relief, or outcome that the parties could have received in court, including awards of attorney's fees and costs, in accordance with the law(s) that applies to the case.

(b) In addition to a final award, the arbitrator may make other decisions, including interim, interlocutory, or partial rulings, orders, and awards. In any interim, interlocutory, or partial award, the arbitrator may assess and divide up the fees, expenses, and compensation related to such award as the arbitrator decides is

appropriate, subject to the provisions and limitations contained in the Costs of Arbitration section.

(c) The arbitrator may also allocate compensation, expenses as defined in sections (v) and (vii) of the Costs of Arbitration section, and administrative fees (which include Filing and Hearing Fees) to any party upon the arbitrator's determination that the party's claim or counterclaim was filed for purposes of harassment or is patently frivolous.

(d) In the final award, the arbitrator shall assess the fees, expenses, and compensation provided in Sections R-4, R-5, and R-7 in favor of any party, subject to the provisions and limitations contained in the Costs of Arbitration section.

R-45. Award upon Settlement

If the parties settle their dispute at any point during the arbitration and at the parties' request, the arbitrator may lay out the terms of the settlement in a "consent award" (an award drafted and signed by the arbitrator that reflects the settlement terms of the parties). A consent award must include a division of the arbitration costs, including administrative fees and expenses as well as arbitrator fees and expenses. Consent awards will not be made available to the public per Rule 43(c) unless the parties agree otherwise.

R-46. Delivery of Award to Parties

Parties shall accept as notice and delivery of the award the placing of the award or a true copy thereof in the mail addressed to the parties or their representatives at the last known addresses, personal or electronic service of the award, or the filing of the award in any other manner that is permitted by law.

R-47. Modification of Award for Clerical, Typographical, or Mathematical Errors

(a) Within 20 days after the award is transmitted, any party, upon notice to the opposing parties, may contact the AAA and request that the arbitrator correct any clerical, typographical, or mathematical errors in the award. The arbitrator has no power to re-determine the merits of any claim already decided.

(b) The opposing parties shall be given 10 days to respond to the request. The arbitrator shall make a decision on the request within 20 days after the AAA transmits the request and any responses to the arbitrator.

(c) If applicable law provides a different procedural time frame, that procedure shall be followed.

Post Hearing**R-48. Release of Documents for Judicial Proceedings**

The AAA shall give a party certified copies of any records in the AAA's possession that may be required in judicial proceedings relating to the arbitration, except for records determined by the AAA to be privileged or confidential. The party will have to pay a fee for this service.

R-49. Applications to Court and Exclusion of Liability

(a) No court or judicial proceeding by a party relating to the subject matter of the arbitration shall be deemed a waiver of the party's right to arbitrate.

(b) Neither the AAA nor any arbitrator in a proceeding under these Rules is a necessary or proper party in judicial proceedings relating to the arbitration.

(c) Parties to an arbitration under these Rules shall be deemed to have consented that judgment upon the arbitration award may be entered in any federal or state court having jurisdiction thereof.

(d) Parties to an arbitration under these Rules shall be deemed to have consented that neither the AAA, AAA employees, nor any arbitrator shall be liable to any party in any action for damages or injunctive relief for any act or omission in connection with any arbitration under these rules.

(e) Parties to an arbitration under these Rules may not call the arbitrator, the AAA, or any AAA employee as a witness in litigation or any other proceeding relating to the arbitration. The arbitrator, the AAA, and AAA employees are not competent to and may not testify as witnesses in any such proceeding.

General Procedural Rules**R-50. Waiver of Rules**

If a party knows that any of these Rules have not been followed, it must object in writing before proceeding with arbitration or it will lose its right to object that the rule has not been followed.

R-51. Extensions of Time

The parties may agree to change any period of time provided for in the Rules, except that any such modification that negatively affects the efficient resolution of

the dispute is subject to review and approval by the arbitrator. The AAA or the arbitrator may for good cause extend any period of time in these Rules, except as set forth in R-42. The AAA will notify the parties of any extension.

R-52. Serving of Notice and AAA and Arbitrator Communications

(a) Any papers or notices necessary for the initiation or continuation of an arbitration under these Rules, or for the entry of judgment on any award made under these Rules, may be served on a party by mail or email addressed to the party or its representative at the last-known address or by personal service, in or outside the state where the arbitration is to be held, provided that reasonable opportunity to be heard with regard to the dispute is or has been granted to the party.

(b) The AAA, the arbitrator, and the parties also may use overnight delivery, electronic facsimile transmission (fax), or electronic mail (email) to give the notices required by these rules. Where all parties and the arbitrator agree, notices may be sent by other methods of communication.

(c) Unless directed differently by the AAA or by the arbitrator, any documents and all written communications submitted by any party to the AAA or to the arbitrator also shall be sent at the same time to all parties to the arbitration.

(d) A failure to provide the other parties with copies of communications made to the AAA or to the arbitrator may prevent the AAA or the arbitrator from acting on any requests or objections contained within those communications.

(e) A party and/or someone acting on behalf of a party cannot have any communications with an arbitrator or a potential arbitrator about the arbitration outside of the presence of the opposing party. All such communications shall be conducted through the AAA.

(f) The AAA may direct that any oral or written communications that are sent by a party or their representative shall be sent in a particular manner. The failure of a party or its representative to do so may result in the AAA's refusal to consider the issue raised in the communication.

R-53. Interpretation and Application of Rules

The arbitrator shall interpret and apply these Rules as they relate to the arbitrator's powers and duties. When there is more than one arbitrator and a difference arises among them concerning the meaning or application of these Rules, it shall be decided by a majority vote. If that is not possible, either an arbitrator or

a party may refer the question to the AAA for final decision. All other Rules shall be interpreted and applied by the AAA.

R-54. Remedies for Nonpayment

(a) If arbitrator compensation or administrative charges have not been paid in full, the AAA may inform the parties so that one of them may forward the required payment.

(b) Once the AAA informs the parties that payments have not been received, a party may request an order from the arbitrator directing what measures might be taken in light of a party's nonpayment.

Such measures may include limiting a party's ability to assert or pursue its claim. However, a party shall never be precluded from defending a claim or counterclaim. The arbitrator must provide the party opposing a request for relief with the opportunity to respond prior to making any determination. In the event that the arbitrator grants any request for relief that limits any party's participation in the arbitration, the arbitrator will require the party who is making a claim and who has made appropriate payments to submit the evidence required to make an award.

(c) Upon receipt of information from the AAA that full payments have not been received, the arbitrator, on the arbitrator's own initiative, may order the suspension of the arbitration. If no arbitrator has yet been appointed, the AAA may suspend the proceedings.

(d) If arbitrator compensation or AAA administrative fees remain unpaid after a determination to suspend an arbitration due to nonpayment, the arbitrator has the authority to terminate the proceedings. Such an order shall be in writing and signed by the arbitrator. The impact of the termination for nonpayment of the Consumer Clause Registry fee is the removal from the "Registered" section of the Registry.

R-55. Declining or Ceasing Arbitration

The AAA in its sole discretion may decline to accept a Demand for Arbitration or stop the administration of an ongoing arbitration due to a party's improper conduct, including threatening or harassing behavior towards any AAA staff, an arbitrator, or a party or party's representative.

Costs of Arbitration (including AAA Administrative Fees)*

Arbitrator compensation is not included as part of the administrative fees charged by the AAA. Arbitrator compensation is based on a rate established by the AAA as set forth below. If a Preliminary Management Hearing is held by the arbitrator, the arbitrator is entitled to one-half the arbitration compensation rate for a full hearing day or a documents-only hearing. Once evidentiary hearings are held, the arbitrator is entitled to the full-day rate of compensation. The business shall pay the arbitrator's compensation unless the consumer, post dispute, voluntarily elects to pay a portion of the arbitrator's compensation. Arbitrator compensation, expenses as defined in sections (v) and (vii) below, and administrative fees (which include Filing and Hearing Fees) are not subject to reallocation by the arbitrator(s) except as may be required by applicable law or upon the arbitrator's determination that a claim or counterclaim was filed for purposes of harassment or is patently frivolous.

Party	Desk Arbitration	In-Person or Telephonic Hearing – Single Arbitrator	In-Person or Telephonic Hearing – Three or More Arbitrators
Consumer	Filing Fee – \$200 (nonrefundable)	Filing Fee – \$200 (nonrefundable)	Filing Fee – \$200 (nonrefundable)
Business	Filing Fee – \$1,700 Arbitrator Compensation – \$750 per case	Filing Fee – \$1,700 Hearing Fee – \$500 Arbitrator Compensation – \$1,500 per hearing day	Filing Fee – \$2,200 Hearing Fee – \$500 Arbitrator Compensation – \$1,500 per hearing day per arbitrator

(i) Filing Fees

* Pursuant to Section 1284.3 of the California Code of Civil Procedure, consumers with a gross monthly income of less than 300% of the federal poverty guidelines are entitled to a waiver of arbitration fees and costs, exclusive of arbitrator fees. This law applies to all consumer agreements subject to the California Arbitration Act, and to all consumer arbitrations conducted in California. If you believe that you meet these requirements, you must submit to the AAA a declaration under oath regarding your monthly income and the number of persons in your household. Please contact the AAA at 1-800-778-7879, if you have any questions regarding the waiver of administrative fees. (Effective January 1, 2003)

In cases before a single arbitrator, a nonrefundable filing fee capped in the amount of \$200 is payable in full by the consumer when a case is filed, unless the parties' agreement provides that the consumer pay less. A partially refundable fee in the amount of \$1,700 is payable in full by the business, unless the parties' agreement provides that the business pay more. This fee is due from the business once the consumer has met the filing requirements.

In cases before three or more arbitrators, a nonrefundable filing fee capped in the amount of \$200 is payable in full by the consumer when a case is filed, unless the parties' agreement provides that the consumer pay less. A partially refundable fee in the amount of \$2,200 is payable in full by the business, unless the parties' agreement provides that the business pay more. This fee is due from the business once the consumer has met the filing requirements.

There shall be no filing fee charged for a counterclaim.

The AAA reserves the right to assess additional administrative fees for services performed by the AAA beyond those provided for in these Rules and which may be required by the parties' agreement or stipulation.

(ii) Neutral Arbitrator's Compensation

Arbitrators serving on a case with an in-person or telephonic hearing will receive compensation at a rate of **\$1,500 per day**.

Arbitrators serving on a case with a desk arbitration/documents-only hearing will receive compensation at a rate of **\$750 per case**.

The AAA reserves the right to raise the daily or per-case arbitrator compensation rate because of the complexity of the case or for processes and procedures beyond those provided for in these Rules and which may be required by the parties' requests, agreement, or stipulation (1) at the time of the AAA's initiation of the case; (2) upon the addition of a new party; (3) when a change of claim is made and, if necessary, approved by the arbitrator(s); (4) or if circumstances arise during the course of the case due to the complexity of issues and submissions by the parties. Any determination by the AAA on compensation rates is in the sole discretion of the AAA and such decision is final and binding on the parties and arbitrator.

(iii) Refund Schedule

Once the claimant has met the filing requirements, refunds to the business will be calculated as follows:

- if the case is settled or withdrawn within 30 calendar days, 50% of the filing fee will be refunded to the business.

However, no refund of the filing fee will be made once an arbitrator has been appointed and no refunds will be made on awarded cases. The date the claimant's filing requirements are met is the date used to calculate any refund of filing fees. If the matter is settled or withdrawn prior to receipt of filing fees from the business, the AAA will bill the business in accordance with this refund schedule.

(iv) Hearing Fees

For telephonic hearings or in-person hearings held, an additional administrative fee of \$500 is payable by the business.

There is no AAA hearing fee for the initial Administrative Conference (see R-10).

(v) Hearing Room Rental

The hearing fees described above do not cover the rental of hearing rooms. The AAA maintains rental hearing rooms in most offices for the convenience of the parties. Check with the administrator for availability and rates. Hearing room rental fees will be borne by the business.

(vi) Abeyance Fee

Parties on cases held as inactive for one year will be assessed an annual abeyance fee of \$300. If a party refuses to pay the assessed fee, the opposing party or parties may pay the entire fee on behalf of all parties, otherwise the matter will be administratively closed. All filing requirements, including payment of filing fees, must be met before a matter may be placed in abeyance.

(vii) Expenses

All expenses of the arbitrator, including required travel and other expenses, and any AAA expenses, as well as the costs relating to proof and witnesses produced at the direction of the arbitrator, shall be borne by the business.

(viii) Consumer Clause Review and Registry Fee

Please note that all fees described below are **nonrefundable**.

For businesses submitting a clause, the cost of reviewing the clause and maintaining that clause on the Registry is \$500. A yearly Registry fee of \$500 will be charged to maintain each clause on the Registry for each calendar year thereafter.

If the AAA receives a demand for consumer arbitration from an arbitration clause that was not previously submitted to the AAA for review and placement on the Registry, the business will incur an additional \$250 fee to conduct an expedited review of the clause.

Any subsequent changes, additions, deletions, or amendments to currently registered arbitration agreement must be resubmitted for review and a review fee of \$500 will assessed at that time.

Procedures for the Resolution of Disputes through Document Submission**D-1. Applicability**

(a) In any case, regardless of claim size, the parties may agree to waive in-person/ telephonic hearings and resolve the dispute through submission of documents to one arbitrator. Such agreement should be confirmed in writing no later than the deadline for the filing of an answer.

(b) Where no disclosed claims or counterclaims exceed \$25,000, the dispute shall be resolved by these Procedures, unless a party asks for a hearing or the arbitrator decides that a hearing is necessary.

(c) If one party makes a request to use the Procedures for the Resolution of Disputes through Document Submission (Procedures) and the opposing party is unresponsive, the arbitrator shall have the power to determine whether to proceed under the Procedures. If both parties seek to use the Procedures after the appointment of an arbitrator, the arbitrator must also consent to the process.

(d) When parties agree to these Procedures, the procedures in Sections D-1 through D-4 of these Rules shall supplement other portions of these rules which are not in conflict with the Procedures.

D-2. Preliminary Management Hearing

Within 14 calendar days of confirmation of the arbitrator's appointment, the arbitrator shall convene a preliminary management hearing, via conference call, video conference, or internet, to establish a fair and equitable procedure for the submission of documents, and, if the arbitrator deems appropriate, a schedule for one or more telephonic or electronic conferences.

D-3. Removal from the Procedures

(a) The arbitrator has the discretion to remove the case from the Procedures if the arbitrator determines that an in-person or telephonic hearing is necessary.

(b) If the parties agree to in-person or telephonic hearings after a previous agreement to proceed under the Procedures, the arbitrator shall conduct such hearings. If a party seeks to have in-person or telephonic hearings after agreeing to the Procedures, but there is not agreement among the parties to proceed with in-person or telephonic hearings, the arbitrator shall resolve the issue after the parties have been given the opportunity to provide their respective positions on the issue.

D-4. Time of Award

(a) The arbitrator shall establish the date for either final written submissions or a final telephonic or electronic conference. Such date shall operate to close the hearing, and the time for the rendering of the award shall commence on that day as well.

(b) The arbitrator shall render the award within 14 calendar days from the date the hearing is closed.

(c) The award is subject to all other provisions of these Rules that pertain to awards.

Replace the JAMS Employment Arbitration Rules and Procedures on pages 161-177 of the Documentary Supplement with the following:

JAMS Employment Arbitration Rules and Procedures*
Effective July 1, 2014

Rule 1. Scope of Rules

(a) The JAMS Employment Arbitration Rules and Procedures (“Rules”) govern binding Arbitrations of disputes or claims that are administered by JAMS and in which the Parties agree to use these Rules or, in the absence of such agreement, the disputes or claims are employment-related, unless other Rules are prescribed.

(b) The Parties shall be deemed to have made these Rules a part of their Arbitration agreement (“Agreement”) whenever they have provided for Arbitration by JAMS under its Employment Rules or for Arbitration by JAMS without specifying any particular JAMS Rules and the disputes or claims meet the criteria of the first paragraph of this Rule.

(c) The authority and duties of JAMS as prescribed in the Agreement of the Parties and in these Rules shall be carried out by the JAMS National Arbitration Committee (“NAC”) or the office of JAMS General Counsel or their designees.

(d) JAMS may, in its discretion, assign the administration of an Arbitration to any of its Resolution Centers.

(e) The term “Party” as used in these Rules includes Parties to the Arbitration and their counsel or representatives.

(f) “Electronic filing” (e-file) means the electronic transmission of documents to and from JAMS and other Parties for the purpose of filing via the Internet. “Electronic service” (e-service) means the electronic transmission of documents via JAMS Electronic Filing System to a party, attorney or representative under these Rules.

Rule 2. Party Self-Determination

(a) The Parties may agree on any procedures not specified herein or in lieu of these Rules that are consistent with the applicable law and JAMS policies

* Reprinted with permission. Copyright © 2014 by JAMS. All rights reserved.

(including, without limitation, the JAMS Policy on Employment Arbitration Minimum Standards of Procedural Fairness and Rules 15(i), 30 and 31). The Parties shall promptly notify JAMS of any such Party-agreed procedures and shall confirm such procedures in writing. The Party-agreed procedures shall be enforceable as if contained in these Rules.

(b) When an Arbitration Agreement provides that the Arbitration will be non-administered or administered by an entity other than JAMS and/or conducted in accordance with rules other than JAMS Rules, the Parties may subsequently agree to modify that Agreement to provide that the Arbitration will be administered by JAMS and/or conducted in accordance with JAMS Rules.

Rule 3. Amendment of Rules

JAMS may amend these Rules without notice. The Rules in effect on the date of the commencement of an Arbitration (as defined in Rule 5) shall apply to that Arbitration, unless the Parties have agreed upon another version of the Rules.

Rule 4. Conflict with Law

If any of these Rules, or modification of these Rules agreed to by the Parties, is determined to be in conflict with a provision of applicable law, the provision of law will govern over the Rule in conflict, and no other Rule will be affected.

Rule 5. Commencing an Arbitration

(a) The Arbitration is deemed commenced when JAMS issues a Commencement Letter based upon the existence of one of the following:

(i) A post-dispute Arbitration Agreement fully executed by all Parties specifying JAMS administration or use of any JAMS Rules; or

(ii) A pre-dispute written contractual provision requiring the Parties to arbitrate the employment dispute or claim and specifying JAMS administration or use of any JAMS Rules or that the Parties agree shall be administered by JAMS; or

(iii) A written confirmation of an oral agreement of all Parties to participate in an Arbitration administered by JAMS or conducted pursuant to any JAMS Rules; or

(iv) The Respondent's failure to timely object to JAMS administration;
or

(v) A copy of a court order compelling Arbitration at JAMS.

(b) The issuance of the Commencement Letter confirms that requirements for commencement have been met, that JAMS has received all payments required under the applicable fee schedule and that the Claimant has provided JAMS with contact information for all Parties along with evidence that the Demand for Arbitration has been served on all Parties.

(c) If a Party that is obligated to arbitrate in accordance with subparagraph (a) of this Rule fails to agree to participate in the Arbitration process, JAMS shall confirm in writing that Party's failure to respond or participate, and, pursuant to Rule 19, the Arbitrator, once appointed, shall schedule, and provide appropriate notice of, a Hearing or other opportunity for the Party demanding the Arbitration to demonstrate its entitlement to relief.

(d) The date of commencement of the Arbitration is the date of the Commencement Letter but is not intended to be applicable to any legal requirements such as the statute of limitations, any contractual limitations period or claims notice requirements. The term "commencement," as used in this Rule, is intended only to pertain to the operation of this and other Rules (such as Rule 3, 13(a), 17(a), 31(a)).

Rule 6. Preliminary and Administrative Matters

(a) JAMS may convene, or the Parties may request, administrative conferences to discuss any procedural matter relating to the administration of the Arbitration.

(b) If no Arbitrator has yet been appointed, at the request of a Party and in the absence of Party agreement, JAMS may determine the location of the Hearing, subject to Arbitrator review. In determining the location of the Hearing, such factors as the subject matter of the dispute, the convenience of the Parties and witnesses, and the relative resources of the Parties shall be considered, but in no event will the Hearing be scheduled in a location that precludes attendance by the Employee.

(c) If, at any time, any Party has failed to pay fees or expenses in full, JAMS may order the suspension or termination of the proceedings. JAMS may so inform the Parties in order that one of them may advance the required payment. If one Party advances the payment owed by a non-paying Party, the Arbitration shall

proceed, and the Arbitrator may allocate the non-paying Party's share of such costs, in accordance with Rules 24(f) and 31(c). An administrative suspension shall toll any other time limits contained in these Rules or the Parties' Agreement.

(d) JAMS does not maintain an official record of documents filed in the Arbitration. If the Parties wish to have any documents returned to them, they must advise JAMS in writing within thirty (30) calendar days of the conclusion of the Arbitration. If special arrangements are required regarding file maintenance or document retention, they must be agreed to in writing, and JAMS reserves the right to impose an additional fee for such special arrangements. Documents that are submitted for e-filing are retained for thirty (30) calendar days following the conclusion of the Arbitration.

(e) Unless the Parties' Agreement or applicable law provides otherwise, JAMS, if it determines that the Arbitrations so filed have common issues of fact or law, may consolidate Arbitrations in the following instances:

(i) If a Party files more than one Arbitration with JAMS, JAMS may consolidate the Arbitrations into a single Arbitration.

(ii) Where a Demand or Demands for Arbitration is or are submitted naming Parties already involved in another Arbitration or Arbitrations pending under these Rules, JAMS may decide that the new case or cases shall be consolidated into one or more of the pending proceedings and referred to one of the Arbitrators or panels of Arbitrators already appointed.

(iii) Where a Demand or Demands for Arbitration is or are submitted naming parties that are not identical to the Parties in the existing Arbitration or Arbitrations, JAMS may decide that the new case or cases shall be consolidated into one or more of the pending proceedings and referred to one of the Arbitrators or panels of Arbitrators already appointed.

When rendering its decision, JAMS will take into account all circumstances, including the links between the cases and the progress already made in the existing Arbitrations.

Unless applicable law provides otherwise, where JAMS decides to consolidate a proceeding into a pending Arbitration, the Parties to the consolidated case or cases will be deemed to have waived their right to designate an Arbitrator as well as any contractual provision with respect to the site of the Arbitration.

(f) Where a third party seeks to participate in an Arbitration already pending under these Rules or where a Party to an Arbitration under these Rules seeks to compel a third party to participate in a pending Arbitration, the Arbitrator shall

determine such request, taking into account all circumstances he or she deems relevant and applicable.

Rule 7. Number and Neutrality of Arbitrators; Appointment and Authority of Chairperson

(a) The Arbitration shall be conducted by one neutral Arbitrator, unless all Parties agree otherwise. In these Rules, the term “Arbitrator” shall mean, as the context requires, the Arbitrator or the panel of Arbitrators in a tripartite Arbitration.

(b) In cases involving more than one Arbitrator, the Parties shall agree on, or, in the absence of agreement, JAMS shall designate, the Chairperson of the Arbitration Panel. If the Parties and the Arbitrators agree, a single member of the Arbitration Panel may, acting alone, decide discovery and procedural matters, including the conduct of hearings to receive documents and testimony from third parties who have been subpoenaed to produce documents.

(c) Where the Parties have agreed that each Party is to name one Arbitrator, the Arbitrators so named shall be neutral and independent of the appointing Party, unless the Parties have agreed that they shall be non-neutral.

Rule 8. Service

(a) The Arbitrator may at any time require electronic filing and service of documents in an Arbitration. If an Arbitrator requires electronic filing, the Parties shall maintain and regularly monitor a valid, usable and live email address for the receipt of all documents filed through JAMS Electronic Filing System. Any document filed electronically shall be considered as filed with JAMS when the transmission to JAMS Electronic Filing System is complete. Any document e-filed by 11:59 p.m. (of the sender’s time zone) shall be deemed filed on that date. Upon completion of filing, JAMS Electronic Filing System shall issue a confirmation receipt that includes the date and time of receipt. The confirmation receipt shall serve as proof of filing.

(b) Every document filed with JAMS Electronic Filing System shall be deemed to have been signed by the Arbitrator, Case Manager, attorney or declarant who submits the document to JAMS Electronic Filing System, and shall bear the typed name, address and telephone number of a signing attorney. Documents containing signatures of third parties (i.e., unopposed motions, affidavits, stipulations, etc.) may also be filed electronically by indicating that the original signatures are maintained by the filing Party in paper format.

(c) Delivery of e-service documents through JAMS Electronic Filing System to other registered users shall be considered as valid and effective service and shall have the same legal effect as an original paper document. Recipients of e-service documents shall access their documents through JAMS Electronic Filing System. E-service shall be deemed complete when the Party initiating e-service completes the transmission of the electronic document(s) to JAMS Electronic Filing System for e-filing and/or e-service. Upon actual or constructive receipt of the electronic document(s) by the Party to be served, a Certificate of Electronic Service shall be issued by JAMS Electronic Filing System to the Party initiating e-service, and that Certificate shall serve as proof of service. Any Party who ignores or attempts to refuse e-service shall be deemed to have received the electronic document(s) 72 hours following the transmission of the electronic document(s) to JAMS Electronic Filing System.

(d) If an electronic filing or service does not occur because of (1) an error in the transmission of the document to JAMS Electronic Filing System or served Party which was unknown to the sending Party; (2) a failure to process the electronic document when received by JAMS Electronic Filing System; (3) the Party was erroneously excluded from the service list; or (4) other technical problems experienced by the filer, the Arbitrator or JAMS may, for good cause shown, permit the document to be filed *nunc pro tunc* to the date it was first attempted to be sent electronically. Or, in the case of service, the Party shall, absent extraordinary circumstances, be entitled to an order extending the date for any response or the period within which any right, duty or other act must be performed.

(e) For documents that are not filed electronically, service by a Party under these Rules is effected by providing one signed copy of the document to each Party and two copies in the case of a sole Arbitrator and four copies in the case of a tripartite panel to JAMS. Service may be made by hand-delivery, overnight delivery service or U.S. mail. Service by any of these means is considered effective upon the date of deposit of the document.

(f) In computing any period of time prescribed or allowed by these Rules for a Party to do some act within a prescribed period after the service of a notice or other paper on the Party and the notice or paper is served on the Party only by U.S. mail, three (3) calendar days shall be added to the prescribed period.

Rule 9. Notice of Claims

(a) Each Party shall afford all other Parties reasonable and timely notice of its claims, affirmative defenses or counterclaims. Any such notice shall include a short statement of its factual basis. No claim, remedy, counterclaim, or affirmative

defense will be considered by the Arbitrator in the absence of such prior notice to the other Parties, unless the Arbitrator determines that no Party has been unfairly prejudiced by such lack of formal notice or all Parties agree that such consideration is appropriate notwithstanding the lack of prior notice.

(b) Claimant's notice of claims is the Demand for Arbitration referenced in Rule 5. It shall include a statement of the remedies sought. The Demand for Arbitration may attach and incorporate a copy of a Complaint previously filed with a court. In the latter case, Claimant may accompany the Complaint with a copy of any Answer to that Complaint filed by any Respondent.

(c) Within fourteen (14) calendar days of service of the notice of claim, a Respondent may submit to JAMS and serve on other Parties a response and a statement of any affirmative defenses, including jurisdictional challenges, or counterclaims it may have.

(d) Within fourteen (14) calendar days of service of a counterclaim, a Claimant may submit to JAMS and serve on other Parties a response to such counterclaim and any affirmative defenses, including jurisdictional challenges, it may have.

(e) Any claim or counterclaim to which no response has been served will be deemed denied.

(f) Jurisdictional challenges under Rule 11 shall be deemed waived, unless asserted in a response to a Demand or counterclaim or promptly thereafter, when circumstances first suggest an issue of arbitrability.

Rule 10. Changes of Claims

After the filing of a claim and before the Arbitrator is appointed, any Party may make a new or different claim against a Party or any third Party that is subject to Arbitration in the proceeding. Such claim shall be made in writing, filed with JAMS and served on the other Parties. Any response to the new claim shall be made within fourteen (14) calendar days after service of such claim. After the Arbitrator is appointed, no new or different claim may be submitted, except with the Arbitrator's approval. A Party may request a hearing on this issue. Each Party has the right to respond to any new or amended claim in accordance with Rule 9(c) or (d).

Rule 11. Interpretation of Rules and Jurisdictional Challenges

(a) Once appointed, the Arbitrator shall resolve disputes about the interpretation and applicability of these Rules and conduct of the Arbitration Hearing. The resolution of the issue by the Arbitrator shall be final.

(b) Jurisdictional and arbitrability disputes, including disputes over the formation, existence, validity, interpretation or scope of the agreement under which Arbitration is sought, and who are proper Parties to the Arbitration, shall be submitted to and ruled on by the Arbitrator. Unless the relevant law requires otherwise, the Arbitrator has the authority to determine jurisdiction and arbitrability issues as a preliminary matter.

(c) Disputes concerning the appointment of the Arbitrator shall be resolved by JAMS.

(d) The Arbitrator may, upon a showing of good cause or *sua sponte*, when necessary to facilitate the Arbitration, extend any deadlines established in these Rules, provided that the time for rendering the Award may only be altered in accordance with Rules 22(i) or 24.

Rule 12. Representation

(a) The Parties, whether natural persons or legal entities such as corporations, LLCs, or partnerships, may be represented by counsel or any other person of the Party's choice. Each Party shall give prompt written notice to the Case Manager and the other Parties of the name, address, telephone and fax numbers and email address of its representative. The representative of a Party may act on the Party's behalf in complying with these Rules.

(b) Changes in Representation. A Party shall give prompt written notice to the Case Manager and the other Parties of any change in its representation, including the name, address, telephone and fax numbers and email address of the new representative. Such notice shall state that the written consent of the former representative, if any, and of the new representative, has been obtained and shall state the effective date of the new representation.

Rule 13. Withdrawal from Arbitration

(a) No Party may terminate or withdraw from an Arbitration after the issuance of the Commencement Letter (see Rule 5), except by written agreement of all Parties to the Arbitration.

(b) A Party that asserts a claim or counterclaim may unilaterally withdraw that claim or counterclaim without prejudice by serving written notice on the other Parties and the Arbitrator. However, the opposing Parties may, within seven (7) calendar days of such notice, request that the Arbitrator condition the withdrawal upon such terms as he or she may direct.

Rule 14. *Ex Parte* Communications

(a) No Party may have any *ex parte* communication with a neutral Arbitrator, except as provided in section (b) of this Rule. The Arbitrator(s) may authorize any Party to communicate directly with the Arbitrator(s) by email or other written means as long as copies are simultaneously forwarded to the JAMS Case Manager and the other Parties.

(b) A Party may have *ex parte* communication with its appointed neutral or non-neutral Arbitrator as necessary to secure the Arbitrator's services and to assure the absence of conflicts, as well as in connection with the selection of the Chairperson of the arbitral panel.

(c) The Parties may agree to permit more extensive *ex parte* communication between a Party and a non-neutral Arbitrator. More extensive communications with a non-neutral Arbitrator may also be permitted by applicable law and rules of ethics.

Rule 15. Arbitrator Selection, Disclosures and Replacement

(a) Unless the Arbitrator has been previously selected by agreement of the Parties, JAMS may attempt to facilitate agreement among the Parties regarding selection of the Arbitrator.

(b) If the Parties do not agree on an Arbitrator, JAMS shall send the Parties a list of at least five (5) Arbitrator candidates in the case of a sole Arbitrator and ten (10) Arbitrator candidates in the case of a tripartite panel. JAMS shall also provide each Party with a brief description of the background and experience of each Arbitrator candidate. JAMS may replace any or all names on the list of Arbitrator candidates for reasonable cause at any time before the Parties have submitted their choice pursuant to subparagraph (c) below.

(c) Within seven (7) calendar days of service by the Parties of the list of names, each Party may strike two (2) names in the case of a sole Arbitrator and three (3) names in the case of a tripartite panel, and shall rank the remaining

Arbitrator candidates in order of preference. The remaining Arbitrator candidate with the highest composite ranking shall be appointed the Arbitrator. JAMS may grant a reasonable extension of the time to strike and rank the Arbitrator candidates to any Party without the consent of the other Parties.

(d) If this process does not yield an Arbitrator or a complete panel, JAMS shall designate the sole Arbitrator or as many members of the tripartite panel as are necessary to complete the panel.

(e) If a Party fails to respond to a list of Arbitrator candidates within seven (7) calendar days after its service, or fails to respond according to the instructions provided by JAMS, JAMS shall deem that Party to have accepted all of the Arbitrator candidates.

(f) Entities whose interests are not adverse with respect to the issues in dispute shall be treated as a single Party for purposes of the Arbitrator selection process. JAMS shall determine whether the interests between entities are adverse for purposes of Arbitrator selection, considering such factors as whether the entities are represented by the same attorney and whether the entities are presenting joint or separate positions at the Arbitration.

(g) If, for any reason, the Arbitrator who is selected is unable to fulfill the Arbitrator's duties, a successor Arbitrator shall be chosen in accordance with this Rule. If a member of a panel of Arbitrators becomes unable to fulfill his or her duties after the beginning of a Hearing but before the issuance of an Award, a new Arbitrator will be chosen in accordance with this Rule, unless, in the case of a tripartite panel, the Parties agree to proceed with the remaining two Arbitrators. JAMS will make the final determination as to whether an Arbitrator is unable to fulfill his or her duties, and that decision shall be final.

(h) Any disclosures regarding the selected Arbitrator shall be made as required by law or within ten (10) calendar days from the date of appointment. Such disclosures may be provided in electronic format, provided that JAMS will produce a hard copy to any Party that requests it. The Parties and their representatives shall disclose to JAMS any circumstances likely to give rise to justifiable doubt as to the Arbitrator's impartiality or independence, including any bias or any financial or personal interest in the result of the Arbitration or any past or present relationship with the Parties and their representatives. The obligation of the Arbitrator, the Parties and their representatives to make all required disclosures continues throughout the Arbitration process.

(i) At any time during the Arbitration process, a Party may challenge the continued service of an Arbitrator for cause. The challenge must be based upon information that was not available to the Parties at the time the Arbitrator was

selected. A challenge for cause must be in writing and exchanged with opposing Parties, who may respond within seven (7) days of service of the challenge. JAMS shall make the final determination as to such challenge. Such determination shall take into account the materiality of the facts and any prejudice to the Parties. That decision will be final.

(j) Where the Parties have agreed that a Party-appointed Arbitrator is to be non-neutral, that Party-appointed Arbitrator is not obliged to withdraw if requested to do so only by the party who did not appoint that Arbitrator.

Rule 16. Preliminary Conference

At the request of any Party or at the direction of the Arbitrator, a Preliminary Conference shall be conducted with the Parties or their counsel or representatives. The Preliminary Conference may address any or all of the following subjects:

- (a) The exchange of information in accordance with Rule 17 or otherwise;
- (b) The schedule for discovery as permitted by the Rules, as agreed by the Parties or as required or authorized by applicable law;
- (c) The pleadings of the Parties and any agreement to clarify or narrow the issues or structure the Arbitration Hearing;
- (d) The scheduling of the Hearing and any pre-Hearing exchanges of information, exhibits, motions or briefs;
- (e) The attendance of witnesses as contemplated by Rule 21;
- (f) The scheduling of any dispositive motion pursuant to Rule 18;
- (g) The premarking of exhibits, preparation of joint exhibit lists and the resolution of the admissibility of exhibits;
- (h) The form of the Award; and
- (i) Such other matters as may be suggested by the Parties or the Arbitrator.

The Preliminary Conference may be conducted telephonically and may be resumed from time to time as warranted.

Rule 17. Exchange of Information

(a) The Parties shall cooperate in good faith in the voluntary and informal exchange of all non-privileged documents and other information (including electronically stored information (“ESI”)) relevant to the dispute or claim immediately after commencement of the Arbitration. They shall complete an initial exchange of all relevant, non-privileged documents, including, without limitation, copies of all documents in their possession or control on which they rely in support of their positions, names of individuals whom they may call as witnesses at the Arbitration Hearing and names of all experts who may be called to testify at the Arbitration Hearing, together with each expert’s report, which may be introduced at the Arbitration Hearing, within twenty-one (21) calendar days after all pleadings or notice of claims have been received. The Arbitrator may modify these obligations at the Preliminary Conference.

(b) Each Party may take at least one deposition of an opposing Party or an individual under the control of the opposing Party. The Parties shall attempt to agree on the number, time, location, and duration of the deposition(s). Absent agreement, the Arbitrator shall determine these issues, including whether to grant a request for additional depositions, based upon the reasonable need for the requested information, the availability of other discovery and the burdensomeness of the request on the opposing Parties and witness.

(c) As they become aware of new documents or information, including experts who may be called upon to testify, all Parties continue to be obligated to provide relevant, non-privileged documents, to supplement their identification of witnesses and experts and to honor any informal agreements or understandings between the Parties regarding documents or information to be exchanged. Documents that were not previously exchanged, or witnesses and experts that were not previously identified, may not be considered by the Arbitrator at the Hearing, unless agreed by the Parties or upon a showing of good cause.

(d) The Parties shall promptly notify JAMS when a dispute exists regarding discovery issues. A conference shall be arranged with the Arbitrator, either by telephone or in person, and the Arbitrator shall decide the dispute. With the written consent of all Parties, and in accordance with an agreed written procedure, the Arbitrator may appoint a special master to assist in resolving a discovery dispute.

Rule 18. Summary Disposition of a Claim or Issue

The Arbitrator may permit any Party to file a Motion for Summary Disposition of a particular claim or issue, either by agreement of all interested

Parties or at the request of one Party, provided other interested Parties have reasonable notice to respond to the motion.

Rule 19. Scheduling and Location of Hearing

(a) The Arbitrator, after consulting with the Parties that have appeared, shall determine the date, time and location of the Hearing. The Arbitrator and the Parties shall attempt to schedule consecutive Hearing days if more than one day is necessary.

(b) If a Party has failed to participate in the Arbitration process, and the Arbitrator reasonably believes that the Party will not participate in the Hearing, the Arbitrator may set the Hearing without consulting with that Party. The non-participating Party shall be served with a Notice of Hearing at least thirty (30) calendar days prior to the scheduled date, unless the law of the relevant jurisdiction allows for, or the Parties have agreed to, shorter notice.

(c) The Arbitrator, in order to hear a third-party witness, or for the convenience of the Parties or the witnesses, may conduct the Hearing at any location. Any JAMS Resolution Center may be designated a Hearing location for purposes of the issuance of a subpoena or subpoena *duces tecum* to a third-party witness.

Rule 20. Pre-Hearing Submissions

(a) Except as set forth in any scheduling order that may be adopted, at least fourteen (14) calendar days before the Arbitration Hearing, the Parties shall file with JAMS and serve and exchange (1) a list of the witnesses they intend to call, including any experts; (2) a short description of the anticipated testimony of each such witness and an estimate of the length of the witness' direct testimony; and (3) a list of all exhibits intended to be used at the Hearing. The Parties should exchange with each other copies of any such exhibits to the extent that they have not been previously exchanged. The Parties should pre-mark exhibits and shall attempt to resolve any disputes regarding the admissibility of exhibits prior to the Hearing.

(b) The Arbitrator may require that each Party submit a concise written statement of position, including summaries of the facts and evidence a Party intends to present, discussion of the applicable law and the basis for the requested Award or denial of relief sought. The statements, which may be in the form of a letter, shall be filed with JAMS and served upon the other Parties at least seven (7) calendar days before the Hearing date. Rebuttal statements or other pre-Hearing

written submissions may be permitted or required at the discretion of the Arbitrator.

Rule 21. Securing Witnesses and Documents for the Arbitration Hearing

At the written request of a Party, all other Parties shall produce for the Arbitration Hearing all specified witnesses in their employ or under their control without need of subpoena. The Arbitrator may issue subpoenas for the attendance of witnesses or the production of documents either prior to or at the Hearing pursuant to this Rule or Rule 19(c). The subpoena or subpoena *duces tecum* shall be issued in accordance with the applicable law. Pre-issued subpoenas may be used in jurisdictions that permit them. In the event a Party or a subpoenaed person objects to the production of a witness or other evidence, the Party or subpoenaed person may file an objection with the Arbitrator, who shall promptly rule on the objection, weighing both the burden on the producing Party and witness and the need of the proponent for the witness or other evidence.

Rule 22. The Arbitration Hearing

(a) The Arbitrator will ordinarily conduct the Arbitration Hearing in the manner set forth in these Rules. The Arbitrator may vary these procedures if it is determined to be reasonable and appropriate to do so. It is expected that the Employee will attend the Arbitration Hearing, as will any other individual party with information about a significant issue.

(b) The Arbitrator shall determine the order of proof, which will generally be similar to that of a court trial.

(c) The Arbitrator shall require witnesses to testify under oath if requested by any Party, or otherwise at the discretion of the Arbitrator.

(d) Strict conformity to the rules of evidence is not required, except that the Arbitrator shall apply applicable law relating to privileges and work product. The Arbitrator shall consider evidence that he or she finds relevant and material to the dispute, giving the evidence such weight as is appropriate. The Arbitrator may be guided in that determination by principles contained in the Federal Rules of Evidence or any other applicable rules of evidence. The Arbitrator may limit testimony to exclude evidence that would be immaterial or unduly repetitive, provided that all Parties are afforded the opportunity to present material and relevant evidence.

(e) The Arbitrator shall receive and consider relevant deposition testimony

recorded by transcript or videotape, provided that the other Parties have had the opportunity to attend and cross-examine. The Arbitrator may in his or her discretion consider witness affidavits or other recorded testimony even if the other Parties have not had the opportunity to cross-examine, but will give that evidence only such weight as he or she deems appropriate.

(f) The Parties will not offer as evidence, and the Arbitrator shall neither admit into the record nor consider, prior settlement offers by the Parties or statements or recommendations made by a mediator or other person in connection with efforts to resolve the dispute being arbitrated, except to the extent that applicable law permits the admission of such evidence.

(g) The Hearing, or any portion thereof, may be conducted telephonically or videographically with the agreement of the Parties or at the discretion of the Arbitrator.

(h) When the Arbitrator determines that all relevant and material evidence and arguments have been presented, and any interim or partial Awards have been issued, the Arbitrator shall declare the Hearing closed. The Arbitrator may defer the closing of the Hearing until a date determined by the Arbitrator, to permit the Parties to submit post-Hearing briefs, which may be in the form of a letter, and/or to make closing arguments. If post-Hearing briefs are to be submitted, or closing arguments are to be made, the Hearing shall be deemed closed upon receipt by the Arbitrator of such briefs or at the conclusion of such closing arguments, whichever is later.

(i) At any time before the Award is rendered, the Arbitrator may, *sua sponte* or on application of a Party for good cause shown, reopen the Hearing. If the Hearing is reopened, the time to render the Award shall be calculated from the date the reopened Hearing is declared closed by the Arbitrator.

(j) The Arbitrator may proceed with the Hearing in the absence of a Party that, after receiving notice of the Hearing pursuant to Rule 19, fails to attend. The Arbitrator may not render an Award solely on the basis of the default or absence of the Party, but shall require any Party seeking relief to submit such evidence as the Arbitrator may require for the rendering of an Award. If the Arbitrator reasonably believes that a Party will not attend the Hearing, the Arbitrator may schedule the Hearing as a telephonic Hearing and may receive the evidence necessary to render an Award by affidavit. The notice of Hearing shall specify if it will be in person or telephonic.

(k) Any Party may arrange for a stenographic or other record to be made of the Hearing and shall inform the other Parties in advance of the Hearing.

(i) The requesting Party shall bear the cost of such stenographic record. If all other Parties agree to share the cost of the stenographic record, it shall be made available to the Arbitrator and may be used in the proceeding.

(ii) If there is no agreement to share the cost, the stenographic record may not be provided to the Arbitrator and may not be used in the proceeding, unless the Party arranging for the stenographic record agrees to provide access to the stenographic record either at no charge or on terms that are acceptable to the Parties and the reporting service.

(iii) If the Parties agree to the Optional Arbitration Appeal Procedure (see Rule 34), they shall, if possible, ensure that a stenographic or other record is made of the Hearing.

(iv) The Parties may agree that the cost of the stenographic record shall or shall not be allocated by the Arbitrator in the Award.

Rule 23. Waiver of Hearing

The Parties may agree to waive the oral Hearing and submit the dispute to the Arbitrator for an Award based on written submissions and other evidence as the Parties may agree.

Rule 24. Awards

(a) The Arbitrator shall render a Final Award or a Partial Final Award within thirty (30) calendar days after the date of the close of the Hearing, as defined in Rule 22(h) or (i), or, if a Hearing has been waived, within thirty (30) calendar days after the receipt by the Arbitrator of all materials specified by the Parties, except (1) by the agreement of the Parties; (2) upon good cause for an extension of time to render the Award; or (3) as provided in Rule 22(i). The Arbitrator shall provide the Final Award or the Partial Final Award to JAMS for issuance in accordance with this Rule.

(b) Where a panel of Arbitrators has heard the dispute, the decision and Award of a majority of the panel shall constitute the Arbitration Award.

(c) In determining the merits of the dispute, the Arbitrator shall be guided by the rules of law agreed upon by the Parties. In the absence of such agreement, the Arbitrator will be guided by the law or the rules of law that he or she deems to be most appropriate. The Arbitrator may grant any remedy or relief that is just and

equitable and within the scope of the Parties' agreement, including, but not limited to, specific performance of a contract or any other equitable or legal remedy.

(d) In addition to a Final Award or Partial Final Award, the Arbitrator may make other decisions, including interim or partial rulings, orders and Awards.

(e) Interim Measures. The Arbitrator may grant whatever interim measures are deemed necessary, including injunctive relief and measures for the protection or conservation of property and disposition of disposable goods. Such interim measures may take the form of an interim or Partial Final Award, and the Arbitrator may require security for the costs of such measures. Any recourse by a Party to a court for interim or provisional relief shall not be deemed incompatible with the agreement to arbitrate or a waiver of the right to arbitrate.

(f) The Award of the Arbitrator may allocate Arbitration fees and Arbitrator compensation and expenses, unless such an allocation is expressly prohibited by the Parties' Agreement or by applicable law. (Such a prohibition may not limit the power of the Arbitrator to allocate Arbitration fees and Arbitrator compensation and expenses pursuant to Rule 31(c).)

(g) The Award of the Arbitrator may allocate attorneys' fees and expenses and interest (at such rate and from such date as the Arbitrator may deem appropriate) if provided by the Parties' Agreement or allowed by applicable law. When the Arbitrator is authorized to award attorneys' fees and must determine the reasonable amount of such fees, he or she may consider whether the failure of a Party to cooperate reasonably in the discovery process and/or comply with the Arbitrator's discovery orders caused delay to the proceeding or additional costs to the other Parties.

(h) The Award shall consist of a written statement signed by the Arbitrator regarding the disposition of each claim and the relief, if any, as to each claim. The Award shall also contain a concise written statement of the reasons for the Award, stating the essential findings and conclusions on which the Award is based. The Parties may agree to any other form of Award, unless the Arbitration is based on an arbitration agreement that is required as a condition of employment.

(i) After the Award has been rendered, and provided the Parties have complied with Rule 31, the Award shall be issued by serving copies on the Parties. Service may be made by U.S. mail. It need not be sent certified or registered.

(j) Within seven (7) calendar days after service of a Partial Final Award or Final Award by JAMS, any Party may serve upon the other Parties and on JAMS a request that the Arbitrator correct any computational, typographical or other similar error in an Award (including the reallocation of fees pursuant to Rule 31 or

on account of the effect of an offer to allow judgment), or the Arbitrator may *sua sponte* propose to correct such errors in an Award. A Party opposing such correction shall have seven (7) calendar days thereafter in which to file any objection. The Arbitrator may make any necessary and appropriate corrections to the Award within twenty-one (21) calendar days of receiving a request or fourteen (14) calendar days after his or her proposal to do so. The Arbitrator may extend the time within which to make corrections upon good cause. The corrected Award shall be served upon the Parties in the same manner as the Award.

(k) The Award is considered final, for purposes of either the Optional Arbitration Appeal Procedure pursuant to Rule 34 or a judicial proceeding to enforce, modify or vacate the Award pursuant to Rule 25, fourteen (14) calendar days after service is deemed effective if no request for a correction is made, or as of the effective date of service of a corrected Award.

Rule 25. Enforcement of the Award

Proceedings to enforce, confirm, modify or vacate an Award will be controlled by and conducted in conformity with the Federal Arbitration Act, 9 U.S.C. Sec 1, *et seq.*, or applicable state law. The Parties to an Arbitration under these Rules shall be deemed to have consented that judgment upon the Award may be entered in any court having jurisdiction thereof.

Rule 26. Confidentiality and Privacy

(a) JAMS and the Arbitrator shall maintain the confidential nature of the Arbitration proceeding and the Award, including the Hearing, except as necessary in connection with a judicial challenge to or enforcement of an Award, or unless otherwise required by law or judicial decision.

(b) The Arbitrator may issue orders to protect the confidentiality of proprietary information, trade secrets or other sensitive information.

(c) Subject to the discretion of the Arbitrator or agreement of the Parties, any person having a direct interest in the Arbitration may attend the Arbitration Hearing. The Arbitrator may exclude any non-Party from any part of a Hearing.

Rule 27. Waiver

(a) If a Party becomes aware of a violation of or failure to comply with these Rules and fails promptly to object in writing, the objection will be deemed waived,

unless the Arbitrator determines that waiver will cause substantial injustice or hardship.

(b) If any Party becomes aware of information that could be the basis of a challenge for cause to the continued service of the Arbitrator, such challenge must be made promptly, in writing, to the Arbitrator or JAMS. Failure to do so shall constitute a waiver of any objection to continued service by the Arbitrator.

Rule 28. Settlement and Consent Award

(a) The Parties may agree, at any stage of the Arbitration process, to submit the case to JAMS for mediation. The JAMS mediator assigned to the case may not be the Arbitrator or a member of the Appeal Panel, unless the Parties so agree, pursuant to Rule 28(b).

(b) The Parties may agree to seek the assistance of the Arbitrator in reaching settlement. By their written agreement to submit the matter to the Arbitrator for settlement assistance, the Parties will be deemed to have agreed that the assistance of the Arbitrator in such settlement efforts will not disqualify the Arbitrator from continuing to serve as Arbitrator if settlement is not reached; nor shall such assistance be argued to a reviewing court as the basis for vacating or modifying an Award.

(c) If, at any stage of the Arbitration process, all Parties agree upon a settlement of the issues in dispute and request the Arbitrator to embody the agreement in a Consent Award, the Arbitrator shall comply with such request, unless the Arbitrator believes the terms of the agreement are illegal or undermine the integrity of the Arbitration process. If the Arbitrator is concerned about the possible consequences of the proposed Consent Award, he or she shall inform the Parties of that concern and may request additional specific information from the Parties regarding the proposed Consent Award. The Arbitrator may refuse to enter the proposed Consent Award and may withdraw from the case.

Rule 29. Sanctions

The Arbitrator may order appropriate sanctions for failure of a Party to comply with its obligations under any of these Rules or with an order of the Arbitrator. These sanctions may include, but are not limited to, assessment of Arbitration fees and Arbitrator compensation and expenses; any other costs occasioned by the actionable conduct, including reasonable attorneys' fees; exclusion of certain evidence; drawing adverse inferences; or, in extreme cases, determining

an issue or issues submitted to Arbitration adversely to the Party that has failed to comply.

Rule 30. Disqualification of the Arbitrator as a Witness or Party and Exclusion of Liability

(a) The Parties may not call the Arbitrator, the Case Manager or any other JAMS employee or agent as a witness or as an expert in any pending or subsequent litigation or other proceeding involving the Parties and relating to the dispute that is the subject of the Arbitration. The Arbitrator, Case Manager and other JAMS employees and agents are also incompetent to testify as witnesses or experts in any such proceeding.

(b) The Parties shall defend and/or pay the cost (including any attorneys' fees) of defending the Arbitrator, Case Manager and/or JAMS from any subpoenas from outside parties arising from the Arbitration.

(c) The Parties agree that neither the Arbitrator, nor the Case Manager, nor JAMS is a necessary Party in any litigation or other proceeding relating to the Arbitration or the subject matter of the Arbitration, and neither the Arbitrator, nor the Case Manager, nor JAMS, including its employees or agents, shall be liable to any Party for any act or omission in connection with any Arbitration conducted under these Rules, including, but not limited to, any disqualification of or recusal by the Arbitrator.

Rule 31. Fees

(a) Except as provided in paragraph (c) below, unless the Parties have agreed to a different allocation, each Party shall pay its *pro rata* share of JAMS fees and expenses as set forth in the JAMS fee schedule in effect at the time of the commencement of the Arbitration. To the extent possible, the allocation of such fees and expenses shall not be disclosed to the Arbitrator. JAMS' agreement to render services is jointly with the Party and the attorney or other representative of the Party in the Arbitration. The non-payment of fees may result in an administrative suspension of the case in accordance with Rule 6(c).

(b) JAMS requires that the Parties deposit the fees and expenses for the Arbitration from time to time during the course of the proceedings and prior to the Hearing. The Arbitrator may preclude a Party that has failed to deposit its *pro rata* or agreed-upon share of the fees and expenses from offering evidence of any affirmative claim at the Hearing.

(c) If an Arbitration is based on a clause or agreement that is required as a condition of employment, the only fee that an employee may be required to pay is the initial JAMS Case Management Fee. JAMS does not preclude an employee from contributing to administrative and Arbitrator fees and expenses. If an Arbitration is not based on a clause or agreement that is required as a condition of employment, the Parties are jointly and severally liable for the payment of JAMS Arbitration fees and Arbitrator compensation and expenses. In the event that one Party has paid more than its share of such fees, compensation and expenses, the Arbitrator may award against any other Party any such fees, compensation and expenses that such Party owes with respect to the Arbitration.

(d) Entities whose interests are not adverse with respect to the issues in dispute shall be treated as a single Party for purposes of JAMS' assessment of fees. JAMS shall determine whether the interests between entities are adverse for purpose of fees, considering such factors as whether the entities are represented by the same attorney and whether the entities are presenting joint or separate positions at the Arbitration.

Rule 32. Bracketed (or High-Low) Arbitration Option

(a) At any time before the issuance of the Arbitration Award, the Parties may agree, in writing, on minimum and maximum amounts of damages that may be awarded on each claim or on all claims in the aggregate. The Parties shall promptly notify JAMS and provide to JAMS a copy of their written agreement setting forth the agreed-upon minimum and maximum amounts.

(b) JAMS shall not inform the Arbitrator of the agreement to proceed with this option or of the agreed-upon minimum and maximum levels without the consent of the Parties.

(c) The Arbitrator shall render the Award in accordance with Rule 24.

(d) In the event that the Award of the Arbitrator is between the agreed-upon minimum and maximum amounts, the Award shall become final as is. In the event that the Award is below the agreed-upon minimum amount, the final Award issued shall be corrected to reflect the agreed-upon minimum amount. In the event that the Award is above the agreed-upon maximum amount, the final Award issued shall be corrected to reflect the agreed-upon maximum amount.

Rule 33. Final Offer (or Baseball) Arbitration Option

(a) Upon agreement of the Parties to use the option set forth in this Rule, at least seven (7) calendar days before the Arbitration Hearing, the Parties shall exchange and provide to JAMS written proposals for the amount of money damages they would offer or demand, as applicable, and that they believe to be appropriate based on the standard set forth in Rule 24(c). JAMS shall promptly provide copies of the Parties' proposals to the Arbitrator, unless the Parties agree that they should not be provided to the Arbitrator. At any time prior to the close of the Arbitration Hearing, the Parties may exchange revised written proposals or demands, which shall supersede all prior proposals. The revised written proposals shall be provided to JAMS, which shall promptly provide them to the Arbitrator, unless the Parties agree otherwise.

(b) If the Arbitrator has been informed of the written proposals, in rendering the Award, the Arbitrator shall choose between the Parties' last proposals, selecting the proposal that the Arbitrator finds most reasonable and appropriate in light of the standard set forth in Rule 24(c). This provision modifies Rule 24(h) in that no written statement of reasons shall accompany the Award.

(c) If the Arbitrator has not been informed of the written proposals, the Arbitrator shall render the Award as if pursuant to Rule 24, except that the Award shall thereafter be corrected to conform to the closest of the last proposals and the closest of the last proposals will become the Award.

(d) Other than as provided herein, the provisions of Rule 24 shall be applicable.

Rule 34. Optional Arbitration Appeal Procedure

The Parties may agree at any time to the JAMS Optional Arbitration Appeal Procedure. All Parties must agree in writing for such procedures to be effective. Once a Party has agreed to the Optional Arbitration Appeal Procedure, it cannot unilaterally withdraw from it, unless it withdraws, pursuant to Rule 13, from the Arbitration.

Insert the following at the end of Article I of the UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules on page 186 of the Documentary Supplement:

4. For investor-State arbitration initiated pursuant to a treaty providing for the protection of investments or investors, these Rules include the UNCITRAL Rules on Transparency in Treaty-based Investor-State Arbitration (“Rules on Transparency”), subject to article 1 of the Rules on Transparency.

Insert the following after the UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules on page 196 of the Documentary Supplement:

**UNCITRAL Rules on Transparency
in Treaty-based Investor-State Arbitration (2013)**

Article 1 — Scope of application

Applicability of the Rules

1. The UNCITRAL Rules on Transparency in Treaty-based Investor-State Arbitration (“Rules on Transparency”) shall apply to investor-State arbitration initiated under the UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules pursuant to a treaty providing for the protection of investments or investors (“treaty”)¹ concluded on or after 1st April 2014, unless the Parties to the treaty² have agreed otherwise.

2. In investor-State arbitrations initiated under the UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules pursuant to a treaty concluded before 1st April 2014, these Rules shall apply only when:

(a) the parties to an arbitration (the “disputing parties”) agree to their application in respect of that arbitration; or,

(b) the Parties to the treaty or, in the case of a multilateral treaty, the State of the claimant and the respondent State, have agreed after 1st April 2014 to their application.

Application of the Rules

3. In any arbitration in which the Rules on Transparency apply pursuant to a treaty or to an agreement by the Parties to that treaty:

¹ For the purpose of the Rules on Transparency, a ‘treaty’ shall be understood broadly as encompassing any bilateral or multilateral treaty that contains provisions on the protection of investments or investors and a right for investors to resort to arbitration against Parties to the treaty, including any treaty commonly referred to as a free trade agreement, economic integration agreement, trade and investment framework or cooperation agreement, or bilateral investment treaty.

² For the purpose of the Rules on Transparency, any reference to a ‘Party to the treaty’ or a ‘State’ includes, for example, a regional economic integration organization where it is a Party to the treaty.

(a) the disputing parties may not derogate from these Rules, by agreement or otherwise, unless permitted to do so by the treaty;

(b) the arbitral tribunal shall have the power, beside its discretionary authority under certain provisions of these Rules, to adapt the requirements of any specific provision of these Rules to the particular circumstances of the case, after consultation with the disputing parties, if such adaptation is necessary to conduct the arbitration in a practical manner and is consistent with the transparency objective of these Rules.

Discretion and authority of the arbitral tribunal

4. Where the Rules on Transparency provide for the arbitral tribunal to exercise discretion, the arbitral tribunal in exercising such discretion shall take into account:

(a) the public interest in transparency in treaty-based investor-State arbitration and in the particular arbitral proceedings; and

(b) the disputing parties' interest in a fair and efficient resolution of their dispute.

5. These Rules shall not affect any authority that the arbitral tribunal may otherwise have under the UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules to conduct the arbitration in such a manner as to promote transparency, for example by accepting submissions from third persons.

6. In the presence of any conduct, measure or other action having the effect of wholly undermining the transparency objectives of these Rules, the arbitral tribunal shall ensure that those objectives prevail.

Applicable instrument in case of conflict

7. Where the Rules on Transparency apply, they shall supplement any applicable arbitration rules. Where there is a conflict between the Rules on Transparency and the applicable arbitration rules, the Rules on Transparency shall prevail. Notwithstanding any provision in these Rules, where there is a conflict between the Rules on Transparency and the treaty, the provisions of the treaty shall prevail.

8. Where any of these Rules is in conflict with a provision of the law applicable to the arbitration from which the disputing parties cannot derogate, that provision shall prevail.

Application in non-UNCITRAL arbitrations

9. These Rules are available for use in investor-State arbitrations initiated under rules other than the UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules or in ad hoc proceedings.

Article 2. Publication of information at the commencement of arbitral proceedings

Once the notice of arbitration has been received by the respondent, each of the disputing parties shall promptly communicate a copy of the notice of arbitration to the repository referred to under article 8. Upon receipt of the notice of arbitration from the respondent, or upon receipt of the notice of arbitration and a record of its transmission to the respondent, the repository shall promptly make available to the public information regarding the name of the disputing parties, the economic sector involved, and the treaty under which the claim is being made.

Article 3. Publication of documents

1. Subject to article 7, the following documents shall be made available to the public: the notice of arbitration, the response to the notice of arbitration, the statement of claim, the statement of defence and any further written statements or written submissions by any disputing party; a table listing all exhibits to the aforesaid documents and to expert reports and witness statements, if such table has been prepared for the proceedings, but not the exhibits themselves; any written submissions by the non-disputing Party(ies) to the treaty and by third persons, transcripts of hearings, where available; and orders, decisions and awards of the arbitral tribunal.

2. Subject to article 7, expert reports and witness statements, exclusive of the exhibits thereto, shall be made available to the public, upon request by any person to the arbitral tribunal.

3. Subject to article 7, the arbitral tribunal may decide, on its own initiative or upon request from any person, and after consultation with the disputing parties, whether and how to make available exhibits and any other documents provided to, or issued by, the arbitral tribunal not falling within paragraphs 1 or 2 above. This may include, for example, making such documents available at a specified site.

4. The documents to be made available to the public pursuant to paragraphs 1 and 2 shall be communicated by the arbitral tribunal to the repository referred to under article 8 as soon as possible, subject to any relevant arrangements or time limits for the protection of confidential or protected information prescribed under

article 7. The documents to be made available pursuant to paragraph 3 may be communicated by the arbitral tribunal to the repository referred to under article 8 as they become available and, if applicable, in a redacted form in accordance with article 7. The repository shall make all documents available in a timely manner, in the form and in the language in which it receives them.

5. A person granted access to documents under paragraph 3 shall bear any administrative costs of making those documents available to that person, such as the cost of photocopying or shipping documents to that person, but not the costs of making those documents available to the public through the repository.

Article 4. Submission by a third person

1. After consultation with the disputing parties, the arbitral tribunal may allow a person that is not a disputing party, and not a non-disputing Party to the treaty, (“third person(s)”) to file a written submission with the arbitral tribunal regarding a matter within the scope of the dispute.

2. A third person wishing to make a submission shall apply to the arbitral tribunal, and shall, in a concise written statement, which is in a language of the arbitration and complies with any page limits set by the arbitral tribunal:

(a) describe the third person, including, where relevant, its membership and legal status (e.g., trade association or other non-governmental organization), its general objectives, the nature of its activities, and any parent organization (including any organization that directly or indirectly controls the third person);

(b) disclose any connection, direct or indirect, which the third person has with any disputing party;

(c) provide information on any government, person or organization that has provided to the third person (i) any financial or other assistance in preparing the submission; or (ii) substantial assistance in either of the two years preceding the application by the third person under this article (e.g. funding around 20 per cent of its overall operations annually);

(d) describe the nature of the interest that the third person has in the arbitration; and

(e) identify the specific issues of fact or law in the arbitration that the third person wishes to address in its written submission.

3. In determining whether to allow such a submission, the arbitral tribunal shall take into consideration, among other factors it determines to be relevant:

(a) whether the third person has a significant interest in the arbitral proceedings; and

(b) the extent to which the submission would assist the arbitral tribunal in the determination of a factual or legal issue related to the arbitral proceedings by bringing a perspective, particular knowledge or insight that is different from that of the disputing parties.

4. The submission filed by the third person shall:

(a) be dated and signed by the person filing the submission on behalf of the third person;

(b) be concise, and in no case longer than as authorized by the arbitral tribunal;

(c) set out a precise statement of the third person's position on issues; and

(d) only address matters within the scope of the dispute.

5. The arbitral tribunal shall ensure that any submission does not disrupt or unduly burden the arbitral proceedings, or unfairly prejudice any disputing party.

6. The arbitral tribunal shall ensure that the disputing parties are given a reasonable opportunity to present their observations on any submission by the third person.

Article 5. Submission by a non-disputing Party to the treaty

1. The arbitral tribunal shall, subject to paragraph 4, allow, or, after consultation with the disputing parties, may invite submissions on issues of treaty interpretation from a non-disputing Party to the treaty.

2. The arbitral tribunal, after consultation with the disputing parties, may allow submissions on further matters within the scope of the dispute from a non-disputing Party to the treaty. In determining whether to allow such submissions, the arbitral tribunal shall take into consideration, among other factors it determines to be relevant, the factors referred to in article 4, paragraph 3, and, for

greater certainty, the need to avoid submissions which would support the claim of the investor in a manner tantamount to diplomatic protection.

3. The arbitral tribunal shall not draw any inference from the absence of any submission or response to any invitation pursuant to paragraphs 1 or 2.

4. The arbitral tribunal shall ensure that any submission does not disrupt or unduly burden the arbitral proceedings, or unfairly prejudice any disputing party.

5. The arbitral tribunal shall ensure that the disputing parties are given a reasonable opportunity to present their observations on any submission by a non-disputing Party to the treaty.

Article 6. Hearings

1. Subject to article 6, paragraphs 2 and 3, hearings for the presentation of evidence or for oral argument (“hearings”) shall be public.

2. Where there is a need to protect confidential information or the integrity of the arbitral process pursuant to article 7, the arbitral tribunal shall make arrangements to hold in private that part of the hearing requiring such protection.

3. The arbitral tribunal shall make logistical arrangements to facilitate the public access to hearings (including where appropriate by organizing attendance through video links or such other means as it deems appropriate). However, the arbitral tribunal may, after consultation with the disputing parties, decide to hold all or part of the hearings in private where this becomes necessary for logistical reasons, such as when the circumstances render any original arrangement for public access to a hearing infeasible.

Article 7. Exceptions to transparency

Confidential or protected information

1. Confidential or protected information, as defined in paragraph 2 and as identified pursuant to the arrangements referred to in paragraphs 3 and 4, shall not be made available to the public pursuant to articles 2 to 6.

2. Confidential or protected information consists of:

(a) confidential business information;

(b) information that is protected against being made available to the public under the treaty;

(c) information that is protected against being made available to the public, in the case of the information of the respondent State, under the law of the respondent State, and in the case of other information, under any law or rules determined by the arbitral tribunal to be applicable to the disclosure of such information; or

(d) information the disclosure of which would impede law enforcement.

3. The arbitral tribunal, after consultation with the disputing parties, shall make arrangements to prevent any confidential or protected information from being made available to the public including by putting in place, as appropriate:

(a) time limits in which a disputing party, non-disputing Party to the treaty, or third person shall give notice that it seeks protection for such information in documents;

(b) procedures for the prompt designation and redaction of the particular confidential or protected information in such documents; and

(c) procedures for holding hearings in private to the extent required by article 6, paragraph 2.

Any determination as to whether information is confidential or protected shall be made by the arbitral tribunal after consultation with the disputing parties.

4. Where the arbitral tribunal determines that information should not be redacted from a document, or that a document should not be prevented from being made available to the public, any disputing party, non-disputing Party to the treaty or third person that voluntarily introduced the document into the record shall be permitted to withdraw all or part of the document from the record of the arbitral proceedings.

5. Nothing in these Rules requires a respondent State to make available to the public information the disclosure of which it considers to be contrary to its essential security interests.

Integrity of the arbitral process

6. Information shall not be made available to the public pursuant to articles 2 to 6 where the information, if made available to the public, would jeopardise the integrity of the arbitral process as determined pursuant to paragraph 7.

7. The arbitral tribunal may, on its own initiative or upon the application of a disputing party, after consultation with the disputing parties where practicable, take appropriate measures to restrain or delay the publication of information where such publication would jeopardise the integrity of the arbitral process because it could hamper the collection or production of evidence, lead to the intimidation of witnesses, lawyers acting for disputing parties, or members of the arbitral tribunal, or in comparably exceptional circumstances.

Article 8. Repository of published information

The repository of published information under the Rules on Transparency shall be the Secretary-General of the United Nations, or an institution named by UNCITRAL.

Replace the AAA/ICDR International Arbitration Rules on pages 197-213 of the Documentary Supplement with the following:

**AMERICAN ARBITRATION ASSOCIATION
INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION
INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION RULES***

**Rules Amended and Effective June 1, 2014
Cost Schedule Amended and Effective July 1, 2016**

Article 1: Scope of These Rules

1. Where parties have agreed to arbitrate disputes under these International Arbitration Rules (“Rules”), or have provided for arbitration of an international dispute by the International Centre for Dispute Resolution (ICDR) or the American Arbitration Association (AAA) without designating particular rules, the arbitration shall take place in accordance with these Rules as in effect at the date of commencement of the arbitration, subject to modifications that the parties may adopt in writing. The ICDR is the Administrator of these Rules.

2. These Rules govern the arbitration, except that, where any such rule is in conflict with any provision of the law applicable to the arbitration from which the parties cannot derogate, that provision shall prevail.

3. When parties agree to arbitrate under these Rules, or when they provide for arbitration of an international dispute by the ICDR or the AAA without designating particular rules, they thereby authorize the ICDR to administer the arbitration. These Rules specify the duties and responsibilities of the ICDR, a division of the AAA, as the Administrator. The Administrator may provide services through any of the ICDR’s case management offices or through the facilities of the AAA or arbitral institutions with which the ICDR or the AAA has agreements of cooperation. Arbitrations administered under these Rules shall be administered only by the ICDR or by an individual or organization authorized by the ICDR to do so.

4. Unless the parties agree or the Administrator determines otherwise, the International Expedited Procedures shall apply in any case in which no disclosed claim or counterclaim exceeds USD \$250,000 exclusive of interest and the costs of arbitration. The parties may also agree to use the International Expedited Procedures in other cases. The International Expedited Procedures shall be applied as described in Articles E-1 through E-10 of these Rules, in addition to any other

* Copyright © 2015 by the American Arbitration Association. Reprinted with permission.

portion of these Rules that is not in conflict with the Expedited Procedures. Where no party's claim or counterclaim exceeds USD \$100,000 exclusive of interest, attorneys' fees, and other arbitration costs, the dispute shall be resolved by written submissions only unless the arbitrator determines that an oral hearing is necessary.

Commencing the Arbitration

Article 2: Notice of Arbitration

1. The party initiating arbitration ("Claimant") shall, in compliance with Article 10, give written Notice of Arbitration to the Administrator and at the same time to the party against whom a claim is being made ("Respondent"). The Claimant may also initiate the arbitration through the Administrator's online filing system located at www.icdr.org.

2. The arbitration shall be deemed to commence on the date on which the Administrator receives the Notice of Arbitration.

3. The Notice of Arbitration shall contain the following information:

- a. a demand that the dispute be referred to arbitration;
- b. the names, addresses, telephone numbers, fax numbers, and email addresses of the parties and, if known, of their representatives;
- c. a copy of the entire arbitration clause or agreement being invoked, and, where claims are made under more than one arbitration agreement, a copy of the arbitration agreement under which each claim is made;
- d. a reference to any contract out of or in relation to which the dispute arises;
- e. a description of the claim and of the facts supporting it;
- f. the relief or remedy sought and any amount claimed; and
- g. optionally, proposals, consistent with any prior agreement between or among the parties, as to the means of designating the arbitrators, the number of arbitrators, the place of arbitration, the language(s) of the arbitration, and any interest in mediating the dispute.

4. The Notice of Arbitration shall be accompanied by the appropriate filing fee.

5. Upon receipt of the Notice of Arbitration, the Administrator shall communicate with all parties with respect to the arbitration and shall acknowledge the commencement of the arbitration.

Article 3: Answer and Counterclaim

1. Within 30 days after the commencement of the arbitration, Respondent shall submit to Claimant, to any other parties, and to the Administrator a written Answer to the Notice of Arbitration.

2. At the time Respondent submits its Answer, Respondent may make any counterclaims covered by the agreement to arbitrate or assert any setoffs and Claimant shall within 30 days submit to Respondent, to any other parties, and to the Administrator a written Answer to the counterclaim or setoffs.

3. A counterclaim or setoff shall contain the same information required of a Notice of Arbitration under Article 2(3) and shall be accompanied by the appropriate filing fee.

4. Respondent shall within 30 days after the commencement of the arbitration submit to Claimant, to any other parties, and to the Administrator a response to any proposals by Claimant not previously agreed upon, or submit its own proposals, consistent with any prior agreement between or among the parties, as to the means of designating the arbitrators, the number of arbitrators, the place of the arbitration, the language(s) of the arbitration, and any interest in mediating the dispute.

5. The arbitral tribunal, or the Administrator if the tribunal has not yet been constituted, may extend any of the time limits established in this Article if it considers such an extension justified.

6. Failure of Respondent to submit an Answer shall not preclude the arbitration from proceeding.

7. In arbitrations with multiple parties, Respondent may make claims or assert setoffs against another Respondent and Claimant may make claims or assert setoffs against another Claimant in accordance with the provisions of this Article 3.

Article 4: Administrative Conference

The Administrator may conduct an administrative conference before the arbitral tribunal is constituted to facilitate party discussion and agreement on

issues such as arbitrator selection, mediating the dispute, process efficiencies, and any other administrative matters.

Article 5: Mediation

Following the time for submission of an Answer, the Administrator may invite the parties to mediate in accordance with the ICDR's International Mediation Rules. At any stage of the proceedings, the parties may agree to mediate in accordance with the ICDR's International Mediation Rules. Unless the parties agree otherwise, the mediation shall proceed concurrently with arbitration and the mediator shall not be an arbitrator appointed to the case.

Article 6: Emergency Measures of Protection

1. A party may apply for emergency relief before the constitution of the arbitral tribunal by submitting a written notice to the Administrator and to all other parties setting forth the nature of the relief sought, the reasons why such relief is required on an emergency basis, and the reasons why the party is entitled to such relief. The notice shall be submitted concurrent with or following the submission of a Notice of Arbitration. Such notice may be given by email, or as otherwise permitted by Article 10, and must include a statement certifying that all parties have been notified or an explanation of the steps taken in good faith to notify all parties.

2. Within one business day of receipt of the notice as provided in Article 6(1), the Administrator shall appoint a single emergency arbitrator. Prior to accepting appointment, a prospective emergency arbitrator shall, in accordance with Article 13, disclose to the Administrator any circumstances that may give rise to justifiable doubts as to the arbitrator's impartiality or independence. Any challenge to the appointment of the emergency arbitrator must be made within one business day of the communication by the Administrator to the parties of the appointment of the emergency arbitrator and the circumstances disclosed.

3. The emergency arbitrator shall as soon as possible, and in any event within two business days of appointment, establish a schedule for consideration of the application for emergency relief. Such schedule shall provide a reasonable opportunity to all parties to be heard and may provide for proceedings by telephone, video, written submissions, or other suitable means, as alternatives to an in-person hearing. The emergency arbitrator shall have the authority vested in the arbitral tribunal under Article 19, including the authority to rule on her/his own jurisdiction, and shall resolve any disputes over the applicability of this Article.

4. The emergency arbitrator shall have the power to order or award any interim or conservancy measures that the emergency arbitrator deems necessary,

including injunctive relief and measures for the protection or conservation of property. Any such measures may take the form of an interim award or of an order. The emergency arbitrator shall give reasons in either case. The emergency arbitrator may modify or vacate the interim award or order. Any interim award or order shall have the same effect as an interim measure made pursuant to Article 24 and shall be binding on the parties when rendered. The parties shall undertake to comply with such an interim award or order without delay.

5. The emergency arbitrator shall have no further power to act after the arbitral tribunal is constituted. Once the tribunal has been constituted, the tribunal may reconsider, modify, or vacate the interim award or order of emergency relief issued by the emergency arbitrator. The emergency arbitrator may not serve as a member of the tribunal unless the parties agree otherwise.

6. Any interim award or order of emergency relief may be conditioned on provision of appropriate security by the party seeking such relief.

7. A request for interim measures addressed by a party to a judicial authority shall not be deemed incompatible with this Article 6 or with the agreement to arbitrate or a waiver of the right to arbitrate.

8. The costs associated with applications for emergency relief shall be addressed by the emergency arbitrator, subject to the power of the arbitral tribunal to determine finally the allocation of such costs.

Article 7: Joinder

1. A party wishing to join an additional party to the arbitration shall submit to the Administrator a Notice of Arbitration against the additional party. No additional party may be joined after the appointment of any arbitrator, unless all parties, including the additional party, otherwise agree. The party wishing to join the additional party shall, at that same time, submit the Notice of Arbitration to the additional party and all other parties. The date on which such Notice of Arbitration is received by the Administrator shall be deemed to be the date of the commencement of arbitration against the additional party. Any joinder shall be subject to the provisions of Articles 12 and 19.

2. The request for joinder shall contain the same information required of a Notice of Arbitration under Article 2(3) and shall be accompanied by the appropriate filing fee.

3. The additional party shall submit an Answer in accordance with the provisions of Article 3.

4. The additional party may make claims, counterclaims, or assert setoffs against any other party in accordance with the provisions of Article 3.

Article 8: Consolidation

1. At the request of a party, the Administrator may appoint a consolidation arbitrator, who will have the power to consolidate two or more arbitrations pending under these Rules, or these and other arbitration rules administered by the AAA or ICDR, into a single arbitration where:

- a. the parties have expressly agreed to consolidation; or
- b. all of the claims and counterclaims in the arbitrations are made under the same arbitration agreement; or
- c. the claims, counterclaims, or setoffs in the arbitrations are made under more than one arbitration agreement; the arbitrations involve the same parties; the disputes in the arbitrations arise in connection with the same legal relationship; and the consolidation arbitrator finds the arbitration agreements to be compatible.

2. A consolidation arbitrator shall be appointed as follows:

- a. The Administrator shall notify the parties in writing of its intention to appoint a consolidation arbitrator and invite the parties to agree upon a procedure for the appointment of a consolidation arbitrator.
- b. If the parties have not within 15 days of such notice agreed upon a procedure for appointment of a consolidation arbitrator, the Administrator shall appoint the consolidation arbitrator.
- c. Absent the agreement of all parties, the consolidation arbitrator shall not be an arbitrator who is appointed to any pending arbitration subject to potential consolidation under this Article.
- d. The provisions of Articles 13-15 of these Rules shall apply to the appointment of the consolidation arbitrator.

3. In deciding whether to consolidate, the consolidation arbitrator shall consult the parties and may consult the arbitral tribunal(s) and may take into account all relevant circumstances, including:

- a. applicable law;

b. whether one or more arbitrators have been appointed in more than one of the arbitrations and, if so, whether the same or different persons have been appointed;

c. the progress already made in the arbitrations;

d. whether the arbitrations raise common issues of law and/or facts;
and

e. whether the consolidation of the arbitrations would serve the interests of justice and efficiency.

4. The consolidation arbitrator may order that any or all arbitrations subject to potential consolidation be stayed pending a ruling on a request for consolidation.

5. When arbitrations are consolidated, they shall be consolidated into the arbitration that commenced first, unless otherwise agreed by all parties or the consolidation arbitrator finds otherwise.

6. Where the consolidation arbitrator decides to consolidate an arbitration with one or more other arbitrations, each party in those arbitrations shall be deemed to have waived its right to appoint an arbitrator. The consolidation arbitrator may revoke the appointment of any arbitrators and may select one of the previously-appointed tribunals to serve in the consolidated proceeding. The Administrator shall, as necessary, complete the appointment of the tribunal in the consolidated proceeding. Absent the agreement of all parties, the consolidation arbitrator shall not be appointed in the consolidated proceeding.

7. The decision as to consolidation, which need not include a statement of reasons, shall be rendered within 15 days of the date for final submissions on consolidation.

Article 9: Amendment or Supplement of Claim, Counterclaim, or Defense

Any party may amend or supplement its claim, counterclaim, setoff, or defense unless the arbitral tribunal considers it inappropriate to allow such amendment or supplement because of the party's delay in making it, prejudice to the other parties, or any other circumstances. A party may not amend or supplement a claim or counterclaim if the amendment or supplement would fall outside the scope of the agreement to arbitrate. The tribunal may permit an amendment or supplement subject to an award of costs and/or the payment of filing fees as determined by the Administrator.

Article 10: Notices

1. Unless otherwise agreed by the parties or ordered by the arbitral tribunal, all notices and written communications may be transmitted by any means of communication that allows for a record of its transmission including mail, courier, fax, or other written forms of electronic communication addressed to the party or its representative at its last-known address, or by personal service.

2. For the purpose of calculating a period of time under these Rules, such period shall begin to run on the day following the day when a notice is made. If the last day of such period is an official holiday at the place received, the period is extended until the first business day that follows. Official holidays occurring during the running of the period of time are included in calculating the period.

The Tribunal**Article 11: Number of Arbitrators**

If the parties have not agreed on the number of arbitrators, one arbitrator shall be appointed unless the Administrator determines in its discretion that three arbitrators are appropriate because of the size, complexity, or other circumstances of the case.

Article 12: Appointment of Arbitrators

1. The parties may agree upon any procedure for appointing arbitrators and shall inform the Administrator as to such procedure. In the absence of party agreement as to the method of appointment, the Administrator may use the ICDR list method as provided in Article 12(6).

2. The parties may agree to select arbitrators, with or without the assistance of the Administrator. When such selections are made, the parties shall take into account the arbitrators' availability to serve and shall notify the Administrator so that a Notice of Appointment can be communicated to the arbitrators, together with a copy of these Rules.

3. If within 45 days after the commencement of the arbitration, all parties have not agreed on a procedure for appointing the arbitrator(s) or have not agreed on the selection of the arbitrator(s), the Administrator shall, at the written request of any party, appoint the arbitrator(s). Where the parties have agreed upon a procedure for selecting the arbitrator(s), but all appointments have not been made within the time limits provided by that procedure, the Administrator shall, at the written request of any party, perform all functions provided for in that procedure that remain to be performed.

4. In making appointments, the Administrator shall, after inviting consultation with the parties, endeavor to appoint suitable arbitrators, taking into account their availability to serve. At the request of any party or on its own initiative, the Administrator may appoint nationals of a country other than that of any of the parties.

5. If there are more than two parties to the arbitration, the Administrator may appoint all arbitrators unless the parties have agreed otherwise no later than 45 days after the commencement of the arbitration.

6. If the parties have not selected an arbitrator(s) and have not agreed upon any other method of appointment, the Administrator, at its discretion, may appoint the arbitrator(s) in the following manner using the ICDR list method. The Administrator shall send simultaneously to each party an identical list of names of persons for consideration as arbitrator(s). The parties are encouraged to agree to an arbitrator(s) from the submitted list and shall advise the Administrator of their agreement. If, after receipt of the list, the parties are unable to agree upon an arbitrator(s), each party shall have 15 days from the transmittal date in which to strike names objected to, number the remaining names in order of preference, and return the list to the Administrator. The parties are not required to exchange selection lists. If a party does not return the list within the time specified, all persons named therein shall be deemed acceptable. From among the persons who have been approved on the parties' lists, and in accordance with the designated order of mutual preference, the Administrator shall invite an arbitrator(s) to serve. If the parties fail to agree on any of the persons listed, or if acceptable arbitrators are unable or unavailable to act, or if for any other reason the appointment cannot be made from the submitted lists, the Administrator shall have the power to make the appointment without the submission of additional lists. The Administrator shall, if necessary, designate the presiding arbitrator in consultation with the tribunal.

7. The appointment of an arbitrator is effective upon receipt by the Administrator of the Administrator's Notice of Appointment completed and signed by the arbitrator.

Article 13: Impartiality and Independence of Arbitrator

1. Arbitrators acting under these Rules shall be impartial and independent and shall act in accordance with the terms of the Notice of Appointment provided by the Administrator.

2. Upon accepting appointment, an arbitrator shall sign the Notice of Appointment provided by the Administrator affirming that the arbitrator is

available to serve and is independent and impartial. The arbitrator shall disclose any circumstances that may give rise to justifiable doubts as to the arbitrator's impartiality or independence and any other relevant facts the arbitrator wishes to bring to the attention of the parties.

3. If, at any stage during the arbitration, circumstances arise that may give rise to such doubts, an arbitrator or party shall promptly disclose such information to all parties and to the Administrator. Upon receipt of such information from an arbitrator or a party, the Administrator shall communicate it to all parties and to the tribunal.

4. Disclosure by an arbitrator or party does not necessarily indicate belief by the arbitrator or party that the disclosed information gives rise to justifiable doubts as to the arbitrator's impartiality or independence.

5. Failure of a party to disclose any circumstances that may give rise to justifiable doubts as to an arbitrator's impartiality or independence within a reasonable period after the party becomes aware of such information constitutes a waiver of the right to challenge an arbitrator based on those circumstances.

6. No party or anyone acting on its behalf shall have any *ex parte* communication relating to the case with any arbitrator, or with any candidate for party-appointed arbitrator, except to advise the candidate of the general nature of the controversy and of the anticipated proceedings and to discuss the candidate's qualifications, availability, or impartiality and independence in relation to the parties, or to discuss the suitability of candidates for selection as a presiding arbitrator where the parties or party-appointed arbitrators are to participate in that selection. No party or anyone acting on its behalf shall have any *ex parte* communication relating to the case with any candidate for presiding arbitrator.

Article 14: Challenge of an Arbitrator

1. A party may challenge an arbitrator whenever circumstances exist that give rise to justifiable doubts as to the arbitrator's impartiality or independence. A party shall send a written notice of the challenge to the Administrator within 15 days after being notified of the appointment of the arbitrator or within 15 days after the circumstances giving rise to the challenge become known to that party. The challenge shall state in writing the reasons for the challenge. The party shall not send this notice to any member of the arbitral tribunal.

2. Upon receipt of such a challenge, the Administrator shall notify the other party of the challenge and give such party an opportunity to respond. The Administrator shall not send the notice of challenge to any member of the tribunal but shall notify the tribunal that a challenge has been received, without identifying

the party challenging. The Administrator may advise the challenged arbitrator of the challenge and request information from the challenged arbitrator relating to the challenge. When an arbitrator has been challenged by a party, the other party may agree to the acceptance of the challenge and, if there is agreement, the arbitrator shall withdraw. The challenged arbitrator, after consultation with the Administrator, also may withdraw in the absence of such agreement. In neither case does withdrawal imply acceptance of the validity of the grounds for the challenge.

3. If the other party does not agree to the challenge or the challenged arbitrator does not withdraw, the Administrator in its sole discretion shall make the decision on the challenge.

4. The Administrator, on its own initiative, may remove an arbitrator for failing to perform his or her duties.

Article 15: Replacement of an Arbitrator

1. If an arbitrator resigns, is incapable of performing the duties of an arbitrator, or is removed for any reason and the office becomes vacant, a substitute arbitrator shall be appointed pursuant to the provisions of Article 12, unless the parties otherwise agree.

2. If a substitute arbitrator is appointed under this Article, unless the parties otherwise agree, the arbitral tribunal shall determine at its sole discretion whether all or part of the case shall be repeated.

3. If an arbitrator on a three-person arbitral tribunal fails to participate in the arbitration for reasons other than those identified in Article 15(1), the two other arbitrators shall have the power in their sole discretion to continue the arbitration and to make any decision, ruling, order, or award, notwithstanding the failure of the third arbitrator to participate. In determining whether to continue the arbitration or to render any decision, ruling, order, or award without the participation of an arbitrator, the two other arbitrators shall take into account the stage of the arbitration, the reason, if any, expressed by the third arbitrator for such non-participation and such other matters as they consider appropriate in the circumstances of the case. In the event that the two other arbitrators determine not to continue the arbitration without the participation of the third arbitrator, the Administrator on proof satisfactory to it shall declare the office vacant, and a substitute arbitrator shall be appointed pursuant to the provisions of Article 12, unless the parties otherwise agree.

General Conditions

Article 16: Party Representation

Any party may be represented in the arbitration. The names, addresses, telephone numbers, fax numbers, and email addresses of representatives shall be communicated in writing to the other party and to the Administrator. Unless instructed otherwise by the Administrator, once the arbitral tribunal has been established, the parties or their representatives may communicate in writing directly with the tribunal with simultaneous copies to the other party and, unless otherwise instructed by the Administrator, to the Administrator. The conduct of party representatives shall be in accordance with such guidelines as the ICDR may issue on the subject.

Article 17: Place of Arbitration

1. If the parties do not agree on the place of arbitration by a date established by the Administrator, the Administrator may initially determine the place of arbitration, subject to the power of the arbitral tribunal to determine finally the place of arbitration within 45 days after its constitution.

2. The tribunal may meet at any place it deems appropriate for any purpose, including to conduct hearings, hold conferences, hear witnesses, inspect property or documents, or deliberate, and, if done elsewhere than the place of arbitration, the arbitration shall be deemed conducted at the place of arbitration and any award shall be deemed made at the place of arbitration.

Article 18: Language of Arbitration

If the parties have not agreed otherwise, the language(s) of the arbitration shall be the language(s) of the documents containing the arbitration agreement, subject to the power of the arbitral tribunal to determine otherwise. The tribunal may order that any documents delivered in another language shall be accompanied by a translation into the language(s) of the arbitration.

Article 19: Arbitral Jurisdiction

1. The arbitral tribunal shall have the power to rule on its own jurisdiction, including any objections with respect to the existence, scope, or validity of the arbitration agreement(s), or with respect to whether all of the claims, counterclaims, and setoffs made in the arbitration may be determined in a single arbitration.

2. The tribunal shall have the power to determine the existence or validity of a contract of which an arbitration clause forms a part. Such an arbitration clause shall be treated as an agreement independent of the other terms of the contract. A decision by the tribunal that the contract is null and void shall not for that reason alone render invalid the arbitration clause.

3. A party must object to the jurisdiction of the tribunal or to arbitral jurisdiction respecting the admissibility of a claim, counterclaim, or setoff no later than the filing of the Answer, as provided in Article 3, to the claim, counterclaim, or setoff that gives rise to the objection. The tribunal may extend such time limit and may rule on any objection under this Article as a preliminary matter or as part of the final award.

4. Issues regarding arbitral jurisdiction raised prior to the constitution of the tribunal shall not preclude the Administrator from proceeding with administration and shall be referred to the tribunal for determination once constituted.

Article 20: Conduct of Proceedings

1. Subject to these Rules, the arbitral tribunal may conduct the arbitration in whatever manner it considers appropriate, provided that the parties are treated with equality and that each party has the right to be heard and is given a fair opportunity to present its case.

2. The tribunal shall conduct the proceedings with a view to expediting the resolution of the dispute. The tribunal may, promptly after being constituted, conduct a preparatory conference with the parties for the purpose of organizing, scheduling, and agreeing to procedures, including the setting of deadlines for any submissions by the parties. In establishing procedures for the case, the tribunal and the parties may consider how technology, including electronic communications, could be used to increase the efficiency and economy of the proceedings.

3. The tribunal may decide preliminary issues, bifurcate proceedings, direct the order of proof, exclude cumulative or irrelevant testimony or other evidence, and direct the parties to focus their presentations on issues whose resolution could dispose of all or part of the case.

4. At any time during the proceedings, the tribunal may order the parties to produce documents, exhibits, or other evidence it deems necessary or appropriate. Unless the parties agree otherwise in writing, the tribunal shall apply Article 21.

5. Documents or information submitted to the tribunal by one party shall at the same time be transmitted by that party to all parties and, unless instructed otherwise by the Administrator, to the Administrator.

6. The tribunal shall determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality, and weight of the evidence.

7. The parties shall make every effort to avoid unnecessary delay and expense in the arbitration. The arbitral tribunal may allocate costs, draw adverse inferences, and take such additional steps as are necessary to protect the efficiency and integrity of the arbitration.

Article 21: Exchange of Information

1. The arbitral tribunal shall manage the exchange of information between the parties with a view to maintaining efficiency and economy. The tribunal and the parties should endeavor to avoid unnecessary delay and expense while at the same time avoiding surprise, assuring equality of treatment, and safeguarding each party's opportunity to present its claims and defenses fairly.

2. The parties may provide the tribunal with their views on the appropriate level of information exchange for each case, but the tribunal retains final authority. To the extent that the parties wish to depart from this Article, they may do so only by written agreement and in consultation with the tribunal.

3. The parties shall exchange all documents upon which each intends to rely on a schedule set by the tribunal.

4. The tribunal may, upon application, require a party to make available to another party documents in that party's possession not otherwise available to the party seeking the documents, that are reasonably believed to exist and to be relevant and material to the outcome of the case. Requests for documents shall contain a description of specific documents or classes of documents, along with an explanation of their relevance and materiality to the outcome of the case.

5. The tribunal may condition any exchange of information subject to claims of commercial or technical confidentiality on appropriate measures to protect such confidentiality.

6. When documents to be exchanged are maintained in electronic form, the party in possession of such documents may make them available in the form (which may be paper copies) most convenient and economical for it, unless the tribunal determines, on application, that there is a compelling need for access to the documents in a different form. Requests for documents maintained in electronic

form should be narrowly focused and structured to make searching for them as economical as possible. The tribunal may direct testing or other means of focusing and limiting any search.

7. The tribunal may, on application, require a party to permit inspection on reasonable notice of relevant premises or objects.

8. In resolving any dispute about pre-hearing exchanges of information, the tribunal shall require a requesting party to justify the time and expense that its request may involve and may condition granting such a request on the payment of part or all of the cost by the party seeking the information. The tribunal may also allocate the costs of providing information among the parties, either in an interim order or in an award.

9. In the event a party fails to comply with an order for information exchange, the tribunal may draw adverse inferences and may take such failure into account in allocating costs.

10. Depositions, interrogatories, and requests to admit as developed for use in U.S. court procedures generally are not appropriate procedures for obtaining information in an arbitration under these Rules.

Article 22: Privilege

The arbitral tribunal shall take into account applicable principles of privilege, such as those involving the confidentiality of communications between a lawyer and client. When the parties, their counsel, or their documents would be subject under applicable law to different rules, the tribunal should, to the extent possible, apply the same rule to all parties, giving preference to the rule that provides the highest level of protection.

Article 23: Hearing

1. The arbitral tribunal shall give the parties reasonable notice of the date, time, and place of any oral hearing.

2. At least 15 days before the hearings, each party shall give the tribunal and the other parties the names and addresses of any witnesses it intends to present, the subject of their testimony, and the languages in which such witnesses will give their testimony.

3. The tribunal shall determine the manner in which witnesses are examined and who shall be present during witness examination.

4. Unless otherwise agreed by the parties or directed by the tribunal, evidence of witnesses may be presented in the form of written statements signed by them. In accordance with a schedule set by the tribunal, each party shall notify the tribunal and the other parties of the names of any witnesses who have presented a witness statement whom it requests to examine. The tribunal may require any witness to appear at a hearing. If a witness whose appearance has been requested fails to appear without valid excuse as determined by the tribunal, the tribunal may disregard any written statement by that witness.

5. The tribunal may direct that witnesses be examined through means that do not require their physical presence.

6. Hearings are private unless the parties agree otherwise or the law provides to the contrary.

Article 24: Interim Measures

1. At the request of any party, the arbitral tribunal may order or award any interim or conservatory measures it deems necessary, including injunctive relief and measures for the protection or conservation of property.

2. Such interim measures may take the form of an interim order or award, and the tribunal may require security for the costs of such measures.

3. A request for interim measures addressed by a party to a judicial authority shall not be deemed incompatible with the agreement to arbitrate or a waiver of the right to arbitrate.

4. The arbitral tribunal may in its discretion allocate costs associated with applications for interim relief in any interim order or award or in the final award.

5. An application for emergency relief prior to the constitution of the arbitral tribunal may be made as provided for in Article 6.

Article 25: Tribunal-Appointed Expert

1. The arbitral tribunal, after consultation with the parties, may appoint one or more independent experts to report to it, in writing, on issues designated by the tribunal and communicated to the parties.

2. The parties shall provide such an expert with any relevant information or produce for inspection any relevant documents or goods that the expert may

require. Any dispute between a party and the expert as to the relevance of the requested information or goods shall be referred to the tribunal for decision.

3. Upon receipt of an expert's report, the tribunal shall send a copy of the report to all parties and shall give the parties an opportunity to express, in writing, their opinion of the report. A party may examine any document on which the expert has relied in such a report.

4. At the request of any party, the tribunal shall give the parties an opportunity to question the expert at a hearing. At this hearing, parties may present expert witnesses to testify on the points at issue.

Article 26: Default

1. If a party fails to submit an Answer in accordance with Article 3, the arbitral tribunal may proceed with the arbitration.

2. If a party, duly notified under these Rules, fails to appear at a hearing without showing sufficient cause for such failure, the tribunal may proceed with the hearing.

3. If a party, duly invited to produce evidence or take any other steps in the proceedings, fails to do so within the time established by the tribunal without showing sufficient cause for such failure, the tribunal may make the award on the evidence before it.

Article 27: Closure of Hearing

1. The arbitral tribunal may ask the parties if they have any further submissions and upon receiving negative replies or if satisfied that the record is complete, the tribunal may declare the arbitral hearing closed.

2. The tribunal in its discretion, on its own motion, or upon application of a party, may reopen the arbitral hearing at any time before the award is made.

Article 28: Waiver

A party who knows of any non-compliance with any provision or requirement of the Rules or the arbitration agreement, and proceeds with the arbitration without promptly stating an objection in writing, waives the right to object.

Article 29: Awards, Orders, Decisions, and Rulings

1. In addition to making a final award, the arbitral tribunal may make interim, interlocutory, or partial awards, orders, decisions, and rulings.

2. When there is more than one arbitrator, any award, order, decision, or ruling of the tribunal shall be made by a majority of the arbitrators.

3. When the parties or the tribunal so authorize, the presiding arbitrator may make orders, decisions, or rulings on questions of procedure, including exchanges of information, subject to revision by the tribunal.

Article 30: Time, Form, and Effect of Award

1. Awards shall be made in writing by the arbitral tribunal and shall be final and binding on the parties. The tribunal shall make every effort to deliberate and prepare the award as quickly as possible after the hearing. Unless otherwise agreed by the parties, specified by law, or determined by the Administrator, the final award shall be made no later than 60 days from the date of the closing of the hearing. The parties shall carry out any such award without delay and, absent agreement otherwise, waive irrevocably their right to any form of appeal, review, or recourse to any court or other judicial authority, insofar as such waiver can validly be made. The tribunal shall state the reasons upon which an award is based, unless the parties have agreed that no reasons need be given.

2. An award shall be signed by the arbitrator(s) and shall state the date on which the award was made and the place of arbitration pursuant to Article 17. Where there is more than one arbitrator and any of them fails to sign an award, the award shall include or be accompanied by a statement of the reason for the absence of such signature.

3. An award may be made public only with the consent of all parties or as required by law, except that the Administrator may publish or otherwise make publicly available selected awards, orders, decisions, and rulings that have become public in the course of enforcement or otherwise and, unless otherwise agreed by the parties, may publish selected awards, orders, decisions, and rulings that have been edited to conceal the names of the parties and other identifying details.

4. The award shall be transmitted in draft form by the tribunal to the Administrator. The award shall be communicated to the parties by the Administrator.

5. If applicable law requires an award to be filed or registered, the tribunal shall cause such requirement to be satisfied. It is the responsibility of the parties to

bring such requirements or any other procedural requirements of the place of arbitration to the attention of the tribunal.

Article 31: Applicable Laws and Remedies

1. The arbitral tribunal shall apply the substantive law(s) or rules of law agreed by the parties as applicable to the dispute. Failing such an agreement by the parties, the tribunal shall apply such law(s) or rules of law as it determines to be appropriate.

2. In arbitrations involving the application of contracts, the tribunal shall decide in accordance with the terms of the contract and shall take into account usages of the trade applicable to the contract.

3. The tribunal shall not decide as *amiable compositeur* or *ex aequo et bono* unless the parties have expressly authorized it to do so.

4. A monetary award shall be in the currency or currencies of the contract unless the tribunal considers another currency more appropriate, and the tribunal may award such pre-award and post-award interest, simple or compound, as it considers appropriate, taking into consideration the contract and applicable law(s).

5. Unless the parties agree otherwise, the parties expressly waive and forego any right to punitive, exemplary, or similar damages unless any applicable law(s) requires that compensatory damages be increased in a specified manner. This provision shall not apply to an award of arbitration costs to a party to compensate for misconduct in the arbitration.

Article 32: Settlement or Other Reasons for Termination

1. If the parties settle the dispute before a final award is made, the arbitral tribunal shall terminate the arbitration and, if requested by all parties, may record the settlement in the form of a consent award on agreed terms. The tribunal is not obliged to give reasons for such an award.

2. If continuation of the arbitration becomes unnecessary or impossible due to the non-payment of deposits required by the Administrator, the arbitration may be suspended or terminated as provided in Article 36(3).

3. If continuation of the arbitration becomes unnecessary or impossible for any reason other than as stated in Sections 1 and 2 of this Article, the tribunal shall inform the parties of its intention to terminate the arbitration. The tribunal shall thereafter issue an order terminating the arbitration, unless a party raises justifiable grounds for objection.

Article 33: Interpretation and Correction of Award

1. Within 30 days after the receipt of an award, any party, with notice to the other party, may request the arbitral tribunal to interpret the award or correct any clerical, typographical, or computational errors or make an additional award as to claims, counterclaims, or setoffs presented but omitted from the award.

2. If the tribunal considers such a request justified after considering the contentions of the parties, it shall comply with such a request within 30 days after receipt of the parties' last submissions respecting the requested interpretation, correction, or additional award. Any interpretation, correction, or additional award made by the tribunal shall contain reasoning and shall form part of the award.

3. The tribunal on its own initiative may, within 30 days of the date of the award, correct any clerical, typographical, or computational errors or make an additional award as to claims presented but omitted from the award.

4. The parties shall be responsible for all costs associated with any request for interpretation, correction, or an additional award, and the tribunal may allocate such costs.

Article 34: Costs of Arbitration

The arbitral tribunal shall fix the costs of arbitration in its award(s). The tribunal may allocate such costs among the parties if it determines that allocation is reasonable, taking into account the circumstances of the case.

Such costs may include:

- a. the fees and expenses of the arbitrators;
- b. the costs of assistance required by the tribunal, including its experts;
- c. the fees and expenses of the Administrator;
- d. the reasonable legal and other costs incurred by the parties;
- e. any costs incurred in connection with a notice for interim or emergency relief pursuant to Articles 6 or 24;
- f. any costs incurred in connection with a request for consolidation pursuant to Article 8; and

- g. any costs associated with information exchange pursuant to Article 21.

Article 35: Fees and Expenses of Arbitral Tribunal

1. The fees and expenses of the arbitrators shall be reasonable in amount, taking into account the time spent by the arbitrators, the size and complexity of the case, and any other relevant circumstances.

2. As soon as practicable after the commencement of the arbitration, the Administrator shall designate an appropriate daily or hourly rate of compensation in consultation with the parties and all arbitrators, taking into account the arbitrators' stated rate of compensation and the size and complexity of the case.

3. Any dispute regarding the fees and expenses of the arbitrators shall be determined by the Administrator.

Article 36: Deposits

1. The Administrator may request that the parties deposit appropriate amounts as an advance for the costs referred to in Article 34.

2. During the course of the arbitration, the Administrator may request supplementary deposits from the parties.

3. If the deposits requested are not paid promptly and in full, the Administrator shall so inform the parties in order that one or more of them may make the required payment. If such payment is not made, the arbitral tribunal may order the suspension or termination of the proceedings. If the tribunal has not yet been appointed, the Administrator may suspend or terminate the proceedings.

4. Failure of a party asserting a claim or counterclaim to pay the required deposits shall be deemed a withdrawal of the claim or counterclaim.

5. After the final award has been made, the Administrator shall render an accounting to the parties of the deposits received and return any unexpended balance to the parties.

Article 37: Confidentiality

1. Confidential information disclosed during the arbitration by the parties or by witnesses shall not be divulged by an arbitrator or by the Administrator. Except as provided in Article 30, unless otherwise agreed by the parties or required by

applicable law, the members of the arbitral tribunal and the Administrator shall keep confidential all matters relating to the arbitration or the award.

2. Unless the parties agree otherwise, the tribunal may make orders concerning the confidentiality of the arbitration or any matters in connection with the arbitration and may take measures for protecting trade secrets and confidential information.

Article 38: Exclusion of Liability

The members of the arbitral tribunal, any emergency arbitrator appointed under Article 6, any consolidation arbitrator appointed under Article 8, and the Administrator shall not be liable to any party for any act or omission in connection with any arbitration under these Rules, except to the extent that such a limitation of liability is prohibited by applicable law. The parties agree that no arbitrator, emergency arbitrator, or consolidation arbitrator, nor the Administrator shall be under any obligation to make any statement about the arbitration, and no party shall seek to make any of these persons a party or witness in any judicial or other proceedings relating to the arbitration.

Article 39: Interpretation of Rules

The arbitral tribunal, any emergency arbitrator appointed under Article 6, and any consolidation arbitrator appointed under Article 8, shall interpret and apply these Rules insofar as they relate to their powers and duties. The Administrator shall interpret and apply all other Rules.

International Expedited Procedures

Article E-1: Scope of Expedited Procedures

These Expedited Procedures supplement the International Arbitration Rules as provided in Article 1(4).

Article E-2: Detailed Submissions

Parties are to present detailed submissions on the facts, claims, counterclaims, setoffs, and defenses, together with all of the evidence then available on which such party intends to rely, in the Notice of Arbitration and the Answer. The arbitrator, in consultation with the parties, shall establish a procedural order, including a timetable, for completion of any written submissions.

Article E-3: Administrative Conference

The Administrator may conduct an administrative conference with the parties and their representatives to discuss the application of these procedures, arbitrator selection, mediating the dispute, and any other administrative matters.

Article E-4: Objection to the Applicability of the Expedited Procedures

If an objection is submitted before the arbitrator is appointed, the Administrator may initially determine the applicability of these Expedited Procedures, subject to the power of the arbitrator to make a final determination. The arbitrator shall take into account the amount in dispute and any other relevant circumstances.

Article E-5: Changes of Claim or Counterclaim

If, after filing of the initial claims and counterclaims, a party amends its claim or counterclaim to exceed USD \$250,000.00 exclusive of interest and the costs of arbitration, the case will continue to be administered pursuant to these Expedited Procedures unless the parties agree otherwise, or the Administrator or the arbitrator determines otherwise. After the arbitrator is appointed, no new or different claim, counterclaim or setoff and no change in amount may be submitted except with the arbitrator's consent.

Article E-6: Appointment and Qualifications of the Arbitrator

A sole arbitrator shall be appointed as follows. The Administrator shall simultaneously submit to each party an identical list of five proposed arbitrators. The parties may agree to an arbitrator from this list and shall so advise the Administrator. If the parties are unable to agree upon an arbitrator, each party may strike two names from the list and return it to the Administrator within 10 days from the transmittal date of the list to the parties. The parties are not required to exchange selection lists. If the parties fail to agree on any of the arbitrators or if acceptable arbitrators are unable or unavailable to act, or if for any other reason the appointment cannot be made from the submitted lists, the Administrator may make the appointment without the circulation of additional lists. The parties will be given notice by the Administrator of the appointment of the arbitrator, together with any disclosures.

Article E-7: Procedural Conference and Order

After the arbitrator's appointment, the arbitrator may schedule a procedural conference call with the parties, their representatives, and the Administrator to

discuss the procedure and schedule for the case. Within 14 days of appointment, the arbitrator shall issue a procedural order.

Article E-8: Proceedings by Written Submissions

In expedited proceedings based on written submissions, all submissions are due within 60 days of the date of the procedural order, unless the arbitrator determines otherwise. The arbitrator may require an oral hearing if deemed necessary.

Article E-9: Proceedings with an Oral Hearing

In expedited proceedings in which an oral hearing is to be held, the arbitrator shall set the date, time, and location of the hearing. The oral hearing shall take place within 60 days of the date of the procedural order unless the arbitrator deems it necessary to extend that period. Hearings may take place in person or via video conference or other suitable means, at the discretion of the arbitrator. Generally, there will be no transcript or stenographic record. Any party desiring a stenographic record may arrange for one. The oral hearing shall not exceed one day unless the arbitrator determines otherwise. The Administrator will notify the parties in advance of the hearing date.

Article E-10: The Award

Awards shall be made in writing and shall be final and binding on the parties. Unless otherwise agreed by the parties, specified by law, or determined by the Administrator, the award shall be made not later than 30 days from the date of the closing of the hearing or from the time established for final written submissions.

Administrative Fees

Administrative Fee Schedules (Standard and Flexible Fees)

For all cases determined to be international by the AAA-ICDR, this International Fee Schedule shall apply. An international case is generally defined as having either the place of arbitration or performance of the agreement outside the United States, or having an arbitration agreement between parties from different countries.

International cases are most frequently administered by the international division of the American Arbitration Association (AAA), the International Centre for Dispute Resolution (ICDR). The international division provides case administration

services for the global business and legal communities with legally trained, multilingual staff and executives, giving special attention to the issues that can arise with international disputes and striving for efficient processes leading to lasting and enforceable results.

The AAA offers parties two options for the payment of administrative fees

For both schedules, administrative fees are based on the amount of the claim or counterclaim and are to be paid by the party bringing the claim or counterclaim at the time the demand or claim is filed with the ICDR. *Arbitrator compensation is not included in either schedule.* Unless the parties' agreement provides otherwise, arbitrator compensation and administrative fees are subject to allocation by an arbitrator in an award.

Standard Fee Schedule: A two-payment schedule that provides for somewhat higher initial filing fees but lower overall administrative fees for cases that proceed to a hearing.

Flexible Fee Schedule: A three-payment schedule that provides for lower initial filing fee and then spreads subsequent payments out over the course of the arbitration. Total administrative fees will be somewhat higher for cases that proceed to a hearing.

Standard Fee Schedule

Amount of Claim	Initial Filing Fee	Final Fee
Up to \$75,000	\$1000	\$1000
>\$75,000 to \$150,000	\$2,025	\$1,450
>\$150,000 to \$300,000	\$3,050	\$2,300
>\$300,000 to \$500,000	\$4,600	\$4,025
>\$500,000 to \$1,000,000	\$5,750	\$7,125
>\$1,000,000 to \$10,000,000	\$8,625	\$10,350
>\$10,000,000	\$12,650 plus .015% of the amount of claim amount above \$10,000,000 up to \$100,000	\$16,100
Undetermined Monetary	\$8,625	\$10,350

Claims		
Nonmonetary Claims	\$3,750	\$2,875
Deficient Filing Fee	\$600	
Additional Party Fees	If there are more than two separately represented parties in the arbitration, an additional 10% of each fee contained in these fee schedules will be charged for each additional separately represented party. However, Additional Party Fees will not exceed 50% of the base fees contained in these fee schedules unless there are more than 10 separately represented parties. <i>See below for additional details.</i>	

- The **Initial Filing Fee** is payable in full by a filing party when a claim, counterclaim, or additional claim is filed.
- The **Final Fee** will be incurred for all cases that proceed to their first hearing and is payable in advance at the time the first hearing is scheduled.
- **Fee Modifications:** Fees are subject to increase if the claim or counterclaim is increased after the initial filing date. Fees are subject to decrease if the claim or counterclaim decreases prior to the first hearing.
- **Cases with Three or More Arbitrators** are subject to a minimum Initial Filing Fee of \$5,750 and a Final Fee of \$7,125.

Refunds—Standard Fee Schedule:

Initial Filing Fees: Subject to a \$600 minimum non-refundable Initial Filing Fee for all cases, refunds of Initial Filing Fees for settled or withdrawn cases will be calculated from the date the ICDR/AAA receives the notice of arbitration as follows:

- within 5 calendar days of filing—100%
- between 6 and 30 calendar days of filing—50%
- between 31 and 60 calendar days of filing—25%

However, *no refunds will be made once:*

- any arbitrator has been appointed (including one arbitrator on a three-arbitrator panel).
- an award has been rendered.

Final Fees: If a case is settled or withdrawn prior to the first hearing taking place, all Final Fees paid will be refunded. However, if the ICDR is not notified of a cancellation at least 24 hours before a scheduled hearing date, the Final fee will remain due and will not be refunded.

Flexible Fee Schedule

Amount of Claim	Initial Filing Fee	Proceed Fee	Final Fee
Up to \$75,000	Only available for claims above \$150,000		
>\$75,000 to \$150,000			
>\$150,000 to \$300,000	\$1,900	\$1,950	\$2,300
>\$300,000 to \$500,000	\$2,300	\$3,450	\$4,025
>\$500,000 to \$1,000,000	\$2,875	\$4,950	\$7,125
>\$1,000,000 to \$10,000,000	\$4,600	\$8,050	\$10,350
>\$10,000,000	\$6,900	\$11,500 plus .015% of the claim amount above \$10,000,000 up to \$100,000	\$16,100
Undetermined Monetary Claims	\$4,600	\$8,050	\$10,350
Nonmonetary Claims	\$2,300	\$2,600	\$2,875
Deficient Filing Fee	\$600		
Additional Party Fees	If there are more than two separately represented parties in the arbitration, an additional 10% of each fee contained in these fee schedules will be charged for each additional separately represented party. However, Additional Party Fees will not exceed 50% of the base fees contained in these fee schedules unless there are more than 10 separately represented parties. <i>See below for additional details.</i>		

- The **Initial Filing Fee** is payable in full by a filing party when a claim, counterclaim, or additional claim is filed.
- The **Proceed Fee** must be paid within 90 days of the filing of the notice of arbitration or a counterclaim before the ICDR will proceed with the further

administration of the arbitration, including the arbitrator appointment process.

- If a Proceed Fee is not submitted within 90 days of the filing of the Claimant's Notice of Arbitration, the ICDR will administratively close the file and notify all parties.
- If the Flexible Fee Schedule is being used for the filing of a counterclaim, the counterclaim will not be presented to the arbitrator until the Proceed Fee is paid.
- The **Final Fee** will be incurred for all cases that proceed to their first hearing and is payable in advance at the time the first hearing is scheduled.
- **Fee Modifications:** Fees are subject to increase if the claim or counterclaim is increased after the initial filing date. Fees are subject to decrease if the claim or counterclaim decreases prior to the first hearing.
- **Cases with Three or More Arbitrators** are subject to a minimum Initial Filing Fee of \$2,875, a \$4,950 Proceed Fee and a Final Fee of \$7,125.

Refunds—Flexible Fee Schedule:

Under the Flexible Fee Schedule, **Filing Fees** and **Proceed Fees** are **non-refundable** once incurred.

Final Fees: If a case is settled or withdrawn prior to the first hearing taking place, all Final Fees paid will be refunded. However, if the ICDR is not notified of a cancellation at least 24 hours before a scheduled hearing date, the Final fee will remain due and will not be refunded.

Additional Fees Applicable to the Standard Fee and Flexible Fee Schedules

Additional Party Fees: Additional Party Fees will be charged as described above, and in addition:

- Additional Party Fees are payable by the party, whether a claimant or respondent, that names the additional parties to the arbitration.
- Such fees shall not exceed 50% of the base fees in the fee schedule, except that the ICDR reserves the right to assess additional fees where there are more than 10 separately represented parties.

- An example of the Additional Party Fee is as follows: A single claimant represented by one attorney brings an arbitration against two separate respondents, however, both respondents are represented by the same attorney. No Additional Party Fees are due. However, if the respondents are represented by different attorneys, or if one of the respondents is self-represented and the other is represented by an attorney, an additional 10% of the Initial Filing fee is charged to the claimant. If the case moves to the Proceed Fee stage or the Final Fee stage, an additional 10% of those fees will also be charged to the claimant.

Incomplete or Deficient Filings: Where the applicable arbitration agreement does not reference the ICDR or AAA, the ICDR will attempt to obtain the agreement of all parties to have the arbitration administered by the ICDR/AAA.

- Where the ICDR is unable to obtain the parties' agreement to have the ICDR/AAA administer the arbitration, the ICDR will not proceed further and will administratively close the case. The ICDR will also return the filing fees to the filing party, less the amount specified in the fee schedule above for deficient filings.
- Parties that file Demands for Arbitration that are incomplete or otherwise do not meet the filing requirements contained in the rules shall also be charged the amount specified above for deficient filings if they fail or are unable to respond to the AAA's request to correct the deficiency.

Arbitrations in Abeyance: Cases held in abeyance by mutual agreement for one year will be assessed an annual abeyance fee of \$600, to be split equally among the parties. If a party refuses to pay the assessed fee, the other party or parties may pay the entire fee on behalf of all parties, otherwise the arbitration will be administratively closed. All filing requirements, including the payment of filing fees, must be met before a matter will be placed in abeyance.

Expedited Procedures—Fees and Compensation: There are no additional administrative fees beyond the Fees outlined above to initiate a case under the Expedited Procedures. The compensation of the arbitrator will be determined by the Administrator, in consultation with the arbitrator, and in consideration of the specific nature of the case and the amount in dispute. There is no refund schedule for cases managed under the Expedited Procedures.

Fees for Additional Services: The ICDR reserves the right to assess additional administrative fees for services performed by the ICDR that go beyond those provided for in the ICDR/AAA's rules, but which are required as a result of the parties' agreement or stipulation.

Hearing Room Rentals: The fees described above do not cover the cost of hearing rooms, which are available on a rental basis. Check with the ICDR/AAA for availability and rates.

Replace the ICC Arbitration Rules on pages 220-253 of the Documentary Supplement with the following:

ICC Rules of Arbitration*
Effective March 1, 2017

INTRODUCTORY PROVISIONS

Article 1: International Court of Arbitration

1) The International Court of Arbitration (the “Court”) of the International Chamber of Commerce (the “ICC”) is the independent arbitration body of the ICC. The statutes of the Court are set forth in Appendix I.

2) The Court does not itself resolve disputes. It administers the resolution of disputes by arbitral tribunals, in accordance with the Rules of Arbitration of the ICC (the “Rules”). The Court is the only body authorized to administer arbitrations under the Rules, including the scrutiny and approval of awards rendered in accordance with the Rules. It draws up its own internal rules, which are set forth in Appendix II (the “Internal Rules”).

3) The President of the Court (the “President”) or, in the President’s absence or otherwise at the President’s request, one of its Vice-Presidents shall have the power to take urgent decisions on behalf of the Court, provided that any such decision is reported to the Court at its next session.

4) As provided for in the Internal Rules, the Court may delegate to one or more committees composed of its members the power to take certain decisions, provided that any such decision is reported to the Court at its next session.

5) The Court is assisted in its work by the Secretariat of the Court (the “Secretariat”) under the direction of its Secretary General (the “Secretary General”).

* Copyright © 2017 by the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC). Reprinted with permission. The text reproduced here is valid at the time of reproduction (July 1, 2017). As amendments may from time to time be made to the text, please refer to the website <www.iccarbitration.org> for the latest version and for more information on this ICC dispute resolution service. The text is also available in the ICC Dispute Resolution Library at <www.iccdrl.com>.

Article 2: Definitions

In the Rules:

- (i) “arbitral tribunal” includes one or more arbitrators;
- (ii) “claimant” includes one or more claimants, “respondent” includes one or more respondents, and “additional party” includes one or more additional parties;
- (iii) “party” or “parties” include claimants, respondents or additional parties;
- (iv) “claim” or “claims” include any claim by any party against any other party;
- (v) “award” includes, inter alia, an interim, partial or final award.

Article 3: Written Notifications or Communications; Time Limits

1) All pleadings and other written communications submitted by any party, as well as all documents annexed thereto, shall be supplied in a number of copies sufficient to provide one copy for each party, plus one for each arbitrator, and one for the Secretariat. A copy of any notification or communication from the arbitral tribunal to the parties shall be sent to the Secretariat.

2) All notifications or communications from the Secretariat and the arbitral tribunal shall be made to the last address of the party or its representative for whom the same are intended, as notified either by the party in question or by the other party. Such notification or communication may be made by delivery against receipt, registered post, courier, email, or any other means of telecommunication that provides a record of the sending thereof.

3) A notification or communication shall be deemed to have been made on the day it was received by the party itself or by its representative, or would have been received if made in accordance with Article 3(2).

4) Periods of time specified in or fixed under the Rules shall start to run on the day following the date a notification or communication is deemed to have been made in accordance with Article 3(3). When the day next following such date is an official holiday, or a non-business day in the country where the notification or communication is deemed to have been made, the period of time shall commence on the first following business day. Official holidays and non-business days are included in the calculation of the period of time. If the last day of the relevant period of time granted is an official holiday or a non-business day in the country where the notification or communication is deemed to have been made, the period of time shall expire at the end of the first following business day.

COMMENCING THE ARBITRATION

Article 4: Request for Arbitration

1) A party wishing to have recourse to arbitration under the Rules shall submit its Request for Arbitration (the “Request”) to the Secretariat at any of the offices specified in the Internal Rules. The Secretariat shall notify the claimant and respondent of the receipt of the Request and the date of such receipt.

2) The date on which the Request is received by the Secretariat shall, for all purposes, be deemed to be the date of the commencement of the arbitration.

3) The Request shall contain the following information:

a) the name in full, description, address and other contact details of each of the parties;

b) the name in full, address and other contact details of any person(s) representing the claimant in the arbitration;

c) a description of the nature and circumstances of the dispute giving rise to the claims and of the basis upon which the claims are made;

d) a statement of the relief sought, together with the amounts of any quantified claims and, to the extent possible, an estimate of the monetary value of any other claims;

e) any relevant agreements and, in particular, the arbitration agreement(s);

f) where claims are made under more than one arbitration agreement, an indication of the arbitration agreement under which each claim is made;

g) all relevant particulars and any observations or proposals concerning the number of arbitrators and their choice in accordance with the provisions of Articles 12 and 13, and any nomination of an arbitrator required thereby; and

h) all relevant particulars and any observations or proposals as to the place of the arbitration, the applicable rules of law and the language of the arbitration.

The claimant may submit such other documents or information with the Request as it considers appropriate or as may contribute to the efficient resolution of the dispute.

4) Together with the Request, the claimant shall:

- a) submit the number of copies thereof required by Article 3(1); and
- b) make payment of the filing fee required by Appendix III (“Arbitration Costs and Fees”) in force on the date the Request is submitted.

In the event that the claimant fails to comply with either of these requirements, the Secretariat may fix a time limit within which the claimant must comply, failing which the file shall be closed without prejudice to the claimant’s right to submit the same claims at a later date in another Request.

5) The Secretariat shall transmit a copy of the Request and the documents annexed thereto to the respondent for its Answer to the Request once the Secretariat has sufficient copies of the Request and the required filing fee.

Article 5: Answer to the Request; Counterclaims

1) Within 30 days from the receipt of the Request from the Secretariat, the respondent shall submit an Answer (the “Answer”) which shall contain the following information:

- a) its name in full, description, address and other contact details;
- b) the name in full, address and other contact details of any person(s) representing the respondent in the arbitration;
- c) its comments as to the nature and circumstances of the dispute giving rise to the claims and the basis upon which the claims are made;
- d) its response to the relief sought;
- e) any observations or proposals concerning the number of arbitrators and their choice in light of the claimant’s proposals and in accordance with the provisions of Articles 12 and 13, and any nomination of an arbitrator required thereby; and
- f) any observations or proposals as to the place of the arbitration, the applicable rules of law and the language of the arbitration.

The respondent may submit such other documents or information with the Answer as it considers appropriate or as may contribute to the efficient resolution of the dispute.

2) The Secretariat may grant the respondent an extension of the time for submitting the Answer, provided the application for such an extension contains the respondent's observations or proposals concerning the number of arbitrators and their choice and, where required by Articles 12 and 13, the nomination of an arbitrator. If the respondent fails to do so, the Court shall proceed in accordance with the Rules.

3) The Answer shall be submitted to the Secretariat in the number of copies specified by Article 3(1).

4) The Secretariat shall communicate the Answer and the documents annexed thereto to all other parties.

5) Any counterclaims made by the respondent shall be submitted with the Answer and shall provide:

a) a description of the nature and circumstances of the dispute giving rise to the counterclaims and of the basis upon which the counterclaims are made;

b) a statement of the relief sought together with the amounts of any quantified counterclaims and, to the extent possible, an estimate of the monetary value of any other counterclaims;

c) any relevant agreements and, in particular, the arbitration agreement(s); and

d) where counterclaims are made under more than one arbitration agreement, an indication of the arbitration agreement under which each counterclaim is made.

The respondent may submit such other documents or information with the counterclaims as it considers appropriate or as may contribute to the efficient resolution of the dispute.

6) The claimant shall submit a reply to any counterclaim within 30 days from the date of receipt of the counterclaims communicated by the Secretariat. Prior to the transmission of the file to the arbitral tribunal, the Secretariat may grant the claimant an extension of time for submitting the reply.

Article 6: Effect of the Arbitration Agreement

1) Where the parties have agreed to submit to arbitration under the Rules, they shall be deemed to have submitted ipso facto to the Rules in effect on the date

of commencement of the arbitration, unless they have agreed to submit to the Rules in effect on the date of their arbitration agreement.

2) By agreeing to arbitration under the Rules, the parties have accepted that the arbitration shall be administered by the Court.

3) If any party against which a claim has been made does not submit an Answer, or if any party raises one or more pleas concerning the existence, validity or scope of the arbitration agreement or concerning whether all of the claims made in the arbitration may be determined together in a single arbitration, the arbitration shall proceed and any question of jurisdiction or of whether the claims may be determined together in that arbitration shall be decided directly by the arbitral tribunal, unless the Secretary General refers the matter to the Court for its decision pursuant to Article 6(4).

4) In all cases referred to the Court under Article 6(3), the Court shall decide whether and to what extent the arbitration shall proceed. The arbitration shall proceed if and to the extent that the Court is *prima facie* satisfied that an arbitration agreement under the Rules may exist. In particular:

(i) where there are more than two parties to the arbitration, the arbitration shall proceed between those of the parties, including any additional parties joined pursuant to Article 7, with respect to which the Court is *prima facie* satisfied that an arbitration agreement under the Rules that binds them all may exist; and

(ii) where claims pursuant to Article 9 are made under more than one arbitration agreement, the arbitration shall proceed as to those claims with respect to which the Court is *prima facie* satisfied (a) that the arbitration agreements under which those claims are made may be compatible, and (b) that all parties to the arbitration may have agreed that those claims can be determined together in a single arbitration.

The Court's decision pursuant to Article 6(4) is without prejudice to the admissibility or merits of any party's plea or pleas.

5) In all matters decided by the Court under Article 6(4), any decision as to the jurisdiction of the arbitral tribunal, except as to parties or claims with respect to which the Court decides that the arbitration cannot proceed, shall then be taken by the arbitral tribunal itself.

6) Where the parties are notified of the Court's decision pursuant to Article 6(4) that the arbitration cannot proceed in respect of some or all of them, any party retains the right to ask any court having jurisdiction whether or not, and in respect of which of them, there is a binding arbitration agreement.

7) Where the Court has decided pursuant to Article 6(4) that the arbitration cannot proceed in respect of any of the claims, such decision shall not prevent a party from reintroducing the same claim at a later date in other proceedings.

8) If any of the parties refuses or fails to take part in the arbitration or any stage thereof, the arbitration shall proceed notwithstanding such refusal or failure.

9) Unless otherwise agreed, the arbitral tribunal shall not cease to have jurisdiction by reason of any allegation that the contract is non-existent or null and void, provided that the arbitral tribunal upholds the validity of the arbitration agreement. The arbitral tribunal shall continue to have jurisdiction to determine the parties' respective rights and to decide their claims and pleas even though the contract itself may be non-existent or null and void.

MULTIPLE PARTIES, MULTIPLE CONTRACTS AND CONSOLIDATION

Article 7: Joinder of Additional Parties

1) A party wishing to join an additional party to the arbitration shall submit its request for arbitration against the additional party (the "Request for Joinder") to the Secretariat. The date on which the Request for Joinder is received by the Secretariat shall, for all purposes, be deemed to be the date of the commencement of arbitration against the additional party. Any such joinder shall be subject to the provisions of Articles 6(3)-6(7) and 9. No additional party may be joined after the confirmation or appointment of any arbitrator, unless all parties, including the additional party, otherwise agree. The Secretariat may fix a time limit for the submission of a Request for Joinder.

2) The Request for Joinder shall contain the following information:

- a) the case reference of the existing arbitration;
- b) the name in full, description, address and other contact details of each of the parties, including the additional party; and
- c) the information specified in Article 4(3) subparagraphs c), d), e) and f).

The party filing the Request for Joinder may submit therewith such other documents or information as it considers appropriate or as may contribute to the efficient resolution of the dispute.

3) The provisions of Articles 4(4) and 4(5) shall apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to the Request for Joinder.

4) The additional party shall submit an Answer in accordance, *mutatis mutandis*, with the provisions of Articles 5(1)-5(4). The additional party may make claims against any other party in accordance with the provisions of Article 8.

Article 8: Claims Between Multiple Parties

1) In an arbitration with multiple parties, claims may be made by any party against any other party, subject to the provisions of Articles 6(3)-6(7) and 9 and provided that no new claims may be made after the Terms of Reference are signed or approved by the Court without the authorization of the arbitral tribunal pursuant to Article 23(4).

2) Any party making a claim pursuant to Article 8(1) shall provide the information specified in Article 4(3) subparagraphs c), d), e) and f).

3) Before the Secretariat transmits the file to the arbitral tribunal in accordance with Article 16, the following provisions shall apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to any claim made: Article 4(4) subparagraph a); Article 4(5); Article 5(1) except for subparagraphs a), b), e) and f); Article 5(2); Article 5(3) and Article 5(4). Thereafter, the arbitral tribunal shall determine the procedure for making a claim.

Article 9: Multiple Contracts

Subject to the provisions of Articles 6(3)-6(7) and 23(4), claims arising out of or in connection with more than one contract may be made in a single arbitration, irrespective of whether such claims are made under one or more than one arbitration agreement under the Rules.

Article 10: Consolidation of Arbitrations

The Court may, at the request of a party, consolidate two or more arbitrations pending under the Rules into a single arbitration, where:

- a) the parties have agreed to consolidation; or
- b) all of the claims in the arbitrations are made under the same arbitration agreement; or
- c) where the claims in the arbitrations are made under more than one arbitration agreement, the arbitrations are between the same parties, the disputes in the arbitrations arise in connection with the same legal relationship, and the Court finds the arbitration agreements to be compatible.

In deciding whether to consolidate, the Court may take into account any circumstances it considers to be relevant, including whether one or more arbitrators have been confirmed or appointed in more than one of the arbitrations and, if so, whether the same or different persons have been confirmed or appointed.

When arbitrations are consolidated, they shall be consolidated into the arbitration that commenced first, unless otherwise agreed by all parties.

THE ARBITRAL TRIBUNAL

Article 11: General Provisions

1) Every arbitrator must be and remain impartial and independent of the parties involved in the arbitration.

2) Before appointment or confirmation, a prospective arbitrator shall sign a statement of acceptance, availability, impartiality and independence. The prospective arbitrator shall disclose in writing to the Secretariat any facts or circumstances which might be of such a nature as to call into question the arbitrator's independence in the eyes of the parties, as well as any circumstances that could give rise to reasonable doubts as to the arbitrator's impartiality. The Secretariat shall provide such information to the parties in writing and fix a time limit for any comments from them.

3) An arbitrator shall immediately disclose in writing to the Secretariat and to the parties any facts or circumstances of a similar nature to those referred to in Article 11(2) concerning the arbitrator's impartiality or independence which may arise during the arbitration.

4) The decisions of the Court as to the appointment, confirmation, challenge or replacement of an arbitrator shall be final.

5) By accepting to serve, arbitrators undertake to carry out their responsibilities in accordance with the Rules.

6) Insofar as the parties have not provided otherwise, the arbitral tribunal shall be constituted in accordance with the provisions of Articles 12 and 13.

Article 12: Constitution of the Arbitral Tribunal

Number of Arbitrators

1) The disputes shall be decided by a sole arbitrator or by three arbitrators.

2) Where the parties have not agreed upon the number of arbitrators, the Court shall appoint a sole arbitrator, save where it appears to the Court that the dispute is such as to warrant the appointment of three arbitrators. In such case, the claimant shall nominate an arbitrator within a period of 15 days from the receipt of the notification of the decision of the Court, and the respondent shall nominate an arbitrator within a period of 15 days from the receipt of the notification of the nomination made by the claimant. If a party fails to nominate an arbitrator, the appointment shall be made by the Court.

Sole Arbitrator

3) Where the parties have agreed that the dispute shall be resolved by a sole arbitrator, they may, by agreement, nominate the sole arbitrator for confirmation. If the parties fail to nominate a sole arbitrator within 30 days from the date when the claimant's Request for Arbitration has been received by the other party, or within such additional time as may be allowed by the Secretariat, the sole arbitrator shall be appointed by the Court.

Three Arbitrators

4) Where the parties have agreed that the dispute shall be resolved by three arbitrators, each party shall nominate in the Request and the Answer, respectively, one arbitrator for confirmation. If a party fails to nominate an arbitrator, the appointment shall be made by the Court.

5) Where the dispute is to be referred to three arbitrators, the third arbitrator, who will act as president of the arbitral tribunal, shall be appointed by the Court, unless the parties have agreed upon another procedure for such appointment, in which case the nomination will be subject to confirmation pursuant to Article 13. Should such procedure not result in a nomination within 30 days from the confirmation or appointment of the co-arbitrators or any other time limit agreed by the parties or fixed by the Court, the third arbitrator shall be appointed by the Court.

6) Where there are multiple claimants or multiple respondents, and where the dispute is to be referred to three arbitrators, the multiple claimants, jointly, and the multiple respondents, jointly, shall nominate an arbitrator for confirmation pursuant to Article 13.

7) Where an additional party has been joined, and where the dispute is to be referred to three arbitrators, the additional party may, jointly with the claimant(s) or with the respondent(s), nominate an arbitrator for confirmation pursuant to Article 13.

8) In the absence of a joint nomination pursuant to Articles 12(6) or 12(7) and where all parties are unable to agree to a method for the constitution of the arbitral tribunal, the Court may appoint each member of the arbitral tribunal and shall designate one of them to act as president. In such case, the Court shall be at liberty to choose any person it regards as suitable to act as arbitrator, applying Article 13 when it considers this appropriate.

Article 13: Appointment and Confirmation of the Arbitrators

1) In confirming or appointing arbitrators, the Court shall consider the prospective arbitrator's nationality, residence and other relationships with the countries of which the parties or the other arbitrators are nationals and the prospective arbitrator's availability and ability to conduct the arbitration in accordance with the Rules. The same shall apply where the Secretary General confirms arbitrators pursuant to Article 13(2).

2) The Secretary General may confirm as co-arbitrators, sole arbitrators and presidents of arbitral tribunals persons nominated by the parties or pursuant to their particular agreements, provided that the statement they have submitted contains no qualification regarding impartiality or independence or that a qualified statement regarding impartiality or independence has not given rise to objections. Such confirmation shall be reported to the Court at its next session. If the Secretary General considers that a co-arbitrator, sole arbitrator or president of an arbitral tribunal should not be confirmed, the matter shall be submitted to the Court.

3) Where the Court is to appoint an arbitrator, it shall make the appointment upon proposal of a National Committee or Group of the ICC that it considers to be appropriate. If the Court does not accept the proposal made, or if the National Committee or Group fails to make the proposal requested within the time limit fixed by the Court, the Court may repeat its request, request a proposal from another National Committee or Group that it considers to be appropriate, or appoint directly any person whom it regards as suitable.

4) The Court may also appoint directly to act as arbitrator any person whom it regards as suitable where:

- a) one or more of the parties is a state or may be considered to be a state entity;

b) the Court considers that it would be appropriate to appoint an arbitrator from a country or territory where there is no National Committee or Group; or

c) the President certifies to the Court that circumstances exist which, in the President's opinion, make a direct appointment necessary and appropriate.

5) The sole arbitrator or the president of the arbitral tribunal shall be of a nationality other than those of the parties. However, in suitable circumstances and provided that none of the parties objects within the time limit fixed by the Court, the sole arbitrator or the president of the arbitral tribunal may be chosen from a country of which any of the parties is a national.

Article 14: Challenge of Arbitrators

1) A challenge of an arbitrator, whether for an alleged lack of impartiality or independence, or otherwise, shall be made by the submission to the Secretariat of a written statement specifying the facts and circumstances on which the challenge is based.

2) For a challenge to be admissible, it must be submitted by a party either within 30 days from receipt by that party of the notification of the appointment or confirmation of the arbitrator, or within 30 days from the date when the party making the challenge was informed of the facts and circumstances on which the challenge is based if such date is subsequent to the receipt of such notification.

3) The Court shall decide on the admissibility and, at the same time, if necessary, on the merits of a challenge after the Secretariat has afforded an opportunity for the arbitrator concerned, the other party or parties and any other members of the arbitral tribunal to comment in writing within a suitable period of time. Such comments shall be communicated to the parties and to the arbitrators.

Article 15: Replacement of Arbitrators

1) An arbitrator shall be replaced upon death, upon acceptance by the Court of the arbitrator's resignation, upon acceptance by the Court of a challenge, or upon acceptance by the Court of a request of all the parties.

2) An arbitrator shall also be replaced on the Court's own initiative when it decides that the arbitrator is prevented de jure or de facto from fulfilling the arbitrator's functions, or that the arbitrator is not fulfilling those functions in accordance with the Rules or within the prescribed time limits.

3) When, on the basis of information that has come to its attention, the Court considers applying Article 15(2), it shall decide on the matter after the arbitrator concerned, the parties and any other members of the arbitral tribunal have had an opportunity to comment in writing within a suitable period of time. Such comments shall be communicated to the parties and to the arbitrators.

4) When an arbitrator is to be replaced, the Court has discretion to decide whether or not to follow the original nominating process. Once reconstituted, and after having invited the parties to comment, the arbitral tribunal shall determine if and to what extent prior proceedings shall be repeated before the reconstituted arbitral tribunal.

5) Subsequent to the closing of the proceedings, instead of replacing an arbitrator who has died or been removed by the Court pursuant to Articles 15(1) or 15(2), the Court may decide, when it considers it appropriate, that the remaining arbitrators shall continue the arbitration. In making such determination, the Court shall take into account the views of the remaining arbitrators and of the parties and such other matters that it considers appropriate in the circumstances.

THE ARBITRAL PROCEEDINGS

Article 16: Transmission of the File to the Arbitral Tribunal

The Secretariat shall transmit the file to the arbitral tribunal as soon as it has been constituted, provided the advance on costs requested by the Secretariat at this stage has been paid.

Article 17: Proof of Authority

At any time after the commencement of the arbitration, the arbitral tribunal or the Secretariat may require proof of the authority of any party representatives.

Article 18: Place of the Arbitration

1) The place of the arbitration shall be fixed by the Court, unless agreed upon by the parties.

2) The arbitral tribunal may, after consultation with the parties, conduct hearings and meetings at any location it considers appropriate, unless otherwise agreed by the parties.

3) The arbitral tribunal may deliberate at any location it considers appropriate.

Article 19: Rules Governing the Proceedings

The proceedings before the arbitral tribunal shall be governed by the Rules and, where the Rules are silent, by any rules which the parties or, failing them, the arbitral tribunal may settle on, whether or not reference is thereby made to the rules of procedure of a national law to be applied to the arbitration.

Article 20: Language of the Arbitration

In the absence of an agreement by the parties, the arbitral tribunal shall determine the language or languages of the arbitration, due regard being given to all relevant circumstances, including the language of the contract.

Article 21: Applicable Rules of Law

1) The parties shall be free to agree upon the rules of law to be applied by the arbitral tribunal to the merits of the dispute. In the absence of any such agreement, the arbitral tribunal shall apply the rules of law which it determines to be appropriate.

2) The arbitral tribunal shall take account of the provisions of the contract, if any, between the parties and of any relevant trade usages.

3) The arbitral tribunal shall assume the powers of an amiable compositeur or decide ex aequo et bono only if the parties have agreed to give it such powers.

Article 22: Conduct of the Arbitration

1) The arbitral tribunal and the parties shall make every effort to conduct the arbitration in an expeditious and cost-effective manner, having regard to the complexity and value of the dispute.

2) In order to ensure effective case management, the arbitral tribunal, after consulting the parties, may adopt such procedural measures as it considers appropriate, provided that they are not contrary to any agreement of the parties.

3) Upon the request of any party, the arbitral tribunal may make orders concerning the confidentiality of the arbitration proceedings or of any other matters in connection with the arbitration and may take measures for protecting trade secrets and confidential information.

4) In all cases, the arbitral tribunal shall act fairly and impartially and ensure that each party has a reasonable opportunity to present its case.

5) The parties undertake to comply with any order made by the arbitral tribunal.

Article 23: Terms of Reference

1) As soon as it has received the file from the Secretariat, the arbitral tribunal shall draw up, on the basis of documents or in the presence of the parties and in the light of their most recent submissions, a document defining its Terms of Reference. This document shall include the following particulars:

a) the names in full, description, address and other contact details of each of the parties and of any person(s) representing a party in the arbitration;

b) the addresses to which notifications and communications arising in the course of the arbitration may be made;

c) a summary of the parties' respective claims and of the relief sought by each party, together with the amounts of any quantified claims and, to the extent possible, an estimate of the monetary value of any other claims;

d) unless the arbitral tribunal considers it inappropriate, a list of issues to be determined;

e) the names in full, address and other contact details of each of the arbitrators;

f) the place of the arbitration; and

g) particulars of the applicable procedural rules and, if such is the case, reference to the power conferred upon the arbitral tribunal to act as amiable compositeur or to decide ex aequo et bono.

2) The Terms of Reference shall be signed by the parties and the arbitral tribunal. Within 30 days of the date on which the file has been transmitted to it, the arbitral tribunal shall transmit to the Court the Terms of Reference signed by it and by the parties. The Court may extend this time limit pursuant to a reasoned request from the arbitral tribunal or on its own initiative if it decides it is necessary to do so.

3) If any of the parties refuses to take part in the drawing up of the Terms of Reference or to sign the same, they shall be submitted to the Court for approval. When the Terms of Reference have been signed in accordance with Article 23(2) or approved by the Court, the arbitration shall proceed.

4) After the Terms of Reference have been signed or approved by the Court, no party shall make new claims which fall outside the limits of the Terms of Reference unless it has been authorized to do so by the arbitral tribunal, which shall consider the nature of such new claims, the stage of the arbitration and other relevant circumstances.

Article 24: Case Management Conference and Procedural Timetable

1) When drawing up the Terms of Reference or as soon as possible thereafter, the arbitral tribunal shall convene a case management conference to consult the parties on procedural measures that may be adopted pursuant to Article 22(2). Such measures may include one or more of the case management techniques described in Appendix IV.

2) During or following such conference, the arbitral tribunal shall establish the procedural timetable that it intends to follow for the conduct of the arbitration. The procedural timetable and any modifications thereto shall be communicated to the Court and the parties.

3) To ensure continued effective case management, the arbitral tribunal, after consulting the parties by means of a further case management conference or otherwise, may adopt further procedural measures or modify the procedural timetable.

4) Case management conferences may be conducted through a meeting in person, by video conference, telephone or similar means of communication. In the absence of an agreement of the parties, the arbitral tribunal shall determine the means by which the conference will be conducted. The arbitral tribunal may request the parties to submit case management proposals in advance of a case management conference and may request the attendance at any case management conference of the parties in person or through an internal representative.

Article 25: Establishing the Facts of the Case

1) The arbitral tribunal shall proceed within as short a time as possible to establish the facts of the case by all appropriate means.

2) After studying the written submissions of the parties and all documents relied upon, the arbitral tribunal shall hear the parties together in person if any of them so requests or, failing such a request, it may of its own motion decide to hear them.

3) The arbitral tribunal may decide to hear witnesses, experts appointed by the parties or any other person, in the presence of the parties, or in their absence provided they have been duly summoned.

4) The arbitral tribunal, after having consulted the parties, may appoint one or more experts, define their terms of reference and receive their reports. At the request of a party, the parties shall be given the opportunity to question at a hearing any such expert.

5) At any time during the proceedings, the arbitral tribunal may summon any party to provide additional evidence.

6) The arbitral tribunal may decide the case solely on the documents submitted by the parties unless any of the parties requests a hearing.

Article 26: Hearings

1) When a hearing is to be held, the arbitral tribunal, giving reasonable notice, shall summon the parties to appear before it on the day and at the place fixed by it.

2) If any of the parties, although duly summoned, fails to appear without valid excuse, the arbitral tribunal shall have the power to proceed with the hearing.

3) The arbitral tribunal shall be in full charge of the hearings, at which all the parties shall be entitled to be present. Save with the approval of the arbitral tribunal and the parties, persons not involved in the proceedings shall not be admitted.

4) The parties may appear in person or through duly authorized representatives. In addition, they may be assisted by advisers.

Article 27: Closing of the Proceedings and Date for Submission of Draft Awards

As soon as possible after the last hearing concerning matters to be decided in an award or the filing of the last authorized submissions concerning such matters, whichever is later, the arbitral tribunal shall:

a) declare the proceedings closed with respect to the matters to be decided in the award; and

b) inform the Secretariat and the parties of the date by which it expects to submit its draft award to the Court for approval pursuant to Article 34.

After the proceedings are closed, no further submission or argument may be made, or evidence produced, with respect to the matters to be decided in the award, unless requested or authorized by the arbitral tribunal.

Article 28: Conservatory and Interim Measures

1) Unless the parties have otherwise agreed, as soon as the file has been transmitted to it, the arbitral tribunal may, at the request of a party, order any interim or conservatory measure it deems appropriate. The arbitral tribunal may make the granting of any such measure subject to appropriate security being furnished by the requesting party. Any such measure shall take the form of an order, giving reasons, or of an award, as the arbitral tribunal considers appropriate.

2) Before the file is transmitted to the arbitral tribunal, and in appropriate circumstances even thereafter, the parties may apply to any competent judicial authority for interim or conservatory measures. The application of a party to a judicial authority for such measures or for the implementation of any such measures ordered by an arbitral tribunal shall not be deemed to be an infringement or a waiver of the arbitration agreement and shall not affect the relevant powers reserved to the arbitral tribunal. Any such application and any measures taken by the judicial authority must be notified without delay to the Secretariat. The Secretariat shall inform the arbitral tribunal thereof.

Article 29: Emergency Arbitrator

1) A party that needs urgent interim or conservatory measures that cannot await the constitution of an arbitral tribunal (“Emergency Measures”) may make an application for such measures pursuant to the Emergency Arbitrator Rules in Appendix V. Any such application shall be accepted only if it is received by the Secretariat prior to the transmission of the file to the arbitral tribunal pursuant to Article 16 and irrespective of whether the party making the application has already submitted its Request for Arbitration.

2) The emergency arbitrator’s decision shall take the form of an order. The parties undertake to comply with any order made by the emergency arbitrator.

3) The emergency arbitrator’s order shall not bind the arbitral tribunal with respect to any question, issue or dispute determined in the order. The arbitral tribunal may modify, terminate or annul the order or any modification thereto made by the emergency arbitrator.

4) The arbitral tribunal shall decide upon any party’s requests or claims related to the emergency arbitrator proceedings, including the reallocation of the costs of such proceedings and any claims arising out of or in connection with the compliance or non-compliance with the order.

5) Articles 29(1)-29(4) and the Emergency Arbitrator Rules set forth in Appendix V (collectively the “Emergency Arbitrator Provisions”) shall apply only to

parties that are either signatories of the arbitration agreement under the Rules that is relied upon for the application or successors to such signatories.

6) The Emergency Arbitrator Provisions shall not apply if:

a) the arbitration agreement under the Rules was concluded before 1 January 2012;

b) the parties have agreed to opt out of the Emergency Arbitrator Provisions; or

c) the parties have agreed to another pre-arbitral procedure that provides for the granting of conservatory, interim or similar measures.

7) The Emergency Arbitrator Provisions are not intended to prevent any party from seeking urgent interim or conservatory measures from a competent judicial authority at any time prior to making an application for such measures, and in appropriate circumstances even thereafter, pursuant to the Rules. Any application for such measures from a competent judicial authority shall not be deemed to be an infringement or a waiver of the arbitration agreement. Any such application and any measures taken by the judicial authority must be notified without delay to the Secretariat.

Article 30: Expedited Procedure

1) By agreeing to arbitration under the Rules, the parties agree that this Article 30 and the Expedited Procedure Rules set forth in Appendix VI (collectively the “Expedited Procedure Provisions”) shall take precedence over any contrary terms of the arbitration agreement.

2) The Expedited Procedure Rules set forth in Appendix VI shall apply if:

a) the amount in dispute does not exceed the limit set out in Article 1(2) of Appendix VI at the time of the communication referred to in Article 1(3) of that Appendix; or

b) the parties so agree.

3) The Expedited Procedure Provisions shall not apply if:

a) the arbitration agreement under the Rules was concluded before the date on which the Expedited Procedure Provisions came into force;

b) the parties have agreed to opt out of the Expedited Procedure Provisions; or

c) the Court, upon the request of a party before the constitution of the arbitral tribunal or on its own motion, determines that it is inappropriate in the circumstances to apply the Expedited Procedure Provisions.

AWARDS

Article 31: Time Limit for the Final Award

1) The time limit within which the arbitral tribunal must render its final award is six months. Such time limit shall start to run from the date of the last signature by the arbitral tribunal or by the parties of the Terms of Reference or, in the case of application of Article 23(3), the date of the notification to the arbitral tribunal by the Secretariat of the approval of the Terms of Reference by the Court. The Court may fix a different time limit based upon the procedural timetable established pursuant to Article 24(2).

2) The Court may extend the time limit pursuant to a reasoned request from the arbitral tribunal or on its own initiative if it decides it is necessary to do so.

Article 32: Making of the Award

1) When the arbitral tribunal is composed of more than one arbitrator, an award is made by a majority decision. If there is no majority, the award shall be made by the president of the arbitral tribunal alone.

2) The award shall state the reasons upon which it is based.

3) The award shall be deemed to be made at the place of the arbitration and on the date stated therein.

Article 33: Award by Consent

If the parties reach a settlement after the file has been transmitted to the arbitral tribunal in accordance with Article 16, the settlement shall be recorded in the form of an award made by consent of the parties, if so requested by the parties and if the arbitral tribunal agrees to do so.

Article 34: Scrutiny of the Award by the Court

Before signing any award, the arbitral tribunal shall submit it in draft form to the Court. The Court may lay down modifications as to the form of the award and, without affecting the arbitral tribunal's liberty of decision, may also draw its

attention to points of substance. No award shall be rendered by the arbitral tribunal until it has been approved by the Court as to its form.

Article 35: Notification, Deposit and Enforceability of the Award

1) Once an award has been made, the Secretariat shall notify to the parties the text signed by the arbitral tribunal, provided always that the costs of the arbitration have been fully paid to the ICC by the parties or by one of them.

2) Additional copies certified true by the Secretary General shall be made available on request and at any time to the parties, but to no one else.

3) By virtue of the notification made in accordance with Article 35(1), the parties waive any other form of notification or deposit on the part of the arbitral tribunal.

4) An original of each award made in accordance with the Rules shall be deposited with the Secretariat.

5) The arbitral tribunal and the Secretariat shall assist the parties in complying with whatever further formalities may be necessary.

6) Every award shall be binding on the parties. By submitting the dispute to arbitration under the Rules, the parties undertake to carry out any award without delay and shall be deemed to have waived their right to any form of recourse insofar as such waiver can validly be made.

Article 36: Correction and Interpretation of the Award; Remission of Awards

1) On its own initiative, the arbitral tribunal may correct a clerical, computational or typographical error, or any errors of similar nature contained in an award, provided such correction is submitted for approval to the Court within 30 days of the date of such award.

2) Any application of a party for the correction of an error of the kind referred to in Article 36(1), or for the interpretation of an award, must be made to the Secretariat within 30 days of the receipt of the award by such party, in a number of copies as stated in Article 3(1). After transmittal of the application to the arbitral tribunal, the latter shall grant the other party a short time limit, normally not exceeding 30 days, from the receipt of the application by that party, to submit any comments thereon. The arbitral tribunal shall submit its decision on the application in draft form to the Court not later than 30 days following the expiration of the time limit for the receipt of any comments from the other party or within such other period as the Court may decide.

3) A decision to correct or to interpret the award shall take the form of an addendum and shall constitute part of the award. The provisions of Articles 32, 34 and 35 shall apply *mutatis mutandis*.

4) Where a court remits an award to the arbitral tribunal, the provisions of Articles 32, 34, 35 and this Article 36 shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to any addendum or award made pursuant to the terms of such remission. The Court may take any steps as may be necessary to enable the arbitral tribunal to comply with the terms of such remission and may fix an advance to cover any additional fees and expenses of the arbitral tribunal and any additional ICC administrative expenses.

COSTS

Article 37: Advance to Cover the Costs of the Arbitration

1) After receipt of the Request, the Secretary General may request the claimant to pay a provisional advance in an amount intended to cover the costs of the arbitration

a) until the Terms of Reference have been drawn up; or

b) when the Expedited Procedure Provisions apply, until the case management conference.

Any provisional advance paid will be considered as a partial payment by the claimant of any advance on costs fixed by the Court pursuant to this Article 37.

2) As soon as practicable, the Court shall fix the advance on costs in an amount likely to cover the fees and expenses of the arbitrators and the ICC administrative expenses for the claims which have been referred to it by the parties, unless any claims are made under Article 7 or 8 in which case Article 37(4) shall apply. The advance on costs fixed by the Court pursuant to this Article 37(2) shall be payable in equal shares by the claimant and the respondent.

3) Where counterclaims are submitted by the respondent under Article 5 or otherwise, the Court may fix separate advances on costs for the claims and the counterclaims. When the Court has fixed separate advances on costs, each of the parties shall pay the advance on costs corresponding to its claims.

4) Where claims are made under Article 7 or 8, the Court shall fix one or more advances on costs that shall be payable by the parties as decided by the Court. Where the Court has previously fixed any advance on costs pursuant to this Article

36, any such advance shall be replaced by the advance(s) fixed pursuant to this Article 37(4), and the amount of any advance previously paid by any party will be considered as a partial payment by such party of its share of the advance(s) on costs as fixed by the Court pursuant to this Article 37(4).

5) The amount of any advance on costs fixed by the Court pursuant to this Article 37 may be subject to readjustment at any time during the arbitration. In all cases, any party shall be free to pay any other party's share of any advance on costs should such other party fail to pay its share.

6) When a request for an advance on costs has not been complied with, and after consultation with the arbitral tribunal, the Secretary General may direct the arbitral tribunal to suspend its work and set a time limit, which must be not less than 15 days, on the expiry of which the relevant claims shall be considered as withdrawn. Should the party in question wish to object to this measure, it must make a request within the aforementioned period for the matter to be decided by the Court. Such party shall not be prevented, on the ground of such withdrawal, from reintroducing the same claims at a later date in another proceeding.

7) If one of the parties claims a right to a set-off with regard to any claim, such set-off shall be taken into account in determining the advance to cover the costs of the arbitration in the same way as a separate claim insofar as it may require the arbitral tribunal to consider additional matters.

Article 38: Decision as to the Costs of the Arbitration

1) The costs of the arbitration shall include the fees and expenses of the arbitrators and the ICC administrative expenses fixed by the Court, in accordance with the scale in force at the time of the commencement of the arbitration, as well as the fees and expenses of any experts appointed by the arbitral tribunal and the reasonable legal and other costs incurred by the parties for the arbitration.

2) The Court may fix the fees of the arbitrators at a figure higher or lower than that which would result from the application of the relevant scale should this be deemed necessary due to the exceptional circumstances of the case.

3) At any time during the arbitral proceedings, the arbitral tribunal may make decisions on costs, other than those to be fixed by the Court, and order payment.

4) The final award shall fix the costs of the arbitration and decide which of the parties shall bear them or in what proportion they shall be borne by the parties.

5) In making decisions as to costs, the arbitral tribunal may take into account such circumstances as it considers relevant, including the extent to which each party has conducted the arbitration in an expeditious and cost-effective manner.

6) In the event of the withdrawal of all claims or the termination of the arbitration before the rendering of a final award, the Court shall fix the fees and expenses of the arbitrators and the ICC administrative expenses. If the parties have not agreed upon the allocation of the costs of the arbitration or other relevant issues with respect to costs, such matters shall be decided by the arbitral tribunal. If the arbitral tribunal has not been constituted at the time of such withdrawal or termination, any party may request the Court to proceed with the constitution of the arbitral tribunal in accordance with the Rules so that the arbitral tribunal may make decisions as to costs.

MISCELLANEOUS

Article 39: Modified Time Limits

1) The parties may agree to shorten the various time limits set out in the Rules. Any such agreement entered into subsequent to the constitution of an arbitral tribunal shall become effective only upon the approval of the arbitral tribunal.

2) The Court, on its own initiative, may extend any time limit which has been modified pursuant to Article 39(1) if it decides that it is necessary to do so in order that the arbitral tribunal and the Court may fulfil their responsibilities in accordance with the Rules.

Article 40: Waiver

A party which proceeds with the arbitration without raising its objection to a failure to comply with any provision of the Rules, or of any other rules applicable to the proceedings, any direction given by the arbitral tribunal, or any requirement under the arbitration agreement relating to the constitution of the arbitral tribunal or the conduct of the proceedings, shall be deemed to have waived its right to object.

Article 41: Limitation of Liability

The arbitrators, any person appointed by the arbitral tribunal, the emergency arbitrator, the Court and its members, the ICC and its employees, and the ICC National Committees and Groups and their employees and representatives shall not be liable to any person for any act or omission in connection with the

arbitration, except to the extent such limitation of liability is prohibited by applicable law.

Article 42: General Rule

In all matters not expressly provided for in the Rules, the Court and the arbitral tribunal shall act in the spirit of the Rules and shall make every effort to make sure that the award is enforceable at law.

APPENDIX I: STATUTES OF THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF ARBITRATION

Article 1: Function

1) The function of the International Court of Arbitration of the International Chamber of Commerce (the “Court”) is to ensure the application of the Rules of Arbitration of the International Chamber of Commerce, and it has all the necessary powers for that purpose.

2) As an autonomous body, it carries out these functions in complete independence from the ICC and its organs.

3) Its members are independent from the ICC National Committees and Groups.

Article 2: Composition of the Court

The Court shall consist of a President, Vice-Presidents, and members and alternate members (collectively designated as members). In its work it is assisted by its Secretariat (Secretariat of the Court).

Article 3: Appointment

1) The President is elected by the ICC World Council upon the recommendation of the Executive Board of the ICC.

2) The ICC World Council appoints the Vice-Presidents of the Court from among the members of the Court or otherwise.

3) Its members are appointed by the ICC World Council on the proposal of National Committees or Groups, one member for each National Committee or Group.

4) On the proposal of the President of the Court, the World Council may appoint alternate members.

5) The term of office of all members, including, for the purposes of this paragraph, the President and Vice-Presidents, is three years. If a member is no longer in a position to exercise the member's functions, a successor is appointed by the World Council for the remainder of the term. Upon the recommendation of the Executive Board, the duration of the term of office of any member may be extended beyond three years if the World Council so decides.

Article 4: Plenary Session of the Court

The Plenary Sessions of the Court are presided over by the President or, in the President's absence, by one of the Vice-Presidents designated by the President. The deliberations shall be valid when at least six members are present. Decisions are taken by a majority vote, the President or Vice-President, as the case may be, having a casting vote in the event of a tie.

Article 5: Committees

The Court may set up one or more Committees and establish the functions and organization of such Committees.

Article 6: Confidentiality

The work of the Court is of a confidential nature which must be respected by everyone who participates in that work in whatever capacity. The Court lays down the rules regarding the persons who can attend the meetings of the Court and its Committees and who are entitled to have access to materials related to the work of the Court and its Secretariat.

Article 7: Modification of the Rules of Arbitration

Any proposal of the Court for a modification of the Rules is laid before the Commission on Arbitration and ADR before submission to the Executive Board of the ICC for approval, provided, however, that the Court, in order to take account of developments in information technology, may propose to modify or supplement the provisions of Article 3 of the Rules or any related provisions in the Rules without laying any such proposal before the Commission.

APPENDIX II: INTERNAL RULES OF THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF ARBITRATION

Article 1: Confidential Character of the Work of the International Court of Arbitration

1) For the purposes of this Appendix, members of the Court include the President and Vice-Presidents of the Court.

2) The sessions of the Court, whether plenary or those of a Committee of the Court, are open only to its members and to the Secretariat.

3) However, in exceptional circumstances, the President of the Court may invite other persons to attend. Such persons must respect the confidential nature of the work of the Court.

4) The documents submitted to the Court, or drawn up by it or the Secretariat in the course of the Court's proceedings, are communicated only to the members of the Court and to the Secretariat and to persons authorized by the President to attend Court sessions.

5) The President or the Secretary General of the Court may authorize researchers undertaking work of an academic nature to acquaint themselves with awards and other documents of general interest, with the exception of memoranda, notes, statements and documents remitted by the parties within the framework of arbitration proceedings.

6) Such authorization shall not be given unless the beneficiary has undertaken to respect the confidential character of the documents made available and to refrain from publishing anything based upon information contained therein without having previously submitted the text for approval to the Secretary General of the Court.

7) The Secretariat will in each case submitted to arbitration under the Rules retain in the archives of the Court all awards, Terms of Reference and decisions of the Court, as well as copies of the pertinent correspondence of the Secretariat.

8) Any documents, communications or correspondence submitted by the parties or the arbitrators may be destroyed unless a party or an arbitrator requests in writing within a period fixed by the Secretariat the return of such documents, communications or correspondence. All related costs and expenses for the return of those documents shall be paid by such party or arbitrator.

Article 2: Participation of Members of the International Court of Arbitration in ICC Arbitration

1) The President and the members of the Secretariat of the Court may not act as arbitrators or as counsel in cases submitted to ICC arbitration.

2) The Court shall not appoint Vice-Presidents or members of the Court as arbitrators. They may, however, be proposed for such duties by one or more of the parties, or pursuant to any other procedure agreed upon by the parties, subject to confirmation.

3) When the President, a Vice-President or a member of the Court or of the Secretariat is involved in any capacity whatsoever in proceedings pending before the Court, such person must inform the Secretary General of the Court upon becoming aware of such involvement.

4) Such person must be absent from the Court session whenever the matter is considered by the Court and shall not participate in the discussions or in the decisions of the Court.

5) Such person will not receive any material documentation or information pertaining to such proceedings.

Article 3: Relations between the Members of the Court and the ICC National Committees and Groups

1) By virtue of their capacity, the members of the Court are independent of the ICC National Committees and Groups which proposed them for appointment by the ICC World Council.

2) Furthermore, they must regard as confidential, vis-à-vis the said National Committees and Groups, any information concerning individual cases with which they have become acquainted in their capacity as members of the Court, except when they have been requested by the President of the Court, by a Vice-President of the Court authorized by the President of the Court, or by the Court's Secretary General to communicate specific information to their respective National Committees or Groups.

Article 4: Committee of the Court

1) In accordance with the provisions of Article 1(4) of the Rules and Article 5 of Appendix I, the Court hereby establishes a Committee of the Court.

2) The members of the Committee consist of a president and at least two other members. The President of the Court acts as the president of the Committee.

In the President's absence or otherwise at the President's request, a Vice-President of the Court or, in exceptional circumstances, another member of the Court may act as president of the Committee.

3) The other two members of the Committee are appointed by the Court from among the Vice-Presidents or the other members of the Court. At each Plenary Session the Court appoints the members who are to attend the meetings of the Committee to be held before the next Plenary Session.

4) The Committee meets when convened by its president. Two members constitute a quorum.

5)(a) The Court shall determine the decisions that may be taken by the Committee.

(b) The decisions of the Committee are taken unanimously.

(c) When the Committee cannot reach a decision or deems it preferable to abstain, it transfers the case to the next Plenary Session, making any suggestions it deems appropriate.

(d) The Committee's decisions are brought to the notice of the Court at its next Plenary Session.

6) For the purpose of expedited procedures and in accordance with the provisions of Article 1(4) of the Rules and Article 5 of Appendix I, the Court may exceptionally establish a Committee consisting of one member. Articles 4(2), 4(3), 4(4), 4(5), subparagraphs b) and c), of this Appendix II shall not apply.

Article 5: Court Secretariat

1) In the Secretary General's absence or otherwise at the Secretary General's request, the Deputy Secretary General and/or the General Counsel shall have the authority to refer matters to the Court, confirm arbitrators, certify true copies of awards and request the payment of a provisional advance, respectively provided for in Articles 6(3), 13(2), 35 (2) and 37(1) of the Rules, as well as to take the measure provided for in Article 37(6).

2) The Secretariat may, with the approval of the Court, issue notes and other documents for the information of the parties and the arbitrators, or as necessary for the proper conduct of the arbitral proceedings.

3) Offices of the Secretariat may be established outside the headquarters of the ICC. The Secretariat shall keep a list of offices designated by the Secretary General. Requests for Arbitration may be submitted to the Secretariat at any of its

offices, and the Secretariat's functions under the Rules may be carried out from any of its offices, as instructed by the Secretary General, Deputy Secretary General or General Counsel.

Article 6: Scrutiny of Arbitral Awards

When the Court scrutinizes draft awards in accordance with Article 34 of the Rules, it considers, to the extent practicable, the requirements of mandatory law at the place of the arbitration.

APPENDIX III: ARBITRATION COSTS AND FEES

Article 1: Advance on Costs

1) Each request to commence an arbitration pursuant to the Rules must be accompanied by a filing fee of US\$ 5,000. Such payment is non-refundable and shall be credited to the claimant's portion of the advance on costs.

2) The provisional advance fixed by the Secretary General according to Article 37(1) of the Rules shall normally not exceed the amount obtained by adding together the ICC administrative expenses, the minimum of the fees (as set out in the scale hereinafter) based upon the amount of the claim and the expected reimbursable expenses of the arbitral tribunal incurred with respect to the drafting of the Terms of Reference. If such amount is not quantified, the provisional advance shall be fixed at the discretion of the Secretary General. Payment by the claimant shall be credited to its share of the advance on costs fixed by the Court.

3) In general, the arbitral tribunal shall, in accordance with Article 37(6) of the Rules, proceed only with respect to those claims or counterclaims in regard to which the whole of the advance on costs has been paid.

4) The advance on costs fixed by the Court according to Articles 37(2) or 37(4) of the Rules comprises the fees of the arbitrator or arbitrators (hereinafter referred to as "arbitrator"), any arbitration-related expenses of the arbitrator and the ICC administrative expenses.

5) Each party shall pay its share of the total advance on costs in cash. However, if a party's share of the advance on costs is greater than US\$ 500,000 (the "Threshold Amount"), such party may post a bank guarantee for any amount above the Threshold Amount. The Court may modify the Threshold Amount at any time at its discretion.

6) The Court may authorize the payment of advances on costs, or any party's share thereof, in instalments, subject to such conditions as the Court thinks fit, including the payment of additional ICC administrative expenses.

7) A party that has already paid in full its share of the advance on costs fixed by the Court may, in accordance with Article 37(5) of the Rules, pay the unpaid portion of the advance owed by the defaulting party by posting a bank guarantee.

8) When the Court has fixed separate advances on costs pursuant to Article 37(3) of the Rules, the Secretariat shall invite each party to pay the amount of the advance corresponding to its respective claim(s).

9) When, as a result of the fixing of separate advances on costs, the separate advance fixed for the claim of either party exceeds one half of such global advance as was previously fixed (in respect of the same claims and counterclaims that are the subject of separate advances), a bank guarantee may be posted to cover any such excess amount. In the event that the amount of the separate advance is subsequently increased, at least one half of the increase shall be paid in cash.

10) The Secretariat shall establish the terms governing all bank guarantees which the parties may post pursuant to the above provisions.

11) As provided in Article 37(5) of the Rules, the advance on costs may be subject to readjustment at any time during the arbitration, in particular to take into account fluctuations in the amount in dispute, changes in the amount of the estimated expenses of the arbitrator, or the evolving difficulty or complexity of arbitration proceedings.

12) Before any expertise ordered by the arbitral tribunal can be commenced, the parties, or one of them, shall pay an advance on costs fixed by the arbitral tribunal sufficient to cover the expected fees and expenses of the expert as determined by the arbitral tribunal. The arbitral tribunal shall be responsible for ensuring the payment by the parties of such fees and expenses.

13) The amounts paid as advances on costs do not yield interest for the parties or the arbitrator.

Article 2: Costs and Fees

1) Subject to Article 38(2) of the Rules, the Court shall fix the fees of the arbitrator in accordance with the scale hereinafter set out or, where the amount in dispute is not stated, at its discretion.

2) In setting the arbitrator's fees, the Court shall take into consideration the diligence and efficiency of the arbitrator, the time spent, the rapidity of the

proceedings, the complexity of the dispute and the timeliness of the submission of the draft award, so as to arrive at a figure within the limits specified or, in exceptional circumstances (Article 38(2) of the Rules), at a figure higher or lower than those limits.

3) When a case is submitted to more than one arbitrator, the Court, at its discretion, shall have the right to increase the total fees up to a maximum which shall normally not exceed three times the fees of one arbitrator.

4) The arbitrator's fees and expenses shall be fixed exclusively by the Court as required by the Rules. Separate fee arrangements between the parties and the arbitrator are contrary to the Rules.

5) The Court shall fix the ICC administrative expenses of each arbitration in accordance with the scale hereinafter set out or, where the amount in dispute is not stated, at its discretion. Where the parties have agreed upon additional services, or in exceptional circumstances, the Court may fix the ICC administrative expenses at a lower or higher figure than that which would result from the application of such scale, provided that such expenses shall normally not exceed the maximum amount of the scale.

6) At any time during the arbitration, the Court may fix as payable a portion of the ICC administrative expenses corresponding to services that have already been performed by the Court and the Secretariat.

7) The Court may require the payment of administrative expenses in addition to those provided in the scale of administrative expenses as a condition for holding an arbitration in abeyance at the request of the parties or of one of them with the acquiescence of the other.

8) If an arbitration terminates before the rendering of a final award, the Court shall fix the fees and expenses of the arbitrators and the ICC administrative expenses at its discretion, taking into account the stage attained by the arbitral proceedings and any other relevant circumstances.

9) Any amount paid by the parties as an advance on costs exceeding the costs of the arbitration fixed by the Court shall be reimbursed to the parties having regard to the amounts paid.

10) In the case of an application under Article 36(2) of the Rules or of a remission pursuant to Article 36(4) of the Rules, the Court may fix an advance to cover additional fees and expenses of the arbitral tribunal and additional ICC administrative expenses and may make the transmission of such application to the arbitral tribunal subject to the prior cash payment in full to the ICC of such advance. The Court shall fix at its discretion the costs of the procedure following an

application or a remission, which shall include any possible fees of the arbitrator and ICC administrative expenses, when approving the decision of the arbitral tribunal.

11) The Secretariat may require the payment of administrative expenses in addition to those provided in the scale of administrative expenses for any expenses arising in relation to a request pursuant to Article 35(5) of the Rules.

12) When an arbitration is preceded by proceedings under the ICC Mediation Rules, one half of the ICC administrative expenses paid for such proceedings shall be credited to the ICC administrative expenses of the arbitration.

13) Amounts paid to the arbitrator do not include any possible value added tax (VAT) or other taxes or charges and imposts applicable to the arbitrator's fees. Parties have a duty to pay any such taxes or charges; however, the recovery of any such charges or taxes is a matter solely between the arbitrator and the parties.

14) Any ICC administrative expenses may be subject to value added tax (VAT) or charges of a similar nature at the prevailing rate.

Article 3: Scales of Administrative Expenses and Arbitrator's Fees

1) The scales of administrative expenses and arbitrator's fees set forth below shall be effective as of 1 January 2017 in respect of all arbitrations commenced on or after such date, irrespective of the version of the Rules applying to such arbitrations.

2) To calculate the ICC administrative expenses and the arbitrator's fees, the amounts calculated for each successive tranche of the amount in dispute must be added together, except that where the amount in dispute is over US\$ 500 million, a flat amount of US\$ 150,000 shall constitute the entirety of the ICC administrative expenses.

3) The scales of administrative expenses and arbitrator's fees for the expedited procedure set forth below shall be effective as of 1 March 2017 in respect of all arbitrations commenced on or after such date, irrespective of the version of the Rules applying to such arbitrations. When parties have agreed to the expedited procedure pursuant to Article 30(2), subparagraph b), the scales for the expedited procedure will apply.

4) All amounts fixed by the Court or pursuant to any of the appendices to the Rules are payable in US\$ except where prohibited by law or decided otherwise by the Court, in which case the ICC may apply a different scale and fee arrangement in another currency. . . .

Replace the LCIA Arbitration Rules on pages 249-269 of the Documentary Supplement with the following:

LCIA Arbitration Rules*
Effective October 1, 2014

Preamble

Where any agreement, submission or reference howsoever made or evidenced in writing (whether signed or not) provides in whatsoever manner for arbitration under the rules of or by the LCIA, the London Court of International Arbitration, the London Court of Arbitration or the London Court, the parties thereto shall be taken to have agreed in writing that any arbitration between them shall be conducted in accordance with the LCIA Rules or such amended rules as the LCIA may have adopted hereafter to take effect before the commencement of the arbitration and that such LCIA Rules form part of their agreement (collectively, the “Arbitration Agreement”). These LCIA Rules comprise this Preamble, the Articles and the Index, together with the Annex to the LCIA Rules and the Schedule of Costs as both from time to time may be separately amended by the LCIA (the “LCIA Rules”).

Article 1 Request for Arbitration

1.1 Any party wishing to commence an arbitration under the LCIA Rules (the “Claimant”) shall deliver to the Registrar of the LCIA Court (the “Registrar”) a written request for arbitration (the “Request”), containing or accompanied by:

(i) the full name and all contact details (including postal address, e-mail address, telephone and facsimile numbers) of the Claimant for the purpose of receiving delivery of all documentation in the arbitration; and the same particulars of the Claimant’s legal representatives (if any) and of all other parties to the arbitration;

(ii) the full terms of the Arbitration Agreement (excepting the LCIA Rules) invoked by the Claimant to support its claim, together with a copy of any contractual or other documentation in which those terms are contained and to which the Claimant’s claim relates;

(iii) a statement briefly summarising the nature and circumstances of the dispute, its estimated monetary amount or value, the transaction(s) at issue and the claim advanced by the Claimant against any other party to the

* Copyright © 2014 by the LCIA. Reprinted with permission.

arbitration (each such other party being here separately described as a "Respondent");

(iv) a statement of any procedural matters for the arbitration (such as the arbitral seat, the language(s) of the arbitration, the number of arbitrators, their qualifications and identities) upon which the parties have already agreed in writing or in respect of which the Claimant makes any proposal under the Arbitration Agreement;

(v) if the Arbitration Agreement (or any other written agreement) howsoever calls for any form of party nomination of arbitrators, the full name, postal address, e-mail address, telephone and facsimile numbers of the Claimant's nominee;

(vi) confirmation that the registration fee prescribed in the Schedule of Costs has been or is being paid to the LCIA, without which actual receipt of such payment the Request shall be treated by the Registrar as not having been delivered and the arbitration as not having been commenced under the Arbitration Agreement; and

(vii) confirmation that copies of the Request (including all accompanying documents) have been or are being delivered to all other parties to the arbitration by one or more means to be identified specifically in such confirmation, to be supported then or as soon as possible thereafter by documentary proof satisfactory to the LCIA Court of actual delivery (including the date of delivery) or, if actual delivery is demonstrated to be impossible to the LCIA Court's satisfaction, sufficient information as to any other effective form of notification.

1.2 The Request (including all accompanying documents) may be submitted to the Registrar in electronic form (as e-mail attachments) or in paper form or in both forms. If submitted in paper form, the Request shall be submitted in two copies where a sole arbitrator is to be appointed, or, if the parties have agreed or the Claimant proposes that three arbitrators are to be appointed, in four copies.

1.3 The Claimant may use, but is not required to do so, the standard electronic form available on-line from the LCIA's website for LCIA Requests.

1.4 The date of receipt by the Registrar of the Request shall be treated as the date upon which the arbitration has commenced for all purposes (the "Commencement Date"), subject to the LCIA's actual receipt of the registration fee.

1.5 There may be one or more Claimants (whether or not jointly represented); and in such event, where appropriate, the term “Claimant” shall be so interpreted under the Arbitration Agreement.

Article 2 Response

2.1 Within 28 days of the Commencement Date, or such lesser or greater period to be determined by the LCIA Court upon application by any party or upon its own initiative (pursuant to Article 22.5), the Respondent shall deliver to the Registrar a written response to the Request (the “Response”), containing or accompanied by:

(i) the Respondent’s full name and all contact details (including postal address, e-mail address, telephone and facsimile numbers) for the purpose of receiving delivery of all documentation in the arbitration and the same particulars of its legal representatives (if any);

(ii) confirmation or denial of all or part of the claim advanced by the Claimant in the Request, including the Claimant’s invocation of the Arbitration Agreement in support of its claim;

(iii) if not full confirmation, a statement briefly summarising the nature and circumstances of the dispute, its estimated monetary amount or value, the transaction(s) at issue and the defence advanced by the Respondent, and also indicating whether any cross-claim will be advanced by the Respondent against any other party to the arbitration (such cross-claim to include any counterclaim against any Claimant and any other cross-claim against any Respondent);

(iv) a response to any procedural statement for the arbitration contained in the Request under Article 1.1(iv), including the Respondent’s own statement relating to the arbitral seat, the language(s) of the arbitration, the number of arbitrators, their qualifications and identities and any other procedural matter upon which the parties have already agreed in writing or in respect of which the Respondent makes any proposal under the Arbitration Agreement;

(v) if the Arbitration Agreement (or any other written agreement) howsoever calls for party nomination of arbitrators, the full name, postal address, e-mail address, telephone and facsimile numbers of the Respondent’s nominee; and

(vi) confirmation that copies of the Response (including all accompanying documents) have been or are being delivered to all other

parties to the arbitration by one or more means of delivery to be identified specifically in such confirmation, to be supported then or as soon as possible thereafter by documentary proof satisfactory to the LCIA Court of actual delivery (including the date of delivery) or, if actual delivery is demonstrated to be impossible to the LCIA Court's satisfaction, sufficient information as to any other effective form of notification.

2.2 The Response (including all accompanying documents) may be submitted to the Registrar in electronic form (as e-mail attachments) or in paper form or in both forms. If submitted in paper form, the Response shall be submitted in two copies where a sole arbitrator is to be appointed, or, if the parties have agreed or the Respondent proposes that three arbitrators are to be appointed, in four copies.

2.3 The Respondent may use, but is not required to do so, the standard electronic form available on-line from the LCIA's website for LCIA Responses.

2.4 Failure to deliver a Response within time shall constitute an irrevocable waiver of that party's opportunity to nominate or propose any arbitral candidate. Failure to deliver any or any part of a Response within time or at all shall not (by itself) preclude the Respondent from denying any claim or from advancing any defence or cross-claim in the arbitration.

2.5 There may be one or more Respondents (whether or not jointly represented); and in such event, where appropriate, the term "Respondent" shall be so interpreted under the Arbitration Agreement.

Article 3 LCIA Court and Registrar

3.1 The functions of the LCIA Court under the Arbitration Agreement shall be performed in its name by the President of the LCIA Court (or any of its Vice-Presidents, Honorary Vice-Presidents or former Vice-Presidents) or by a division of three or more members of the LCIA Court appointed by its President or any Vice-President (the "LCIA Court").

3.2 The functions of the Registrar under the Arbitration Agreement shall be performed under the supervision of the LCIA Court by the Registrar or any deputy Registrar.

3.3 All communications in the arbitration to the LCIA Court from any party, arbitrator or expert to the Arbitral Tribunal shall be addressed to the Registrar.

Article 4 Written Communications and Periods of Time

4.1 Any written communication by the LCIA Court, the Registrar or any party may be delivered personally or by registered postal or courier service or (subject to Article 4.3) by facsimile, e-mail or any other electronic means of telecommunication that provides a record of its transmission, or in any other manner ordered by the Arbitral Tribunal.

4.2 Unless otherwise ordered by the Arbitral Tribunal, if an address has been agreed or designated by a party for the purpose of receiving any communication in regard to the Arbitration Agreement or (in the absence of such agreement or designation) has been regularly used in the parties' previous dealings, any written communication (including the Request and Response) may be delivered to such party at that address, and if so delivered, shall be treated as having been received by such party.

4.3 Delivery by electronic means (including e-mail and facsimile) may only be effected to an address agreed or designated by the receiving party for that purpose or ordered by the Arbitral Tribunal.

4.4 For the purpose of determining the commencement of any time-limit, a written communication shall be treated as having been received by a party on the day it is delivered or, in the case of electronic means, transmitted in accordance with Articles 4.1 to 4.3 (such time to be determined by reference to the recipient's time-zone).

4.5 For the purpose of determining compliance with a time-limit, a written communication shall be treated as having been sent by a party if made or transmitted in accordance with Articles 4.1 to 4.3 prior to or on the date of the expiration of the time-limit.

4.6 For the purpose of calculating a period of time, such period shall begin to run on the day following the day when a written communication is received by the addressee. If the last day of such period is an official holiday or non-business day at the place of that addressee (or the place of the party against whom the calculation of time applies), the period shall be extended until the first business day which follows that last day. Official holidays and non-business days occurring during the running of the period of time shall be included in calculating that period.

Article 5 Formation of Arbitral Tribunal

5.1 The formation of the Arbitral Tribunal by the LCIA Court shall not be impeded by any controversy between the parties relating to the sufficiency of the Request or the Response. The LCIA Court may also proceed with the arbitration

notwithstanding that the Request is incomplete or the Response is missing, late or incomplete.

5.2 The expression the “Arbitral Tribunal” includes a sole arbitrator or all the arbitrators where more than one.

5.3 All arbitrators shall be and remain at all times impartial and independent of the parties; and none shall act in the arbitration as advocate for or representative of any party. No arbitrator shall advise any party on the parties’ dispute or the outcome of the arbitration.

5.4 Before appointment by the LCIA Court, each arbitral candidate shall furnish to the Registrar (upon the latter’s request) a brief written summary of his or her qualifications and professional positions (past and present); the candidate shall also agree in writing fee-rates conforming to the Schedule of Costs; the candidate shall sign a written declaration stating: (i) whether there are any circumstances currently known to the candidate which are likely to give rise in the mind of any party to any justifiable doubts as to his or her impartiality or independence and, if so, specifying in full such circumstances in the declaration; and (ii) whether the candidate is ready, willing and able to devote sufficient time, diligence and industry to ensure the expeditious and efficient conduct of the arbitration. The candidate shall furnish promptly such agreement and declaration to the Registrar.

5.5 If appointed, each arbitral candidate shall thereby assume a continuing duty as an arbitrator, until the arbitration is finally concluded, forthwith to disclose in writing any circumstances becoming known to that arbitrator after the date of his or her written declaration (under Article 5.4) which are likely to give rise in the mind of any party to any justifiable doubts as to his or her impartiality or independence, to be delivered to the LCIA Court, any other members of the Arbitral Tribunal and all parties in the arbitration.

5.6 The LCIA Court shall appoint the Arbitral Tribunal promptly after receipt by the Registrar of the Response or, if no Response is received, after 35 days from the Commencement Date (or such other lesser or greater period to be determined by the LCIA Court pursuant to Article 22.5).

5.7 No party or third person may appoint any arbitrator under the Arbitration Agreement: the LCIA Court alone is empowered to appoint arbitrators (albeit taking into account any written agreement or joint nomination by the parties).

5.8 A sole arbitrator shall be appointed unless the parties have agreed in writing otherwise or if the LCIA Court determines that in the circumstances a three-member tribunal is appropriate (or, exceptionally, more than three).

5.9 The LCIA Court shall appoint arbitrators with due regard for any particular method or criteria of selection agreed in writing by the parties. The LCIA Court shall also take into account the transaction(s) at issue, the nature and circumstances of the dispute, its monetary amount or value, the location and languages of the parties, the number of parties and all other factors which it may consider relevant in the circumstances.

5.10 The President of the LCIA Court shall only be eligible to be appointed as an arbitrator if the parties agree in writing to nominate him or her as the sole or presiding arbitrator; and the Vice Presidents of the LCIA Court and the Chairman of the LCIA Board of Directors (the latter being ex officio a member of the LCIA Court) shall only be eligible to be appointed as arbitrators if nominated in writing by a party or parties – provided that no such nominee shall have taken or shall take thereafter any part in any function of the LCIA Court or LCIA relating to such arbitration.

Article 6 Nationality of Arbitrators

6.1 Where the parties are of different nationalities, a sole arbitrator or the presiding arbitrator shall not have the same nationality as any party unless the parties who are not of the same nationality as the arbitral candidate all agree in writing otherwise.

6.2 The nationality of a party shall be understood to include those of its controlling shareholders or interests.

6.3 A person who is a citizen of two or more States shall be treated as a national of each State; citizens of the European Union shall be treated as nationals of its different Member States and shall not be treated as having the same nationality; a citizen of a State's overseas territory shall be treated as a national of that territory and not of that State; and a legal person incorporated in a State's overseas territory shall be treated as such and not (by such fact alone) as a national of or a legal person incorporated in that State.

Article 7 Party and Other Nominations

7.1 If the parties have agreed howsoever that any arbitrator is to be appointed by one or more of them or by any third person (other than the LCIA Court), that agreement shall be treated under the Arbitration Agreement as an agreement to nominate an arbitrator for all purposes. Such nominee may only be appointed by the LCIA Court as arbitrator subject to that nominee's compliance with Articles 5.3 to 5.5; and the LCIA Court shall refuse to appoint any nominee if it determines that the nominee is not so compliant or is otherwise unsuitable.

7.2 Where the parties have howsoever agreed that the Claimant or the Respondent or any third person (other than the LCIA Court) is to nominate an arbitrator and such nomination is not made within time or at all (in the Request, Response or otherwise), the LCIA Court may appoint an arbitrator notwithstanding any absent or late nomination.

7.3 In the absence of written agreement between the Parties, no party may unilaterally nominate a sole arbitrator or presiding arbitrator.

Article 8 Three or More Parties

8.1 Where the Arbitration Agreement entitles each party howsoever to nominate an arbitrator, the parties to the dispute number more than two and such parties have not all agreed in writing that the disputant parties represent collectively two separate “sides” for the formation of the Arbitral Tribunal (as Claimants on one side and Respondents on the other side, each side nominating a single arbitrator), the LCIA Court shall appoint the Arbitral Tribunal without regard to any party's entitlement or nomination.

8.2 In such circumstances, the Arbitration Agreement shall be treated for all purposes as a written agreement by the parties for the nomination and appointment of the Arbitral Tribunal by the LCIA Court alone.

Article 9A Expedited Formation of Arbitral Tribunal

9.1 In the case of exceptional urgency, any party may apply to the LCIA Court for the expedited formation of the Arbitral Tribunal under Article 5.

9.2 Such an application shall be made to the Registrar in writing (preferably by electronic means), together with a copy of the Request (if made by a Claimant) or a copy of the Response (if made by a Respondent), delivered or notified to all other parties to the arbitration. The application shall set out the specific grounds for exceptional urgency requiring the expedited formation of the Arbitral Tribunal.

9.3 The LCIA Court shall determine the application as expeditiously as possible in the circumstances. If the application is granted, for the purpose of forming the Arbitral Tribunal the LCIA Court may abridge any period of time under the Arbitration Agreement or other agreement of the parties (pursuant to Article 22.5).

Article 9B Emergency Arbitrator

9.4 Subject always to Article 9.14 below, in the case of emergency at any time prior to the formation or expedited formation of the Arbitral Tribunal (under Articles 5 or 9A), any party may apply to the LCIA Court for the immediate appointment of a temporary sole arbitrator to conduct emergency proceedings pending the formation or expedited formation of the Arbitral Tribunal (the “Emergency Arbitrator”).

9.5 Such an application shall be made to the Registrar in writing (preferably by electronic means), together with a copy of the Request (if made by a Claimant) or a copy of the Response (if made by a Respondent), delivered or notified to all other parties to the arbitration. The application shall set out, together with all relevant documentation: (i) the specific grounds for requiring, as an emergency, the appointment of an Emergency Arbitrator; and (ii) the specific claim, with reasons, for emergency relief. The application shall be accompanied by the applicant’s written confirmation that the applicant has paid or is paying to the LCIA the Special Fee under Article 9B, without which actual receipt of such payment the application shall be dismissed by the LCIA Court. The Special Fee shall be subject to the terms of the Schedule of Costs. Its amount is prescribed in the Schedule, covering the fees and expenses of the Emergency Arbitrator and the administrative fees and expenses of the LCIA, with additional charges (if any) of the LCIA Court. After the appointment of the Emergency Arbitrator, the amount of the Special Fee payable by the applicant may be increased by the LCIA Court in accordance with the Schedule. Article 24 shall not apply to any Special Fee paid to the LCIA.

9.6 The LCIA Court shall determine the application as soon as possible in the circumstances. If the application is granted, an Emergency Arbitrator shall be appointed by the LCIA Court within three days of the Registrar’s receipt of the application (or as soon as possible thereafter). Articles 5.1, 5.7, 5.9, 5.10, 6, 9C, 10 and 16.2 (last sentence) shall apply to such appointment. The Emergency Arbitrator shall comply with the requirements of Articles 5.3, 5.4 and (until the emergency proceedings are finally concluded) Article 5.5.

9.7 The Emergency Arbitrator may conduct the emergency proceedings in any manner determined by the Emergency Arbitrator to be appropriate in the circumstances, taking account of the nature of such emergency proceedings, the need to afford to each party, if possible, an opportunity to be consulted on the claim for emergency relief (whether or not it avails itself of such opportunity), the claim and reasons for emergency relief and the parties’ further submissions (if any). The Emergency Arbitrator is not required to hold any hearing with the parties (whether in person, by telephone or otherwise) and may decide the claim for emergency relief on available documentation. In the event of a hearing, Articles 16.3, 19.2, 19.3 and 19.4 shall apply.

9.8 The Emergency Arbitrator shall decide the claim for emergency relief as soon as possible, but no later than 14 days following the Emergency Arbitrator's appointment. This deadline may only be extended by the LCIA Court in exceptional circumstances (pursuant to Article 22.5) or by the written agreement of all parties to the emergency proceedings. The Emergency Arbitrator may make any order or award which the Arbitral Tribunal could make under the Arbitration Agreement (excepting Arbitration and Legal Costs under Articles 28.2 and 28.3); and, in addition, make any order adjourning the consideration of all or any part of the claim for emergency relief to the proceedings conducted by the Arbitral Tribunal (when formed).

9.9 An order of the Emergency Arbitrator shall be made in writing, with reasons. An award of the Emergency Arbitrator shall comply with Article 26.2 and, when made, take effect as an award under Article 26.8 (subject to Article 9.11). The Emergency Arbitrator shall be responsible for delivering any order or award to the Registrar, who shall transmit the same promptly to the parties by electronic means, in addition to paper form (if so requested by any party). In the event of any disparity between electronic and paper forms, the electronic form shall prevail.

9.10 The Special Fee paid shall form a part of the Arbitration Costs under Article 28.2 determined by the LCIA Court (as to the amount of Arbitration Costs) and decided by the Arbitral Tribunal (as to the proportions in which the parties shall bear Arbitration Costs). Any legal or other expenses incurred by any party during the emergency proceedings shall form a part of the Legal Costs under Article 28.3 decided by the Arbitral Tribunal (as to amount and as to payment between the parties of Legal Costs).

9.11 Any order or award of the Emergency Arbitrator (apart from any order adjourning to the Arbitral Tribunal, when formed, any part of the claim for emergency relief) may be confirmed, varied, discharged or revoked, in whole or in part, by order or award made by the Arbitral Tribunal upon application by any party or upon its own initiative.

9.12 Article 9B shall not prejudice any party's right to apply to a state court or other legal authority for any interim or conservatory measures before the formation of the Arbitration Tribunal; and it shall not be treated as an alternative to or substitute for the exercise of such right. During the emergency proceedings, any application to and any order by such court or authority shall be communicated promptly in writing to the Emergency Arbitrator, the Registrar and all other parties.

9.13 Articles 3.3, 13.1-13.4, 14.4, 14.5, 16, 17, 18, 22.3, 22.4, 23, 28, 29, 30, 31 and 32 and the Annex shall apply to emergency proceedings. In addition to the

provisions expressly set out there and in Article 9B above, the Emergency Arbitrator and the parties to the emergency proceedings shall also be guided by other provisions of the Arbitration Agreement, whilst recognising that several such provisions may not be fully applicable or appropriate to emergency proceedings. Wherever relevant, the LCIA Court may abridge under any such provisions any period of time (pursuant to Article 22.5).

9.14 Article 9B shall not apply if either: (i) the parties have concluded their arbitration agreement before 1 October 2014 and the parties have not agreed in writing to 'opt in' to Article 9B; or (ii) the parties have agreed in writing at any time to 'opt out' of Article 9B.

Article 9C Expedited Appointment of Replacement Arbitrator

9.15 Any party may apply to the LCIA Court for the expedited appointment of a replacement arbitrator under Article 11.

9.16 Such an application shall be made in writing to the Registrar (preferably by electronic means), delivered (or notified) to all other parties to the arbitration; and it shall set out the specific grounds requiring the expedited appointment of the replacement arbitrator.

9.17 The LCIA Court shall determine the application as expeditiously as possible in the circumstances. If the application is granted, for the purpose of expediting the appointment of the replacement arbitrator the LCIA Court may abridge any period of time in the Arbitration Agreement or any other agreement of the parties (pursuant to Article 22.5).

Article 10 Revocation and Challenges

10.1 The LCIA Court may revoke any arbitrator's appointment upon its own initiative, at the written request of all other members of the Arbitral Tribunal or upon a written challenge by any party if: (i) that arbitrator gives written notice to the LCIA Court of his or her intent to resign as arbitrator, to be copied to all parties and all other members of the Arbitral Tribunal (if any); (ii) that arbitrator falls seriously ill, refuses or becomes unable or unfit to act; or (iii) circumstances exist that give rise to justifiable doubts as to that arbitrator's impartiality or independence.

10.2 The LCIA Court may determine that an arbitrator is unfit to act under Article 10.1 if that arbitrator: (i) acts in deliberate violation of the Arbitration Agreement; (ii) does not act fairly or impartially as between the parties; or (iii) does not conduct or participate in the arbitration with reasonable efficiency, diligence and industry.

10.3 A party challenging an arbitrator under Article 10.1 shall, within 14 days of the formation of the Arbitral Tribunal or (if later) within 14 days of becoming aware of any grounds described in Article 10.1 or 10.2, deliver a written statement of the reasons for its challenge to the LCIA Court, the Arbitral Tribunal and all other parties. A party may challenge an arbitrator whom it has nominated, or in whose appointment it has participated, only for reasons of which it becomes aware after the appointment has been made by the LCIA Court.

10.4 The LCIA Court shall provide to those other parties and the challenged arbitrator a reasonable opportunity to comment on the challenging party's written statement. The LCIA Court may require at any time further information and materials from the challenging party, the challenged arbitrator, other parties and other members of the Arbitral Tribunal (if any).

10.5 If all other parties agree in writing to the challenge within 14 days of receipt of the written statement, the LCIA Court shall revoke that arbitrator's appointment (without reasons).

10.6 Unless the parties so agree or the challenged arbitrator resigns in writing within 14 days of receipt of the written statement, the LCIA Court shall decide the challenge and, if upheld, shall revoke that arbitrator's appointment. The LCIA Court's decision shall be made in writing, with reasons; and a copy shall be transmitted by the Registrar to the parties, the challenged arbitrator and other members of the Arbitral Tribunal (if any). A challenged arbitrator who resigns in writing prior to the LCIA Court's decision shall not be considered as having admitted any part of the written statement.

10.7 The LCIA Court shall determine the amount of fees and expenses (if any) to be paid for the former arbitrator's services, as it may consider appropriate in the circumstances. The LCIA Court may also determine whether, in what amount and to whom any party should pay forthwith the costs of the challenge; and the LCIA Court may also refer all or any part of such costs to the later decision of the Arbitral Tribunal and/or the LCIA Court under Article 28.

Article 11 Nomination and Replacement

11.1 In the event that the LCIA Court determines that justifiable doubts exist as to any arbitral candidate's suitability, independence or impartiality, or if a nominee declines appointment as arbitrator, or if an arbitrator is to be replaced for any reason, the LCIA Court may determine whether or not to follow the original nominating process for such arbitral appointment.

11.2 The LCIA Court may determine that any opportunity given to a party to make any re-nomination (under the Arbitration Agreement or otherwise) shall be waived if not exercised within 14 days (or such lesser or greater time as the LCIA Court may determine), after which the LCIA Court shall appoint the replacement arbitrator without such re-nomination.

Article 12 Majority Power to Continue Deliberations

12.1 In exceptional circumstances, where an arbitrator without good cause refuses or persistently fails to participate in the deliberations of an Arbitral Tribunal, the remaining arbitrators jointly may decide (after their written notice of such refusal or failure to the LCIA Court, the parties and the absent arbitrator) to continue the arbitration (including the making of any award) notwithstanding the absence of that other arbitrator, subject to the written approval of the LCIA Court.

12.2 In deciding whether to continue the arbitration, the remaining arbitrators shall take into account the stage of the arbitration, any explanation made by or on behalf of the absent arbitrator for his or her refusal or non-participation, the likely effect upon the legal recognition or enforceability of any award at the seat of the arbitration and such other matters as they consider appropriate in the circumstances. The reasons for such decision shall be stated in any award made by the remaining arbitrators without the participation of the absent arbitrator.

12.3 In the event that the remaining arbitrators decide at any time thereafter not to continue the arbitration without the participation of the absent arbitrator, the remaining arbitrators shall notify in writing the parties and the LCIA Court of such decision; and, in that event, the remaining arbitrators or any party may refer the matter to the LCIA Court for the revocation of the absent arbitrator's appointment and the appointment of a replacement arbitrator under Articles 10 and 11.

Article 13 Communications between Parties and Arbitral Tribunal

13.1 Following the formation of the Arbitral Tribunal, all communications shall take place directly between the Arbitral Tribunal and the parties (to be copied to the Registrar), unless the Arbitral Tribunal decides that communications should continue to be made through the Registrar.

13.2 Where the Registrar sends any written communication to one party on behalf of the Arbitral Tribunal or the LCIA Court, he or she shall send a copy to each of the other parties.

13.3 Where any party delivers to the Arbitral Tribunal any communication (including statements and documents under Article 15), whether by electronic means or otherwise, it shall deliver a copy to each arbitrator, all other parties and the Registrar; and it shall confirm to the Arbitral Tribunal in writing that it has done or is doing so.

13.4 During the arbitration from the Arbitral Tribunal's formation onwards, no party shall deliberately initiate or attempt to initiate any unilateral contact relating to the arbitration or the parties' dispute with any member of the Arbitral Tribunal or any member of the LCIA Court exercising any function in regard to the arbitration (but not including the Registrar), which has not been disclosed in writing prior to or shortly after the time of such contact to all other parties, all members of the Arbitral Tribunal (if comprised of more than one arbitrator) and the Registrar.

13.5 Prior to the Arbitral Tribunal's formation, unless the parties agree otherwise in writing, any arbitrator, candidate or nominee who is required to participate in the selection of a presiding arbitrator may consult any party in order to obtain the views of that party as to the suitability of any candidate or nominee as presiding arbitrator, provided that such arbitrator, candidate or nominee informs the Registrar of such consultation.

Article 14 Conduct of Proceedings

14.1 The parties and the Arbitral Tribunal are encouraged to make contact (whether by a hearing in person, telephone conference-call, video conference or exchange of correspondence) as soon as practicable but no later than 21 days from receipt of the Registrar's written notification of the formation of the Arbitral Tribunal.

14.2 The parties may agree on joint proposals for the conduct of their arbitration for consideration by the Arbitral Tribunal. They are encouraged to do so in consultation with the Arbitral Tribunal and consistent with the Arbitral Tribunal's general duties under the Arbitration Agreement.

14.3 Such agreed proposals shall be made by the parties in writing or recorded in writing by the Arbitral Tribunal at the parties' request and with their authority.

14.4 Under the Arbitration Agreement, the Arbitral Tribunal's general duties at all times during the arbitration shall include:

(i) a duty to act fairly and impartially as between all parties, giving each a reasonable opportunity of putting its case and dealing with that of its opponent(s); and

(ii) a duty to adopt procedures suitable to the circumstances of the arbitration, avoiding unnecessary delay and expense, so as to provide a fair, efficient and expeditious means for the final resolution of the parties' dispute.

14.5 The Arbitral Tribunal shall have the widest discretion to discharge these general duties, subject to such mandatory law(s) or rules of law as the Arbitral Tribunal may decide to be applicable; and at all times the parties shall do everything necessary in good faith for the fair, efficient and expeditious conduct of the arbitration, including the Arbitral Tribunal's discharge of its general duties.

14.6 In the case of an Arbitral Tribunal other than a sole arbitrator, the presiding arbitrator, with the prior agreement of its other members and all parties, may make procedural orders alone.

Article 15 Written Statements

15.1 Unless the parties have agreed or jointly proposed in writing otherwise or the Arbitral Tribunal should decide differently, the written stage of the arbitration and its procedural time-table shall be as set out in this Article 15.

15.2 Within 28 days of receipt of the Registrar's written notification of the Arbitral Tribunal's formation, the Claimant shall deliver to the Arbitral Tribunal and all other parties either: (i) its written election to have its Request treated as its Statement of Case complying with this Article 15.2; or (ii) its written Statement of Case setting out in sufficient detail the relevant facts and legal submissions on which it relies, together with the relief claimed against all other parties, and all essential documents.

15.3 Within 28 days of receipt of the Claimant's Statement of Case or the Claimant's election to treat the Request as its Statement of Case, the Respondent shall deliver to the Arbitral Tribunal and all other parties either: (i) its written election to have its Response treated as its Statement of Defence and (if applicable) Cross-claim complying with this Article 15.3; or (ii) its written Statement of Defence and (if applicable) Statement of Cross-claim setting out in sufficient detail the relevant facts and legal submissions on which it relies, together with the relief claimed against all other parties, and all essential documents.

15.4 Within 28 days of receipt of the Respondent's Statement of Defence and (if applicable) Statement of Cross-claim or the Respondent's election to treat the Response as its Statement of Defence and (if applicable) Cross-claim, the Claimant

shall deliver to the Arbitral Tribunal and all other parties a written Statement of Reply which, where there are any cross-claims, shall also include a Statement of Defence to Cross-claim in the same manner required for a Statement of Defence, together with all essential documents.

15.5 If the Statement of Reply contains a Statement of Defence to Cross-claim, within 28 days of its receipt the Respondent shall deliver to the Arbitral Tribunal and all other parties its written Statement of Reply to the Defence to Cross-claim, together with all essential documents.

15.6 The Arbitral Tribunal may provide additional directions as to any part of the written stage of the arbitration (including witness statements, submissions and evidence), particularly where there are multiple claimants, multiple respondents or any cross-claim between two or more respondents or between two or more claimants.

15.7 No party may submit any further written statement following the last of these Statements, unless otherwise ordered by the Arbitral Tribunal.

15.8 If the Respondent fails to submit a Statement of Defence or the Claimant a Statement of Defence to Cross-claim, or if at any time any party fails to avail itself of the opportunity to present its written case in the manner required under this Article 15 or otherwise by order of the Arbitral Tribunal, the Arbitral Tribunal may nevertheless proceed with the arbitration (with or without a hearing) and make one or more awards.

15.9 As soon as practicable following this written stage of the arbitration, the Arbitral Tribunal shall proceed in such manner as has been agreed in writing by the parties or pursuant to its authority under the Arbitration Agreement.

15.10 In any event, the Arbitral Tribunal shall seek to make its final award as soon as reasonably possible following the last submission from the parties (whether made orally or in writing), in accordance with a timetable notified to the parties and the Registrar as soon as practicable (if necessary, as revised and re-notified from time to time). When the Arbitral Tribunal (not being a sole arbitrator) establishes a time for what it contemplates shall be the last submission from the parties (whether written or oral), it shall set aside adequate time for deliberations as soon as possible after that last submission and notify the parties of the time it has set aside.

Article 16 Seat(s) of Arbitration and Place(s) of Hearing

16.1 The parties may agree in writing the seat (or legal place) of their arbitration at any time before the formation of the Arbitral Tribunal and, after such formation, with the prior written consent of the Arbitral Tribunal.

16.2 In default of any such agreement, the seat of the arbitration shall be London (England), unless and until the Arbitral Tribunal orders, in view of the circumstances and after having given the parties a reasonable opportunity to make written comments to the Arbitral Tribunal, that another arbitral seat is more appropriate. Such default seat shall not be considered as a relevant circumstance by the LCIA Court in appointing any arbitrators under Articles 5, 9A, 9B, 9C and 11.

16.3 The Arbitral Tribunal may hold any hearing at any convenient geographical place in consultation with the parties and hold its deliberations at any geographical place of its own choice; and if such place(s) should be elsewhere than the seat of the arbitration, the arbitration shall nonetheless be treated for all purposes as an arbitration conducted at the arbitral seat and any order or award as having been made at that seat.

16.4 The law applicable to the Arbitration Agreement and the arbitration shall be the law applicable at the seat of the arbitration, unless and to the extent that the parties have agreed in writing on the application of other laws or rules of law and such agreement is not prohibited by the law applicable at the arbitral seat.

Article 17 Language(s) of Arbitration

17.1 The initial language of the arbitration (until the formation of the Arbitral Tribunal) shall be the language or prevailing language of the Arbitration Agreement, unless the parties have agreed in writing otherwise.

17.2 In the event that the Arbitration Agreement is written in more than one language of equal standing, the LCIA Court may, unless the Arbitration Agreement provides that the arbitration proceedings shall be conducted from the outset in more than one language, determine which of those languages shall be the initial language of the arbitration.

17.3 A non-participating or defaulting party shall have no cause for complaint if communications to and from the LCIA Court and Registrar are conducted in the initial language(s) of the arbitration or of the arbitral seat.

17.4 Following the formation of the Arbitral Tribunal, unless the parties have agreed upon the language or languages of the arbitration, the Arbitral Tribunal shall decide upon the language(s) of the arbitration after giving the parties a

reasonable opportunity to make written comments and taking into account the initial language(s) of the arbitration and any other matter it may consider appropriate in the circumstances.

17.5 If any document is expressed in a language other than the language(s) of the arbitration and no translation of such document is submitted by the party relying upon the document, the Arbitral Tribunal may order or (if the Arbitral Tribunal has not been formed) the Registrar may request that party to submit a translation of all or any part of that document in any language(s) of the arbitration or of the arbitral seat.

Article 18 Legal Representatives

18.1 Any party may be represented in the arbitration by one or more authorised legal representatives appearing by name before the Arbitral Tribunal.

18.2 Until the Arbitral Tribunal's formation, the Registrar may request from any party: (i) written proof of the authority granted by that party to any legal representative designated in its Request or Response; and (ii) written confirmation of the names and addresses of all such party's legal representatives in the arbitration. After its formation, at any time, the Arbitral Tribunal may order any party to provide similar proof or confirmation in any form it considers appropriate.

18.3 Following the Arbitral Tribunal's formation, any intended change or addition by a party to its legal representatives shall be notified promptly in writing to all other parties, the Arbitral Tribunal and the Registrar; and any such intended change or addition shall only take effect in the arbitration subject to the approval of the Arbitral Tribunal.

18.4 The Arbitral Tribunal may withhold approval of any intended change or addition to a party's legal representatives where such change or addition could compromise the composition of the Arbitral Tribunal or the finality of any award (on the grounds of possible conflict or other like impediment). In deciding whether to grant or withhold such approval, the Arbitral Tribunal shall have regard to the circumstances, including: the general principle that a party may be represented by a legal representative chosen by that party, the stage which the arbitration has reached, the efficiency resulting from maintaining the composition of the Arbitral Tribunal (as constituted throughout the arbitration) and any likely wasted costs or loss of time resulting from such change or addition.

18.5 Each party shall ensure that all its legal representatives appearing by name before the Arbitral Tribunal have agreed to comply with the general guidelines contained in the Annex to the LCIA Rules, as a condition of such

representation. In permitting any legal representative so to appear, a party shall thereby represent that the legal representative has agreed to such compliance.

18.6 In the event of a complaint by one party against another party's legal representative appearing by name before the Arbitral Tribunal (or of such complaint by the Arbitral Tribunal upon its own initiative), the Arbitral Tribunal may decide, after consulting the parties and granting that legal representative a reasonable opportunity to answer the complaint, whether or not the legal representative has violated the general guidelines. If such violation is found by the Arbitral Tribunal, the Arbitral Tribunal may order any or all of the following sanctions against the legal representative: (i) a written reprimand; (ii) a written caution as to future conduct in the arbitration; and (iii) any other measure necessary to fulfil within the arbitration the general duties required of the Arbitral Tribunal under Articles 14.4(i) and (ii).

Article 19 Oral Hearing(s)

19.1 Any party has the right to a hearing before the Arbitral Tribunal on the parties' dispute at any appropriate stage of the arbitration (as decided by the Arbitral Tribunal), unless the parties have agreed in writing upon a documents-only arbitration. For this purpose, a hearing may consist of several part-hearings (as decided by the Arbitral Tribunal).

19.2 The Arbitral Tribunal shall organise the conduct of any hearing in advance, in consultation with the parties. The Arbitral Tribunal shall have the fullest authority under the Arbitration Agreement to establish the conduct of a hearing, including its date, form, content, procedure, time-limits and geographical place. As to form, a hearing may take place by video or telephone conference or in person (or a combination of all three). As to content, the Arbitral Tribunal may require the parties to address a list of specific questions or issues arising from the parties' dispute.

19.3 The Arbitral Tribunal shall give to the parties reasonable notice in writing of any hearing.

19.4 All hearings shall be held in private, unless the parties agree otherwise in writing.

Article 20 Witness(es)

20.1 Before any hearing, the Arbitral Tribunal may order any party to give written notice of the identity of each witness that party wishes to call (including rebuttal witnesses), as well as the subject-matter of that witness's testimony, its content and its relevance to the issues in the arbitration.

20.2 Subject to any order otherwise by the Arbitral Tribunal, the testimony of a witness may be presented by a party in written form, either as a signed statement or like document.

20.3 The Arbitral Tribunal may decide the time, manner and form in which these written materials shall be exchanged between the parties and presented to the Arbitral Tribunal; and it may allow, refuse or limit the written and oral testimony of witnesses (whether witnesses of fact or expert witnesses).

20.4 The Arbitral Tribunal and any party may request that a witness, on whose written testimony another party relies, should attend for oral questioning at a hearing before the Arbitral Tribunal. If the Arbitral Tribunal orders that other party to secure the attendance of that witness and the witness refuses or fails to attend the hearing without good cause, the Arbitral Tribunal may place such weight on the written testimony or exclude all or any part thereof altogether as it considers appropriate in the circumstances.

20.5 Subject to the mandatory provisions of any applicable law, rules of law and any order of the Arbitral Tribunal otherwise, it shall not be improper for any party or its legal representatives to interview any potential witness for the purpose of presenting his or her testimony in written form to the Arbitral Tribunal or producing such person as an oral witness at any hearing.

20.6 Subject to any order by the Arbitral Tribunal otherwise, any individual intending to testify to the Arbitral Tribunal may be treated as a witness notwithstanding that the individual is a party to the arbitration or was, remains or has become an officer, employee, owner or shareholder of any party or is otherwise identified with any party.

20.7 Subject to the mandatory provisions of any applicable law, the Arbitral Tribunal shall be entitled (but not required) to administer any appropriate oath to any witness at any hearing, prior to the oral testimony of that witness.

20.8 Any witness who gives oral testimony at a hearing before the Arbitral Tribunal may be questioned by each of the parties under the control of the Arbitral Tribunal. The Arbitral Tribunal may put questions at any stage of such testimony.

Article 21 Expert(s) to Arbitral Tribunal

21.1 The Arbitral Tribunal, after consultation with the parties, may appoint one or more experts to report in writing to the Arbitral Tribunal and the parties on specific issues in the arbitration, as identified by the Arbitral Tribunal.

21.2 Any such expert shall be and remain impartial and independent of the parties; and he or she shall sign a written declaration to such effect, delivered to the Arbitral Tribunal and copied to all parties.

21.3 The Arbitral Tribunal may require any party at any time to give to such expert any relevant information or to provide access to any relevant documents, goods, samples, property, site or thing for inspection under that party's control on such terms as the Arbitral Tribunal thinks appropriate in the circumstances.

21.4 If any party so requests or the Arbitral Tribunal considers it necessary, the Arbitral Tribunal may order the expert, after delivery of the expert's written report, to participate in a hearing at which the parties shall have a reasonable opportunity to question the expert on the report and to present witnesses in order to testify on relevant issues arising from the report.

21.5 The fees and expenses of any expert appointed by the Arbitral Tribunal under this Article 21 may be paid out of the deposits payable by the parties under Article 24 and shall form part of the Arbitration Costs under Article 28.

Article 22 Additional Powers

22.1 The Arbitral Tribunal shall have the power, upon the application of any party or (save for sub-paragraphs (viii), (ix) and (x) below) upon its own initiative, but in either case only after giving the parties a reasonable opportunity to state their views and upon such terms (as to costs and otherwise) as the Arbitral Tribunal may decide:

(i) to allow a party to supplement, modify or amend any claim, defence, cross-claim, defence to cross-claim and reply, including a Request, Response and any other written statement, submitted by such party;

(ii) to abridge or extend (even where the period of time has expired) any period of time prescribed under the Arbitration Agreement, any other agreement of the parties or any order made by the Arbitral Tribunal;

(iii) to conduct such enquiries as may appear to the Arbitral Tribunal to be necessary or expedient, including whether and to what extent the Arbitral Tribunal should itself take the initiative in identifying relevant issues and ascertaining relevant facts and the law(s) or rules of law applicable to the Arbitration Agreement, the arbitration and the merits of the parties' dispute;

(iv) to order any party to make any documents, goods, samples, property, site or thing under its control available for inspection by the

Arbitral Tribunal, any other party, any expert to such party and any expert to the Tribunal;

(v) to order any party to produce to the Arbitral Tribunal and to other parties documents or copies of documents in their possession, custody or power which the Arbitral Tribunal decides to be relevant;

(vi) to decide whether or not to apply any strict rules of evidence (or any other rules) as to the admissibility, relevance or weight of any material tendered by a party on any issue of fact or expert opinion; and to decide the time, manner and form in which such material should be exchanged between the parties and presented to the Arbitral Tribunal;

(vii) to order compliance with any legal obligation, payment of compensation for breach of any legal obligation and specific performance of any agreement (including any arbitration agreement or any contract relating to land);

(viii) to allow one or more third persons to be joined in the arbitration as a party provided any such third person and the applicant party have consented to such joinder in writing following the Commencement Date or (if earlier) in the Arbitration Agreement; and thereafter to make a single final award, or separate awards, in respect of all parties so implicated in the arbitration;

(ix) to order, with the approval of the LCIA Court, the consolidation of the arbitration with one or more other arbitrations into a single arbitration subject to the LCIA Rules where all the parties to the arbitrations to be consolidated so agree in writing;

(x) to order, with the approval of the LCIA Court, the consolidation of the arbitration with one or more other arbitrations subject to the LCIA Rules commenced under the same arbitration agreement or any compatible arbitration agreement(s) between the same disputing parties, provided that no arbitral tribunal has yet been formed by the LCIA Court for such other arbitration(s) or, if already formed, that such tribunal(s) is(are) composed of the same arbitrators; and

(xi) to order the discontinuance of the arbitration if it appears to the Arbitral Tribunal that the arbitration has been abandoned by the parties or all claims and any cross-claims withdrawn by the parties, provided that, after fixing a reasonable period of time within which the parties shall be invited to agree or to object to such discontinuance, no party has stated its

written objection to the Arbitral Tribunal to such discontinuance upon the expiry of such period of time.

22.2 By agreeing to arbitration under the Arbitration Agreement, the parties shall be treated as having agreed not to apply to any state court or other legal authority for any order available from the Arbitral Tribunal (if formed) under Article 22.1, except with the agreement in writing of all parties.

22.3 The Arbitral Tribunal shall decide the parties' dispute in accordance with the law(s) or rules of law chosen by the parties as applicable to the merits of their dispute. If and to the extent that the Arbitral Tribunal decides that the parties have made no such choice, the Arbitral Tribunal shall apply the law(s) or rules of law which it considers appropriate.

22.4 The Arbitral Tribunal shall only apply to the merits of the dispute principles deriving from "ex aequo et bono", "amiable composition" or "honourable engagement" where the parties have so agreed in writing.

22.5 Subject to any order of the Arbitral Tribunal under Article 22.1(ii), the LCIA Court may also abridge or extend any period of time under the Arbitration Agreement or other agreement of the parties (even where the period of time has expired).

22.6 Without prejudice to the generality of Articles 22.1(ix) and (x), the LCIA Court may determine, after giving the parties a reasonable opportunity to state their views, that two or more arbitrations, subject to the LCIA Rules and commenced under the same arbitration agreement between the same disputing parties, shall be consolidated to form one single arbitration subject to the LCIA Rules, provided that no arbitral tribunal has yet been formed by the LCIA Court for any of the arbitrations to be consolidated.

Article 23 Jurisdiction and Authority

23.1 The Arbitral Tribunal shall have the power to rule upon its own jurisdiction and authority, including any objection to the initial or continuing existence, validity, effectiveness or scope of the Arbitration Agreement.

23.2 For that purpose, an arbitration clause which forms or was intended to form part of another agreement shall be treated as an arbitration agreement independent of that other agreement. A decision by the Arbitral Tribunal that such other agreement is non-existent, invalid or ineffective shall not entail (of itself) the non-existence, invalidity or ineffectiveness of the arbitration clause.

23.3 An objection by a Respondent that the Arbitral Tribunal does not have jurisdiction shall be raised as soon as possible but not later than the time for its Statement of Defence; and a like objection by any party responding to a cross-claiming party shall be raised as soon as possible but not later than the time for its Statement of Defence to Cross-claim. An objection that the Arbitral Tribunal is exceeding the scope of its authority shall be raised promptly after the Arbitral Tribunal has indicated its intention to act upon the matter alleged to lie beyond its authority. The Arbitral Tribunal may nevertheless admit an untimely objection as to its jurisdiction or authority if it considers the delay justified in the circumstances.

23.4 The Arbitral Tribunal may decide the objection to its jurisdiction or authority in an award as to jurisdiction or authority or later in an award on the merits, as it considers appropriate in the circumstances.

23.5 By agreeing to arbitration under the Arbitration Agreement, after the formation of the Arbitral Tribunal the parties shall be treated as having agreed not to apply to any state court or other legal authority for any relief regarding the Arbitral Tribunal's jurisdiction or authority, except (i) with the prior agreement in writing of all parties to the arbitration, or (ii) the prior authorisation of the Arbitral Tribunal, or (iii) following the latter's award on the objection to its jurisdiction or authority.

Article 24 Deposits

24.1 The LCIA Court may direct the parties, in such proportions and at such times as it thinks appropriate, to make one or more payments to the LCIA on account of the Arbitration Costs. Such payments deposited by the parties may be applied by the LCIA Court to pay any item of such Arbitration Costs (including the LCIA's own fees and expenses) in accordance with the LCIA Rules.

24.2 All payments made by parties on account of the Arbitration Costs shall be held by the LCIA in trust under English law in England, to be disbursed or otherwise applied by the LCIA in accordance with the LCIA Rules and invested having regard also to the interests of the LCIA. Each payment made by a party shall be credited by the LCIA with interest at the rate from time to time credited to an overnight deposit of that amount with the bank(s) engaged by the LCIA to manage deposits from time to time; and any surplus income (beyond such interest) shall accrue for the sole benefit of the LCIA. In the event that payments (with such interest) exceed the total amount of the Arbitration Costs at the conclusion of the arbitration, the excess amount shall be returned by the LCIA to the parties as the ultimate default beneficiaries of the trust.

24.3 Save for exceptional circumstances, the Arbitral Tribunal should not proceed with the arbitration without having ascertained from the Registrar that the LCIA is or will be in requisite funds as regards outstanding and future Arbitration Costs.

24.4 In the event that a party fails or refuses to make any payment on account of the Arbitration Costs as directed by the LCIA Court, the LCIA Court may direct the other party or parties to effect a substitute payment to allow the arbitration to proceed (subject to any order or award on Arbitration Costs).

24.5 In such circumstances, the party effecting the substitute payment may request the Arbitral Tribunal to make an order or award in order to recover that amount as a debt immediately due and payable to that party by the defaulting party, together with any interest.

24.6 Failure by a claiming or cross-claiming party to make promptly and in full any required payment on account of Arbitration Costs may be treated by the Arbitral Tribunal as a withdrawal from the arbitration of the claim or cross-claim respectively, thereby removing such claim or cross-claim (as the case may be) from the scope of the Arbitral Tribunal's jurisdiction under the Arbitration Agreement, subject to any terms decided by the Arbitral Tribunal as to the reinstatement of the claim or cross-claim in the event of subsequent payment by the claiming or cross-claiming party. Such a withdrawal shall not preclude the claiming or cross-claiming party from defending as a respondent any claim or cross-claim made by another party.

Article 25 Interim and Conservatory Measures

25.1 The Arbitral Tribunal shall have the power upon the application of any party, after giving all other parties a reasonable opportunity to respond to such application and upon such terms as the Arbitral Tribunal considers appropriate in the circumstances:

(i) to order any respondent party to a claim or cross-claim to provide security for all or part of the amount in dispute, by way of deposit or bank guarantee or in any other manner;

(ii) to order the preservation, storage, sale or other disposal of any documents, goods, samples, property, site or thing under the control of any party and relating to the subject-matter of the arbitration; and

(iii) to order on a provisional basis, subject to a final decision in an award, any relief which the Arbitral Tribunal would have power to grant in

an award, including the payment of money or the disposition of property as between any parties.

Such terms may include the provision by the applicant party of a cross-indemnity, secured in such manner as the Arbitral Tribunal considers appropriate, for any costs or losses incurred by the respondent party in complying with the Arbitral Tribunal's order. Any amount payable under such cross-indemnity and any consequential relief may be decided by the Arbitral Tribunal by one or more awards in the arbitration.

25.2 The Arbitral Tribunal shall have the power upon the application of a party, after giving all other parties a reasonable opportunity to respond to such application, to order any claiming or cross-claiming party to provide or procure security for Legal Costs and Arbitration Costs by way of deposit or bank guarantee or in any other manner and upon such terms as the Arbitral Tribunal considers appropriate in the circumstances. Such terms may include the provision by that other party of a cross-indemnity, itself secured in such manner as the Arbitral Tribunal considers appropriate, for any costs and losses incurred by such claimant or cross-claimant in complying with the Arbitral Tribunal's order. Any amount payable under such cross-indemnity and any consequential relief may be decided by the Arbitral Tribunal by one or more awards in the arbitration. In the event that a claiming or cross-claiming party does not comply with any order to provide security, the Arbitral Tribunal may stay that party's claims or cross-claims or dismiss them by an award.

25.3 The power of the Arbitral Tribunal under Article 25.1 shall not prejudice any party's right to apply to a state court or other legal authority for interim or conservatory measures to similar effect: (i) before the formation of the Arbitral Tribunal; and (ii) after the formation of the Arbitral Tribunal, in exceptional cases and with the Arbitral Tribunal's authorisation, until the final award. After the Commencement Date, any application and any order for such measures before the formation of the Arbitral Tribunal shall be communicated promptly in writing by the applicant party to the Registrar; after its formation, also to the Arbitral Tribunal; and in both cases also to all other parties.

25.4 By agreeing to arbitration under the Arbitration Agreement, the parties shall be taken to have agreed not to apply to any state court or other legal authority for any order for security for Legal Costs or Arbitration Costs.

Article 26 Award(s)

26.1 The Arbitral Tribunal may make separate awards on different issues at different times, including interim payments on account of any claim or cross-claim

(including Legal and Arbitration Costs). Such awards shall have the same status as any other award made by the Arbitral Tribunal.

26.2 The Arbitral Tribunal shall make any award in writing and, unless all parties agree in writing otherwise, shall state the reasons upon which such award is based. The award shall also state the date when the award is made and the seat of the arbitration; and it shall be signed by the Arbitral Tribunal or those of its members assenting to it.

26.3 An award may be expressed in any currency, unless the parties have agreed otherwise.

26.4 Unless the parties have agreed otherwise, the Arbitral Tribunal may order that simple or compound interest shall be paid by any party on any sum awarded at such rates as the Arbitral Tribunal decides to be appropriate (without being bound by rates of interest practised by any state court or other legal authority) in respect of any period which the Arbitral Tribunal decides to be appropriate ending not later than the date upon which the award is complied with.

26.5 Where there is more than one arbitrator and the Arbitral Tribunal fails to agree on any issue, the arbitrators shall decide that issue by a majority. Failing a majority decision on any issue, the presiding arbitrator shall decide that issue.

26.6 If any arbitrator refuses or fails to sign the award, the signatures of the majority or (failing a majority) of the presiding arbitrator shall be sufficient, provided that the reason for the omitted signature is stated in the award by the majority or by the presiding arbitrator.

26.7 The sole or presiding arbitrator shall be responsible for delivering the award to the LCIA Court, which shall transmit to the parties the award authenticated by the Registrar as an LCIA award, provided that all Arbitration Costs have been paid in full to the LCIA in accordance with Articles 24 and 28. Such transmission may be made by any electronic means, in addition to paper form (if so requested by any party). In the event of any disparity between electronic and paper forms, the paper form shall prevail.

26.8 Every award (including reasons for such award) shall be final and binding on the parties. The parties undertake to carry out any award immediately and without any delay (subject only to Article 27); and the parties also waive irrevocably their right to any form of appeal, review or recourse to any state court or other legal authority, insofar as such waiver shall not be prohibited under any applicable law.

26.9 In the event of any final settlement of the parties' dispute, the Arbitral Tribunal may decide to make an award recording the settlement if the parties jointly so request in writing (a "Consent Award"), provided always that such Consent Award shall contain an express statement on its face that it is an award made at the parties' joint request and with their consent. A Consent Award need not contain reasons. If the parties do not jointly request a Consent Award, on written confirmation by the parties to the LCIA Court that a final settlement has been reached, the Arbitral Tribunal shall be discharged and the arbitration proceedings concluded by the LCIA Court, subject to payment by the parties of any outstanding Arbitration Costs in accordance with Articles 24 and 28.

Article 27 Correction of Award(s) and Additional Award(s)

27.1 Within 28 days of receipt of any award, a party may by written notice to the Registrar (copied to all other parties) request the Arbitral Tribunal to correct in the award any error in computation, any clerical or typographical error, any ambiguity or any mistake of a similar nature. If the Arbitral Tribunal considers the request to be justified, after consulting the parties, it shall make the correction within 28 days of receipt of the request. Any correction shall take the form of a memorandum by the Arbitral Tribunal.

27.2 The Arbitral Tribunal may also correct any error (including any error in computation, any clerical or typographical error or any error of a similar nature) upon its own initiative in the form of a memorandum within 28 days of the date of the award, after consulting the parties.

27.3 Within 28 days of receipt of the final award, a party may by written notice to the Registrar (copied to all other parties), request the Arbitral Tribunal to make an additional award as to any claim or cross-claim presented in the arbitration but not decided in any award. If the Arbitral Tribunal considers the request to be justified, after consulting the parties, it shall make the additional award within 56 days of receipt of the request.

27.4 As to any claim or cross-claim presented in the arbitration but not decided in any award, the Arbitral Tribunal may also make an additional award upon its own initiative within 28 days of the date of the award, after consulting the parties.

27.5 The provisions of Article 26.2 to 26.7 shall apply to any memorandum or additional award made hereunder. A memorandum shall be treated as part of the award.

Article 28 Arbitration Costs and Legal Costs

28.1 The costs of the arbitration other than the legal or other expenses incurred by the parties themselves (the “Arbitration Costs”) shall be determined by the LCIA Court in accordance with the Schedule of Costs. The parties shall be jointly and severally liable to the LCIA and the Arbitral Tribunal for such Arbitration Costs.

28.2 The Arbitral Tribunal shall specify by an award the amount of the Arbitration Costs determined by the LCIA Court (in the absence of a final settlement of the parties’ dispute regarding liability for such costs). The Arbitral Tribunal shall decide the proportions in which the parties shall bear such Arbitration Costs. If the Arbitral Tribunal has decided that all or any part of the Arbitration Costs shall be borne by a party other than a party which has already covered such costs by way of a payment to the LCIA under Article 24, the latter party shall have the right to recover the appropriate amount of Arbitration Costs from the former party.

28.3 The Arbitral Tribunal shall also have the power to decide by an award that all or part of the legal or other expenses incurred by a party (the “Legal Costs”) be paid by another party. The Arbitral Tribunal shall decide the amount of such Legal Costs on such reasonable basis as it thinks appropriate. The Arbitral Tribunal shall not be required to apply the rates or procedures for assessing such costs practised by any state court or other legal authority.

28.4 The Arbitral Tribunal shall make its decisions on both Arbitration Costs and Legal Costs on the general principle that costs should reflect the parties’ relative success and failure in the award or arbitration or under different issues, except where it appears to the Arbitral Tribunal that in the circumstances the application of such a general principle would be inappropriate under the Arbitration Agreement or otherwise. The Arbitral Tribunal may also take into account the parties’ conduct in the arbitration, including any co-operation in facilitating the proceedings as to time and cost and any non-co-operation resulting in undue delay and unnecessary expense. Any decision on costs by the Arbitral Tribunal shall be made with reasons in the award containing such decision.

28.5 In the event that the parties have howsoever agreed before their dispute that one or more parties shall pay the whole or any part of the Arbitration Costs or Legal Costs whatever the result of any dispute, arbitration or award, such agreement (in order to be effective) shall be confirmed by the parties in writing after the Commencement Date.

28.6 If the arbitration is abandoned, suspended, withdrawn or concluded, by agreement or otherwise, before the final award is made, the parties shall remain

jointly and severally liable to pay to the LCIA and the Arbitral Tribunal the Arbitration Costs determined by the LCIA Court.

28.7 In the event that the Arbitration Costs are less than the deposits received by the LCIA under Article 24, there shall be a refund by the LCIA to the parties in such proportions as the parties may agree in writing, or failing such agreement, in the same proportions and to the same payers as the deposits were paid to the LCIA.

Article 29 Determinations and Decisions by LCIA Court

29.1 The determinations of the LCIA Court with respect to all matters relating to the arbitration shall be conclusive and binding upon the parties and the Arbitral Tribunal, unless otherwise directed by the LCIA Court. Save for reasoned decisions on arbitral challenges under Article 10, such determinations are to be treated as administrative in nature; and the LCIA Court shall not be required to give reasons for any such determination.

29.2 To the extent permitted by any applicable law, the parties shall be taken to have waived any right of appeal or review in respect of any determination and decision of the LCIA Court to any state court or other legal authority. If such appeal or review takes place due to mandatory provisions of any applicable law or otherwise, the LCIA Court may determine whether or not the arbitration should continue, notwithstanding such appeal or review.

Article 30 Confidentiality

30.1 The parties undertake as a general principle to keep confidential all awards in the arbitration, together with all materials in the arbitration created for the purpose of the arbitration and all other documents produced by another party in the proceedings not otherwise in the public domain, save and to the extent that disclosure may be required of a party by legal duty, to protect or pursue a legal right, or to enforce or challenge an award in legal proceedings before a state court or other legal authority.

30.2 The deliberations of the Arbitral Tribunal shall remain confidential to its members, save as required by any applicable law and to the extent that disclosure of an arbitrator's refusal to participate in the arbitration is required of the other members of the Arbitral Tribunal under Articles 10, 12, 26 and 27.

30.3 The LCIA does not publish any award or any part of an award without the prior written consent of all parties and the Arbitral Tribunal.

Article 31 Limitation of Liability

31.1 None of the LCIA (including its officers, members and employees), the LCIA Court (including its President, Vice-Presidents, Honourary Vice-Presidents and members), the Registrar (including any deputy Registrar), any arbitrator, any Emergency Arbitrator and any expert to the Arbitral Tribunal shall be liable to any party howsoever for any act or omission in connection with any arbitration, save: (i) where the act or omission is shown by that party to constitute conscious and deliberate wrongdoing committed by the body or person alleged to be liable to that party; or (ii) to the extent that any part of this provision is shown to be prohibited by any applicable law.

31.2 After the award has been made and all possibilities of any memorandum or additional award under Article 27 have lapsed or been exhausted, neither the LCIA (including its officers, members and employees), the LCIA Court (including its President, Vice-Presidents, Honourary Vice-Presidents and members), the Registrar (including any deputy Registrar), any arbitrator, any Emergency Arbitrator or any expert to the Arbitral Tribunal shall be under any legal obligation to make any statement to any person about any matter concerning the arbitration; nor shall any party seek to make any of these bodies or persons a witness in any legal or other proceedings arising out of the arbitration.

Article 32 General Rules

32.1 A party who knows that any provision of the Arbitration Agreement has not been complied with and yet proceeds with the arbitration without promptly stating its objection as to such non-compliance to the Registrar (before the formation of the Arbitral Tribunal) or the Arbitral Tribunal (after its formation), shall be treated as having irrevocably waived its right to object for all purposes.

32.2 For all matters not expressly provided in the Arbitration Agreement, the LCIA Court, the LCIA, the Registrar, the Arbitral Tribunal and each of the parties shall act at all times in good faith, respecting the spirit of the Arbitration Agreement, and shall make every reasonable effort to ensure that any award is legally recognised and enforceable at the arbitral seat.

32.3 If and to the extent that any part of the Arbitration Agreement is decided by the Arbitral Tribunal, the Emergency Arbitrator, or any court or other legal authority of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, ineffective or unenforceable, such decision shall not, of itself, adversely affect any order or award by the Arbitral Tribunal or the Emergency Arbitrator or any other part of the Arbitration Agreement which shall remain in full force and effect, unless prohibited by any applicable law.

...

Annex to the LCIA Rules

General Guidelines for the Parties' Legal Representatives (Articles 18.5 and 18.6 of the LCIA Rules)

Paragraph 1: These general guidelines are intended to promote the good and equal conduct of the parties' legal representatives appearing by name within the arbitration. Nothing in these guidelines is intended to derogate from the Arbitration Agreement or to undermine any legal representative's primary duty of loyalty to the party represented in the arbitration or the obligation to present that party's case effectively to the Arbitral Tribunal. Nor shall these guidelines derogate from any mandatory laws, rules of law, professional rules or codes of conduct if and to the extent that any are shown to apply to a legal representative appearing in the arbitration.

Paragraph 2: A legal representative should not engage in activities intended unfairly to obstruct the arbitration or to jeopardise the finality of any award, including repeated challenges to an arbitrator's appointment or to the jurisdiction or authority of the Arbitral Tribunal known to be unfounded by that legal representative.

Paragraph 3: A legal representative should not knowingly make any false statement to the Arbitral Tribunal or the LCIA Court.

Paragraph 4: A legal representative should not knowingly procure or assist in the preparation of or rely upon any false evidence presented to the Arbitral Tribunal or the LCIA Court.

Paragraph 5: A legal representative should not knowingly conceal or assist in the concealment of any document (or any part thereof) which is ordered to be produced by the Arbitral Tribunal.

Paragraph 6: During the arbitration proceedings, a legal representative should not deliberately initiate or attempt to initiate with any member of the Arbitral Tribunal or with any member of the LCIA Court making any determination or decision in regard to the arbitration (but not including the Registrar) any unilateral contact relating to the arbitration or the parties' dispute, which has not been disclosed in writing prior to or shortly after the time of such contact to all other parties, all members of the Arbitral Tribunal (if comprised of more than one arbitrator) and the Registrar in accordance with Article 13.4.

Paragraph 7: In accordance with Articles 18.5 and 18.6, the Arbitral Tribunal may decide whether a legal representative has violated these general guidelines

and, if so, how to exercise its discretion to impose any or all of the sanctions listed in Article 18.6.

Schedule of LCIA Arbitration Costs

effective 1 October 2014

This schedule of arbitration costs (the Schedule), as amended from time to time by the LCIA, forms part of the Rules, and will apply in all current and future arbitrations as from its effective date.

1. Administrative charges

1(i) Registration Fee (payable in advance with the Request for Arbitration: non-refundable).

Registration Fee	£1,750
------------------	--------

1(ii) Time spent* by the Secretariat of the LCIA in the administration of the arbitration.**

Registrar / Deputy Registrar	£250 per hour
Counsel	£225 per hour
Case administrators	£175 per hour
Casework accounting functions	£150 per hour

1(iii) Time spent by members of the LCIA Court in carrying out their functions in deciding any challenge brought under the Rules.**

at hourly rates advised by members of the LCIA Court

1(iv) A sum equivalent to 5% of the fees of the Tribunal (excluding expenses) in respect of the LCIA's general overhead.**

1(v) Expenses incurred by the Secretariat and by members of the LCIA Court, in connection with the arbitration (such as postage, telephone, facsimile, travel etc.), and additional arbitration support services, whether provided by the Secretariat or by the members of the LCIA Court from their own resources or otherwise.**

* Minimum unit of time in all cases: 15 minutes.

** Items 1(ii), 1(iii), 1(iv) and 1(v) above, are payable on interim invoice; with the award, or as directed by the LCIA Court under Article 24.1 of the Rules.

1(vi) The LCIA's charges will be invoiced in sterling, but may be paid in other convertible currencies, at rates prevailing at the time of payment.

1(vii) Charges may be subject to Value Added Tax at the prevailing rate.

2. Fees and expenses of the Tribunal

2(i) The Tribunal's fees will be calculated by reference to work done by its members in connection with the arbitration and will be charged at rates appropriate to the particular circumstances of the case, including its complexity and the special qualifications of the arbitrators. The Tribunal shall agree in writing upon fee rates conforming to the Schedule prior to its appointment by the LCIA Court. The rates will be advised by the Registrar to the parties at the time of the appointment of the Tribunal, but may be reviewed if the duration or a change in the circumstances of the arbitration requires.

Fees shall be at hourly rates **not exceeding £450**.

However, in exceptional cases, the rate may be higher, provided that, in such cases, (i) the fees of the Tribunal shall be fixed by the LCIA Court on the recommendation of the Registrar, following consultations with the arbitrator(s), and (ii) the fees shall be agreed expressly by all parties.

2(ii) The Tribunal's fees may include a charge for time spent travelling.

2(iii) The Tribunal's fees may also include a charge for time reserved but not used as a result of late postponement or cancellation of hearings, provided that the basis for such charge shall be advised in writing to, and approved by, the LCIA Court and that the parties have been informed in advance.

2(iv) The Tribunal may also recover such expenses as are reasonably incurred in connection with the arbitration, and as are reasonable in amount, provided that claims for expenses should be supported by invoices or receipts.

2(v) The Tribunal's fees shall be invoiced in the currency of account between the Tribunal and the parties.

2(vi) In the event of the revocation of the appointment of any arbitrator, pursuant to the provisions of Article 10 of the Rules, the LCIA Court shall, in accordance with Article 10.7, determine the amount of fees and expenses (if any) to be paid for the former arbitrator's services as it may consider appropriate in all the circumstances. 2(vii) Charges may be subject to Value Added Tax at the prevailing rate.

3. Deposits

3(i) The LCIA Court may direct the parties, in such proportions and at such times as it thinks appropriate, to make one or more payments to the LCIA on account of the costs of the arbitration, other than the legal or other expenses incurred by the parties themselves (the Arbitration Costs). Such payments deposited by the parties may be applied by the LCIA Court to pay any item of such Arbitration Costs (including the LCIA's own fees and expenses) in accordance with the LCIA Rules.

3(ii) All payments made by parties on account of the Arbitration Costs shall be held by the LCIA in trust under English law in England, to be disbursed or otherwise applied by the LCIA in accordance with the LCIA Rules and invested having regard also to the interests of the LCIA. Each payment made by a party shall be credited by the LCIA with interest at the rate from time to time credited to an overnight deposit of that amount with the bank(s) engaged by the LCIA to manage deposits from time to time; and any surplus income (beyond such interest) shall accrue for the sole benefit of the LCIA. In the event that payments (with such interest) exceed the total amount of the Arbitration Costs at the conclusion of the arbitration, the excess amount shall be returned by the LCIA to the parties as the ultimate default beneficiaries of the trust.

3(iii) Save for exceptional circumstances, the Arbitral Tribunal should not proceed with the arbitration without having ascertained from the Registrar that the LCIA is or will be in requisite funds as regards outstanding and future Arbitration Costs.

(iv) In the event that a party fails or refuses to make any payment on account of the Arbitration Costs as directed by the LCIA Court, the LCIA Court may direct the other party or parties to effect a substitute payment to allow the arbitration to proceed (subject to any order or award on Arbitration Costs).

3(v) In such circumstances, the party effecting the substitute payment may request the Arbitral Tribunal to make an order or award in order to recover that amount as a debt immediately due and payable to that party by the defaulting party, together with any interest.

4. Interim payments

When interim payments are required to cover any part of the Arbitration Costs, including the LCIA's administrative charges; the fees or expenses of members of the LCIA Court, the Tribunal's fees or expenses, including the fees or expenses of any expert appointed by the Tribunal, the fees or expenses of any Secretary to the Tribunal; or charges for hearing rooms and other support services,

such payments may be made against the invoices for any of the above from funds held on deposit. If no or insufficient funds are held at the time the interim payment is required, the invoices for any of the above may be submitted for payment direct by the parties.

5. Registrar's authority

5(i) For the purposes of sections 3(i) and 3(iv) above, and of Articles 24.1 and 24.4 of the Rules, the Registrar has the authority of the LCIA Court to make the directions referred to, under the supervision of the Court.

5(ii) For the purposes of section 4 above, and of Article 24.1 of the Rules, the Registrar has the authority of the LCIA Court to approve the payments referred to.

5(iii) Any request by an arbitrator for payment on account of his fees shall be supported by a fee note, which shall include, or be accompanied by, a detailed breakdown of the time spent at the rates that have been advised to the parties by the LCIA, and the fee note will be forwarded to the parties prior to settlement of the account.

5(iv) Any dispute regarding the LCIA's administrative charges, or the fees and expenses of the Tribunal shall be determined by the LCIA Court.

6. Arbitration costs

6(i) The parties shall be jointly and severally liable to the Tribunal and the LCIA for the costs of the arbitration (other than the legal or other costs incurred by the parties themselves).

6(ii) Any bank charges incurred on any transfer of funds by the parties to the LCIA shall be borne exclusively by the party or parties transferring the funds. 6(iii) In accordance with Article 26.7 of the Rules, the Tribunal's Award(s) shall be transmitted to the parties by the LCIA Court provided that the costs of the arbitration have been paid to the LCIA in accordance with Article 28 of the Rules.

7. Emergency Arbitrator

7(i) Application fee (payable with the application for the appointment of an Emergency Arbitrator under Article 9B of the Rules: non-refundable).

Application fee

£8,000

7(ii) Emergency Arbitrator's fee, to cover time charges and expenses (payable with the application for the appointment of an Emergency Arbitrator: non-refundable if the LCIA Court appoints an Emergency Arbitrator).

Emergency Arbitrator's fee

£20,000

7(iii) The Emergency Arbitrator's fee may be increased by the LCIA Court on the recommendation of the Registrar at any time during the emergency proceedings if the particular circumstances of the case are deemed to warrant a higher fee.

7(iv) In the event of a challenge by any party to the Emergency Arbitrator, the party that applied for the appointment of the Emergency Arbitrator shall pay forthwith to the LCIA such further sum as may be directed by the LCIA Court in respect of the fees and expenses of the individual or division appointed to decide the challenge.

7(v) If the LCIA refuses an application for the appointment of an Emergency Arbitrator, the Emergency Arbitrator's fee shall be treated as a deposit lodged by the applicant party on account of the Arbitration Costs in accordance with Article 24 of the Rules and the Schedule.

Replace the IBA Guidelines on Conflicts of Interest in International Arbitration on pages 345-359 of the Documentary Supplement with the following:

**INTERNATIONAL BAR ASSOCIATION
GUIDELINES ON CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
IN INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION*
Approved 23 October 2014**

Introduction

1. Arbitrators and party representatives are often unsure about the scope of their disclosure obligations. The growth of international business, including larger corporate groups and international law firms, has generated more disclosures and resulted in increased complexity in the analysis of disclosure and conflict of interest issues. Parties have more opportunities to use challenges of arbitrators to delay arbitrations, or to deny the opposing party the arbitrator of its choice. Disclosure of any relationship, no matter how minor or serious, may lead to unwarranted or frivolous challenges. At the same time, it is important that more information be made available to the parties, so as to protect awards against challenges based upon alleged failures to disclose, and to promote a level playing field among parties and among counsel engaged in international arbitration.

2. Parties, arbitrators, institutions and courts face complex decisions about the information that arbitrators should disclose and the standards to apply to disclosure. In addition, institutions and courts face difficult decisions when an objection or a challenge is made after a disclosure. There is a tension between, on the one hand, the parties' right to disclosure of circumstances that may call into question an arbitrator's impartiality or independence in order to protect the parties' right to a fair hearing, and, on the other hand, the need to avoid unnecessary challenges against arbitrators in order to protect the parties' ability to select arbitrators of their choosing.

3. It is in the interest of the international arbitration community that arbitration proceedings are not hindered by ill-founded challenges against arbitrators and that the legitimacy of the process is not affected by uncertainty and a lack of uniformity in the applicable standards for disclosures, objections and challenges. The 2004 Guidelines reflected the view that the standards existing at the time lacked sufficient clarity and uniformity in their application. The

* The IBA Guidelines on Conflicts of Interest in International Arbitration are reproduced by kind permission of the International Bar Association, London, UK. Copyright © International Bar Association.

Guidelines, therefore, set forth some ‘General Standards and Explanatory Notes on the Standards’. Moreover, in order to promote greater consistency and to avoid unnecessary challenges and arbitrator withdrawals and removals, the Guidelines list specific situations indicating whether they warrant disclosure or disqualification of an arbitrator. Such lists, designated ‘Red’, ‘Orange’ and ‘Green’ (the ‘Application Lists’), have been updated and appear at the end of these revised Guidelines.

4. The Guidelines reflect the understanding of the IBA Arbitration Committee as to the best current international practice, firmly rooted in the principles expressed in the General Standards below. The General Standards and the Application Lists are based upon statutes and case law in a cross-section of jurisdictions, and upon the judgement and experience of practitioners involved in international arbitration. In reviewing the 2004 Guidelines, the IBA Arbitration Committee updated its analysis of the laws and practices in a number of jurisdictions. The Guidelines seek to balance the various interests of parties, representatives, arbitrators and arbitration institutions, all of whom have a responsibility for ensuring the integrity, reputation and efficiency of international arbitration. Both the 2004 Working Group and the Subcommittee in 2012/2014 have sought and considered the views of leading arbitration institutions, corporate counsel and other persons involved in international arbitration through public consultations at IBA annual meetings, and at meetings with arbitrators and practitioners. The comments received were reviewed in detail and many were adopted. The IBA Arbitration Committee is grateful for the serious consideration given to its proposals by so many institutions and individuals.

5. The Guidelines apply to international commercial arbitration and investment arbitration, whether the representation of the parties is carried out by lawyers or non-lawyers, and irrespective of whether or not non-legal professionals serve as arbitrators.

6. These Guidelines are not legal provisions and do not override any applicable national law or arbitral rules chosen by the parties. However, it is hoped that, as was the case for the 2004 Guidelines and other sets of rules and guidelines of the IBA Arbitration Committee, the revised Guidelines will find broad acceptance within the international arbitration community, and that they will assist parties, practitioners, arbitrators, institutions and courts in dealing with these important questions of impartiality and independence. The IBA Arbitration Committee trusts that the Guidelines will be applied with robust common sense and without unduly formalistic interpretation.

7. The Application Lists cover many of the varied situations that commonly arise in practice, but they do not purport to be exhaustive, nor could they be. Nevertheless, the IBA Arbitration Committee is confident that the Application Lists

provide concrete guidance that is useful in applying the General Standards. The IBA Arbitration Committee will continue to study the actual use of the Guidelines with a view to furthering their improvement.

8. In 1987, the IBA published Rules of Ethics for International Arbitrators. Those Rules cover more topics than these Guidelines, and they remain in effect as to subjects that are not discussed in the Guidelines. The Guidelines supersede the Rules of Ethics as to the matters treated here.

Part I: General Standards Regarding Impartiality, Independence and Disclosure

(1) General Principle

Every arbitrator shall be impartial and independent of the parties at the time of accepting an appointment to serve and shall remain so until the final award has been rendered or the proceedings have otherwise finally terminated.

Explanation to General Standard 1:

A fundamental principle underlying these Guidelines is that each arbitrator must be impartial and independent of the parties at the time he or she accepts an appointment to act as arbitrator, and must remain so during the entire course of the arbitration proceeding, including the time period for the correction or interpretation of a final award under the relevant rules, assuming such time period is known or readily ascertainable. The question has arisen as to whether this obligation should extend to the period during which the award may be challenged before the relevant courts. The decision taken is that this obligation should not extend in this manner, unless the final award may be referred back to the original Arbitral Tribunal under the relevant applicable law or relevant institutional rules. Thus, the arbitrator's obligation in this regard ends when the Arbitral Tribunal has rendered the final award, and any correction or interpretation as may be permitted under the relevant rules has been issued, or the time for seeking the same has elapsed, the proceedings have been finally terminated (for example, because of a settlement), or the arbitrator otherwise no longer has jurisdiction. If, after setting aside or other proceedings, the dispute is referred back to the same Arbitral Tribunal, a fresh round of disclosure and review of potential conflicts of interests may be necessary.

(2) Conflicts of Interest

(a) An arbitrator shall decline to accept an appointment or, if the arbitration has already been commenced, refuse to continue to act as an arbitrator, if he or she has any doubt as to his or her ability to be impartial or independent.

(b) The same principle applies if facts or circumstances exist, or have arisen since the appointment, which, from the point of view of a reasonable third person having knowledge of the relevant facts and circumstances, would give rise to justifiable doubts as to the arbitrator's impartiality or independence, unless the parties have accepted the arbitrator in accordance with the requirements set out in General Standard 4.

(c) Doubts are justifiable if a reasonable third person, having knowledge of the relevant facts and circumstances, would reach the conclusion that there is a likelihood that the arbitrator may be influenced by factors other than the merits of the case as presented by the parties in reaching his or her decision. (d) Justifiable doubts necessarily exist as to the arbitrator's impartiality or independence in any of the situations described in the Non-Waivable Red List.

Explanation to General Standard 2:

(a) If the arbitrator has doubts as to his or her ability to be impartial and independent, the arbitrator must decline the appointment. This standard should apply regardless of the stage of the proceedings. This is a basic principle that is spelled out in these Guidelines in order to avoid confusion and to foster confidence in the arbitral process.

(b) In order for standards to be applied as consistently as possible, the test for disqualification is an objective one. The wording 'impartiality or independence' derives from the widely adopted Article 12 of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) Model Law, and the use of an appearance test based on justifiable doubts as to the impartiality or independence of the arbitrator, as provided in Article 12(2) of the UNCITRAL Model Law, is to be applied objectively (a 'reasonable third person test'). Again, as described in the Explanation to General Standard 3(e), this standard applies regardless of the stage of the proceedings.

(c) Laws and rules that rely on the standard of justifiable doubts often do not define that standard. This General Standard is intended to provide some context for making this determination.

(d) The Non-Waivable Red List describes circumstances that necessarily raise justifiable doubts as to the arbitrator's impartiality or independence. For

example, because no one is allowed to be his or her own judge, there cannot be identity between an arbitrator and a party. The parties, therefore, cannot waive the conflict of interest arising in such a situation.

(3) Disclosure by the Arbitrator

(a) If facts or circumstances exist that may, in the eyes of the parties, give rise to doubts as to the arbitrator's impartiality or independence, the arbitrator shall disclose such facts or circumstances to the parties, the arbitration institution or other appointing authority (if any, and if so required by the applicable institutional rules) and the co-arbitrators, if any, prior to accepting his or her appointment or, if thereafter, as soon as he or she learns of them.

(b) An advance declaration or waiver in relation to possible conflicts of interest arising from facts and circumstances that may arise in the future does not discharge the arbitrator's ongoing duty of disclosure under General Standard 3(a).

(c) It follows from General Standards 1 and 2(a) that an arbitrator who has made a disclosure considers himself or herself to be impartial and independent of the parties, despite the disclosed facts, and, therefore, capable of performing his or her duties as arbitrator. Otherwise, he or she would have declined the nomination or appointment at the outset, or resigned.

(d) Any doubt as to whether an arbitrator should disclose certain facts or circumstances should be resolved in favour of disclosure.

(e) When considering whether facts or circumstances exist that should be disclosed, the arbitrator shall not take into account whether the arbitration is at the beginning or at a later stage.

Explanation to General Standard 3:

(a) The arbitrator's duty to disclose under General Standard 3(a) rests on the principle that the parties have an interest in being fully informed of any facts or circumstances that may be relevant in their view. Accordingly, General Standard 3(d) provides that any doubt as to whether certain facts or circumstances should be disclosed should be resolved in favour of disclosure. However, situations that, such as those set out in the Green List, could never lead to disqualification under the objective test set out in General Standard 2, need not be disclosed. As reflected in General Standard 3(c), a disclosure does not imply that the disclosed facts are such as to disqualify the arbitrator under General Standard 2. The duty of disclosure under General Standard 3(a) is ongoing in nature.

(b) The IBA Arbitration Committee has considered the increasing use by prospective arbitrators of declarations in respect of facts or circumstances that may arise in the future, and the possible conflicts of interest that may result, sometimes referred to as ‘advance waivers’. Such declarations do not discharge the arbitrator’s ongoing duty of disclosure under General Standard 3(a). The Guidelines, however, do not otherwise take a position as to the validity and effect of advance declarations or waivers, because the validity and effect of any advance declaration or waiver must be assessed in view of the specific text of the advance declaration or waiver, the particular circumstances at hand and the applicable law.

(c) A disclosure does not imply the existence of a conflict of interest. An arbitrator who has made a disclosure to the parties considers himself or herself to be impartial and independent of the parties, despite the disclosed facts, or else he or she would have declined the nomination, or resigned. An arbitrator making a disclosure thus feels capable of performing his or her duties. It is the purpose of disclosure to allow the parties to judge whether they agree with the evaluation of the arbitrator and, if they so wish, to explore the situation further. It is hoped that the promulgation of this General Standard will eliminate the misconception that disclosure itself implies doubts sufficient to disqualify the arbitrator, or even creates a presumption in favour of disqualification. Instead, any challenge should only be successful if an objective test, as set forth in General Standard 2 above, is met. Under Comment 5 of the Practical Application of the General Standards, a failure to disclose certain facts and circumstances that may, in the eyes of the parties, give rise to doubts as to the arbitrator’s impartiality or independence, does not necessarily mean that a conflict of interest exists, or that a disqualification should ensue.

(d) In determining which facts should be disclosed, an arbitrator should take into account all circumstances known to him or her. If the arbitrator finds that he or she should make a disclosure, but that professional secrecy rules or other rules of practice or professional conduct prevent such disclosure, he or she should not accept the appointment, or should resign.

(e) Disclosure or disqualification (as set out in General Standards 2 and 3) should not depend on the particular stage of the arbitration. In order to determine whether the arbitrator should disclose, decline the appointment or refuse to continue to act, the facts and circumstances alone are relevant, not the current stage of the proceedings, or the consequences of the withdrawal. As a practical matter, arbitration institutions may make a distinction depending on the stage of the arbitration. Courts may likewise apply different standards. Nevertheless, no distinction is made by these Guidelines depending on the stage of the arbitral proceedings. While there are practical concerns, if an arbitrator must withdraw after the arbitration has commenced, a distinction based on the stage of the arbitration would be inconsistent with the General Standards.

(4) Waiver by the Parties

(a) If, within 30 days after the receipt of any disclosure by the arbitrator, or after a party otherwise learns of facts or circumstances that could constitute a potential conflict of interest for an arbitrator, a party does not raise an express objection with regard to that arbitrator, subject to paragraphs (b) and (c) of this General Standard, the party is deemed to have waived any potential conflict of interest in respect of the arbitrator based on such facts or circumstances and may not raise any objection based on such facts or circumstances at a later stage.

(b) However, if facts or circumstances exist as described in the Non-Waivable Red List, any waiver by a party (including any declaration or advance waiver, such as that contemplated in General Standard 3(b)), or any agreement by the parties to have such a person serve as arbitrator, shall be regarded as invalid.

(c) A person should not serve as an arbitrator when a conflict of interest, such as those exemplified in the Waivable Red List, exists. Nevertheless, such a person may accept appointment as arbitrator, or continue to act as an arbitrator, if the following conditions are met: (i) all parties, all arbitrators and the arbitration institution, or other appointing authority (if any), have full knowledge of the conflict of interest; and (ii) all parties expressly agree that such a person may serve as arbitrator, despite the conflict of interest.

(d) An arbitrator may assist the parties in reaching a settlement of the dispute, through conciliation, mediation or otherwise, at any stage of the proceedings. However, before doing so, the arbitrator should receive an express agreement by the parties that acting in such a manner shall not disqualify the arbitrator from continuing to serve as arbitrator. Such express agreement shall be considered to be an effective waiver of any potential conflict of interest that may arise from the arbitrator's participation in such a process, or from information that the arbitrator may learn in the process. If the assistance by the arbitrator does not lead to the final settlement of the case, the parties remain bound by their waiver. However, consistent with General Standard 2(a) and notwithstanding such agreement, the arbitrator shall resign if, as a consequence of his or her involvement in the settlement process, the arbitrator develops doubts as to his or her ability to remain impartial or independent in the future course of the arbitration.

Explanation to General Standard 4:

(a) Under General Standard 4(a), a party is deemed to have waived any potential conflict of interest, if such party has not raised an objection in respect of such conflict of interest within 30 days. This time limit should run from the date on

which the party learns of the relevant facts or circumstances, including through the disclosure process.

(b) General Standard 4(b) serves to exclude from the scope of General Standard 4(a) the facts and circumstances described in the Non-Waivable Red List. Some arbitrators make declarations that seek waivers from the parties with respect to facts or circumstances that may arise in the future. Irrespective of any such waiver sought by the arbitrator, as provided in General Standard 3(b), facts and circumstances arising in the course of the arbitration should be disclosed to the parties by virtue of the arbitrator's ongoing duty of disclosure.

(c) Notwithstanding a serious conflict of interest, such as those that are described by way of example in the Waivable Red List, the parties may wish to engage such a person as an arbitrator. Here, party autonomy and the desire to have only impartial and independent arbitrators must be balanced. Persons with a serious conflict of interest, such as those that are described by way of example in the Waivable Red List, may serve as arbitrators only if the parties make fully informed, explicit waivers.

(d) The concept of the Arbitral Tribunal assisting the parties in reaching a settlement of their dispute in the course of the arbitration proceedings is well-established in some jurisdictions, but not in others. Informed consent by the parties to such a process prior to its beginning should be regarded as an effective waiver of a potential conflict of interest. Certain jurisdictions may require such consent to be in writing and signed by the parties. Subject to any requirements of applicable law, express consent may be sufficient and may be given at a hearing and reflected in the minutes or transcript of the proceeding. In addition, in order to avoid parties using an arbitrator as mediator as a means of disqualifying the arbitrator, the General Standard makes clear that the waiver should remain effective, if the mediation is unsuccessful. In giving their express consent, the parties should realise the consequences of the arbitrator assisting them in a settlement process, including the risk of the resignation of the arbitrator.

(5) Scope

(a) These Guidelines apply equally to tribunal chairs, sole arbitrators and co-arbitrators, howsoever appointed.

(b) Arbitral or administrative secretaries and assistants, to an individual arbitrator or the Arbitral Tribunal, are bound by the same duty of independence and impartiality as arbitrators, and it is the responsibility of the Arbitral Tribunal to ensure that such duty is respected at all stages of the arbitration.

Explanation to General Standard 5:

(a) Because each member of an Arbitral Tribunal has an obligation to be impartial and independent, the General Standards do not distinguish between sole arbitrators, tribunal chairs, party-appointed arbitrators or arbitrators appointed by an institution.

(b) Some arbitration institutions require arbitral or administrative secretaries and assistants to sign a declaration of independence and impartiality. Whether or not such a requirement exists, arbitral or administrative secretaries and assistants to the Arbitral Tribunal are bound by the same duty of independence and impartiality (including the duty of disclosure) as arbitrators, and it is the responsibility of the Arbitral Tribunal to ensure that such duty is respected at all stages of the arbitration. Furthermore, this duty applies to arbitral or administrative secretaries and assistants to either the Arbitral Tribunal or individual members of the Arbitral Tribunal.

(6) Relationships

(a) The arbitrator is in principle considered to bear the identity of his or her law firm, but when considering the relevance of facts or circumstances to determine whether a potential conflict of interest exists, or whether disclosure should be made, the activities of an arbitrator's law firm, if any, and the relationship of the arbitrator with the law firm, should be considered in each individual case. The fact that the activities of the arbitrator's firm involve one of the parties shall not necessarily constitute a source of such conflict, or a reason for disclosure. Similarly, if one of the parties is a member of a group with which the arbitrator's firm has a relationship, such fact should be considered in each individual case, but shall not necessarily constitute by itself a source of a conflict of interest, or a reason for disclosure.

(b) If one of the parties is a legal entity, any legal or physical person having a controlling influence on the legal entity, or a direct economic interest in, or a duty to indemnify a party for, the award to be rendered in the arbitration, may be considered to bear the identity of such party.

Explanation to General Standard 6:

(a) The growing size of law firms should be taken into account as part of today's reality in international arbitration. There is a need to balance the interests of a party to appoint the arbitrator of its choice, who may be a partner at a large law firm, and the importance of maintaining confidence in the impartiality and independence of international arbitrators. The arbitrator must, in principle, be considered to bear the identity of his or her law firm, but the activities of the

arbitrator's firm should not automatically create a conflict of interest. The relevance of the activities of the arbitrator's firm, such as the nature, timing and scope of the work by the law firm, and the relationship of the arbitrator with the law firm, should be considered in each case. General Standard 6(a) uses the term 'involve' rather than 'acting for' because the relevant connections with a party may include activities other than representation on a legal matter. Although barristers' chambers should not be equated with law firms for the purposes of conflicts, and no general standard is proffered for barristers' chambers, disclosure may be warranted in view of the relationships among barristers, parties or counsel. When a party to an arbitration is a member of a group of companies, special questions regarding conflicts of interest arise. Because individual corporate structure arrangements vary widely, a catch-all rule is not appropriate. Instead, the particular circumstances of an affiliation with another entity within the same group of companies, and the relationship of that entity with the arbitrator's law firm, should be considered in each individual case.

(b) When a party in international arbitration is a legal entity, other legal and physical persons may have a controlling influence on this legal entity, or a direct economic interest in, or a duty to indemnify a party for, the award to be rendered in the arbitration. Each situation should be assessed individually, and General Standard 6(b) clarifies that such legal persons and individuals may be considered effectively to be that party. Third-party funders and insurers in relation to the dispute may have a direct economic interest in the award, and as such may be considered to be the equivalent of the party. For these purposes, the terms 'third-party funder' and 'insurer' refer to any person or entity that is contributing funds, or other material support, to the prosecution or defence of the case and that has a direct economic interest in, or a duty to indemnify a party for, the award to be rendered in the arbitration.

(7) Duty of the Parties and the Arbitrator

(a) A party shall inform an arbitrator, the Arbitral Tribunal, the other parties and the arbitration institution or other appointing authority (if any) of any relationship, direct or indirect, between the arbitrator and the party (or another company of the same group of companies, or an individual having a controlling influence on the party in the arbitration), or between the arbitrator and any person or entity with a direct economic interest in, or a duty to indemnify a party for, the award to be rendered in the arbitration. The party shall do so on its own initiative at the earliest opportunity.

(b) A party shall inform an arbitrator, the Arbitral Tribunal, the other parties and the arbitration institution or other appointing authority (if any) of the identity of its counsel appearing in the arbitration, as well as of any relationship, including membership of the same barristers' chambers, between its counsel and

the arbitrator. The party shall do so on its own initiative at the earliest opportunity, and upon any change in its counsel team.

(c) In order to comply with General Standard 7(a), a party shall perform reasonable enquiries and provide any relevant information available to it.

(d) An arbitrator is under a duty to make reasonable enquiries to identify any conflict of interest, as well as any facts or circumstances that may reasonably give rise to doubts as to his or her impartiality or independence. Failure to disclose a conflict is not excused by lack of knowledge, if the arbitrator does not perform such reasonable enquiries.

Explanation to General Standard 7:

(a) The parties are required to disclose any relationship with the arbitrator. Disclosure of such relationships should reduce the risk of an unmeritorious challenge of an arbitrator's impartiality or independence based on information learned after the appointment. The parties' duty of disclosure of any relationship, direct or indirect, between the arbitrator and the party (or another company of the same group of companies, or an individual having a controlling influence on the party in the arbitration) has been extended to relationships with persons or entities having a direct economic interest in the award to be rendered in the arbitration, such as an entity providing funding for the arbitration, or having a duty to indemnify a party for the award.

(b) Counsel appearing in the arbitration, namely the persons involved in the representation of the parties in the arbitration, must be identified by the parties at the earliest opportunity. A party's duty to disclose the identity of counsel appearing in the arbitration extends to all members of that party's counsel team and arises from the outset of the proceedings.

(c) In order to satisfy their duty of disclosure, the parties are required to investigate any relevant information that is reasonably available to them. In addition, any party to an arbitration is required, at the outset and on an ongoing basis during the entirety of the proceedings, to make a reasonable effort to ascertain and to disclose available information that, applying the general standard, might affect the arbitrator's impartiality or independence.

(d) In order to satisfy their duty of disclosure under the Guidelines, arbitrators are required to investigate any relevant information that is reasonably available to them.

Part II: Practical Application of the General Standards

1. If the Guidelines are to have an important practical influence, they should address situations that are likely to occur in today's arbitration practice and should provide specific guidance to arbitrators, parties, institutions and courts as to which situations do or do not constitute conflicts of interest, or should or should not be disclosed. For this purpose, the Guidelines categorise situations that may occur in the following Application Lists. These lists cannot cover every situation. In all cases, the General Standards should control the outcome.

2. The Red List consists of two parts: 'a Non-Waivable Red List' (see General Standards 2(d) and 4(b)); and 'a Waivable Red List' (see General Standard 4(c)). These lists are non-exhaustive and detail specific situations that, depending on the facts of a given case, give rise to justifiable doubts as to the arbitrator's impartiality and independence. That is, in these circumstances, an objective conflict of interest exists from the point of view of a reasonable third person having knowledge of the relevant facts and circumstances (see General Standard 2(b)). The Non-Waivable Red List includes situations deriving from the overriding principle that no person can be his or her own judge. Therefore, acceptance of such a situation cannot cure the conflict. The Waivable Red List covers situations that are serious but not as severe. Because of their seriousness, unlike circumstances described in the Orange List, these situations should be considered waivable, but only if and when the parties, being aware of the conflict of interest situation, expressly state their willingness to have such a person act as arbitrator, as set forth in General Standard 4(c).

3. The Orange List is a non-exhaustive list of specific situations that, depending on the facts of a given case, may, in the eyes of the parties, give rise to doubts as to the arbitrator's impartiality or independence. The Orange List thus reflects situations that would fall under General Standard 3(a), with the consequence that the arbitrator has a duty to disclose such situations. In all these situations, the parties are deemed to have accepted the arbitrator if, after disclosure, no timely objection is made, as established in General Standard 4(a).

4. Disclosure does not imply the existence of a conflict of interest; nor should it by itself result either in a disqualification of the arbitrator, or in a presumption regarding disqualification. The purpose of the disclosure is to inform the parties of a situation that they may wish to explore further in order to determine whether objectively – that is, from the point of view of a reasonable third person having knowledge of the relevant facts and circumstances – there are justifiable doubts as to the arbitrator's impartiality or independence. If the conclusion is that there are no justifiable doubts, the arbitrator can act. Apart from the situations covered by the Non-Waivable Red List, he or she can also act if there is no timely objection by the parties or, in situations covered by the Waivable Red List, if there is a specific

acceptance by the parties in accordance with General Standard 4(c). If a party challenges the arbitrator, he or she can nevertheless act, if the authority that rules on the challenge decides that the challenge does not meet the objective test for disqualification.

5. A later challenge based on the fact that an arbitrator did not disclose such facts or circumstances should not result automatically in non-appointment, later disqualification or a successful challenge to any award. Nondisclosure cannot by itself make an arbitrator partial or lacking independence: only the facts or circumstances that he or she failed to disclose can do so.

6. Situations not listed in the Orange List or falling outside the time limits used in some of the Orange List situations are generally not subject to disclosure. However, an arbitrator needs to assess on a case-by-case basis whether a given situation, even though not mentioned in the Orange List, is nevertheless such as to give rise to justifiable doubts as to his or her impartiality or independence. Because the Orange List is a non-exhaustive list of examples, there may be situations not mentioned, which, depending on the circumstances, may need to be disclosed by an arbitrator. Such may be the case, for example, in the event of repeat past appointments by the same party or the same counsel beyond the three-year period provided for in the Orange List, or when an arbitrator concurrently acts as counsel in an unrelated case in which similar issues of law are raised. Likewise, an appointment made by the same party or the same counsel appearing before an arbitrator, while the case is ongoing, may also have to be disclosed, depending on the circumstances. While the Guidelines do not require disclosure of the fact that an arbitrator concurrently serves, or has in the past served, on the same Arbitral Tribunal with another member of the tribunal, or with one of the counsel in the current proceedings, an arbitrator should assess on a case-by-case basis whether the fact of having frequently served as counsel with, or as an arbitrator on, Arbitral Tribunals with another member of the tribunal may create a perceived imbalance within the tribunal. If the conclusion is ‘yes’, the arbitrator should consider a disclosure.

7. The Green List is a non-exhaustive list of specific situations where no appearance and no actual conflict of interest exists from an objective point of view. Thus, the arbitrator has no duty to disclose situations falling within the Green List. As stated in the Explanation to General Standard 3(a), there should be a limit to disclosure, based on reasonableness; in some situations, an objective test should prevail over the purely subjective test of ‘the eyes’ of the parties.

8. The borderline between the categories that comprise the Lists can be thin. It can be debated whether a certain situation should be on one List instead of another. Also, the Lists contain, for various situations, general terms such as ‘significant’ and ‘relevant’. The Lists reflect international principles and best

practices to the extent possible. Further definition of the norms, which are to be interpreted reasonably in light of the facts and circumstances in each case, would be counterproductive.

1. Non-Waivable Red List

1.1 There is an identity between a party and the arbitrator, or the arbitrator is a legal representative or employee of an entity that is a party in the arbitration.

1.2 The arbitrator is a manager, director or member of the supervisory board, or has a controlling influence on one of the parties or an entity that has a direct economic interest in the award to be rendered in the arbitration.

1.3 The arbitrator has a significant financial or personal interest in one of the parties, or the outcome of the case.

1.4 The arbitrator or his or her firm regularly advises the party, or an affiliate of the party, and the arbitrator or his or her firm derives significant financial income therefrom.

2. Waivable Red List

2.1 Relationship of the arbitrator to the dispute

2.1.1 The arbitrator has given legal advice, or provided an expert opinion, on the dispute to a party or an affiliate of one of the parties.

2.1.2 The arbitrator had a prior involvement in the dispute.

2.2 Arbitrator's direct or indirect interest in the dispute

2.2.1 The arbitrator holds shares, either directly or indirectly, in one of the parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties, this party or an affiliate being privately held.

2.2.2 A close family member³ of the arbitrator has a significant financial interest in the outcome of the dispute.

³ Throughout the Application Lists, the term 'close family member' refers to a: spouse, sibling, child, parent or life partner, in addition to any other family member with whom a close relationship exists.

2.2.3 The arbitrator, or a close family member of the arbitrator, has a close relationship with a non-party who may be liable to recourse on the part of the unsuccessful party in the dispute.

2.3 Arbitrator's relationship with the parties or counsel

2.3.1 The arbitrator currently represents or advises one of the parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties.

2.3.2 The arbitrator currently represents or advises the lawyer or law firm acting as counsel for one of the parties.

2.3.3 The arbitrator is a lawyer in the same law firm as the counsel to one of the parties.

2.3.4 The arbitrator is a manager, director or member of the supervisory board, or has a controlling influence in an affiliate⁴ of one of the parties, if the affiliate is directly involved in the matters in dispute in the arbitration.

2.3.5 The arbitrator's law firm had a previous but terminated involvement in the case without the arbitrator being involved himself or herself.

2.3.6 The arbitrator's law firm currently has a significant commercial relationship with one of the parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties.

2.3.7 The arbitrator regularly advises one of the parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties, but neither the arbitrator nor his or her firm derives a significant financial income therefrom.

2.3.8 The arbitrator has a close family relationship with one of the parties, or with a manager, director or member of the supervisory board, or any person having a controlling influence in one of the parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties, or with a counsel representing a party.

2.3.9 A close family member of the arbitrator has a significant financial or personal interest in one of the parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties.

⁴ Throughout the Application Lists, the term 'affiliate' encompasses all companies in a group of companies, including the parent company.

3. Orange List

3.1 Previous services for one of the parties or other involvement in the case

3.1.1 The arbitrator has, within the past three years, served as counsel for one of the parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties, or has previously advised or been consulted by the party, or an affiliate of the party, making the appointment in an unrelated matter, but the arbitrator and the party, or the affiliate of the party, have no ongoing relationship.

3.1.2 The arbitrator has, within the past three years, served as counsel against one of the parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties, in an unrelated matter.

3.1.3 The arbitrator has, within the past three years, been appointed as arbitrator on two or more occasions by one of the parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties.⁵

3.1.4 The arbitrator's law firm has, within the past three years, acted for or against one of the parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties, in an unrelated matter without the involvement of the arbitrator.

3.1.5 The arbitrator currently serves, or has served within the past three years, as arbitrator in another arbitration involving one of the parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties.

3.2 Current services for one of the parties

3.2.1 The arbitrator's law firm is currently rendering services to one of the parties, or to an affiliate of one of the parties, without creating a significant commercial relationship for the law firm and without the involvement of the arbitrator.

3.2.2 A law firm or other legal organisation that shares significant fees or other revenues with the arbitrator's law firm renders services to one of the parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties, before the Arbitral Tribunal.

⁵ It may be the practice in certain types of arbitration, such as maritime, sports or commodities arbitration, to draw arbitrators from a smaller or specialised pool of individuals. If in such fields it is the custom and practice for parties to frequently appoint the same arbitrator in different cases, no disclosure of this fact is required, where all parties in the arbitration should be familiar with such custom and practice.

3.2.3 The arbitrator or his or her firm represents a party, or an affiliate of one of the parties to the arbitration, on a regular basis, but such representation does not concern the current dispute.

3.3 Relationship between an arbitrator and another arbitrator or counsel

3.3.1 The arbitrator and another arbitrator are lawyers in the same law firm.

3.3.2 The arbitrator and another arbitrator, or the counsel for one of the parties, are members of the same barristers' chambers.

3.3.3 The arbitrator was, within the past three years, a partner of, or otherwise affiliated with, another arbitrator or any of the counsel in the arbitration.

3.3.4 A lawyer in the arbitrator's law firm is an arbitrator in another dispute involving the same party or parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties.

3.3.5 A close family member of the arbitrator is a partner or employee of the law firm representing one of the parties, but is not assisting with the dispute.

3.3.6 A close personal friendship exists between an arbitrator and a counsel of a party.

3.3.7 Enmity exists between an arbitrator and counsel appearing in the arbitration.

3.3.8 The arbitrator has, within the past three years, been appointed on more than three occasions by the same counsel, or the same law firm.

3.3.9 The arbitrator and another arbitrator, or counsel for one of the parties in the arbitration, currently act or have acted together within the past three years as co-counsel.

3.4 Relationship between arbitrator and party and others involved in the arbitration

3.4.1 The arbitrator's law firm is currently acting adversely to one of the parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties.

3.4.2 The arbitrator has been associated with a party, or an affiliate of one of the parties, in a professional capacity, such as a former employee or partner.

3.4.3 A close personal friendship exists between an arbitrator and a manager or director or a member of the supervisory board of: a party; an entity that has a direct economic interest in the award to be rendered in the arbitration; or any person having a controlling influence, such as a controlling shareholder interest, on one of the parties or an affiliate of one of the parties or a witness or expert.

3.4.4 Enmity exists between an arbitrator and a manager or director or a member of the supervisory board of: a party; an entity that has a direct economic interest in the award; or any person having a controlling influence in one of the parties or an affiliate of one of the parties or a witness or expert.

3.4.5 If the arbitrator is a former judge, he or she has, within the past three years, heard a significant case involving one of the parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties.

3.5 Other circumstances

3.5.1 The arbitrator holds shares, either directly or indirectly, that by reason of number or denomination constitute a material holding in one of the parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties, this party or affiliate being publicly listed.

3.5.2 The arbitrator has publicly advocated a position on the case, whether in a published paper, or speech, or otherwise.

3.5.3 The arbitrator holds a position with the appointing authority with respect to the dispute.

3.5.4 The arbitrator is a manager, director or member of the supervisory board, or has a controlling influence on an affiliate of one of the parties, where the affiliate is not directly involved in the matters in dispute in the arbitration.

4. Green List

4.1 Previously expressed legal opinions

4.1.1 The arbitrator has previously expressed a legal opinion (such as in a law review article or public lecture) concerning an issue that also arises in the arbitration (but this opinion is not focused on the case).

4.2 Current services for one of the parties

4.2.1 A firm, in association or in alliance with the arbitrator's law firm, but that does not share significant fees or other revenues with the arbitrator's law firm, renders services to one of the parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties, in an unrelated matter.

4.3 Contacts with another arbitrator, or with counsel for one of the parties

4.3.1 The arbitrator has a relationship with another arbitrator, or with the counsel for one of the parties, through membership in the same professional association, or social or charitable organisation, or through a social media network.

4.3.2 The arbitrator and counsel for one of the parties have previously served together as arbitrators.

4.3.3 The arbitrator teaches in the same faculty or school as another arbitrator or counsel to one of the parties, or serves as an officer of a professional association or social or charitable organisation with another arbitrator or counsel for one of the parties.

4.3.4 The arbitrator was a speaker, moderator or organiser in one or more conferences, or participated in seminars or working parties of a professional, social or charitable organisation, with another arbitrator or counsel to the parties.

4.4 Contacts between the arbitrator and one of the parties

4.4.1 The arbitrator has had an initial contact with a party, or an affiliate of a party (or their counsel) prior to appointment, if this contact is limited to the arbitrator's availability and qualifications to serve, or to the names of possible candidates for a chairperson, and did not address the merits or procedural aspects of the dispute, other than to provide the arbitrator with a basic understanding of the case.

4.4.2 The arbitrator holds an insignificant amount of shares in one of the parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties, which is publicly listed.

4.4.3 The arbitrator and a manager, director or member of the supervisory board, or any person having a controlling influence on one of the parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties, have worked together as joint experts, or in another professional capacity, including as arbitrators in the same case.

4.4.4 The arbitrator has a relationship with one of the parties or its affiliates through a social media network.

Add the following after the IBA Guidelines on Conflicts of Interest on page 359 of the Documentary Supplement:

International Bar Association, IBA Guidelines on Party Representation in International Arbitration (2013), available at <http://www.ibanet.org/Document/Default.aspx?DocumentUid=6F0C57D7-E7A0-43AF-B76E-714D9FE74D7F>

Replace the AAA's *Drafting Dispute Resolution Clauses* on pages 361-383 with the following updated version:

American Arbitration Association, *Drafting Dispute Resolution Clauses—A Practical Guide* (2013), *available at*
https://www.adr.org/sites/default/files/document_repository/Drafting%20Dispute%20Resolution%20Clauses%20A%20Practical%20Guide.pdf