

Global Arbitration Review

The Guide to Challenging and Enforcing Arbitration Awards

General Editor
J William Rowley QC

Editors
Emmanuel Gaillard and Gordon E Kaiser

The Guide to Challenging and Enforcing Arbitration Awards

General Editor

J William Rowley QC

Editors

Emmanuel Gaillard and Gordon E Kaiser

Reproduced with permission from Law Business Research Ltd

This article was first published in May 2019

For further information please contact Natalie.Clarke@lbresearch.com



Publisher

David Samuels

Business Development Manager

Gemma Chalk

Editorial Coordinator

Hannah Higgins

Head of Production

Adam Myers

Copy-editor

Caroline Fewkes

Proofreader

Martin Roach

Published in the United Kingdom
by Law Business Research Ltd, London
87 Lancaster Road, London, W11 1QQ, UK
© 2019 Law Business Research Ltd
www.globalarbitrationreview.com

No photocopying: copyright licences do not apply.

The information provided in this publication is general and may not apply in a specific situation, nor does it necessarily represent the views of authors' firms or their clients. Legal advice should always be sought before taking any legal action based on the information provided. The publishers accept no responsibility for any acts or omissions contained herein. Although the information provided is accurate as at March 2019, be advised that this is a developing area.

Enquiries concerning reproduction should be sent to Law Business Research, at the address above. Enquiries concerning editorial content should be directed to the Publisher – david.samuels@lbresearch.com.

ISBN 978-1-83862-205-3

Printed in Great Britain by
Encompass Print Solutions, Derbyshire
Tel: 0844 2480 112

Acknowledgements

The publisher acknowledges and thanks the following for their learned assistance throughout the preparation of this book:

20 ESSEX STREET CHAMBERS

ADVOKATFIRMAN VINGE KB

AEQUITAS LAW FIRM

ARBLIT RADICATI DI BROZOLO SABATINI BENEDETTELLI TORSELLO

BARBORA ŠNÁBLOVÁ ATTORNEYS

CECIL ABRAHAM & PARTNERS

CLEARY GOTTlieb STEEN & HAMILTON LLP

CURTIS, MALLETT-PREVOST, COLT & MOSLE LLP

DE BRAUW BLACKSTONE WESTBROEK NV

DEBEVOISE & PLIMPTON

DLA PIPER

EGOROV PUGINSKY AFANASIEV & PARTNERS

ENERGY ARBITRATION CHAMBERS

FIELDFISHER LLP

FRESHFIELDS BRUCKHAUS DERINGER LLP

FRORIEP LEGAL SA

GÓMEZ PINZÓN ABOGADOS

JENNER & BLOCK LONDON LLP

JONES DAY

Acknowledgements

K&L GATES LLP

KHAITAN & CO

KING & SPALDING INTERNATIONAL LLP

KONRAD PARTNERS

LOYENS & LOEFF

MHR | MARTÍNEZ DE HOZ & RUEDA

MILBANK LLP

NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT LLP

RASHED R AL MARRI LAW OFFICE

REED SMITH LLP

SHEARMAN & STERLING LLP

SPA AJIBADE & CO

URÍA MENÉNDEZ

VIEIRA DE ALMEIDA

VON WOBESER Y SIERRA, SC

YOUSSEF & PARTNERS

YULCHON LLC

ZAMFIRESCU RACOȚI & PARTNERS

Publisher's Note

Global Arbitration Review is delighted to publish this new volume, *The Guide to Challenging and Enforcing Arbitration Awards*.

For those unfamiliar with Global Arbitration Review, we are the online home for international arbitration specialists, telling them everything they need to know about all the developments that matter. We provide daily news and analysis, and a series of more in-depth books and reviews, and also organise conferences and build work-flow tools. Visit us at www.globalarbitrationreview.com.

As the unofficial journal of international arbitration, sometimes we spot gaps in the literature earlier than other publishers. Recently, as J William Rowley QC observes in his excellent preface, it became obvious that the time spent on post-award matters has increased vastly compared with, say, 10 years ago, and it was high time someone published a reference work focused on this phase.

The Guide to Challenging and Enforcing Arbitration Awards is that book. It is a practical know-how text covering both sides of the coin – challenging and enforcing – first at thematic level, and then country by country. We are delighted to have worked with so many leading firms and individuals to produce it.

If you find it useful, you may also like the other books in the GAR Guides series. They cover energy, construction, M&A and mining disputes in the same unique, practical way. We also have books on advocacy in international arbitration and the assessment of damages.

My thanks to the editors for their vision and energy in pursuing this project and to my colleagues in production for achieving such a polished work.

Contents

| | |
|----------------------------|----|
| Preface | ix |
| <i>J William Rowley QC</i> | |

Part I: Issues relating to Challenging and Enforcing Arbitration Awards

| | | |
|---|--|----|
| 1 | Awards: Early Stage Consideration of Enforcement Issues..... | 3 |
| | <i>Sally-Ann Underhill and M Cristina Cárdenas</i> | |
| 2 | Awards: Form, Content, Effect | 12 |
| | <i>James Hope</i> | |
| 3 | Awards: Challenges | 22 |
| | <i>Michael Ostrove, James Carter and Ben Sanderson</i> | |
| 4 | Arbitrability and Public Policy Challenges | 33 |
| | <i>Elie Kleiman and Claire Pauly</i> | |
| 5 | Jurisdictional Challenges..... | 43 |
| | <i>Michael Nolan and Kamel Aitelaj</i> | |
| 6 | Due Process and Procedural Irregularities: Challenges | 52 |
| | <i>Simon Sloane, Daniel Hayward and Rebecca McKee</i> | |
| 7 | Awards: Challenges based on misuse of tribunal secretaries | 60 |
| | <i>Chloe Carswell and Lucy Winnington-Ingram</i> | |
| 8 | Substantive Grounds for Challenge | 74 |
| | <i>Joseph D Pizzurro, Robert B García and Juan O Perla</i> | |
| 9 | Enforcement under the New York Convention..... | 86 |
| | <i>Emmanuel Gaillard and Benjamin Siino</i> | |

Contents

| | | |
|----|--|-----|
| 10 | Enforcement of Interim Measures | 100 |
| | <i>James E Castello and Rami Chahine</i> | |
| 11 | Prevention of Asset Stripping: Worldwide Freezing Orders..... | 114 |
| | <i>Charlie Lightfoot, James Woolrich and Michaela Croft</i> | |
| 12 | Grounds to Refuse Enforcement | 125 |
| | <i>Sherina Petit and Ewelina Kajkowska</i> | |
| 13 | ICSID Awards | 136 |
| | <i>Claudia Annacker, Laurie Ahtouk-Spivak, Zeïneb Bouraoui</i> | |

Part II: Challenging and Enforcing Arbitration Awards: Jurisdictional Know-How

| | | |
|----|--|-----|
| 14 | Argentina | 155 |
| | <i>José Martínez de Hoz and Francisco A Amallo</i> | |
| 15 | Austria | 170 |
| | <i>Christian W Konrad and Philipp A Peters</i> | |
| 16 | Belgium | 187 |
| | <i>Hakim Boularbah, Olivier van der Haegen and Jasmine Rayée</i> | |
| 17 | Canada | 204 |
| | <i>Gordon E Kaiser</i> | |
| 18 | Colombia | 225 |
| | <i>David Araque Quijano and Johan Rodríguez Fonseca</i> | |
| 19 | Czech Republic | 237 |
| | <i>Barbora Šnáblová and Lucie Mikolandová</i> | |
| 20 | Egypt | 252 |
| | <i>Karim A Youssef</i> | |
| 21 | England and Wales | 268 |
| | <i>Oliver Marsden and Ella Davies</i> | |
| 22 | France | 285 |
| | <i>Noah Rubins and Maxence Rivoire</i> | |
| 23 | Germany | 300 |
| | <i>Boris Kasolowsky and Carsten Wendler</i> | |

Contents

| | | |
|----|---|-----|
| 24 | Hong Kong..... | 315 |
| | <i>Tony Dymond and ZJ Jennifer Lim</i> | |
| 25 | India | 329 |
| | <i>Sanjeev Kapoor and Saman Ahsan</i> | |
| 26 | Italy | 345 |
| | <i>Massimo Benedettelli and Marco Torsello</i> | |
| 27 | Japan | 361 |
| | <i>Nicholas Lingard and Toshiki Yashima</i> | |
| 28 | Kazakhstan | 376 |
| | <i>Lyailya Tleulina and Ardak Idayatova</i> | |
| 29 | Korea | 389 |
| | <i>Sae Youn Kim and Andrew White</i> | |
| 30 | Malaysia | 403 |
| | <i>Cecil W M Abraham, Aniz Ahmad Amirudin and Syukran Syafiq</i> | |
| 31 | Mexico | 415 |
| | <i>Adrián Magallanes Pérez and David Ament</i> | |
| 32 | Netherlands..... | 428 |
| | <i>Marnix Leijten, Erin Cronjé and Abdel Zirar</i> | |
| 33 | Nigeria..... | 442 |
| | <i>Babatunde Ajibade and Kolawole Mayomi</i> | |
| 34 | Portugal | 454 |
| | <i>Frederico Gonçalves Pereira, Miguel Pinto Cardoso, Rui Andrade, Filipe Rocha Vieira, Joana Neves, Catarina Cunha and Matilde Libano Monteiro</i> | |
| 35 | Qatar..... | 468 |
| | <i>Matthew R M Walker, Marieke Witkamp and Claudia El Hage</i> | |
| 36 | Romania..... | 481 |
| | <i>Cosmin Vásile</i> | |
| 37 | Russia | 493 |
| | <i>Dmitry Dyakin, Evgeny Raschevsky, Dmitry Kaysin, Maxim Bezruchenkov and Veronika Lakhno</i> | |

Contents

| | | |
|----|--|-----|
| 38 | Singapore | 505 |
| | <i>Kohe Hasan and Shourav Lahiri</i> | |
| 39 | Spain | 521 |
| | <i>Jesús Remón, Álvaro López de Argumedo, Jesús Saracho, Atenea Martínez</i> | |
| 40 | Sweden | 538 |
| | <i>James Hope</i> | |
| 41 | Switzerland | 551 |
| | <i>Franz Stirnimann Fuentes, Jean Marguerat, Tomás Navarro Blakemore and James F Reardon</i> | |
| 42 | United States | 567 |
| | <i>Elliot Friedman, David Y Livshiz and Shannon M Leitner</i> | |
| | About the Authors | 581 |
| | Contact Details | 619 |

Editor's Preface

During the past two decades, the explosive and continuous growth in cross-border trade and investments that began after World War II has jet-propelled the growth of international arbitration. Today, arbitration (whether *ad hoc* or institutional) is the universal first choice over transnational litigation for the resolution of cross-border business disputes.

Why parties choose arbitration for international disputes

During the same period, forests have been destroyed to print the thousands of papers, pamphlets, scholarly treatises and texts that have analysed every aspect of arbitration as a dispute resolution tool. The eight or 10 reasons usually given for why arbitration is the best way to resolve cross-border disputes have remained pretty constant, but their comparative rankings have changed somewhat. At present, two reasons probably outweigh all others.

The first must be the widespread disinclination of those doing business internationally to entrust the resolution of prospective disputes to the national court systems of their foreign counterparties. This unwillingness to trust foreign courts (whether based on knowledge or simply uncertainty as to whether the counterparty's court system is worthy – i.e., efficient, experienced and impartial) leaves international arbitration as the only realistic alternative, assuming the parties have equal bargaining power.

The second is that, unlike court judgments, arbitral awards benefit from a series of international treaties that provide robust and effective means of enforcement. Unquestionably, the most important of these is the 1958 New York Convention, which enables the straightforward enforcement of arbitral awards in approximately 160 countries. When enforcement against a sovereign state is at issue, the ICSID Convention of 1966 requires that ICSID awards are to be treated as final judgments of the courts of the relevant contracting state, of which there are currently 161.

Awards used to be honoured

A decade ago, international corporate counsel who responded to the 2008 Queen Mary/PricewaterhouseCoopers Survey on Corporate Attitudes and Practices in Relation to Investment Arbitration (the 2008 Queen Mary Survey) reported positive outcomes on the use of international arbitration to resolve disputes. A very high percentage (84 per cent) indicated that, in more than 76 per cent of arbitration proceedings, the non-prevailing party voluntarily complied with the arbitral award. Where enforcement was required, 57 per cent said that it took less than a year for awards to be recognised and enforced, 44 per cent received the full value of the award and 84 per cent received more than three-quarters of the award. Of those who experienced problems in enforcement, most described them as complications rather than insurmountable difficulties. The survey results amounted to a stunning endorsement of international arbitration for the resolution of cross-border disputes.

Is the situation changing?

As an arbitrator, my job is done with the delivery of a timely and enforceable award. When the award is issued, my attention invariably turns to other cases, rather than to whether the award produces results. The question of enforcing the award (or challenging it) is for others. This has meant that, until relatively recently, I have not given much thought to whether the recipient of an award would be as sanguine today about its enforceability and payment as those who responded to the 2008 Queen Mary Survey.

My interest in the question of whether international business disputes are still being resolved effectively by the delivery of an award perked up a few years ago. This was a result of the frequency of media reports – pretty well daily – of awards being challenged (either on appeal or by applications to vacate) and of prevailing parties being required to bring enforcement proceedings (often in multiple jurisdictions).

Increasing press reports of awards under attack

During 2018, *Global Arbitration Review's* daily news reports contained literally hundreds of headlines that suggest that a repeat of the 2008 Queen Mary Survey today could well lead to a significantly different view as to the state of voluntary compliance with awards or the need to seek enforcement.

A sprinkling of last year's headlines on the subject are illustrative:

- 'Well known' arbitrator sees award set aside in London
- Gazprom challenges gas pricing award in Sweden
- ICC award set aside in Paris in Russia–Ukrainian dispute
- Yukos bankruptcy denied recognition in the Netherlands
- Award against Zimbabwe upheld after eight years
- Malaysia to challenge multibillion-dollar 1MBD settlement
- Uzbekistan escapes Swiss enforcement bid
- India wins leave to challenge award on home turf

Regrettably, no source of reliable data is available as yet to test the question of whether challenges to awards are on the increase or the ease of enforcement has changed materially

since 2008. However, given the importance of the subject (without effective enforcement, there really is no effective resolution) and my anecdote-based perception of increasing concerns, last summer I raised the possibility of doing a book on the subject with David Samuels (*Global Arbitration Review's* publisher). Ultimately, we became convinced that a practical, 'know-how' text that covered both sides of the coin – challenges and enforcement – would be a useful addition to the bookshelves of those who more frequently than in the past may have to deal with challenges to, and enforcement of, international arbitration awards. Being well equipped (and up to date) on how to deal with a client's post-award options is essential for counsel in today's increasingly disputatious environment.

David and I were obviously delighted when Emmanuel Gaillard and Gordon Kaiser agreed to become partners in the project.

Editorial approach

As editors, we have not approached our work with a particular view on whether parties are currently making inappropriate use of mechanisms to challenge or resist the enforcement of awards. Any consideration of that question should be made against an understanding that not every tribunal delivers a flawless award. As Pierre Lalive said in a report 35 years ago:

an arbitral award is not always worthy of being respected and enforced; in consequence, appeals against awards [where permitted] or the refusal of enforcement can, in certain cases, be justified both in the general interest and in that of a better quality of arbitration.

Nevertheless, the 2008 Queen Mary Survey, and the statistics kept by a number of the leading arbitral institutions, suggest that the great majority of awards come to conclusions that should normally be upheld and enforced.

Structure of the guide

This guide is structured to include, in Part I, coverage of general matters that will always need to be considered by parties, wherever situated, when faced with the need to enforce or to challenge an award. In this first edition, the 13 chapters in Part I deal with subjects that include (1) initial strategic considerations in relation to prospective proceedings, (2) how best to achieve an enforceable award, (3) challenges generally, (4) a variety of specific types of challenges, (5) enforcement generally, (6) the enforcement of interim measures, (7) how to prevent asset stripping, (8) grounds to refuse enforcement, and (9) the special case of ICSID awards.

Part II of the book is designed to provide answers to more specific questions that practitioners will need to consider when reaching decisions concerning the use (or avoidance) of a particular national jurisdiction – whether this concerns the choice of that jurisdiction as a seat of an arbitration, as a physical venue for the hearing, as a place for enforcement, or as a place in which to challenge an award. This first edition includes reports on 29 national jurisdictions. The author, or authors, of each chapter have been asked to address the same 35 questions. All relate to essential, practical information on the local approach and requirements relating to challenging or seeking to enforce awards in each jurisdiction. Obviously, the answers to a common set of questions will provide readers

with a straightforward way in which to assess the comparative advantages and disadvantages of competing jurisdictions.

Through this approach, we have tried to produce a coherent and comprehensive coverage of many of the most obvious, recurring or new issues that are now faced by parties who find that they will need to take steps to enforce these awards or, conversely, find themselves with an award that ought not to have been made and should not be enforced.

Quality control and future editions

Having taken on the task, my aim as general editor has been to achieve a substantive quality consistent with *The Guide to Challenging and Enforcing Arbitration Awards* being seen as an essential desktop reference work in our field. To ensure content of high quality, I agreed to go forward only if we could attract as contributors, colleagues who were some of the internationally recognised leaders in the field. Emmanuel, Gordon and I feel blessed to have been able to enlist the support of such an extraordinarily capable list of contributors.

In future editions, we hope to fill in important omissions. In Part I, these could include chapters on successful cross-border asset tracing, the new role played by funders at the enforcement stage, and the special skill sets required by successful enforcement counsel. In Part II, we plan to expand the geographical reach with chapters on China, Saudi Arabia, Turkey and Venezuela.

Without the tireless efforts of the Global Arbitration Review team at Law Business Research, this work never would have been completed within the very tight schedule we allowed ourselves; David Samuels and I are greatly indebted to them. Finally, I am enormously grateful to Doris Hutton Smith (my long-suffering PA), who has managed endless correspondence with our contributors with skill, grace and patience.

I hope that all my friends and colleagues who have helped with this project have saved us from error – but it is I alone who should be charged with the responsibility for such errors as may appear.

Although it should go without saying, this first edition of this publication will obviously benefit from the thoughts and suggestions of our readers on how we might be able to improve the next edition, for which we will be extremely grateful.

J William Rowley QC

April 2019

London

Part II

Challenging and Enforcing Arbitration
Awards: Jurisdictional Know-How

24

Hong Kong

Tony Dymond and Z J Jennifer Lim¹

Applicable requirements as to the form of arbitral awards

Applicable legislation as to the form of awards

1 Must an award take any particular form (e.g., in writing, signed, dated, place, the need for reasons, delivery)?

Section 67 of the Hong Kong Arbitration Ordinance (Cap. 609) (HKAO), which gives effect to Article 31 of the UNCITRAL Model Law, sets out the formal and substantive requirements for an award. It provides that an award must:

- be in writing;
- be signed by the arbitrator or arbitrators. A signature by a tribunal majority is sufficient in proceedings with more than one arbitrator, provided that the reason for any omitted signature is stated (e.g., death, incapacity, permanent absence overseas with no means of contact, refusal to sign in the case of dissent);
- state the reasons on which it is based, unless the parties have agreed otherwise; and
- be dated and state the place of arbitration.

A signed copy of the award must be delivered to each party.

There is no default time limit for making an award (Section 72(1), HKAO). The Court of First Instance of the High Court of Hong Kong (the Court) has the power to extend any time limit to render an award, even if it has expired (Section 72(2), HKAO).

¹ Tony Dymond is a partner and Z J Jennifer Lim is a senior associate at Debevoise & Plimpton.

Applicable procedural law for recourse against an award

Applicable legislation governing recourse against an award

2 Are there provisions governing modification, clarification or correction of an award?

Section 69(1) of the HKAO, which gives effect to Article 33 of the UNCITRAL Model Law, provides that within 30 days of receipt of the award (unless the parties have agreed on another time limit), a party, with notice to the other party, may request that the tribunal:

- correct any computational, clerical or typographical errors or similar errors in the award; and
- if so agreed by the parties, give an interpretation of a specific point or part of the award.

Within 30 days of receipt of the request, the tribunal must determine whether the request is justified and, if so, make the correction or give the interpretation. The interpretation will form part of the award. The tribunal can also correct any computational, clerical or typographical or similar error on its own initiative within 30 days of the date of the award (Section 69(1), HKAO).

Unless the parties have agreed otherwise, a party may also, with notice to the other party and within 30 days of receipt of the award, request an additional award as to claims presented in the arbitral proceedings but omitted from the award. The tribunal has 60 days to make the additional award if it considers the request to be justified (Section 69(1)(3), HKAO). The tribunal may extend the time limit to make a correction, interpretation or additional award (Section 69(1)(4), HKAO).

A correction or interpretation of the award, or an additional award, must be made in accordance with the requirements of the HKAO (Section 69(1)(5)) as to form, content and delivery of awards generally, set out in question 1. Section 69(2) of the HKAO further provides that the tribunal has the power to make other changes to an award that are necessary or consequential to the correction or interpretation of the award.

The tribunal may also review an award of costs within 30 days of the award if, when making the award, the tribunal was not aware of certain information relating to costs that it should have taken into account. The tribunal can then confirm, vary or correct the award of costs (Sections 69(3) and 69(4), HKAO).

Appeals from an award

3 May an award be appealed to or set aside by the courts? If so, on what grounds and what procedures? What are the differences between appeals and applications for set-aside?

An award may ordinarily not be appealed. However, the parties may opt into Section 5 of Schedule 2 of the HKAO pursuant to Section 99(e) of the HKAO if they wish to have the right to appeal an award on a question of law or to challenge an award on the grounds of serious irregularity. In those circumstances, the Court will have discretion in determining appeals and will have the power to either confirm, vary, remit or set aside the award.

In set-aside proceedings, the Court will not consider the substantive merits of the dispute or the correctness of the award, whether concerning errors of fact or law. The grounds for setting aside an arbitral award in Hong Kong are set out in Section 81 of the HKAO, which incorporates Article 34 of the UNCITRAL Model Law. The grounds for challenge include incapacity of a party, invalidity of the arbitration agreement, inability to present a party's case, arbitrability, and conflict with Hong Kong public policy. Hong Kong public policy has been construed to mean 'contrary to the fundamental conceptions of morality and justice of Hong Kong', to be construed and applied narrowly (e.g., if an award was procured by fraud, corruption or other unconscionable behaviour (*Hebei Import v. Polytek Engineering* [1999] 2 HKC 205 at 233)).

An award can also be set aside if there has been a successful challenge to an arbitrator who has participated in proceedings resulting in an award (Section 26(5), HKAO).

An application to set aside the award under Section 81 of the HKAO must be made within three months of the date of receipt of the award or, if a request for a correction or interpretation of an award or an additional award has been made, from the date on which the request has been disposed of by the tribunal (Section 81(1)(3), HKAO). However, the Court has discretion to decide on a longer time limit (*Sun Tian Gang v. Hong Kong & China Gas (Jilin) Ltd* [2017] 1 HKC 69 at [90]).

The application is made by originating summons under Order 73, Rule 1 of the Rules of the High Court (Cap. 4A) (RHC). The application and any order thereon may be served out of the jurisdiction by leave of the Court (Order 73, Rule 7(1), RHC).

Applicable procedural law for recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards

Applicable legislation for recognition and enforcement

4 What is the applicable procedural law for recognition and enforcement of an arbitral award in your jurisdiction? Is your jurisdiction party to treaties facilitating recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards?

The HKAO is the applicable legislation in Hong Kong. It divides awards into four main categories for the purposes of enforcement:

- Convention awards (defined in Section 2 of the HKAO as awards made in states or territories that are party to the New York Convention (the Convention), other than the People's Republic of China (PRC)), the enforcement of which is governed by Division 2 of Part 10 of the HKAO;
- Mainland awards (defined in Section 2 of the HKAO as awards made in any part of China other than Hong Kong, Macao and Taiwan), the enforcement of which is governed by Division 3 of Part 10 of the HKAO;
- Macao awards (defined in Section 2 of the HKAO as awards made in the Macao Special Administrative Region), the enforcement of which is governed by Division 4 of Part 10 of the HKAO;
- awards made in Hong Kong and other arbitral awards that are not Convention awards, Mainland awards or Macao awards, the enforcement of which is governed by Division 1 of Part 10 of the HKAO.

Hong Kong, as a Special Administrative Region of the PRC, is not itself a party to the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes Between States and Nationals of Other States (International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes, Washington 1965) (the ICSID Convention). However, when the PRC took over sovereignty of Hong Kong from the United Kingdom in 1997, the PRC notified the United Nations and the World Bank that the ICSID Convention would apply to Hong Kong.

The Arrangement Concerning Mutual Enforcement of Arbitral Awards Between the Mainland and the Hong Kong Special Administration Region allows for the enforcement of arbitral awards as between the PRC and Hong Kong, and similarly, the Arrangement Concerning Reciprocal Recognition and Enforcement of Arbitral Awards Between the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and the Macao Special Administrative Region allows mutual recognition of arbitral awards between Hong Kong and Macao.

With regard to the New York Convention, see question 5.

The New York Convention

- 5 Is the state a party to the 1958 New York Convention? If yes, what is the date of entry into force of the Convention? Was there any reservation made under Article I(3) of the Convention?

As is the position with respect to the ICSID Convention, Hong Kong itself is not a separate contracting state party to the Convention. Nevertheless, the PRC, which contracted to the Convention on 22 January 1987, extended application of the Convention to Hong Kong in 1997 when it resumed sovereignty.

The PRC has made both reciprocity and commercial relationship reservations under Article I(3) of the Convention, which also bind Hong Kong. These mean that Hong Kong will apply the Convention (1) to recognise awards made in the territory of another contracting state (the reciprocity reservation), and (2) 'only to differences out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the national law of the State making such declaration' (the commercial reservation).

Recognition proceedings

Competent court

- 6 Which court has jurisdiction over an application for recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards?

The competent court in Hong Kong for the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards is the Court of First Instance of the High Court of Hong Kong. See Sections 61 and 84 of the HKAO (granting leave to enforce an arbitral order, direction or award); Sections 87(1)(a), 92(1)(a) and 98A(1)(a) of the HKAO (enforcing a Convention, Mainland or Macao award).

Jurisdictional issues

- 7 What are the requirements for the court to have jurisdiction over an application for recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards? Must the applicant identify assets within the jurisdiction of the court that will be the subject of enforcement for the purpose of recognition proceedings?

Section 84 of the HKAO specifies that an award in arbitral proceedings by an arbitral tribunal, whether made within or outside Hong Kong, is enforceable in the same manner as a judgment of the Court that has the same effect, but only with leave of the Court, and otherwise subject to the provisions of the HKAO. Typically, if a party tries to enforce an arbitral award in Hong Kong, it is because there is some jurisdictional nexus with Hong Kong (e.g., assets located in Hong Kong), though this is not a statutory requirement.

Form of the recognition proceedings

- 8 Are the recognition proceedings in your jurisdiction adversarial or *ex parte*?

As discussed in greater detail in question 11, an application seeking leave to enforce an arbitral award under Section 84 of the HKAO is governed by Order 73, Rule 10 of the RHC, as amended by Section 13 of Schedule 4 of the HKAO. The application is made *ex parte*, supported by an affidavit. The Court may direct a summons to be issued where it considers it appropriate to give the other party an opportunity to be heard in an *inter partes* hearing. The recognition and enforcement proceedings themselves are adversarial in nature.

Form of application and required documentation

- 9 What documentation is required to obtain the recognition of an arbitral award?

Under Section 85 of the HKAO, a party seeking recognition of an arbitral award must produce the duly authenticated original award or a duly certified copy of it, the original arbitration agreement or a duly certified copy of it and, if the award or agreement is not in either or both of the official languages, a translation of it in either official language certified by an official or sworn translator or by a diplomatic or consular agent. The official languages of Hong Kong are English and Chinese.

Sections 88, 94 and 98C of the HKAO require similar documents for the recognition of a Convention award, Mainland award and Macao award, respectively.

Translation of required documentation

- 10 If the required documentation is drafted in a language other than the official language of your jurisdiction, is it necessary to submit a translation with an application to obtain recognition of an arbitral award? If yes, in what form must the translation be?

Yes. According to Sections 85, 88, 94 and 98C of the HKAO, if the final arbitral award is not in either or both of the official languages (i.e., English or Chinese), it is necessary for

the award to be translated into either official language, and certified by an official or sworn translator or by a diplomatic or consular agent.

Other practical requirements

11 What are the other practical requirements relating to recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards?

Under Hong Kong law, the first step towards the recognition and enforcement of an arbitral award is the Court's grant of leave to enforce the award.

The procedure for seeking leave to enforce an award under Section 84 is governed by Order 73, Rule 10 of the RHC, as amended by Section 13 of Schedule 4 of the HKAO. The application is usually made on an *ex parte* basis and the applicant must make full and frank disclosure of all relevant information in support of the application, including the existence of any proceedings to set aside the award. The failure to do so could be fatal to the application. The Court may direct a summons to be issued if it considers it appropriate to give the other party an opportunity to be heard in an *inter partes* hearing.

Once leave to enforce is granted, the Court's order must be drawn up by or on behalf of the applicant and personally served on the respondent, delivered to his or her last known or usual place of business or abode, or in such other manner as the Court may direct.

The award may be enforced 14 days after the date of service of the Court's order on the respondent or, under Order 73, Rule 10(6) of the RHC, the respondent may apply by way of summons and affidavit to set aside the order granting enforcement of the award within 14 days of being served. Note also that if an 'application for setting aside or suspending' an award has been made, then 'the court before which enforcement of the award is sought . . . may, if it thinks fit, adjourn the proceedings for the enforcement of the award' (Sections 86(4)(a), 89(5)(a) and 98D(5)(a), HKAO).

Recognition of interim or partial awards

12 Do courts recognise and enforce partial or interim awards?

Section 71 of the HKAO states that 'an arbitral tribunal may make more than one award at different times on different aspects of the matters to be determined', meaning that partial or interim awards can be recognised and enforced.

Grounds for refusing recognition of an award

13 What are the grounds on which an award may be refused recognition? Are the grounds applied by the courts different from the ones provided under Article V of the Convention?

The major grounds for refusing recognition and enforcement of an arbitral award in Hong Kong are set out under Sections 86(1), 89(2), 95(2) and 98D(2) of the HKAO, which substantially replicate the grounds set out in Article V(1) of the Convention.

Effect of a decision recognising an award

- 14 What is the effect of a decision recognising an award in your jurisdiction? Is it immediately enforceable? What challenges are available against a decision recognising an arbitral award in your jurisdiction?

The grant of leave to enforce by the Court is the first step towards recognition and enforcement of an award. The award is enforceable only after expiry of 14 days (or such other period that the Court may fix) from the date of the service of the Court's order granting leave on the award debtor (Order 73, Rule 10(6), RHC). An award debtor on which such an order is served may, within 14 days of the date of service, seek to resist enforcement as a way of challenging the decision recognising an arbitral award.

Once an award becomes enforceable, it is enforced as though it were a local court judgment. As is the case with a local court judgment, the Court may stay enforcement of the award under Order 47, Rule 1(1) of the RHC, which states that 'there are special circumstances which render it inexpedient to enforce the judgment'.

Decisions refusing to recognise an award

- 15 What challenges are available against a decision refusing to recognise an arbitral award in your jurisdiction?

If the Court has refused leave to enforce an award under Section 84(1) of the HKAO, an appeal against that decision may be made with leave of the Court pursuant to Section 84(3) of the HKAO.

Stay of recognition or enforcement proceedings pending annulment proceedings

- 16 Will the courts adjourn the recognition or enforcement proceedings pending the outcome of annulment proceedings at the seat of the arbitration? What trends, if any, are suggested by recent decisions? What are the factors considered by courts to adjourn recognition or enforcement?

It lies within the Court's discretion to determine whether it will adjourn an application to enforce an arbitral award if an action to remit or set aside the award is pending. The Court will consider factors such as the merits and prospects of success of the set-aside application (Sections 86(4)(a), 89(5)(a) and 98D(5)(a), HKAO).

Note that Section 84 of the HKAO is subject to Section 26(2), which means that if an application for the enforcement of an arbitral award is made during the period when a challenge to the appointment of an arbitrator is pending before the Court, and the arbitral tribunal that made the award includes the challenged arbitrator, the Court may refuse enforcement of the award. This usually applies if the award on which enforcement is sought is a partial or interim award, rather than the final award.

Security

- 17 If the courts adjourn the recognition or enforcement proceedings pending the annulment proceedings, will the defendant to the recognition or enforcement proceedings be ordered to post security? What are the factors considered by courts to order security? Based on recent case law, what are the form and amount of the security to be posted by the party resisting enforcement?

Sections 86(4)(b), 89(5)(b) and 98D(5)(b) of the HKAO provide that the court before which enforcement of the award is sought can order security to be posted when an application for setting aside or suspension of the award has been made by a party.

The chief factors likely to be considered by the court when deciding whether or not to order security, include the strength of the grounds of challenge to the award, and the possible difficulty in enforcing the award if security is not ordered. (See *Soleh Boneh International Ltd v. Government of the Republic of Uganda and National Housing Corp* [1993] 2 Lloyd's Rep 208 CA (Eng).)

Recognition or enforcement of an award set aside at the seat

- 18 Is it possible to obtain the recognition and enforcement of an award that has been fully or partly set aside at the seat of the arbitration? If an award is set aside after the decision recognising the award has been issued, what challenges are available against this decision?

Under Section 89(2)(f)(ii) of the HKAO, the court before which enforcement of the award is sought has discretionary powers to refuse enforcement if an award has been 'set aside or suspended by a competent authority of the country in which, or under the law of which, it was made'. If the award has been set aside at the seat of the arbitration, the enforcing court in Hong Kong could nevertheless decide to enforce the award or it could proceed to allow enforcement of the award before the set-aside application has been completed.

Service

Service in your jurisdiction

- 19 What is the applicable procedure for service of extrajudicial and judicial documents to a defendant in your jurisdiction?

The procedure for service with respect to applications to the Court for leave to enforce arbitral awards is governed by Order 65 of the RHC (service of documents in connection with proceedings within Hong Kong).

Order 65 prescribes that service can be effected by personal service, by post or by putting the documents through the letter box of the defendant at his or her usual or last known address, or, in the case of a corporation, at its registered address.

If it appears that it is impracticable to serve the documents in any of the methods described above, the claimant can apply to the Court for an order of substituted service. Substituted service of a document is effected by taking steps as the Court may direct

to bring the document to the notice of the defendant. This type of service is generally made by affidavit *ex parte*. The affidavit should clearly state the type of substituted service proposed, and it must show that the writ is likely to reach the defendant or come to his or her knowledge if the method of substituted service is allowed.

Service out of your jurisdiction

20 What is the applicable procedure for service of extrajudicial and judicial documents to a defendant out of your jurisdiction?

There are different procedures that apply to service out of the jurisdiction, depending on the type of extrajudicial and judicial document being served. For documents that relate to arbitration, the following rules apply:

- Order 73, Rule 7 of the RHC applies to summonses or orders made under the HKAO or any orders made thereon other than those by which an application for leave to enforce an arbitral award is made; Order 73, Rule 10(5) of the RHC applies to an order made further to an *ex parte* application seeking leave to enforce an arbitral award.
- Pursuant to Order 73, Rule 7, summonses or orders made under the HKAO can be served out of the jurisdiction with leave of the Court provided that (1) the summons or order relates to an arbitration governed by Hong Kong law, save where the application is for leave to enforce an arbitral award, (2) the arbitration has been, is being or is to be held within Hong Kong, or (3) the originating summons is one by which an application is made under Section 45(2) (interim measures) or Section 60(1) (inspection, photographing, preservation, custody, detention, sale, sampling or experimenting of any relevant property) of the HKAO.
- Pursuant to Order 73, Rule 10(5), an order made *ex parte* granting leave to enforce an arbitral award can be served without leave. However, if service needs to be outside the jurisdiction, pursuant to Order 11, Rule 1(1)(m), an originating summons by which an application is made to enforce an arbitral award or any orders made thereon can be served out of the jurisdiction with leave of the Court. This type of service is permissible with leave whether or not the arbitration is governed by Hong Kong law.

Identification of assets

Asset databases

21 Are there any databases or publicly available registers allowing the identification of an award debtor's assets within your jurisdiction?

Certain databases are publicly available in Hong Kong and can be used for the identification of assets. For example, land records with information about property assets are kept by the Land Registry, which is open to public searches.

Information available through judicial proceedings

22 Are there any proceedings allowing for the disclosure of information about an award debtor within your jurisdiction?

Section 84 of the HKAO provides that, with leave of the Court, an arbitral award may be enforced in the same manner as a judgment of the Court, subject to the provisions of the HKAO, meaning that orders facilitating the enforcement of judgments, such as the ability to examine judgment debtors under Orders 48 and 49B of the RHC, are also available in relation to the enforcement of arbitral awards.

Pursuant to Order 48 of the RHC, on an *ex parte* application of the award creditor, the Court may order the award debtor to attend before the Registrar, or such officer as the Court may appoint, and be orally examined on the following matters: (1) whether there are any debts owing to the award debtor by other persons, and (2) whether the award debtor has any other property or financial resources that could be used for satisfying the award. If the award debtor is a limited company, the order can be made against a senior officer of the company.

Pursuant to Order 49B of the RHC, where the award is for the payment of a specified sum of money, on an *ex parte* application of the award creditor, the Court may order an examination of the award debtor regarding his or her assets, liabilities, income and expenditure and of the disposal of any assets or income. If it appears to the Court that there is reasonable cause to believe that an order to appear before the Court for examination may be ineffective to secure the award debtor's attendance, the Court may order that the award debtor be arrested and brought before the Court on the day following the day of arrest.

Further, pursuant to Order 38, Rules 13 and 14 of the RHC, the judgment debtor may apply for an order (1) to require a non-party witness to attend any proceedings in the cause or matter and produce any document considered by the Court to be necessary, or (2) to compel the attendance of a non-party witness to give evidence or to produce documents or other material evidence.

Order 38 does not apply to discovery applications against non-party banks, to which Section 21 of the Evidence Ordinance applies. Section 21 provides that: 'On the application of any party to any proceedings, the court or judge may order that such party be at liberty to inspect and take copies of any entries in a banker's record for any of the purposes of such proceedings.' The court in *Pacific King Shipping Holdings Pte Ltd v. Huang Ziqiang* [2015] HKEC 76 noted that, although the court could grant such an order in the appropriate circumstances, it 'would not lightly use its powers to order disclosure of full information touching the confidential relationship of banker and customer'.

Enforcement proceedings

Availability of interim measures

23 Are interim measures against assets available in your jurisdiction? May award creditors apply such interim measures against assets owned by a sovereign state?

Interim measures against assets are available in Hong Kong. Award creditors may apply for such measures before the arbitral tribunal or the Court.

Pursuant to Section 35 of the HKAO, unless otherwise agreed by the parties, the arbitral tribunal may grant interim measures upon the request of any party. Those measures may be granted to a party (1) to maintain or restore the status quo pending determination of the dispute, (2) to take any action that would prevent, or refrain from taking action that is likely to cause, current or imminent harm or prejudice to the arbitral process, (3) to preserve assets out of which a subsequent award may be satisfied, and (4) to preserve evidence that may be relevant or material to the resolution of the dispute.

Pursuant to Section 45 of the HKAO, the Court also may grant interim measures in support of arbitration upon the application of any party. The power conferred by this Section may be exercised by the Court irrespective of whether or not similar powers may be exercised by an arbitral tribunal under Section 35 in relation to the same dispute, though the Court may decline to do so if ‘the interim measure sought is currently the subject of arbitral proceedings’ or if it ‘considers it more appropriate for the interim measure sought to be dealt with by the arbitral tribunal’ (Section 45(4), HKAO).

Award creditors cannot apply such interim measures against assets owned by a sovereign state. Foreign states enjoy absolute immunity from enforcement and jurisdiction in Hong Kong, unless the foreign state has agreed to waive its sovereign immunity (see *Democratic Republic of the Congo v. FG Hemisphere Associates LLC* (2011) 14 HKCFAR 95). With respect to the PRC, because Hong Kong is a Special Administrative Region of the PRC, the PRC will have crown immunity as opposed to sovereign immunity, although the practical effect is similar. Whether or not a PRC entity (such as a PRC state-owned enterprise) would be able to shield its assets through crown immunity, would depend on a test of control (i.e., whether or not the entity in question is able to exercise powers independent of the PRC government), in which case it is less likely to benefit from crown immunity (see *The Hua Tian Long (No.3)* [2010] 3 HKC 557).

Procedure for interim measures

24 What is the procedure to apply interim measures against assets in your jurisdiction? Is it a requirement to obtain prior court authorisation before applying interim measures? If yes, are such proceedings *ex parte*?

Pursuant to Section 35 of the HKAO, an award creditor can apply directly to an arbitral tribunal seated in Hong Kong for interim measures against assets. There is no requirement to obtain prior court authorisation to make such an application. Further, Section 37 of the HKAO (unless the parties have agreed otherwise) allows a party to ‘without notice to any other party, make a request for an interim measure’ (i.e., a party can apply for an interim measure on an *ex parte* basis).

As discussed in question 23, the Court can grant interim measures under Section 45 of the HKAO and this power can be exercised irrespective of whether similar powers may also be exercised by an arbitral tribunal under Section 35 of the HKAO in relation to the same dispute. According to Order 29, Rule 1(2) of the RHC, whereby the Court grants interim measures, where ‘the applicant is the plaintiff and the case is one of urgency, such application may be made *ex parte* on affidavit’.

Interim measures against immovable property

- 25 What is the procedure for interim measures against immovable property within your jurisdiction?

With respect to an application for interim measures, Hong Kong law does not distinguish between immovable, movable, intangible or other forms of property. The procedure set out in question 24 will apply to interim measures for all types of assets or property.

Interim measures against movable property

- 26 What is the procedure for interim measures against movable property within your jurisdiction?

See question 24.

Interim measures against intangible property

- 27 What is the procedure for interim measures against intangible property within your jurisdiction?

See question 24.

Attachment proceedings

- 28 What is the procedure to attach assets in your jurisdiction? Is it a requirement to obtain prior court authorisation before attaching assets? If yes, are such proceedings *ex parte*?

The procedure to attach assets in Hong Kong is to apply to the court. The two main orders by which assets may be attached are garnishee orders and charging orders.

Garnishee order

Pursuant to Order 49, Rule 1 of the RHC, in certain circumstances, award creditors, for the purpose of enforcing the award, may apply to the Court for a garnishee order. Order 49, Rule 2 of the RHC states that an application for a garnishee order must be made *ex parte*, supported by an affidavit or affirmation (1) stating the name and the last known address of the judgment debtor, (2) identifying the judgment to be enforced and stating the amount remaining unpaid under it at the time of the application for the garnishee order, (3) stating that to the best of the information available to, or belief of, the applicant, the garnishee is within the jurisdiction and is indebted to the judgment debtor, and stating the sources of the applicant's information or the grounds for his or her belief, and (4) stating, if the garnishee is a bank having more than one place of business, the name and address of the branch at which the judgment debtor's account is believed to be held or, if it be the case, that this information is not known to the applicant.

The garnishee order initially will be an order *nisi*. The Court may grant the award creditor an order absolute upon further consideration of the matter. The garnishee should pay the amount specified in the order to the award creditor, and any payment made by

the garnishee in compliance with the order shall be a valid discharge of his or her liability towards the award debtor to the extent of the amount paid (Order 49, Rule 3, RHC).

Charging order

For the purpose of enforcing an award, the Court may make an order imposing on any property of the award debtor, a charge to secure the payment of any debt due, or to become due under that award (Order 50, Rule 1, RHC). A charging order can be imposed on the following types of property: land or real estate, securities and funds in court (Section 20A(2), High Court Ordinance).

An application for a charging order may be made *ex parte*, supported by an affidavit or affirmation (1) identifying the award to be enforced and stating the amount remaining unpaid under it as at the date of the application, (2) stating the name of the award debtor and of any creditor whom the applicant can identify, (3) giving full particulars of the subject matter of the intended charge, and (4) verifying that the interest to be charged is owned beneficially by the award debtor. Unless the court otherwise directs, the supporting affidavit or affirmation may contain statements of information or belief and the sources and grounds for that information or belief (Order 50, Rule 1(3), RHC).

An order made by an *ex parte* application will be an order *nisi*. Upon further consideration of the matter, the Court may make the charging order absolute. However, the charging order is not a direct mode of enforcement, but is rather an indirect mode in the sense that it provides the award creditor with security, in whole or in part, over the property of the award debtor. To obtain the actual proceeds of the charge, the award creditor must then proceed to apply further for an order to sell the specified assets and satisfy his or her award (Order 50, Rule 3, RHC).

Attachment against immovable property

29 What is the procedure for enforcement measures against immovable property within your jurisdiction?

With respect to an application for attachment, Hong Kong law does not distinguish between immovable, movable, intangible or other forms of property. The procedure set out in question 28 applies to applications for attachment for all types of property.

Attachment against movable property

30 What is the procedure for enforcement measures against moveable property within your jurisdiction?

See question 28.

Attachment against intangible property

31 What is the procedure for enforcement measures against intangible property within your jurisdiction?

See question 28.

Enforcement against foreign states

Applicable law

- 32 Are there any rules in your jurisdiction that specifically govern recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards against foreign states?

In 2011, the Hong Kong Court of Final Appeal held in *Democratic Republic of the Congo v. FG Hemisphere Associates* (2011) 14 HKCFAR 95 that an arbitral award against a foreign state cannot be enforced in Hong Kong unless the foreign state has waived its sovereign immunity. The Court stated that a waiver must be made ‘in the face of the Court’. Further, the Court observed that when a state enters into ‘an arbitration agreement with a private individual or company, it involve[s] merely the assumption of contractual obligations vis-à-vis the other party to the agreement. That act did not constitute a submission to any other State’s jurisdiction’.

Service of documents to a foreign state

- 33 What is the applicable procedure for service of extrajudicial and judicial documents to a foreign state?

The procedure for service of extrajudicial and judicial documents to a foreign state is governed by Order 11, Rule 7 of the RHC.

Subject to the sovereign state having waived its immunity, as discussed in question 32, after obtaining leave to serve under Order 11, Rule 1, a person who wishes to have the writ served on the state must lodge in the Registry (1) a request for service to be arranged by the chief executive, (2) a copy of the writ and (3) except where the official language of the state is, or the official languages of that party include, English, a translation of the writ in the official language or one of the official languages of that state.

Documents duly lodged will then be sent by the Registrar to the Chief Secretary for the writ to be served on the state.

Immunity from enforcement

- 34 Are assets belonging to a foreign state immune from enforcement in your jurisdiction? If yes, are there exceptions to such immunity?

Assets belonging to a foreign state are immune from enforcement in Hong Kong, unless the foreign state has waived immunity.

Waiver of immunity from enforcement

- 35 Is it possible for a foreign state to waive immunity from enforcement in your jurisdiction? If yes, what are the requirements of such waiver?

It is possible for a foreign state to waive immunity from enforcement in Hong Kong. For the requirements of such a waiver, see question 32.

Appendix 1

About the Authors

Tony Dymond

Debevoise & Plimpton

Tony Dymond is a partner at Debevoise & Plimpton and co-chair of the firm's Asian arbitration practice. His practice focuses on complex, multi-jurisdictional disputes, in both litigation and arbitration. Mr Dymond joined Debevoise in 2014. He has advised clients in a wide range of jurisdictions, having spent the past 20 years in London, Hong Kong and Seoul. He is widely acknowledged as a leading lawyer in high-value disputes arising from large-scale projects, particularly in the energy and infrastructure sectors. He regularly acts on shareholder and joint venture disputes and on corporate governance disputes. He has appeared as advocate in arbitrations under the principal arbitration rules and in the English and Hong Kong courts.

Mr Dymond was called to the Bar of England and Wales in 1993, and was admitted as a solicitor in Hong Kong in 2000 and in England and Wales in 2002.

Z J Jennifer Lim

Debevoise & Plimpton

Z J Jennifer Lim is a senior associate at Debevoise & Plimpton. Her practice focuses on international dispute resolution and arbitration. Ms Lim joined Debevoise in the New York office in 2013 and transferred to the Hong Kong office in June 2016. From 2012 to 2013, she clerked for Judge Hisashi Owada and Judge Leonid Skotnikov at the International Court of Justice in The Hague, Netherlands. Ms Lim received a JD from Columbia Law School, where she was a James Kent scholar, recipient of the David Berger Memorial Prize and a senior editor of the *American Review of International Arbitration*. She received an LLB with first class honours from University College London in 2012. While in law school, Ms Lim participated in the Philip C Jessup International Law Moot Court Competition, and remains the only person in the history of the competition to receive the Stephen M Schwebel Award for best oralist in the World Championship Round for two years in a row. Ms Lim is fluent in Mandarin Chinese.

Ms Lim is a member of the HK45 Committee for 2018–2020.

Debevoise & Plimpton

21/F, AIA Central

1 Connaught Road Central

Central

Hong Kong

Tel: +852 2160 9800

Fax: +852 2810 9828

tdymond@debevoise.com

jlim@debevoise.com

www.debevoise.com

Enforcement used to be an irrelevance in international arbitration. Most losing parties simply paid. Not so any more. The time spent on post-award matters has increased vastly.

The Guide to Challenging and Enforcing Arbitration Awards is a comprehensive volume that addresses this new reality. It offers practical know-how on both sides of the coin: challenging, and enforcing, awards. Part I provides a full thematic overview, while Part II delves into the specifics seat by seat. It covers 29 seats.

Visit globalarbitrationreview.com
Follow @garalerts on Twitter
Find us on LinkedIn

ISBN 978-1-83862-205-3