

IBA GUIDELINES ON CONFLICTS OF INTEREST IN INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION
PROPOSED AMENDMENTS FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION
(SEPTEMBER 2023)

INTRODUCTION 2014	3
PROPOSED INTRODUCTION 2023	5
COMPARE INTRODUCTION 2014 AND PROPOSED 2023.....	7
TASK FORCE COMMENTS ON PROPOSED INTRODUCTION 2023	10
PART I: GENERAL STANDARDS REGARDING IMPARTIALITY, INDEPENDENCE AND DISCLOSURE.....	11
(1) GENERAL PRINCIPLE (2014)	12
(1) GENERAL PRINCIPLE (PROPOSED 2023).....	13
(1) GENERAL PRINCIPLE (COMPARE 2014 AND PROPOSED 2023).....	14
TASK FORCE COMMENTS ON (1) GENERAL PRINCIPLE (PROPOSED 2023).....	15
(2) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST (2014)	16
(2) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST (PROPOSED 2023)	17
(2) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST (COMPARE 2014 AND PROPOSED 2023).....	19
TASK FORCE COMMENTS ON (2) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST (PROPOSED 2023).....	21
(3) DISCLOSURE BY THE ARBITRATOR (2014).....	22
(3) DISCLOSURE BY THE ARBITRATOR (PROPOSED 2023).....	24
(3) DISCLOSURE BY THE ARBITRATOR (COMPARE 2014 AND PROPOSED 2023)	26
TASK FORCE COMMENTS ON: (3) DISCLOSURE BY THE ARBITRATOR (PROPOSED 2023).....	28
(4) WAIVER BY THE PARTIES (2014).....	29
(4) WAIVER BY THE PARTIES (PROPOSED 2023).....	31
(4) WAIVER BY THE PARTIES (COMPARE 2014 AND PROPOSED 2023).....	33
TASK FORCE COMMENTS ON (4) WAIVER BY THE PARTIES (PROPOSED 2023).....	35
(5) SCOPE (2014)	36
(5) SCOPE (PROPOSED 2023)	37
(5) SCOPE (COMPARE 2014 AND PROPOSED 2023).....	38
TASK FORCE COMMENTS ON (5) SCOPE (PROPOSED 2023).....	39
(6) RELATIONSHIPS (2014)	40
(6) RELATIONSHIPS (PROPOSED 2023)	41
(6) RELATIONSHIPS (COMPARE 2014 AND PROPOSED 2023).....	43
TASK FORCE COMMENTS ON (6) RELATIONSHIPS (PROPOSED 2023).....	46
(7) DUTY OF THE PARTIES AND THE ARBITRATOR (2014).....	47
(7) DUTY OF THE PARTIES AND THE ARBITRATOR (PROPOSED 2023).....	48
(7) DUTY OF THE PARTIES AND THE ARBITRATOR (COMPARE 2014 AND PROPOSED 2023).....	50

TASK FORCE COMMENTS ON (7) DUTY OF THE PARTIES AND THE ARBITRATOR (PROPOSED 2023)....	52
PART II: PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF THE GENERAL STANDARDS (2014).....	53
PART II: PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF THE GENERAL STANDARDS (PROPOSED 2023).....	55
PART II: PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF THE GENERAL STANDARDS (COMPARE 2014 AND PROPOSED 2023).....	57
TASK FORCE COMMENTS ON PART II: PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF THE GENERAL STANDARDS (PROPOSED 2023)	59
(1) NON-WAIVABLE RED LIST (2014).....	60
(1) NON-WAIVABLE RED LIST (PROPOSED 2023).....	61
(1) NON-WAIVABLE RED LIST (COMPARE 2014 AND PROPOSED 2023)	62
TASK FORCE COMMENTS ON (1) NON-WAIVABLE RED LIST (PROPOSED 2023)	63
(2) WAIVABLE RED LIST (2014).....	64
(2) WAIVABLE RED LIST (PROPOSED 2023).....	66
(2) WAIVABLE RED LIST (COMPARE 2014 AND PROPOSED 2023)	68
TASK FORCE COMMENTS ON (2) WAIVABLE RED LIST (PROPOSED 2023)	70
(3) ORANGE LIST (2014).....	71
(3) ORANGE LIST (PROPOSED 2023).....	73
(3) ORANGE LIST (COMPARE 2014 AND PROPOSED 2023)	76
TASK FORCE COMMENTS ON (3) ORANGE LIST (PROPOSED 2023).....	79
(4) GREEN LIST (2014)	80
(4) GREEN LIST (PROPOSED 2023)	81
(4) GREEN LIST (COMPARE 2014 AND PROPOSED 2023).....	83
TASK FORCE COMMENTS ON (4) GREEN LIST (PROPOSED 2023).....	85

INTRODUCTION 2014

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 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.

PROPOSED INTRODUCTION 2023

1. In international arbitration, arbitrators are expected to make disclosures to allow parties to identify and assess potential conflicts of interest, and institutions and national courts to address challenges properly. However, this exercise can be difficult, as conflicts questions may be nuanced, and answers are case-specific. Accordingly, in 2004, the IBA Arbitration Committee published guidelines on the subject, after having considered a variety of factors, including (i) the fundamental importance of independent and impartial arbitrators, (ii) the principle of party autonomy, (iii) the timing, nature, scope, burden, and other practicalities of disclosures, and (iv) the consequences and costs that could stem from allowing frivolous challenges.

2. The 2004 Guidelines reflected the view that the standards existing at the time lacked sufficient clarity and uniformity in their application. The 2004 Guidelines, therefore, set forth some ‘General Standards and Explanatory Notes on the Standards’ (the ‘General Standards’). The General Standards were developed to be the primary source for evaluating the existence of conflicts of interest and the obligation to disclose. Moreover, to promote greater consistency and avoid unnecessary challenges and arbitrator withdrawals and removals, the 2004 Guidelines listed specific situations (designated ‘Red’, ‘Orange’ and ‘Green’ Lists) indicating whether they could, in the eyes of the parties, create a reasonable doubt as to the arbitrator’s independence and impartiality so as to require disclosure. The situations on the Red List create a reasonable doubt in the eyes of the parties because an objective conflict of interest exists. The situations on the Green List do not give rise to a reasonable doubt in the eyes of the parties because no objective conflict of interest or appearance thereof exists. The situations on the Orange List may, depending on the facts of a given case, give rise to a reasonable doubt in the eyes of the parties and, for this reason, must also be disclosed. Such lists (the ‘Application Lists’) were last updated in the 2014 revision to the Guidelines. In the 2024 revision, both the General Standards and Application Lists have been further updated to improve them considering their use in practice since 2014.

3. The Guidelines embody 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, practices, and case law in a cross-section of jurisdictions, and upon the judgement and experience of the main participants in international arbitration (i.e., arbitrators, academics, external and in-house counsel, funders, and experts). The Guidelines seek to balance the various interests of parties, counsel, arbitrators and arbitration institutions, all of whom have a responsibility for ensuring the integrity, reputation and efficiency of international arbitration. Like their predecessors, the members of the Task Force for the Revision of the 2014 Guidelines and the Subcommittee in 2021/2023 have further 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 other meetings with and surveys of the international arbitration community. 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.

4. The Guidelines apply to international arbitration, whether the representation of the parties is carried out by lawyers or non-lawyers, and irrespective of whether non-legal professionals serve as arbitrators.

5. These Guidelines do not override any applicable national law, arbitral rules, codes of conduct, or other instruments chosen by the parties. However, it is hoped that, as was the case for the 2004 and 2014 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, counsel, arbitrators, institutions and courts in dealing with these important questions of impartiality and independence. The IBA Arbitration Committee recommends that the Guidelines be applied with robust common sense and without unduly formalistic interpretation.

6. Part I of the Guidelines contains the relevant principles that must always be considered. The Application Lists contained in Part II cover many of the varied situations that commonly arise in practice, but they do not purport to be exhaustive, nor could they be. The IBA Arbitration Committee will continue to study the actual use of the Guidelines with a view to furthering their improvement.

7. 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.

COMPARE INTRODUCTION 2014 AND PROPOSED 2023

~~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.~~
~~1. In international arbitration, arbitrators are expected to make disclosures to allow parties to identify and assess potential conflicts of interest, and institutions and national courts to address challenges properly. However, this exercise can be difficult, as conflicts questions may be nuanced, and answers are case-specific. Accordingly, in 2004, the IBA Arbitration Committee published guidelines on the subject, after having considered a variety of factors, including (i) the fundamental importance of independent and impartial arbitrators, (ii) the principle of party autonomy, (iii) the timing, nature, scope, burden, and other practicalities of disclosures, and (iv) the consequences and costs that could stem from allowing frivolous challenges.~~

~~2. The 2004 Guidelines reflected the view that the standards existing at the time lacked sufficient clarity and uniformity in their application. The 2004 Guidelines, therefore, set forth some 'General Standards and Explanatory Notes on the Standards' (the 'General Standards'). The General Standards were developed to be the primary source for evaluating the existence of conflicts of interest and the obligation to disclose. Moreover, in order to promote greater consistency and to avoid unnecessary challenges and arbitrator withdrawals and removals, the 2004 Guidelines listed specific situations indicating whether they warrant disclosure or disqualification of an arbitrator. Such lists, (designated 'Red', 'Orange' and 'Green' Lists) indicating whether they could, in the eyes of the parties, create a reasonable doubt as to the arbitrator's independence and impartiality so as to require disclosure. The situations on the Red List create a reasonable doubt in the eyes of the parties because an objective conflict of interest exists. The situations on the Green List do not give rise to a reasonable doubt in the eyes of the parties because no objective conflict of interest or appearance thereof exists. The situations on~~

the Orange List may, depending on the facts of a given case, give rise to a reasonable doubt in the eyes of the parties and, for this reason, must also be disclosed. Such lists (the ‘Application Lists’), have been) were last updated and appear at in the end of these revised 2014 revision to the Guidelines. In the 2024 revision, both the General Standards and Application Lists have been further updated to improve them considering their use in practice since 2014.

~~43.~~ The Guidelines reflect embody 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, practices, and case law in a cross-section of jurisdictions, and upon the judgement and experience of practitioners involved the main participants in international arbitration. ~~In reviewing the 2004 Guidelines, the IBA Arbitration Committee updated its analysis of the laws (i.e., arbitrators, academics, external and practices in a number of jurisdictions, house counsel, funders, and experts).~~ The Guidelines seek to balance the various interests of parties, representatives counsel, arbitrators and arbitration institutions, all of whom have a responsibility for ensuring the integrity, reputation and efficiency of international arbitration. ~~Both~~ Like their predecessors, the 2004 Working Group members of the Task Force for the Revision of the 2014 Guidelines and the Subcommittee in 2012/2014 2021/2023 have further 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 other meetings with ~~arbitrators and practitioners~~ surveys of the international arbitration community. 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.

54. 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.

65. These Guidelines ~~are not legal provisions and~~ do not override any applicable national law ~~or~~, arbitral rules, codes of conduct, or other instruments chosen by the parties. However, it is hoped that, as was the case for the 2004 and 2014 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 counsel, arbitrators, institutions and courts in dealing with these important questions of impartiality and independence. The IBA Arbitration Committee ~~trusts~~ recommends that the Guidelines ~~will~~ be applied with robust common sense and without undue formalistic interpretation.

7-6. Part I of the Guidelines contains the relevant principles that must always be considered. The Application Lists contained in Part II 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.

| 87. 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.

TASK FORCE COMMENTS ON PROPOSED INTRODUCTION 2023

The proposed revisions to the Introduction principally aim to:

- Update the Introduction since 2014;
- Clarify that they embody the Arbitration Committee’s understanding of best practices in international arbitration, but do not override other rules, laws, codes of conduct or other instruments agreed by the Parties; and
- Emphasize that the General Standards are what constitute the Guidelines and must always be considered, and always before the Application Lists.

**PART I: GENERAL STANDARDS REGARDING IMPARTIALITY, INDEPENDENCE AND
DISCLOSURE**

(1) GENERAL PRINCIPLE (2014)

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.

(1) GENERAL PRINCIPLE (PROPOSED 2023)

Every arbitrator shall be impartial and independent 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 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. This obligation does not extend to the time period during which the award may be challenged before any relevant courts or bodies, unless the final award is 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.

(1) GENERAL PRINCIPLE (COMPARE 2014 AND PROPOSED 2023)

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~~ This obligation ~~should~~does not extend to the time period during which the award may be challenged before ~~the~~any relevant courts. ~~The decision taken is that this obligation should not extend in this manner or bodies,~~ unless the final award ~~may be~~is 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.

TASK FORCE COMMENTS ON (1) GENERAL PRINCIPLE (PROPOSED 2023)

The proposed revision to General Standard 1 aims to clarify that an arbitrator must not only be independent and impartial with respect to the parties – they should also be so, for example, with respect to counsel.

The proposed revisions to the Explanation to General Standard 1 principally aim to:

- Reflect the proposed modification to General Standard 1; and
- Clarify that the obligation to remain independent and impartial does not extend to the time during which an award is challenged, not only before any relevant courts, but also before other bodies (*e.g.*, ICSID *ad hoc* committees).

(2) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST (2014)

- (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.

(2) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST (PROPOSED 2023)

- (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 to avoid confusion and foster confidence in the arbitral process.
- (b) The wording 'impartiality or independence' derives from the widely adopted Article 12 of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) Model Law. As provided in Article 12(2) of the UNCITRAL Model Law, the test for disqualification is an objective one (a 'reasonable third person test'), using an appearance test based on justifiable doubts as to the impartiality or independence of the arbitrator. The Non-Waivable Red List describes circumstances that necessarily raise justifiable doubts as to the arbitrator's impartiality or independence because an objective conflict of interest exists. 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.
- (c) In order for standards to be applied as consistently as possible, the objective test for disqualification should remain distinct from the subjective test for disclosure addressed in General Standard 3. For example, the situations set forth in the Waivable Red List must be disclosed because they would, in the eyes of the parties, necessarily give rise to justifiable doubts as to the arbitrator's impartiality or independence: an objective conflict of interest exists, but can be waived under General Standard 4. As described in the Explanation to General Standard 3(f), this subjective standard for disclosure applies regardless of the stage of the proceedings.

(d) 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.

(2) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST (COMPARE 2014 AND PROPOSED 2023)

(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.~~ (b) 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.~~ As provided in Article 12(2) of the UNCITRAL Model Law, the test for disqualification is an objective one (a 'reasonable third person test'), using an appearance test based on justifiable doubts as to the impartiality or independence of the arbitrator. The Non-Waivable Red List describes circumstances that necessarily raise justifiable doubts as to the arbitrator's impartiality or independence because an objective conflict of interest exists. 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., ~~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) In order for standards to be applied as consistently as possible, the objective test for disqualification should remain distinct from the subjective test for disclosure addressed in General Standard 3. For example, the situations set forth in the Waivable Red List must be disclosed because they would, in the eyes of the parties, necessarily give rise to justifiable doubts as to the arbitrator's impartiality or independence: an objective conflict of interest exists,~~

but can be waived under General Standard 4. As described in the Explanation to General Standard 3(f), this subjective standard for disclosure applies regardless of the stage of the proceedings.

(d) 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.~~

TASK FORCE COMMENTS ON (2) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST (PROPOSED 2023)

The Task Force has not proposed any revisions to General Standard 2.

The proposed revisions to the Explanation to General Standard 2 principally aim to:

- Emphasize that disclosure is to be carried out from a subjective, “in the eyes of the parties” standard; and
- Clarify that the reference to the objective standard for disqualification does not alter the subjective disclosure obligations. Rather, it provides a reference for arbitrators to consider whether they should decline to serve (*e.g.*, Non-Waivable Red List) or for parties to consider whether they wish to accept the arbitrator’s appointment despite the existence of a conflict of interest (*e.g.*, Waivable Red List).

(3) DISCLOSURE BY THE ARBITRATOR (2014)

(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.

(3) DISCLOSURE BY THE ARBITRATOR (PROPOSED 2023)

(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. Subject to the arbitrator's duty to investigate under General Standard 7(e), in determining whether facts or circumstances should be disclosed, an arbitrator should take into account all circumstances known to him or her.

(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, 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) 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.

(f) 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.

(g) An arbitrator's 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.

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. For its part, 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, such as those set out in the Green List, that could not reasonably call an arbitrator's impartiality or independence into question in the eyes of the parties because no appearance or actual conflict of interest exists from an objective point of view, need not be disclosed. Further, as reflected in General Standard 3(c), a disclosure does not imply that the

disclosed facts are such as to disqualify the arbitrator. The duty of disclosure under General Standard 3(a) is ongoing in nature.

(b) The IBA Arbitration Committee has considered the 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 considers himself or herself to be impartial and independent 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. This General Standard makes clear that disclosure itself cannot imply doubts sufficient to disqualify the arbitrator, or even create a presumption in favour of disqualification. Instead, any challenge should only be successful if an objective test, such as the one established in the UNCITRAL Model Law and set forth in Explanation to General Standard 2 above, is met. A corollary to this is General Standard 3(g), which makes clear that 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) 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. While there may be 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.

(3) DISCLOSURE BY THE ARBITRATOR (COMPARE 2014 AND PROPOSED 2023)

(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. Subject to the arbitrator's duty to investigate under General Standard 7(e), in determining whether facts or circumstances should be disclosed, an arbitrator should take into account all circumstances known to him or her.

(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)~~ 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.

(f) 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.

(g) An arbitrator's 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.

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 For its part, 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, that could never lead to disqualification under not reasonably call an arbitrator's impartiality or independence into question in the eyes of the parties because no appearance or actual conflict of interest exists from an objective test set out in General Standard 2point of view, need not be disclosed. AsFurther, 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~~ This General Standard ~~will eliminate the misconception~~ makes clear that disclosure itself ~~implies~~ cannot imply doubts sufficient to disqualify the arbitrator, or even ~~creates~~ create a presumption in favour of disqualification. Instead, any challenge should only be successful if an objective test, as such as the one established in the UNCITRAL Model Law and set forth in Explanation to General Standard 2 above, is met. ~~Under Comment 5 of the Practical Application of the~~ A corollary to this is General ~~Standards,~~ Standard 3(g), which makes clear that 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)~~ (d) 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,~~ While there may be 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.

TASK FORCE COMMENTS ON: (3) DISCLOSURE BY THE ARBITRATOR (PROPOSED 2023)

With respect to the proposed revisions to General Standard 3:

- The addition to paragraph (a) elevates to the General Standard what was previously the first sentence of paragraph 3(d) of the Explanatory Note;
- The change to paragraph (c) reflects the proposed revision to General Standard 1, namely, to clarify that an arbitrator must not only be independent and impartial with respect to the parties – they should also be so, for example, with respect to counsel;
- New proposed General Standard 3(e) elevates to the General Standard what was previously paragraph 3(d) of the Explanatory Note; and
- New proposed General Standard 3(g) elevates to a General Standard what was previously a comment in the introduction to the Application Lists.

The proposed revisions to the Explanation to General Standard 3 principally aim to:

- Reflect the proposed revisions to General Standard 3; and
- Emphasize that disclosure is to be carried out from a subjective standard, which is distinct from disqualification, which is to be carried out under an objective standard.

(4) WAIVER BY THE PARTIES (2014)

(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.

(4) WAIVER BY THE PARTIES (PROPOSED 2023)

(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. In determining whether and when a party learned of facts or circumstances that could constitute a potential conflict of interest for an arbitrator, a party shall be deemed to have made reasonable enquiries regarding facts or circumstances that are available to it, both at the outset of the arbitration and during the proceedings.

(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 provision of preliminary views (where permitted and on the premise that the preliminary views are without prejudice to the arbitrator's decisions in the arbitration), 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 providing preliminary views or 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 providing preliminary views on the dispute or 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 asking an arbitrator to provide preliminary views or 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 parties are dissatisfied with the arbitrator's expressed preliminary views or if the mediation is unsuccessful. In giving their express consent, the parties should realise the consequences of the arbitrator providing preliminary views (even if provided on the basis that the preliminary views are without prejudice to the arbitrator's decisions in the arbitration) or assisting them in a settlement process, including the risk of the resignation of the arbitrator.

(4) WAIVER BY THE PARTIES (COMPARE 2014 AND PROPOSED 2023)

(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. In determining whether and when a party learned of facts or circumstances that could constitute a potential conflict of interest for an arbitrator, a party shall be deemed to have made reasonable enquiries regarding facts or circumstances that are available to it, both at the outset of the arbitration and during the proceedings.

(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 provision of preliminary views (where permitted and on the premise that the preliminary views are without prejudice to the arbitrator's decisions in the arbitration), 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 providing preliminary views or 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 providing preliminary views on the dispute or 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 asking an arbitrator to provide preliminary views or 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 parties are dissatisfied with the arbitrator's expressed preliminary views or if the mediation is unsuccessful. In giving their express consent, the parties should realise the consequences of the arbitrator providing preliminary views (even if provided on the basis that the preliminary views are without prejudice to the arbitrator's decisions in the arbitration) or assisting them in a settlement process, including the risk of the resignation of the arbitrator.

TASK FORCE COMMENTS ON (4) WAIVER BY THE PARTIES (PROPOSED 2023)

With respect to the proposed revisions to General Standard 4:

- The addition to paragraph (a) aims to reinforce the parties' duty to investigate in the context of waiver; and
- The additions to paragraph (d) address situations, in the context of waiver, where arbitrators are asked to give preliminary views on a matter.

The proposed revisions to the Explanation to General Standard 4 principally aim to reflect the proposed revisions to General Standard 4.

(5) SCOPE (2014)

- (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.

(5) SCOPE (PROPOSED 2023)

- (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 and among 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.

(5) SCOPE (COMPARE 2014 AND PROPOSED 2023)

- (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 **and among** 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 ~~13~~ 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.

TASK FORCE COMMENTS ON (5) SCOPE (PROPOSED 2023)

The Task Force has not proposed any revisions to General Standard 5.

The minor revision to the Explanatory Note to General Standard 5 is meant to reflect General Standard 5 more accurately, insofar as it “applies equally” to all arbitrators.

(6) RELATIONSHIPS (2014)

(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.

(6) RELATIONSHIPS (PROPOSED 2023)

(a) The arbitrator is in principle considered to bear the identity of his or her law firm or employer, 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 or employer, if any, the law firm's or employer's organisational structure and mode of practice, and the relationship of the arbitrator with the law firm or employer, should be considered in each individual case. The fact that the activities of the arbitrator's law firm or employer 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 law firm or employer 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) Any legal entity or physical person having a controlling influence on a party, or a direct 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.

(c) If one of the parties is a legal entity, any legal or physical person over which that party has a controlling influence, may be considered to bear the identity of such party.

Explanation to General Standard 6:

(a) There is a need to balance the interests of a party to appoint the arbitrator of its choice, who may be a lawyer at a large law firm or employed by a company or another kind of organisation, 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 or employer, but the activities of the arbitrator's law firm or employer should not automatically create a conflict of interest. The relevance of (i) the activities of the arbitrator's law firm or employer, such as the nature, timing and scope of the work by the law firm or employer; the law firm's or employer's organisational structure and mode of practice; and (iii) the relationship of the arbitrator with the law firm or employer, 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 between and among barristers, parties and/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 or employer, should be considered in each individual case.

(b) Evolution in the structure of international legal practices gives rise to questions about what constitutes a law firm for purposes of General Standard 6(a). As a general proposition, a law firm for these purposes is any firm in which the arbitrator is a partner or with which the arbitrator is formally associated, including in the capacity of an employee of any designation,

as counsel, or of counsel. Structures such as, for example, Swiss vereins, through which different law firms cooperate, may provide a basis for deeming an arbitrator to bear the identity of such other firms as well under some circumstances. Factors to consider include where (i) the different firms share a corporate name; (ii) the firms coordinate their arbitration practices; (iii) the arbitrator’s remuneration depends in part on the performance of such other firms; and (iv) the matter giving rise to the potential conflict raises issues similar to those in the case in which the arbitrator has been nominated.¹

(c) Particularly where 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 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. Such control, interests, or indemnification obligations may also arise for natural persons, and the same result is obtained.

(d) In the case of third-party funders and insurers that have a direct interest in the prosecution or defence of the case in dispute, such legal entities or physical persons may have a controlling influence on a party to the arbitration, and may have influence over the conduct of proceedings, including the selection of arbitrators, a distinction that may be relevant when considering whether they may be considered to bear the identity of a party.

(e) With respect to corporations, the newly added General Standard 6(c) means that where a parent company is a party to the proceeding, its subsidiary may be considered to bear the identity of the parent company when the parent company has a controlling influence over it.

(f) With respect to States, their organisation typically comprises separate legal entities such as regional or local authorities, or autonomous agencies, which may be legally and politically independent from the central government. Such relationships are not necessarily covered by the criteria of “controlling influence” or “direct interest”. Because the relationships between such entities vary widely, a catch-all rule is not considered appropriate. Instead, the particular circumstances of the relationship and their relevance to the subject matter of the dispute should be considered in each individual case. Thus, whenever a State or a State entity, subdivision or instrumentality is party to the arbitration, the arbitrator should consider disclosing relationships with entities such as regional or local authorities, autonomous agencies, or State-Owned Entities, irrespective of whether they are part of the organisation of the State or have a private status, and vice-versa.

¹ The factors are derived from *Blue Bank International & Trust (Barbados) Ltd. v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela*, Decision on the Parties’ Proposals to Disqualify a Majority of the Tribunal, paras. 67-68 (12 November 2013).

(6) RELATIONSHIPS (COMPARE 2014 AND PROPOSED 2023)

(a) The arbitrator is in principle considered to bear the identity of his or her law firm or employer, 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 or employer, if any, the law firm's or employer's organisational structure and mode of practice, and the relationship of the arbitrator with the law firm or employer, should be considered in each individual case. The fact that the activities of the arbitrator's law firm or employer 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 law firm or employer 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~~ Any legal entity, ~~any legal~~ or physical person having a controlling influence on ~~the legal entity~~ a party, 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.

(c) If one of the parties is a legal entity, any legal or physical person over which that party has a controlling influence, 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.~~ (a) There is a need to balance the interests of a party to appoint the arbitrator of its choice, who may be a ~~partner~~ lawyer at a large law firm or employed by a company or another kind of organisation, 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 or employer, but the activities of the arbitrator's law firm or employer should not automatically create a conflict of interest. The relevance of (i) the activities of the arbitrator's law firm or employer, such as the nature, timing and scope of the work by the law firm, ~~and or employer;~~ the law firm's or employer's organisational structure and mode of practice; and (iii) the relationship of the arbitrator with the law firm or employer, 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 between and among barristers, parties and/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 or employer, should be considered in each individual case.

~~(b) When~~ (b) Evolution in the structure of international legal practices gives rise to questions about what constitutes a law firm for purposes of General Standard 6(a). As a general proposition, a law firm for these purposes is any firm in which the arbitrator is a partner or with which the arbitrator is formally associated, including in the capacity of an employee of any designation, as counsel, or of counsel. Structures such as, for example, Swiss vereins, through which different law firms cooperate, may provide a basis for deeming an arbitrator to bear the identity of such other firms as well under some circumstances. Factors to consider include where (i) the different firms share a corporate name; (ii) the firms coordinate their arbitration practices; (iii) the arbitrator’s remuneration depends in part on the performance of such other firms; and (iv) the matter giving rise to the potential conflict raises issues similar to those in the case in which the arbitrator has been nominated.²

(c) Particularly where 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.~~ Such control, interests, or indemnification obligations may also arise for natural persons, and the same result is obtained.

(d) In the case of third-party funders and insurers that have a direct interest in the prosecution or defence of the case in dispute, such legal entities or physical persons may have a controlling influence on a party to the arbitration, and may have influence over the conduct of proceedings, including the selection of arbitrators, a distinction that may be relevant when considering whether they may be considered to bear the identity of a party.

(e) With respect to corporations, the newly added General Standard 6(c) means that where a parent company is a party to the proceeding, its subsidiary may be considered to bear the identity of the parent company when the parent company has a controlling influence over it.

(f) With respect to States, their organisation typically comprises separate legal entities such as regional or local authorities, or autonomous agencies, which may be legally and politically independent from the central government. Such relationships are not necessarily covered by the criteria of “controlling influence” or “direct interest”. Because the relationships between such entities vary widely, a catch-all rule is not considered appropriate. Instead, the particular circumstances of the relationship and their relevance to the subject matter of the dispute should be considered in each individual case. Thus, whenever a State or a State entity, subdivision or instrumentality is party to the arbitration, the arbitrator should consider disclosing relationships with entities such as regional or local authorities, autonomous agencies, or State-Owned

² The factors are derived from *Blue Bank International & Trust (Barbados) Ltd. v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela*, Decision on the Parties’ Proposals to Disqualify a Majority of the Tribunal, paras. 67-68 (12 November 2013).

Entities, irrespective of whether they are part of the organisation of the State or have a private status, and vice-versa.

TASK FORCE COMMENTS ON (6) RELATIONSHIPS (PROPOSED 2023)

With respect to the proposed revisions to General Standard 6:

- The additions to paragraph (a) address the fact that many arbitrators do not work for law firms and are rather employees of companies;
- The changes to paragraph (b) address that other interests, besides economic ones, may generate conflicts of interest (*e.g.*, not-for-profit third-party funding); and
- New proposed General Standard 6(c) is meant to extend the application of General Standard 6, so that not only may the qualification as a party extend from the controlled entity to the controlling entity (*e.g.*, from the subsidiary to the parent company, as is currently the case under General Standard 6(b)), but also from the controlling entity to the controlled entity (*e.g.*, from the parent company to the subsidiary).

The proposed revisions to the Explanation to General Standard 6 principally aim to:

- Reflect the proposed revisions to General Standard 6;
- Provide further guidance as to what constitutes a law firm for purposes of General Standard 6(a);
- Update possible considerations to determine when third-party funders or insurers may be considered to bear the identity of a party; and
- Provide guidance as to how new proposed General Standard 6(c) applies in cases where a parent company, or State or a State entity, subdivision or instrumentality is party to an arbitration.

(7) DUTY OF THE PARTIES AND THE ARBITRATOR (2014)

(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.

(7) DUTY OF THE PARTIES AND THE ARBITRATOR (PROPOSED 2023)

(a) A party shall inform an arbitrator, the Arbitral Tribunal, the other parties and the arbitration institution or other appointing authority (if any) of

(i) any relationship, direct or indirect, between the arbitrator and the party (and/or another company of the same group of companies, and/or an individual having a controlling influence on the party in the arbitration, and/or any person or entity over which a party has a controlling influence), or between the arbitrator and any person or entity with a direct interest in, or a duty to indemnify a party for, the award to be rendered in the arbitration and

(ii) any person or entity it would like an arbitrator to take into consideration when making disclosures in accordance with General Standard 3.

The party shall do so on its own initiative at the earliest opportunity.

(b) In order to comply with General Standard 7(a), a party shall perform reasonable enquiries and provide all relevant information available to it.

(c) 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.

(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 (and/or another company of the same group of companies, and/or an individual having a controlling influence on the party in the arbitration and/or any legal or physical person over which a party has a controlling influence), extends to relationships with a legal entity or physical person having a direct interest in, or a duty to indemnify a party for, the award to be rendered in the arbitration.

(b) When providing the list of persons or entities the parties would like an arbitrator to take into consideration when making disclosures, the parties are required to explain these persons' and entities' relationship to the dispute.

(c) Counsel appearing 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.

(d) 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 standards, might affect the arbitrator's impartiality or independence.

(e) 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.

(7) DUTY OF THE PARTIES AND THE ARBITRATOR (COMPARE 2014 AND PROPOSED 2023)

(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.~~

(i) any relationship, direct or indirect, between the arbitrator and the party (and/or another company of the same group of companies, and/or an individual having a controlling influence on the party in the arbitration, and/or any person or entity over which a party has a controlling influence), or between the arbitrator and any person or entity with a direct interest in, or a duty to indemnify a party for, the award to be rendered in the arbitration and

(ii) any person or entity it would like an arbitrator to take into consideration when making disclosures in accordance with General Standard 3.

The party shall do so on its own initiative at the earliest opportunity.~~(b)~~

(b) In order to comply with General Standard 7(a), a party shall perform reasonable enquiries and provide all relevant information available to it.

(c) 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 (and/or another company of the same group of companies, and/or an individual having a controlling influence on the party in the arbitration) ~~and/or any legal or physical person over which a party has been extended a controlling influence), extends~~ to relationships with ~~persons~~ a legal entity or entities ~~physical person~~ having a direct ~~economic~~ interest in, or a duty to indemnify a party

~~for, 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) When providing the list of persons or entities the parties would like an arbitrator to take into consideration when making disclosures, the parties are required to explain these persons' and entities' relationship to the dispute.

~~(c) 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.

~~(e)~~ 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~~standards, might affect the arbitrator's impartiality or independence.

~~(e)~~ 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.

**TASK FORCE COMMENTS ON (7) DUTY OF THE PARTIES AND THE ARBITRATOR (PROPOSED
2023)**

With respect to the proposed revisions to General Standard 7:

- The revisions to paragraph (a)(i) aim to broaden the parties’ duty to inform the arbitrator also of persons or entities with or subject to a “controlling influence”, in keeping with the terms used to define relationships in General Standard 6; and
- The new proposed paragraph (a)(ii) reinforces the parties’ duty to inform the arbitrator of persons or entities that they would like the arbitrator to consider for purposes of disclosures under General Standard 3.

The proposed revisions to the Explanation to General Standard 7 principally aim to reflect the proposed revisions to General Standard 7.

PART II: PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF THE GENERAL STANDARDS (2014)

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.

PART II: PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF THE GENERAL STANDARDS (PROPOSED 2023)

1. To have an important practical influence, the Guidelines address situations that are likely to occur in today's arbitration practice in the Application Lists. However, these lists cannot cover every situation, and in all cases, the General Standards should control the outcome; in other words, the General Standards govern over the illustrative Application Lists.

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 described in the Explanation to General Standard 2.

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. As provided in General Standard 3(g), 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 generally are presumed not to be 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 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, in the eyes of the parties, a perceived imbalance within the tribunal that may, depending on the facts and circumstances of the case, give rise to doubts as to an arbitrator's impartiality or independence. If the conclusion is 'yes', the arbitrator should make 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.

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.

**PART II: PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF THE GENERAL STANDARDS (COMPARE 2014 AND
PROPOSED 2023)**

1. ~~If the Guidelines are to To~~ have an important practical influence, ~~they should the Guidelines~~ 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~~ However, these lists cannot cover every situation. ~~In, and in~~ all cases, the General Standards should control the outcome; in other words, the General Standards govern over the illustrative Application Lists.

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: described in the Explanation to General Standard 2.

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~~ As provided in General Standard 3(g), 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 are presumed not to be 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, in the eyes of the parties, a perceived imbalance within the tribunal; that may, depending on the facts and circumstances of the case, give rise to doubts as to an arbitrator's impartiality or independence. If the conclusion is 'yes', the arbitrator should ~~consider~~ make 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.

**TASK FORCE COMMENTS ON PART II: PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF THE GENERAL
STANDARDS (PROPOSED 2023)**

The proposed revisions to the introduction to the Application Lists aim to reflect the principles underlying the proposed updates to the General Standards, discussed in the Introduction to the General Standards and in connection with each General Standard above.

(1) NON-WAIVABLE RED LIST (2014)

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.

(1) NON-WAIVABLE RED LIST (PROPOSED 2023)

1.1 There is an identity between a party and the arbitrator, or the arbitrator is a legal representative or employee of a person or 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 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 currently or regularly advises a party, or an affiliate of a party, and the arbitrator or his or her firm or employer derives significant financial income therefrom.

(1) NON-WAIVABLE RED LIST (COMPARE 2014 AND PROPOSED 2023)

1.1 There is an identity between a party and the arbitrator, or the arbitrator is a legal representative or employee of ~~ana person or~~ 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 ~~currently~~ or ~~his or her firm~~ regularly advises ~~thea~~ party, or an affiliate of ~~thea~~ party, and the arbitrator or his or her firm ~~or employer~~ derives significant financial income therefrom.

TASK FORCE COMMENTS ON (1) NON-WAIVABLE RED LIST (PROPOSED 2023)

With respect to the proposed revisions to the Non-Waivable Red List:

- The addition to paragraph 1.1 reflects that physical persons can be parties to an arbitration;
- The revision to paragraph 1.2 reflects the proposed changes in the General Standards to the effect that other interests, besides economic ones, may generate conflicts of interest (*e.g.*, not-for-profit third-party funding); and
- The revisions to paragraph 1.4 aim to remove from the Non-Waivable Red List, and move to the Waivable Red-List, situations where an arbitrator's firm/employer, but not the arbitrator directly, works for a party and derives significant income therefrom. The Task Force considers that this latter situation is governed by paragraph 2.3.6 of the Waivable Red List.

(2) WAIVABLE RED LIST (2014)

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.

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

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.

⁴ Throughout the Application Lists, the term 'affiliate' encompasses all companies in a group of companies, including the parent company.

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.

(2) WAIVABLE RED LIST (PROPOSED 2023)

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 member⁵ of the arbitrator has a significant financial interest in the outcome of the dispute.

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 or regularly represents or advises one of the parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties, but does not derive significant financial income therefrom.

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 affiliate⁶ 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 or employer 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 or employer currently has a significant commercial relationship with one of the parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties.

2.3.7 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.

⁵ 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.

⁶ Throughout the Application Lists, the term 'affiliate' encompasses all companies in a group of companies, including the parent company, and/or an individual having a controlling influence on the party in the arbitration, and/or any person or entity over which a party has a controlling influence.

2.3.8 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.

(2) WAIVABLE RED LIST (COMPARE 2014 AND PROPOSED 2023)

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 member⁷ of the arbitrator has a significant financial interest in the outcome of the dispute.

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 or regularly represents or advises one of the parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties, but does not derive significant financial income therefrom.

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 affiliate⁸ 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 or employer 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 or employer 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~~2.3.7 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

⁷ 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.

⁸ Throughout the Application Lists, the term 'affiliate' encompasses all companies in a group of companies, including the parent company, and/or an individual having a controlling influence on the party in the arbitration, and/or any person or entity over which a party has a controlling influence.

controlling influence in one of the parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties, or with a counsel representing a party.

2.3.98 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.

TASK FORCE COMMENTS ON (2) WAIVABLE RED LIST (PROPOSED 2023)

With respect to the proposed revisions to the Waivable Red List:

- The additions to paragraph 2.3.1 make clear that an arbitrator who directly works for a party can only act as arbitrator if s/he does not derive significant financial income therefrom;
- The revisions to paragraphs 2.3.5 and 2.3.6 reflect the updates to the General Standards, to the effect that arbitrators do not only work for law firms and are also frequently employees of companies;
- The deletion of paragraph 2.3.7 reflects the Task Force’s view that it is redundant to the newly formulated paragraph 2.3.1 (re the arbitrator) and paragraph 3.2.1 of the Orange List (re the firm); and
- The addition to the footnote (fn. 8 in the compare version) expands the definition of “affiliate” to encompass the concept of “controlling influence”, in keeping with the terms used in General Standard 6 and the revisions to General Standard 7.

(3) ORANGE LIST (2014)

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.⁹

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 on a related issue 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.

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.

⁹ 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.

3.3.4 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.

(3) ORANGE LIST (PROPOSED 2023)

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.¹⁰

3.1.4 The arbitrator has, within the past three years, been appointed to assist in mock-trials or hearing preparations on two or more occasions by one of the parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties.

3.1.5 The arbitrator currently serves, or has served within the past three years, as arbitrator or counsel in another arbitration on a related issue involving one of the parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties.

3.1.6 The arbitrator's law firm or employer is currently defending itself in a dispute with one of the parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties.

3.1.7 The arbitrator currently serves, or has acted within the past three years, as an expert for one of the parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties in an unrelated matter.

3.2 Current services for one of the parties

3.2.1 The arbitrator's law firm or employer is currently rendering or regularly renders 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 or employer 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.

3.2.3 The arbitrator's law 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

¹⁰ 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. In such fields, parties may be required to select arbitrators from a mandatory list or they may be aware of a custom and practice for parties frequently to appoint the same arbitrator in different cases. In that event, while disclosure of appointments may still be desirable consistent with section 3.1.3, the scope of disclosure and consequences of repeat appointments may differ from those set forth in these Guidelines.

3.3.1 The arbitrator and another arbitrator are lawyers in the same law firm or have the same employer.

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 as arbitrator on more than three occasions by the same counsel, or the same law firm in unrelated matters.

3.3.9 The arbitrator has, within the past three years, been appointed as an expert on more than three occasions by the same counsel, or the same law firm.

3.3.10 The arbitrator has, within the past three years, been appointed to assist in mock-trials or hearing preparations on more than three occasions by the same counsel, or the same law firm.

3.3.11 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 an expert, 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 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 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.

3.4.6 The arbitrator, when acting as counsel, concurrently instructs the expert appearing before him/her as arbitrator in another matter as his/her party-appointed expert.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, through social media or on-line professional networking platforms, or otherwise.

3.5.3 The arbitrator holds an executive or decision-making position with the administering institution or appointing authority with respect to the dispute and/or in that position has participated in decisions with respect to the arbitration.

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.

(3) ORANGE LIST (COMPARE 2014 AND PROPOSED 2023)

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.¹¹

3.1.4 The ~~arbitrator's law firm~~ arbitrator has, within the past three years, ~~acted for~~ been appointed to assist in mock-trials or ~~against~~ hearing preparations on two or more occasions by one of the parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties, ~~in an unrelated matter without~~.

~~3.1.5~~ 3.1.5 The arbitrator currently serves, or has served within the ~~involvement~~ past three years, as arbitrator or counsel in another arbitration on a related issue involving one of the ~~arbitrator~~ parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties.

~~3.1.5~~ 3.1.6 The arbitrator's law firm or employer is currently defending itself in a dispute with one of the parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties.

~~3.1.7~~ 3.1.7 The arbitrator currently serves, or has acted within the past three years, as an expert for one of the parties, or an affiliate of one of the parties in an unrelated matter.

3.2 Current services for one of the parties

3.2.1 The arbitrator's law firm or employer is currently rendering or regularly renders 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 or employer 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.

3.2.3 The ~~arbitrator or his or her~~ arbitrator's law 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.

¹¹ 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~~ In such fields ~~it is the~~, parties may be required to select arbitrators from a mandatory list or they may be aware of a custom and practice for parties ~~to~~ frequently to appoint the same arbitrator in different cases, ~~no~~. In that event, while disclosure of ~~this fact is~~ required, where all parties in the arbitration should be familiar appointments may still be desirable consistent with such custom section 3.1.3, the scope of disclosure and practice consequences of repeat appointments may differ from those set forth in these Guidelines.

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- Or have the same employer.

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 as arbitrator on more than three occasions by the same counsel, or the same law firm- In unrelated matters.

3.3.9 The arbitrator has, within the past three years, been appointed as an expert on more than three occasions by the same counsel, or the same law firm.

3.3.10 The arbitrator has, within the past three years, been appointed to assist in mock-trials or hearing preparations on more than three occasions by the same counsel, or the same law firm.

3.3.11 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 an expert, 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~~ 3.4.6 The arbitrator, when acting as counsel, concurrently instructs the expert appearing before him/her as arbitrator in another matter as his/her party-appointed expert.

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 speech, through social media or on-line professional networking platforms, or otherwise.

3.5.3 The arbitrator holds ~~an executive or decision-making~~ position with the administering institution or appointing authority with respect to the dispute and/or in that position has participated in decisions with respect to the arbitration.

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.

TASK FORCE COMMENTS ON (3) ORANGE LIST (PROPOSED 2023)

With respect to the proposed revisions to the Orange List:

- New paragraphs 3.1.4 and 3.3.10 cover the frequent situation where arbitrators are asked by a party or counsel to help with hearing preparations, through a mock arbitration or otherwise;
- Paragraph 3.1.5 has been updated to include that the arbitrator should also make a disclosure if s/he has acted as counsel in another arbitration on a related issue;
- New paragraph 3.1.6 reflects an issue that may arise in practice and is not addressed elsewhere;
- New paragraphs 3.1.7 and 3.3.9 address situations where the arbitrator also acts or has acted as expert;
- Paragraph 3.2.3 has been updated to account for the proposed updates to the Red and Orange Lists;
- New paragraph 3.4.6 addresses an arbitrator's relationship with an expert appearing before him/her in an arbitration; paragraph 3.4.2 has also been updated to include an arbitrator's relationship with an expert;
- Paragraph 3.5.2 has been updated to account for an arbitrator's expressing views on a case via on-line activities;
- Paragraph 3.5.3 has been updated to include an arbitrator's role at an administering institution;
- The footnote (fn. 11 in the compare version) has been updated to reflect that, no matter the type of international arbitration (sports, maritime, etc.), disclosure of repeat appointments remains desirable and consistent with paragraph 3.1.3, even if the scope (and consequences) of the disclosures may be different than those set forth in the Guidelines; and
- The remaining additions or revisions reflect changes proposed to the General Standards and described above.

(4) GREEN LIST (2014)

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.

(4) GREEN LIST (PROPOSED 2023)

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 or employer, but that does not share significant fees or other revenues with the arbitrator's law firm or employer, 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.

4.5 Contacts between the arbitrator and one of the experts

4.5.1 The arbitrator, when acting as arbitrator in another matter, heard testimony from an expert appearing in the current proceedings.

(4) GREEN LIST (COMPARE 2014 AND PROPOSED 2023)

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 or employer, but that does not share significant fees or other revenues with the arbitrator's law firm or employer, 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.

4.5 Contacts between the arbitrator and one of the experts

4.5.1 The arbitrator, when acting as arbitrator in another matter, heard testimony from an expert appearing in the current proceedings.

TASK FORCE COMMENTS ON (4) GREEN LIST (PROPOSED 2023)

With respect to the proposed revisions to the Green List:

- Paragraph 4.2 has been updated to reflect proposed revisions to the General Standards, as described above; and
- New paragraph 4.5 has been added to address a common scenario, in contrast to the other expert-related issues addressed by the proposed revisions to the Orange List.