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**Question 1**:

Guideline 4 of the *IBA Guidelines for Drafting International Arbitration Clauses* (“**the IBA Guidelines**”) provides “*the parties should select the place of arbitration*”[[1]](#footnote-1). As explained by S. Greenberg, C. Kee, R. Weeramantry[[2]](#footnote-2), the best way to record an agreed seat of arbitration is to use simple and clear language specifying both the city and country. However, as there is no mandatory form of wording, other language, “*even vague*”, will usually suffice unless there are conflicting locations in the clause. In this regard, careful attention shall be given to the distinction between “*the seat or the place of the arbitration*” and “*the place of hearing*”. As provided by Guideline 4, “*by designating only the place of the hearing, the parties leave it uncertain whether they have designated the ‘place of arbitration’*”[[3]](#footnote-3).

**As with regards to the first clause**, even though Paris is mentioned, the language is subject to debate. When reading the clause doubts arise as whether Paris is meant to be the seat of the arbitration, the place of the hearing or a mere detail as to the localisation of the ICC headquarters. The confusing language used reinforces the uncertainty: the dispute “*shall be resolved by the ICC Court*”, whereas according to Article 1(2) of the ICC Rules “*the Court does not itself resolve disputes*”.

**As with regards to the second clause**, the Parties specified their will to “*utiliz*[e] *the hearing facilities in Times Square, New York*”. As there is a distinction between the seat and the venue, it is uncertain whether they have designated the place of arbitration.Therefore, one must reach the conclusion that the Parties have failed to designate the seat of arbitration.

**As with regards to the third clause**, one could assert that as the venue is expressly referred to, there is no confusion possible between the seat and the hearing location. However, as the language does not clearly states “*the place of arbitration shall be [city, country]*” as recommended by Guideline 4, it is confusing whether Paris is meant to be the seat of the arbitration, or, a mere precision as to the localisation of the headquarters of the institution.

If one could argue clause No.1 and No.3 designate Paris as the seat of the arbitration, uncertainty prevails. As the choice of the seat is crucial and has important legal consequences, it results from the above analysis that the three arbitration clauses fail to specify the place of arbitration. However, according to Guideline 4, “*an arbitration clause that fails to specify the place of arbitration will be effective, though undesirable*”. Thus, the clauses being effective and designating the ICC as the arbitral institution, failing agreement between the Parties, “the place of the arbitration shall be fixed by the Court” under article 18 of the ICC Rules.

**Question 2**:

1. **Whether Modelville is a suitable place of arbitration for this deal**

According to Guideline 4 (22) of the IBA Guidelines, three elements shall to be considered when selecting the seat of arbitration. Firstly, one should note the information at our disposal does not specify whether Modelania is a member party to the 1958 New York Convention (“the NYC”) and when visiting the NYC website, Modelania does not appear among the States listed as member party. One could therefore reach the conclusion Modelania is not a party to this Convention. Secondly, as Section 4 of the Arbitration Act in Modelania gives effect to the UNCITRAL Model Law, one could conlude Modelania’s law is supportive of arbitration. Furthermore, article 1(3)(a) of the Model Law defines an arbitration as international if “*the parties to an arbitration agreement have, at the time of the conclusion of that agreement, their places of business in different States*”. Therefore, it can be asserted that Modelania’s law does permit arbitration of the subject matter in the present transaction. Finally, as with regards to the third requirement under Guideline 4, we do not dispose of sufficient elements to determine whether Modelania’s courts have a track record of issuing unbiased decisions that are supportive of the arbitral process. Thus, with regards to the above referenced criteria Modelania does not fulfill the requirements and cannot be qualified as a suitable place.

1. **Whether it is necessary to choose an arbitral institution for an arbitration seated in Modelville and the advantages/disadvantages of doing so,**

As provided by the first IBA Guideline, if the Parties choose ad hoc arbitration, they will benefit from a broad flexibility and be able to tailor the proceedings to meet their needs and answer the specificities of their case. Ad hoc arbitration also has the advantage to offer greater confidentiality. Finally, non-administered arbitration is particularly recommended in two cases: (i) when the risk of obstruction of the respondent is inexistent and (ii) when the dispute has already started. If the Parties opt for ad hoc arbitration, they can refer to certain rules such as UNCITRAL Rules and to an institution involved as appointing authority. However, as stated in the IBA Guidelines, “*the burden of running the arbitral proceedings falls entirely on the parties*”. Therefore, in most business transaction, institutions are the safer and most efficient choice. Indeed, the arbitral institution will provide an administrative support and will assist the Parties with practical matters such as organizing hearings, handling communications and payments to the arbitrators. The institution will also provide a recognized set of rules and may even assist the Parties when they failed to anticipate an issue when drafting the clause. Another advantage is arbitral institution allows less risk of obstruction of the parties. In terms of enforceability, the scrutiny of the institution can improve the quality of the award. Finally, a recent PwC study found that 86% of awards rendered over the last ten years were drafted under the rules of an arbitration institution, while 14% were under ad hoc arbitrations.

1. **Which arbitration institution(s) can be chosen for an arbitration seated in Modelville, indicating which one you recommend and why,**

According to guideline 1, Parties “*should seek a reputable institution*” as “*major arbitral institutions can administer arbitrations around the world*”. In that sense, Gary Borne notes Parties often rely on few arbitral institutions to avoid uncertainty that comes from inexperienced ones.

Established in 2000, MAFIA “*has arbitration rules in force as of 2011, which are essentially the 2010 UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules with some amendments*”. Despite the apparent reliability of MAFIA, several inconvenient can arise from that choice. Firstly, if the amendments made to the UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules do not seem to impact the overall set of rules, it could be useful to examine more closely these changes. More importantly, it appears from the facts and the recent creation of MAFIA, that this institution does not have an established track record of administering international cases and still lack experience and recognition. Finally, the information at our disposal reads: “*Modelania established its own arbitration institution called MAFIA*”. Thus, one could be reticent to choose this institution as it could lack autonomy and independence from the state of Modelania.

In this light, I would rather recommend the ICC International Court of Arbitration (“ICC”). The ICC remains the world’s leading international commercial arbitration institution and has extensive experience in administering arbitration seated anywhere in the world. Among the other leading institutions, one can refer to the London Court of International Arbitration (“LCIA”), second most popular European institution, or, the American Arbitration Association (“AAA”). Finally, given that the Canadian company is negotiating with a Turkish governmental authority and that Modelania ratified in 2000 the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States, it could also be advised to the Parties to opt for the International Center for the Settlement of Investment Disputes (“ICSID”). ICSID is an autonomous institution considered to be the leading institution in investor-State dispute settlement. Thus, a further examination of the facts would help us choosing the arbitral institution that best fits the Parties needs and expectations.

1. **Whether it is possible to opt out of all recourse against the award in Modelania and, if so/if not, what recourse there will be against the award,**

According to point 7(a) of the Explanatory Note by the UNCITRAL secretariat, the term “recourse” shall be understood as “*the means through which a party may actively “attack” the award*”.

In principle, arbitration leads to a final award without appeal. In some countries such as Israel or New Zealand, it is possible to opt into an appeal to national courts in second instance. Similarly, according to Section 17 of the Arbitration Act, Modelania allows Parties to agree “*that the award shall be subject to appeal in case there is a fundamental mistake in applying the law*”. The use of the word “*may*” in Section 17(b) also allows Parties to agree the award shall not be subject to appeal. In such an event however, as exposed by Lew, Mistelis and Kro ̈ll, “*[i]n principle, court control over an arbitration award in challenge proceedings can never be excluded*”. Indeed, Article 34 of the ML provides for “a*pplication for setting aside as exclusive recourse against arbitral award*” to the exclusion of any other recourse regulated in any procedural law of the State in question. As explain by S. Greenberg, C. Kee, R. Weeramantry, even though Article 34 of the ML is “*considered mandatory*”, “*some jurisdictions do […] allow parties to limit the power of courts to set aside awards*”. Indeed, as provided by the *UNCITRAL 2012 Digest of Case Law on the Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration*, divergent court decisions have been rendered regarding “*the determination of the non-mandatory character of certain provisions*”, and in particular regarding “*the possible exclusions or limitations of the right to apply for the setting aside of an award*”. For instance, a Canadian Court[[4]](#footnote-4) held article 34 is mandatory, while a court in New Zealand[[5]](#footnote-5) held a right to apply for a review of a violation of the rules of natural justice could not be excluded. Thus, the possibility to opt out of the recourse provided by Article 34 of the Model Law depends of the *lex arbitri* of Modelania. If Article 34 is considered mandatory, the Parties will not be able to opt out, if it is not, they will be able to opt out of all recourse against the award.

1. **What would be a suitable alternative seat of arbitration for this deal and what advantages might such place have over Modelville,**

As exposed previously, the IBA Guideline 4 (22) provide for three criteria to be considered when selecting the seat of arbitration. With regards to the important legal consequences of the *lex arbitri* such as the enforceability of the award, it is crucial for the seat of arbitration to be located in a jurisdiction gathering the criteria of Guideline 4 (22). Thus, any place of arbitration that fulfills the criteria provided for in Guideline 4 is a suitable alternative seat of arbitration for this deal. In selecting the seat, Parties should also take into geographic and infrastructure convenience, as well as, neutrality from the Parties. In this regard, it is generally acknowledged that the “classic, safe and popular” seats of arbitration are: Paris, London, Geneva, Zurick, Singapore, Hong Kong, New York and Vienna.

1. **Any tips you have for what the arbitration clause for this specific deal might include,**

The arbitration clause is at the core of the dispute settlement: it conveys the Parties willingness to arbitrate, but also contains aspects of the process. In this regard, the IBA Guidelines are designed to help drafting effective arbitration clauses ensuring the Parties have tackled the essential elements and highlight the pitfalls to avoid. Parties should refer to the model clauses drafted by arbitral institutions as well as UNCITRAL. In line with to the previous comments, in the present case the parties could insert the following clause: “*All disputes arising out of or in connection with the present contract shall be finally resolved under* [the ICC Rules] *by one or more arbitrators appointed in accordance with the said rules. The place of arbitration shall be* [Paris, France]. *The number of arbitrators shall be* [one/three]. *The language of the arbitration shall be* [English].”

1. **Any other comments or advice you have arising out of the facts provided.**

The Canadian company being negotiating with a Turkish governmental authority specifically set up for the project in question, one could advise to examine further the role of the State and the possibility to attract it in the negotiation as a Party to the arbitration agreement.

**Question 3**:

This arbitration is administered under the ICC Rules and Parties have not agreed on the language of arbitration. Under Article 20 of the ICC Rules, “*in the absence of an agreement by the parties, the arbitral tribunal shall determine the language or languages of the arbitration, due regard being given to all relevant circumstances, including the language of the contract*”. The Arbitral Tribunal is thus empowered to rule on the question of language.

Claimant requests English to be the language of the arbitration, whereas Respondent insists on Arabic referring to Article 25 of the Arbitration Law of the fictitious country. Under Article 20 of the ICC Rules, when deciding on the language, the Arbitral Tribunal shall examine “*all relevant circumstances, including the language of the contract*”. Gary Borne highlights “*it is possible that national law in the arbitral seat would impose language requirements on the award. If this is the case, the award would be exposed to annulment or non recognition if it were not in the required language*”. In this regard, under Article 25 of the Arbitration Law: “*unless otherwise agreed between the parties to the dispute, the award shall be in the Arabic language; otherwise, the award, shall at the time of filing, be accompanied by a legalized translation thereof*”. Nevertheless, the facts at our disposal do not inform us of (i) the seat of arbitration, (ii) or the place of enforcement, (iii) nor does it specify whether the fictitious country is Modelania.

If we presuppose that Article 25 of the Arbitration Law of fictitious country is a mandatory provision of the *lex arbitri*, or, of the place where the award is to be enforced, then, the award shall be in Arabic or “*at the time of filing, be accompanied by a legalized translation thereof*”. Therefore, given that English is the language of the contract, the Arbitral Tribunal may rule it shall apply to the present arbitration with regards to Article 20 of the ICC Rules. Moreover, as noted by G. Borne “the language of the arbitration, which will impliedly extend to the arbitral award”. However, as explained by E. Gaillard, P. Fouchard et B. Goldman, “if and when enforcement is sought, the award may have to be translated into the language of the country where it is to be enforced”. Thus, to ensure the enforceability of the award in the present case, the Arbitral Tribunal and the Parties shall remind, at the time of filing, that the award should be accompanied by a “legalized *translation*”.
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