

Modernizing International Arbitration: A Framework for Smart Mechanisms beyond the New York Convention Regime

Biranchi Narayan P. Panda^{1,*}

¹Xavier Law School, XIM University, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India.
biranchi@xim.edu.in¹

Abstract: Smart arbitration platforms are transforming international dispute resolution through the incorporation of digital technologies and robot capabilities in arbitration proceedings. These innovations are efficient and transparent, but they also raise serious concerns about fairness, data security, and judicial oversight. The New York Convention remains the core of cross-border enforcement, but its assumptions are those of traditional processes rather than emerging digital practices. The study examines problems generated by the conflict between old Convention rules and the development of technological methods in international arbitration. It covers key issues such as procedural uncertainty, accountability, openness, and the growing impact of algorithmic decision-making. The study exemplifies the various strategies of striking a balance between innovation and legal safeguards by comparing Singapore with the European Union. This essay proposes an alternative legal system that blends smart technology with existing arbitration principles, while preserving fairness and due process. The findings contribute to current debates on the modernization of international arbitration and the adaptation of dispute-resolution methods to technological advances.

Keywords: Digital Practices; Smart Mechanisms; Digital Platforms; Blockchain and Enforcement; New York Convention; Smart Arbitration; Smart Contracts; Arbitration and Technology; Procedural Uncertainty.

Received on: 10/07/2025, **Revised on:** 15/09/2025, **Accepted on:** 06/11/2025, **Published on:** 05/06/2026

Journal Homepage: <https://www.fmdbpublish.com/user/journals/details/FTSPL>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.69888/FTSPL.2026.000681>

Cite as: B. N. P. Panda, “Modernizing International Arbitration: A Framework for Smart Mechanisms beyond the New York Convention Regime,” *FMDB Transactions on Sustainable Public and Law*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 80–88, 2026.

Copyright © 2026 B. N. P. Panda, licensed to Fernando Martins De Bulhão (FMDB) Publishing Company. This is an open access article distributed under [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/), which allows unlimited use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium with proper attribution.

1. Introduction

Digital technologies continually transform economic activity and global exchange, with a significant impact on dispute resolution. Arbitration has provided a versatile and confidential means of settling international disputes since ancient times, but its conventional frameworks have been developed in an analogue context [1]. Emerging technologies such as smart contracts, blockchain systems, and automated decision-making tools undermine assumptions that underpin international arbitration systems [2]. The technologies set new standards for speed, transparency, and enforceability, but raise new concerns about fairness and reliability [3]. As trading becomes more online, participants increasingly rely on coded signals that trigger responses without human involvement [4]. This change also prompts a closer look at whether the legal instruments used in the

*Corresponding author.

past are appropriate for addressing disputes arising from digital interactions. Smart arbitration systems aim to resolve the gap between traditional legal processes and these new technological realities [5].

They use digital tools in the process and occasionally automate part of the decision-making or enforcement processes [6]. Their appearance signals increased interest in dispute systems aligned with the pace and format of digital transactions [7]. Nonetheless, it is unclear how they can be incorporated into the greater international legal order. The New York Convention, which regulates the cross-border recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards, was developed in a world where automation and algorithmic processes were not yet conceivable. Consequently, concerns also arise about the appropriateness of these new mechanisms within the existing principles meant to apply to traditional arbitration practice [8]. The key issue that is discussed in this article is the discrepancy between the evolutionary requirements of contemporary dispute resolution and the hardened form of the New York Convention [9]. The Convention has been a great help to international commerce, but it presupposes procedural features that do not necessarily align with technological models. There are problems with the generation and support of awards by automated tools or with the entirely online realisation of proceedings [10].

Courts are likely to find it hard to evaluate whether such procedures meet traditional requirements of consent, due process, or even formal validity. Such uncertainties undermine trust in the enforceability of results generated by smart arbitration mechanisms, especially in the cross-border context [11]. This study aims to determine how intelligent ad hoc arbitration systems can evolve within a consistent and foreseeable legal environment. In the absence of clear standards, parties are likely to be treated differently in different jurisdictions, and institutions will be unable to devise procedures that can be enforced. Policymakers also face challenges in regulating digital dispute systems, where innovation moves faster than legal adjustments can keep pace [12]. A close study of the Convention's boundaries is used to determine the spheres in which reform or additional frameworks might be necessary. This question is timely because technological adoption is still increasing, and legal ambiguity can prevent widespread adoption of digital dispute resolution. The logic of the present study is to foster transparency, equality, and stability in a changing world [13]. This paper seeks to gain a clear comprehension of the drawbacks of the New York Convention as it applies to smart arbitration mechanisms [14].

It identifies the points at which technological changes conflict with long-standing legal assumptions and explains why these tensions are important to international trade [15]. It then assesses the functionality of smart arbitration mechanisms and highlights the features that distinguish them from traditional arbitration mechanisms. The paper compares the strengths and weaknesses of the two approaches by examining their structures [16]. The analysis also examines the possibility of digital dispute systems aligning with the Convention's principles, given their unique characteristics [17]. The paper goes on to propose a legal framework to enhance the enforceability and legitimacy of smart arbitration mechanisms [18]. This model is based on principles informed by comparative practice, technological capability, and the changing demands of international business [19]. The research also examines the chosen jurisdictions that have begun implementing digital dispute systems and draws lessons from their approaches. Theoretical and practical issues are evaluated to ensure that any suggested model is reasonable and sound [20]. The paper concludes with policy recommendations for future development. These goals organise the discussion and analysis of the work [21].

2. Limitations of the New York Convention

2.1. Historical Significance and Achievements

The New York Convention changed the method of enforcement of international arbitral awards and enhanced trust in international trade [22]. It also established a common standard that various jurisdictions could rely on for similar enforcement by the parties. The adoption of the rule has removed the inconsistency between the national rules, which undermined confidence in international awards and deterred international investment [23]. The Convention restricted the grounds for refusal and obligated courts to recognise awards, subject to certain exceptions. The strategy encouraged efficiency and lessened judicial intrusion. The Convention has, over the past decades, helped promote arbitration as the ideal means of resolving international disputes. The fact that it has been accepted worldwide demonstrates its practical usefulness and ensures its key position in the international legal order [24].

Regardless of its success, the Convention's assumptions on arbitration are consistent with the commercial practice of the mid-twentieth century. It assumes the existence of clear documentary evidence, identifiable arbitral tribunals, and proceedings conducted through traditional communication means. These assumptions were valid in their day, but they also reflect the technological context in which the Convention arose. The digital environments that are not necessarily representative of these expectations are becoming an integral part of modern dispute systems. The strengths of the Convention, therefore, are hidden by structural constraints in its application to mechanisms that restructure procedural roles or automate certain decision processes. These issues provide a significant background for determining the appropriateness of the Convention in a rapidly changing technological world.

2.2. Procedural and Enforcement Problems

Procedural requirements in the Convention are also efficient when applied in old-fashioned arbitration, but pose problems when applied in digital or automated processes. It presupposes the presence of a recognisable seat, a human tribunal, and a record of proceedings. These elements are occasionally obscured by the use of smart arbitration mechanisms, which can be based on distributed platforms or automated tools. Courts can then raise the issue of whether these procedures meet the expectations of fairness or good constitution. Such ambiguities may interfere with cross-border recognition and enforcement. Parties need clarity to obtain digitally aided awards that are subject to judicial challenge. In the absence of this clarity, there will be inconsistencies across jurisdictions, eroding trust in technology-mediated dispute resolution. Implementation issues also arise when prizes are coded or automated. Traditional awards are written documents that courts can review to ensure procedural norms are adhered to. Smart mechanisms can generate results by executing code on decentralised systems. When processes are partially automated, courts can have difficulties in interpreting such outcomes or proving their validity. There can also be an issue of transparency, as automated parts do not provide clear reasoning. These problems make it difficult to apply the Convention's grounds for refusal. With the rise of digital processes, the enforcement framework is under pressure to adapt to emergent procedural realities while safeguarding reliability and fairness.

2.3. Technology Gap and the Absence of Flexibility

The Convention was created at a time when there was no digital communication, automated decision tools, or distributed computing. Consequently, it is not foresight of controversy due to coded relationships or online platforms. Smart arbitration systems are based on technological processes that transform how parties negotiate, present evidence, and obtain outcomes. These changes undermine the notions of form, consent, and procedural integrity. The strict application of the documentary requirements set out in the Convention can limit the appreciation of awards created in non-traditional forms. Moreover, automated processes might not be easily accommodated within a provision intended for human-oriented hearings and deliberations. Such discrepancies reveal significant differences between new practices and the Convention's historical structure. Adaptability is a key issue, as technology continues to shape commercial dispute systems. Smart arbitration systems are developing rapidly and tend to integrate automation with human control in ways traditional systems fail to consider. Technologically complex processes might be hard to apply the traditional grounds of refusal to courts. The parties can also find it hard to discern how national courts treat awards based on automated reasoning or blockchain-based execution. In the absence of further clarification, the efficiency of the digital dispute resolution promise can be undermined by ambiguity during implementation. Such problems can be seen as a reason why a legal model should be developed to supplement the Convention and facilitate more creative procedural designs.

3. Emergence of Smart Arbitration Mechanisms

3.1. The Concepts of the Term and Features Defined and Explained

Smart arbitration mechanisms are dispute systems that use digital tools to supplement or automate key procedural steps. They are inspired by smart contracts, which automatically enforce terms when specific conditions are met. These systems use analogous reasoning to dispute resolutions, where digital systems are used to oversee filings, evidence, timing, and, on certain occasions, prior reasoning. They are trying to provide quicker, more convenient, and more predictable results by reducing paperwork. Digital market participants tend to select systems that are as efficient as possible for transactions. Smart mechanisms are thus a sign of an attempt to match conflict resolution with the pace and format of contemporary business transactions. Their key features revolve around automation, transparency, and integration with digital environments. Some systems employ coded rules to direct the procedural steps or cause actions whenever evidence is made available. Other people use platforms that organise communication and securely store records. An increasing number of them are integrating analytics to help decision-makers identify trends or anomalies. These characteristics do not eliminate human judgment, but they transform the nature of the interaction between tribunals and information. Secure data environments are also important to smart mechanisms, as parties demand assurance of high-quality storage and credible transmission. All these features demonstrate how digital solutions can revolutionise arbitration without compromising its key principles.

3.2. AI, Blockchain, and Digital Platforms Role

Artificial intelligence is useful in dispute resolution, as it helps organise information and identify pertinent issues in the shortest possible time. It will be able to help tribunals by examining documents, prioritising arguments, or pointing out factual connections. These abilities help minimise time loss and enable decision-makers to focus on the most important questions. Nevertheless, AI is not a replacement for human reasoning but a supportive technology. Conclusions remain controlled by tribunals, and are fair due to control. Another advantage of AI is that parties can more easily communicate with each other or clarify their procedural expectations. These additions make it more efficient while also maintaining the values that guide

traditional arbitration. Consequently, AI plays a significant, albeit well-monitored, role in intelligent mechanisms. Arbitration can be enabled on the blockchain because it provides tamper-resistant records and data structures. The submissions or procedural steps can be stored on distributed networks by the parties to ensure transparency and reliability. This helps reduce arguments over authenticity and enhances confidence in the process. Coded enforcement can also be enforced with the aid of blockchain, but such capabilities should be closely regulated by law. These factors are connected through digital platforms that provide centralised interfaces for conducting proceedings. They handle notifications, evidence, and scheduling using regular formats. Their form eliminates the administrative overhead and promotes the procedural discipline required in arbitration. All of these technologies enable intelligent mechanisms that deliver effective, reliable procedures that meet modern business requirements.

3.3. Comparative Analysis of Traditional Arbitration

Smart arbitration systems contrast with conventional arbitration in their use of digital, structured settings and automated elements. Conventional arbitration is heavily dependent on human agency, which varies depending on the institution's rules or the parties' consensus. Such variability is minimised by smart mechanisms that incorporate procedural steps into platforms. This promotes uniformity and hastens dispute resolution. Nevertheless, conventional arbitration is more flexible, as human participants can adapt the process to unforeseen events. Wise processes should strike a balance between discipline and discretion, avoiding hard-and-fast rules that fail to account for special situations. This analogy underscores the need to create digital systems with flexible capabilities. The other difference is in transparency and access to information. Traditional arbitration restricts disclosure to maintain confidentiality, but the method relies on manual communication, which can lead to discrepancies. Smart mechanisms archive records in secure digital formats, providing a clear audit trail and stable documentation. These tools enhance trust but can raise concerns about data protection. Also, intelligent systems may use automated tools to assist the initial evaluation, whereas conventional systems rely solely on human evaluation. The challenge will be to ensure that automation does not substitute for human judgment but enhances it. Both methods have similar objectives, but they are attained in different directions, conditioned by technological possibilities and process requirements.

4. Legal Framework of Smart Arbitration

4.1. Fundamental Principles and Legal Validity

The smart arbitration systems should be based on the principles of fairness, consent, and procedural integrity. These principles, applied to the design of digital systems, help preserve trust in automated or semi-automated processes. Consent is always necessary, since parties should realise how technology shapes their rights and obligations. There must be fairness in that transparent procedures are to be applied, in which parties are not at a disadvantage in presenting their position. Integrity requires that digital tools be reliable and maintain the accuracy of the information they produce. These principles resemble those in traditional arbitration, but they should be adjusted to account for technological factors. An authentic framework should thus be able to integrate existing legal concepts and contemporary online realities reasonably and harmoniously. Legal validity is based on the acknowledgment of the role of digital tools at the various stages of the procedure and in evidence practices. Smart systems can be used to automate notifications, sort evidence, or structure communication, but these processes should remain within the bounds of the law. Tribunals need to ensure that automated elements aid, not determine, final results. Confidence is also required that digital procedures meet expectations regarding due process and impartiality. These issues emphasize the need to introduce controls and human inspection into intelligent processes. The legal validity thus results from a mix of sound technology and considerate procedural design. These principles can be used to develop a framework that encourages acceptance and prevents confusion in cross-border enforcement.

4.2. Mechanism of Recognition and Enforcement

The issue of recognition and enforcement is a key issue for parties that employ smart arbitration mechanisms. The New York Convention provides a good basis, but its terms presuppose human judgment and traditional paperwork. Smart systems can generate rewarding systems backed by digital documentation or computer-based components, which do not follow conventional thinking. The courts should determine whether these features meet expectations regarding form, consent, and procedural fairness. In a bid to assist in recognition, intelligent mechanisms are expected to generate understandable and transparent records that the courts can comprehend the procedures that culminated in the result. The standardisation of documentation will enhance the enforceability of digitally supported awards and eliminate uncertainty during judicial review. Coded processes can also serve as enforcement mechanisms that take effect after an award becomes final. These characteristics may speed up compliance, but cannot substitute for the powers of the national courts. There should therefore be an acceptable framework to draw the line between legal enforceability and technological efficiency. The use of automation to execute judicial roles should not override the judicial role. In court, it is necessary to demonstrate that automated elements operate transparently and pose no risk to the parties. The mechanisms should also be smart enough to adapt to judicial directions. A balanced model integrates the security

of technological tools with the security of the enforcement practice in place. This strategy fosters confidence and encourages wider adoption across jurisdictions.

4.3. Interrelations with the Existing International Treaties

Smart arbitration systems will need to interact with existing international agreements governing the settlement of cross-border disputes. The New York Convention is the main tool, but other systems also impact recognition and procedural expectations. These include the UNCITRAL Model Law and regional instruments that inform national law. The effective integration will involve establishing areas of harmony between digital processes and the treaty principles, and identifying gaps where they occur. Many procedural values, including fairness and impartiality, are common to instruments. Intelligent systems can thus enhance compliance by incorporating digital capabilities that improve transparency and trustworthiness. The point of caution, however, should be taken where treaties take traditional procedural forms. It is also through recognising that digital processes should not interfere with existing jurisdictional or institutional frameworks. Arbitration frequently has its roles defined in treaties, including those of tribunals, courts, and parties. The smart systems should not ignore these roles but should provide greater efficiency. They are obliged to provide records that the courts can easily assess, and they may permit supervision where necessary. Harmonisation also benefits from the use of common standards for digital and procedural records. These standards can be used to achieve foreseeable outcomes and minimise uncertainty across jurisdictions. An international arbitration framework that aligns technological practices with treaty obligations will foster stability and encourage innovation.

4.4. Suggested Jurisdictional and Procedural Model

The effective jurisdictional model of smart arbitration should acknowledge the importance of appropriate relationships among parties, digital platforms, and laws. Even when proceedings are conducted through digital systems, parties must determine the seat of arbitration. This will guarantee that the supervisory courts maintain their position. The platforms should operate in a manner that does not undermine the authority of the selected jurisdiction. They are supposed to provide clear accounts and ensure they include information that requires court review. Well-defined jurisdictional regulations reinforce trust and prevent conflicts over the law to be applied. By doing so, this will uphold rather than disrupt the predictable framework of international arbitration through digital innovation. The procedural model must combine automated and purposeful human supervision. Digital tools can handle notifications, evidence organisation, and the structuring of timelines, while tribunals still make the final decisions. Automated components should be questioned by the parties if necessary. Data integrity must also be ensured through systems, as well as the security of cross-border communication. Transparent platform design helps parties understand how procedures will be conducted. The ability to change should be one of the values to keep up with the unforeseen changes. This is a moderated model in which efficient mechanisms can be achieved without undermining fairness. It fosters the belief and provides a plausible basis for the future growth of the international legal system.

4.5. Case Studies and Comparative Jurisdictions

4.5.1. Digital Dispute Resolution and Singapore

Singapore has established itself as a major hub for technology-driven dispute resolution. Its legislative system encourages innovation without undermining the existing principles of arbitration. Singaporean institutions have established digital processes that have facilitated case management and increased procedural transparency. These organisations rely on systems that help provide secure communication and organise evidence effectively. Singaporean courts also generally facilitate arbitration by taking a pro-enforcement stance. This legal and technological preparedness makes Singapore a favourable venue for parties seeking predictability and efficiency in resolving their disputes. The experience shows that digital tools can supplement established arbitration practices without undermining the fairness of the process. The overall policy climate in Singapore further supports digital dispute resolution. The government is very active in encouraging the use of technology in law and business. This has led to experimentation with platforms that incorporate digital tools into arbitration. Some of the efforts involve revising legislative frameworks to accommodate technology-driven disputes. The strategy used in Singapore also focuses on education and career development, with practitioners made aware of new technologies and their potential. Such initiatives create a favourable environment for innovation and have solid legal underpinnings. Singapore thus offers useful lessons on how jurisdictions can adopt digital approaches without compromising the trust and confidence in arbitration outcomes.

4.5.2. EU Model and Technological Integration

The European Union encourages digital innovation through regulatory frameworks that shape dispute-resolution practices. These frameworks focus on data protection, transparency, and accountability, which determine how digital tools are used in arbitration. EU projects promote the responsible use of such technologies as blockchain and artificial intelligence. Such tools

should operate within a transparent framework that safeguards individuals' rights and ensures the integrity of the procedure. The EU policy documents emphasise the need to ensure fairness in the automation process and to prevent loss of human control. This focus offers insight into the development of intelligent arbitration provisions that may meet the legal expectations in Europe. The EU's policy, therefore, takes a balanced stance on innovation and regulation. EU institutions and research organisations are considering using smart contracts and digital solutions to facilitate dispute resolution. Several reports identify technological opportunities to improve the reliability of documentaries and the efficiency of procedures. They also single out threats that arise when manual processes are replaced with digital tools without adequate controls. These lessons can be used to develop intelligent arbitration systems that remain reconcilable with EU legal values. The EU promotes collaboration between governments and businesses to establish trusted online spaces. This partnership strategy reinforces trust in new technologies and supports coherent adoption across member states. The EU model thus provides a systematic and principled basis for incorporating technology into arbitration.

4.5.3. Lessons Learned and Global Trends

A comparison shows that there is much to learn from jurisdictions seeking to adopt smart arbitration mechanisms. Singapore shows how useful technological potential and the implementation of favourable laws can be. Its history shows that innovation can succeed when institutions, courts, and policymakers are on the same page. The European Union emphasises the need for robust protection and open procedures. The fact that it focuses on data protection and management makes digital tools responsible. All these examples demonstrate that successful smart arbitration requires not only technological preparation but also clear regulation. Jurisdictions that incorporate these factors can develop efficient, reliable, and trusted dispute systems that are credible to international parties. International tendencies suggest an increase in the popularity of digital dispute resolution. Learning institutions across the globe investigate the tools that can simplify case management, enhance record-keeping, and aid decision-making. Policymakers understand that online trade needs swift, predictable dispute-resolution mechanisms. Nevertheless, they also realise that there must be balanced protection mechanisms that safeguard rights. The combination of innovation and responsibility influences developments across the world today. The question of how current arbitration systems can evolve without becoming disjointed is of interest to many jurisdictions. This trend worldwide indicates that intelligent mechanisms will become more widespread. The lessons from success stories can be used to develop strong, adaptable models that withstand changing business conditions.

4.6. Challenges and Ethical Considerations

4.6.1. Data Privacy and Cybersecurity

The smart arbitration systems are based on online systems that archive and transfer sensitive data. These systems should then have effective data protection measures. During the proceedings, parties demand that their documents, communications, and evidence be secure. Participants are exposed to risks, including data breaches and unauthorised access, due to weak protection. These violations undermine trust and can jeopardise the impartiality of the process. Cyberspace security policies should therefore ensure the privacy and integrity of information. Platforms must use trusted encryption and access controls and be monitored. These solutions address weaknesses and build trust in online dispute systems. Nevertheless, protective measures should be open to change, as the risks posed by technology change rapidly. Data privacy is also an issue, since smart arbitration systems handle large volumes of personal and business data. Privacy laws differ widely across jurisdictions, and online sites may operate in multiple locations. Such differences create confusion about compliance requirements. Parties might also be concerned about how platforms store their information or about improper distribution of that information. There should be clear policies to address the use, storage, and protection of data. Transparency helps parties understand their roles and responsibilities in the digital space. Good data governance then becomes the main focus for creating equity and avoiding arguments over platform practices. Cybersecurity and privacy must collaborate to uphold trust in technology-enabled arbitration.

4.6.2. Accountability and Transparency Problems

The issue of accountability is even more complicated when digital tools affect procedures or decision-making. The parties must know which parties remain in charge of every aspect of the process. There should never be automated features that affect the tribunal's role and limit parties' opportunities to challenge procedural steps. Clear supervision will ensure that technology supports other vital human functions rather than substituting for them. Accountability is also enhanced by transparency. Parties should understand how systems work, what data is processed, and how procedural decisions are made. These are some factors that make the process legitimate. In the absence of transparency, parties might question the fairness of results and make more frequent challenges against awards. The structures of smart arbitration mechanisms must thus embrace ways to capture the effects of automated elements. Platforms are expected to generate transparent reports on the influence of digital tools on communications, deadlines, or evidence. These documents facilitate judicial review, in which the courts assess procedural fairness. They also assist parties in learning the rationale of procedural decisions. Tribunals should be given the power to modify

automated processes where necessary. This type of flexibility ensures that each special situation receives the attention it deserves. Accountability also involves identifying the responsibilities of platform providers, arbitrators, and parties. The credible model shares these responsibilities and does not result in a grey area. This is a systematic practice that fosters trust and harmonises smart processes with established arbitration principles.

4.6.3. Algorithmic Bias and Due Process Risk

Algorithms can be subtly biased and affect information processing or presentation. Such biases occur when the data that is used to train systems is unbalanced. Unchecked, such biases can be detrimental to the parties or distort the process's results. The tribunals should thus examine digital tools with caution and ensure that automated suggestions do not unfairly affect their decisions. Openness about algorithmic operations helps the parties assess potential risks. Mechanisms must also be smart enough to allow review of automated outputs to protect fairness. Due process implies that parties must be aware of the implications of technology in their case. Good oversight means that no one will suffer due to unknown or uninvestigated computational procedures. Due process also requires substantive involvement, even in a digital setting. The platforms should enable parties to present arguments, provide evidence, and interact with automated tools with ease. These rights are facilitated through clear communication channels and flexible procedures that allow for addressing any unexpected developments. Tribunals have to step in when the automated processes cause confusion or uncertainty. These duties support the human role in smart arbitration. Technology can make things more efficient, but it cannot substitute judgment needed to ensure fairness. Reducing bias and maintaining participation can make digital dispute systems legitimate. These security measures guard against the trust in the results produced in high-technology settings.

4.7. Policy Recommendations

4.7.1. Some Reforms to the New York Convention

The New York Convention should be reformed to clarify whether digital and automated processes can be incorporated into its current principles. The Convention's wording assumes conventional arbitration, which can be confusing when applied to technologically advanced mechanisms. Digitally generated records and safe electronic formats could be acknowledged by a reform agenda to meet the documentary requirements. It can also explain the interplay between automated processes and the due process requirement. Through such reforms, courts would have guidance, and parties would be more confident when utilising digital systems. Transparency enhances consistency and facilitates consistent interpretation across various jurisdictions worldwide.

The other area of reform is the acknowledgment of the use of digital platforms to facilitate arbitration. The Convention may contain recommendations on the way records created on platforms are to be assessed by courts. This would ensure that digital processes are not discarded simply because they are not like traditional forms. Reforms can also establish minimum safeguards for technology-enabled processes. These may comprise the transparency requirements, data security pledges, and the possibility of allowing parties to appeal automated procedures. Obvious protection would assist the courts in determining whether the proceedings were fairly processed. These suggestions aim to make the Convention more predictable without undermining its structural basis. They offer guidance on integrating digital innovations into existing enforcement systems.

4.7.2. Future-Proofing Arbitration Contracts

Arbitration agreements between parties should be drafted to anticipate technological changes and favorable procedural developments. The use of digital platforms can be defined, roles for ensuring safe communication can be specified, and control over automated tools can be specified. Those provisions help prevent conflicts over procedural expectations and enhance enforcement options. Language is also clear, which helps tribunals understand the parties' intentions. Agreements can be updated as technology evolves by including flexible terms. Such flexibility minimises the risk of obsolete clauses that cannot accommodate new digital practices. A progressive strategy is essential to ensure that contracts remain up to date and efficient in the fast-evolving business world.

Contracts must also include measures that maintain a sense of fairness and transparency. It may be that parties need automated components disclosed, or demand the right to challenge digital processes. They can also reach an agreement on data protection and cybersecurity standards. These undertakings ensure trust and minimise uncertainty in proceedings. Selecting an institution that approves digital approaches and understands their implications is also part of future-proofing. Organisations with high technological potential provide consistent conditions for smart arbitration. Parties who consider these factors can establish agreements that facilitate efficient, safe, and predictable dispute resolution. This kind of agreement sets out the parties' expectations for the future and does not violate the principles of arbitration.

4.7.3. Roadmap for Implementation

A legal framework for smart arbitration requires concerted effort by institutions, legislators, and practitioners to implement. Organisations need to devise explicit policies that balance the use of digital tools without compromising basic procedural barriers. These regulations should uphold openness, equal involvement, and quality records. Governments can reinforce the process by examining laws that may impede the implementation of digital procedures. Laws can also be updated to clarify the status of digital records and to assist in award recognition through technological means. This type of cooperation promotes innovation without an unstable legal environment. A clear roadmap would help jurisdictions implement smart mechanisms responsibly and predictably. Implementation is also centred on education and professional training. Practitioners should be aware of the functionality of the digital tools and their influence on the procedural decisions. Institutions can facilitate this by providing guidance materials, practice notes, and frequent training. Cooperation with technology suppliers also increases the system's reliability and helps define roles. Monitoring and evaluation help identify issues and drive long-term improvement. These initiatives give smart arbitration mechanisms the ability to remain responsive and effective as technology evolves. The international arbitration community should adopt a balanced approach to innovation through a properly crafted roadmap that fosters trust, promotes consistency in practice, and encourages regular practice.

5. Conclusion

This paper discussed how smart arbitration mechanisms relate to the New York Convention. It demonstrated that the Convention remains a robust basis for cross-border enforcement, but some of its assumptions strain when applied to digital processes. Automated, platform-based capabilities enable the efficiency, transparency, and reliability of smart mechanisms. Nonetheless, they also raise the issues of data protection, procedural fairness, and judicial review. Comparative lessons from Singapore and the European Union can show how the balance between innovation safeguards can be achieved. The examples indicate that successful adoption requires adjustments to clear principles, robust institutional support, and careful regulation. The findings, when put together, demonstrate the potential and difficulties of adopting technology in arbitration. The paper has also identified several key loopholes in the Convention's procedural expectations. These are documentary requirements influenced by customary practices, minimal awareness of automated actions, and worries about coded aspects. Smart arbitration systems refute these assumptions by re-arranging the process through which parties share information and obtain results. This discussion has outlined the need to supplement this framework with one that promotes transparency, accountability, and adaptability. A balanced model enables technology to add more value to arbitration without disrupting fairness. The results establish that the reform efforts should be aimed at clarity and predictability.

They also demonstrate that collaboration among institutions, legislators, and practitioners leads to long-term success. The use of smart arbitration mechanisms is a major advancement in international dispute resolution. They reflect broader trends in international business and the growing power of digital systems. The evolution they are currently undergoing demands legal frameworks that enable them to be innovative while maintaining the necessary protection. The paper proposed principles for aligning technological capabilities with the arbitration values. These values emphasise the need for fairness, transparency, and human control. They also stress the importance of high standards of documentation and the definition of jurisdictional rules. As technology advances, legal regulations should be adaptable and responsive to emerging issues. Future studies should examine the potential applications of advanced technologies in arbitration processes. Research can examine the relationship between tribunals and artificial intelligence, or the impact of automated capabilities on evidentiary determinations. Additional research is also required to analyse the cross-border data governance and its effects on digital dispute systems. Scholars had the opportunity to evaluate the efficiency of institutional regulations aimed at smart mechanisms and to analyse the interpretation of awards supported by technological means by national courts. These initiatives will enhance the knowledge and facilitate the responsible development of online dispute resolution. Further research and collaboration will help ensure that arbitral practices evolve to meet the needs of global business and safeguard the integrity of the procedures.

Acknowledgment: The author sincerely acknowledges Xavier Law School, XIM University, for providing the academic support, facilities, and resources that contributed to the successful completion of this research.

Data Availability Statement: The data associated with this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request, subject to applicable privacy and ethical considerations.

Funding Statement: This research was conducted without the support of any external funding or financial assistance.

Conflicts of Interest Statement: The author confirms that there are no conflicts of interest in relation to this study.

Ethics and Consent Statement: The study was performed in compliance with ethical standards and received approval from the appropriate institutional review board.

References

1. G. Born, "International Commercial Arbitration," 3rd ed., *Kluwer Law International*, Alphen aan den Rijn, Netherlands, 2020.
2. H. Kronke, D. Otto, P. Nacimiento, and N. C. Port, eds., "Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards: A Global Commentary on the New York Convention," 2nd ed., *Kluwer Law International*, Alphen aan den Rijn, Netherlands, 2024.
3. R. Wolff, "New York Convention: Article-by-Article Commentary," 2nd ed., *Bloomsbury Publishing*, London, United Kingdom, 2019.
4. P. Ortolani, "Smart Contracts, ODR and the New Landscape of the Dispute Resolution Market," In: Cappiello, B., Carullo, G. (eds) *Blockchain, Law and Governance*, Springer, Cham, Switzerland, 2021.
5. N. Goh, J. Lim, and P. Tan "Singapore International Arbitration Act: A Commentary," *Oxford University Press*, Oxford, United Kingdom, 2023.
6. M. Chevalier, "From Smart Contract Litigation to Blockchain Arbitration, a New Decentralized Approach Leading Towards the Blockchain Arbitral Order," *Journal of International Dispute Settlement*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 558–584, 2021.
7. Y. Zhao and H. Chen, "Enhancing access to digital justice: digital governance of dispute resolution and dispute prevention in online commercial activities," *Journal of International Dispute Settlement*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 273–304, 2024.
8. G. Arnone, "Smart Contracts for Online Dispute Resolution: Legal Implications and Practical Applications under EU Regulations," *European Journal of Privacy Law & Technologies*, vol. 2, no. 9, pp. 1–16, 2025.
9. T. Takashima, "Developing Legal Frameworks for Dispute Resolution in the Digital Age," *Radboud University Press*, Nijmegen, Netherlands, 2024.
10. Y. Agarwal, "Blockchain and Online Dispute Resolution: Reshaping Access to Justice," *Live Law*, 2021. [Accessed by 06/05/2025].
11. J. H. Xue and R. Holz, "Applying smart contracts in online dispute resolutions on a large scale and its regulatory implications," in *Blockchain and Web 3.0*, Routledge, Milton Park, Oxfordshire, United Kingdom, 2019.
12. European Law Institute, "ELI Principles on Blockchain Technology, Smart Contracts and Consumer Protection," *European Law Institute*, 2022. [Accessed by 06/05/2025].
13. EU Blockchain Observatory and Forum, "Smart Contracts," *European Commission Report*, 2022. [Accessed by 12/05/2025].
14. EU Justice and fundamental rights, "Digitalisation of justice," *European Commission Report*, 2023. [Accessed by 12/05/2025].
15. EU High-Level Expert Group on Artificial Intelligence, "Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI," *Shaping Europe's digital future*, 2019.
16. Clifford Chance, "Arbitration of cryptoasset and smart contract disputes: arbitration unchained?" *Clifford Chance*, 2023. [Accessed by 17/05/2025].
17. JAMS, "JAMS Smart Contract Clause and Rules," *JAMS*, 2023. [Accessed by 17/05/2025].
18. OECD, "Artificial intelligence," *OECD*, 2024. [Accessed by 17/05/2025].
19. Singapore International Dispute Resolution Academy (SIDRA), "Review of the Singapore International Arbitration Act," *SIDRA*, 2024. [Accessed by 20/05/2024].
20. Singapore Ministry of Law, "MinLaw Seeks Feedback on Singapore's International Arbitration Regime and the International Arbitration Act 1994," *Singapore Ministry of Law*, 2025. [Accessed by 20/04/2026].
21. UNCITRAL, "UNCITRAL's Dispute Resolution in the Digital Economy Initiative," *UNCITRAL*, 2024. [Accessed by 20/05/2025].
22. European Union, "Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation)," *EUR-Lex*, 2016. [Accessed by 23/05/2025].
23. A. J. van den Berg, "New York Convention of 1958: Refusals of Enforcement," *ICC International Court of Arbitration Bulletin*, vol. 18, no. 2 pp. 1–35, 2007.
24. A. J. van den Berg, "The New York Arbitration Convention of 1958: towards a uniform judicial interpretation," *Kluwer Law and Taxation*, Alphen aan den Rijn, Netherlands, 1981.

Publisher's Note: The publisher remains impartial concerning jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations. Responsibility for the content rests entirely with the authors and does not necessarily reflect the publisher's perspectives.