

INDEX OF ISSUE 1

- Arbitrations
 - agreement, defined, 14.3–14.4
 - replacement
 - available programmes, 14.4–14.5
 - parties' choice, 14.2–14.4
 - technology, 14.1–14.2
 - two-tier
 - appellate arbitrations (institutional or ad hoc), 14.59–14.60
 - appellate arbitrations overview, 14.57–14.59
 - appellate body's authority, 14.60–14.62
 - grounds of appeal, 14.60
- Arbitrators. *See also* Artificial intelligence (AI)
 - combining with human, 14.5–14.6
 - replacement issues
 - due process, 14.10–14.11
 - legitimacy in reasoning, 14.12–14.13
 - limitations of AI, 14.8–14.9
 - risk of bias, 14.9–14.10
 - trust in human arbitrator, 14.11–14.12
 - supporting artificial intelligence (AI)
 - analytical processing, 14.7–14.8
 - checking arbitrators, 14.8
 - data processing, 14.6–14.7
- Artificial intelligence (AI)
 - arbitration replacement
 - available programmes, 14.4–14.5
 - parties' choice, 14.2–14.4
 - technology, 14.1–14.2
 - arbitrators, replacement issues
 - due process, 14.10–14.11
 - legitimacy in reasoning, 14.12–14.13
 - limitations of AI, 14.8–14.9
 - risk of bias, 14.9–14.10
 - trust in human arbitrator, 14.11–14.12
 - combining with human arbitrators, 14.5–14.6
 - supporting arbitrators with analytical processing, 14.7–14.8
 - checking arbitrators, 14.8
 - data processing, 14.6–14.7
- Bilateral investment treaties (BITs)
 - 'Laos' and 'China.', 14.16
 - Notes Verbales*, 14.17
 - Singapore court, 14.16–14.17
- Critical date rule and notes verbales
 - application of, 14.22–14.23
 - Article 29 VCLT, 14.24–14.25
 - Article 31 VCLT, 14.23
 - CA's consideration, 14.21–14.22
 - to post-critical date evidence of State parties, 14.23
 - 'subsequent agreement,' 14.24
- Indian jurisprudence on appellate arbitration, 14.62–14.64
 - Amin Merchant v. Bipin M. Gandhi*, 14.63
 - Fazalally Jivaji Raja v. Khimji Poonji & Co.*, 14.62–14.63
 - Heeralal Agarwalla & Co. v. Joakim Nahapiet & Co. Ltd.*, 14.62
 - M. A. & Sons v. Madras Oil and Seeds Exchange Ltd. and Anr.*, 14.63
 - M/s Steel Authority of India v. Engineers Project India Ltd.*, 14.63–14.64
- International arbitration ethics, Singapore
 - on ethical standards in arbitration
 - clamour by international community for consensus, 14.40–14.43
 - on ethical standards in arbitration, 14.38–14.40
 - final analysis, 14.52–14.54
 - as global financial and business, 14.38
- Singapore credo and ethics
 - being ethical agnostics, 14.44–14.45
 - disclosure of third-party funding, 14.48–14.50
 - ethically disingenuous, 14.51
 - inflow of arbitration, 14.45–14.47
 - witness coaching, 14.47–14.48
 - steps in right direction, 14.51–14.52

- International intellectual property (IP) disputes
- advantages of, 14.115–14.116
 - applicable law, 14.110–14.111
 - arbitrability
 - freely disposable, 14.97–14.99
 - potential public policy arguments against arbitrability, 14.100–14.103
 - public policy and arbitrability of, 14.99–14.100
 - rebutting public policy arguments against IP arbitrability, 14.103–14.110
 - benefits and limitations of arbitration in arbitration is not panacea, 14.95–14.97
 - international arbitration as alternative, 14.91–14.95
 - importance of, 14.89–14.90
 - party autonomy
 - applicable law of arbitration clause and choice of law clause, 14.112–14.113
 - express agreement, 14.111
 - limitations to party autonomy: mandatory rules, 14.113–14.115
- Legal practitioners, 14.40–14.41
- Notes verbales*, state parties in BITS bearing risk of ambiguous BIT, 14.34–14.36
- CA's judgment, 14.17
- evidentiary weight and joint declaration, 14.31–14.34
- facts and, 14.18–14.21
- 'Laos' and 'China', 14.16
- preliminary comments on critical date rule and usage, 14.21–14.25
- provenance of critical date rule, 14.25–14.30
- Singapore Court of Appeal, 14.15–14.16
- Party autonomy
- international public policy, 14.115
 - of law governing relationship, 14.114
 - of other jurisdictions, 14.114–14.115
 - of seat of arbitration, 14.114
- Public policy arguments rebutting, IP arbitrability
- insufficiency of, 14.103–14.104
 - monopolies and policy interest rationales, 14.106–14.108
 - overlap between arbitral tribunals and public bodies, 14.108–14.110
 - state involvement and sovereign Acts arguments, 14.104–14.106
- Scope of arbitrability of disputes
- 'arbitrability of disputes,' defined, 14.72–14.73
 - international arbitral standards, 14.87–14.88
 - mandate to decide objection, 14.74–14.77
 - as a mode of dispute resolution, 14.71–14.72
 - nature of claim (legal rights and remedies) test, 14.84–14.86
 - remedies or relief sought test, 14.83–14.84
 - 'scope of arbitrability' description, 14.73–14.74
 - tests of arbitrability
 - adjudication of disputes test, 14.81–14.83
 - 'nature of legal right's' test, 14.77–14.81
- Singapore credo and ethics
- being ethical agnostics, 14.44–14.45
 - disclosure of third-party funding, 14.48–14.50
 - ethically disingenuous, 14.51
 - inflow of arbitration, 14.45–14.47
 - witness coaching, 14.47–14.48
- Supreme court in *centrotrade* 2016
- contrary views to, 14.67–14.69
 - in dispute resolution package, 14.70
 - dissecting appeal clause in
 - binding nature of first award *versus* second award, 14.65–14.66
 - different arbitral seat in appellate stage, 14.64
 - grounds of appeal and appellate body's scope of authority, 14.66
 - not violative of public policy of India, 14.65
 - and factual matrix, 14.55–14.57
- Indian jurisprudence on appellate arbitration, 14.62–14.64
- two-tier arbitrations
- appellate arbitrations (institutional or *ad hoc*), 14.59–14.60
 - appellate arbitrations overview, 14.57–14.59
 - appellate body's authority, 14.60–14.62
 - grounds of appeal, 14.60
- UNCITRAL Model Law, 14.3–14.4. *See also* Arbitrators
- Arbitration rules, 14.18
- section 8, 14.75–14.76