

Editorial 92:1

As we begin a new volume, we are pleased to announce the implementation of our new policy on artificial intelligence (AI). As you will see on the journal website, *Arbitration* seeks to protect and promote the integrity of the scholarship it publishes by outlining both permissible and impermissible uses of AI by authors. Not only do we now require authors to make disclosures to the editorial team about the use of AI to research and draft submissions, we also provide a starred footnote to advise readers of the nature and extent to which AI has been used on a particular piece. In so doing, *Arbitration* hopes to increase reader confidence in the quality of research featured in these pages while also encouraging other publications in our field to adopt AI policies of their own. While AI can be a useful tool when used properly, we as a profession must protect against practices that would diminish the quality of practical and academic research in the law.

Volume 92 also marks the initiation of a new substantive initiative. Cognizant of our readers' need to keep abreast of recent developments around the world, *Arbitration* has decided to publish annual updates of events in different regions of the world in each issue. We hope that this new project will provide both a deep and broad understanding of global developments in our field.

Turning to the current issue, our first article is based on a research project recently undertaken by the Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne Université concerning the possibility of a European Union (EU) law on international commercial arbitration. One of the research team members, Nima Nashrollahi Shahri, has provided an analysis highlighting the key findings from the study.

The next article, by Gabriel Melchiorre, provides an interesting countervailing perspective to the findings reported by Shahri. Melchiorre considers whether and to what extent it is possible to harmonize the enforcement foreign arbitral awards in the EU and offers a tangible proposal on how to achieve those ends.

Whereas the first two articles in this issue provide forward-looking analyses, the third piece, by Markos Kostantinidis, creates a cohesive conceptual framework of existing EU jurisprudence. In his article, Kostantinidis proposes an intriguing taxonomy of arbitration cases that have been brought before the Court of Justice of the EU (CJEU).

The issue then shifts from an exclusively EU focus to a comparative one. In her article, Alexandra Goetz-Charlier compares the EU approach to data

¹Editorial 92:1'. *Arbitration: The Int'l J. of Arb., Med. & Dispute Mgmt* 92, no. 1 (2026): 1–2.

protection disputes to the United Nations' approach. In so doing, she provides both organizations with useful suggestions for improvement.

The discussion then moves to Africa, with an article by Abdulhafeez Apena. In his piece, Apena considers interstate water disputes involving the River Nile, providing deep and timely insights into a timeless problem.

Next, Tala Zein and Sarah Zein analyse issues relating to estoppel in international arbitration. Their discussion provides a useful and in-depth comparison of civil law and common law approaches.

The final article in this issue is our first regional update. The piece, which was written by Ben Hayward, focuses on recent developments in the Asia-Pacific region. Hayward provides an outstanding overview of recent, pending and proposed legislation, arbitral rules and judicial decisions, offering scholars and practitioners with useful insights into this part of the world.

The issue includes two case notes. The first, by Aayushi Singh and Mohak Rana, considers the groundbreaking decision by the CJEU in *RFC Seraing v. Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA)*. The second, by Dawid Maruszyk and Claudia Wortmann, addresses issues raised by the Supreme Court of Bavaria in its decision of 1 October 2024 relating to the production of evidence in arbitration.

We close the issue with the CIArb Australia Annual Lecture, given by Doug Jones. In his remarks, Jones focuses on diversity of experience in arbitration, an enduring subject of interest and importance.

We hope that these articles and initiatives prove useful in your practical and academic work.

S.I. Strong,

Editor,

Email: stacie.strong@emory.edu.