Law Research Journal (LRJ)
Volume 3 Issue 2, 2025
ISSN(P): 3006-3027, ISSN(E): 3006-3035
Homepage: https://lawresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal

The Effectiveness of German vs. EU Arbitration Law in Resolving Cross-Border Disputes

Mirza Muhammad Ans Ali
School of Law and Policy, University of Management and Technology, Lahore, Pakistan

How to Cite this Article:
Ali, M. M. A. (2025). The Effectiveness of German vs. EU Arbitration Law in Resolving Cross-Border Disputes. *Law Research Journal*, *3*(2), 140–156.

Abstract
The present paper is a critical discussion on the effectiveness of German law of arbitration and European Union (EU) framework of arbitration in settling cross-border commercial and investment disputes. Although arbitration is a well-known alternative to litigation, which is considered efficient, the regulative environment that surrounds this process influences greatly its predictability and enforceability as well as the procedural fairness. The paper assesses the German as a judicial system, which is based on the Zivilprozessordnung (ZPO) and the UNCITRAL Model Law, its transparency, efficiency, and the minimum judicial interference offering a safe international arbitration ground in general. On the other hand, a fragmented legal terrain in the EU, including the legislation of member states, the Brussels I Regulation, and other strong-willed European Court of Justice judgments (Achmea and Komstroy) that have provided certain ambiguity in the procedure of intra-EU arbitral awards enforcement has been analyzed in the paper. With the help of comparative analysis, case studies, and practical considerations, this paper will show that the German arbitration law is better in providing legal certainty and predictability of enforcement of law compared to EU arbitration, which experiences the obstacle of complex regulations as well as lack of judicial enforcement. The paper draws a conclusion that there is need to advise businesses and legal practitioners to use German arbitration frameworks in resolving cross-border disputes because this ensures efficiency and legal risks are reduced.

Keywords
International Commercial Arbitration, German Arbitration Law, EU Arbitration Law, Zivilprozessordnung (ZPO), UNCITRAL Model Law, New York Convention, European Court of Justice (ECJ), Achmea Decision, Cross-Border Dispute Resolution, Enforcement of Arbitral Awards, Party Autonomy, Judicial Intervention, Intra-EU Investment Arbitration

Corresponding Authors: mirzaans786@gmail.com

1. Introduction

1.1 Background & Importance of Arbitration in Cross-Border Disputes

The dispute resolution process referred to as arbitration delivers legally enforced decisions through private hearings beyond typical court establishments.[1] The legal world accepts arbitration as a superior method when compared to litigation, especially when dealing with international disputes. The procedural rules and arbitrators' choice come from parties in arbitration since this dispute resolution process operates outside court systems, unlike traditional litigation.[2] This mechanism serves as the main dispute resolution only for international business contracts and investment treaties together with commercial transactions.

Consolidation of cross-border disputes proves to be challenging because it creates difficulties stemming from laws, conflicts, and jurisdictional complications along with the necessity to pursue prolonged court cases

[1] Margaret M Gallagher, Annalese H Reese, and Paul K Reese, "Alternative Dispute Resolution," *Routledge EBooks*, September 3, 2019, 897–918, https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429283642-38.

[2] Oksana Melenko, "Mediation as an Alternative Form of Dispute Resolution: Comparative-Legal Analysis," *European Journal of Law and Public Administration* 7, no. 2 (2020): 46–63, https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=956631.

across international boundaries. These difficulties fade away when businesses utilize arbitration because it offers a specialized international dispute resolution system. Its enforceability is a fundamental benefit because the New York Convention of 1958 provides recognition and enforcement in more than 170 countries. Businesses, along with investors, benefit from arbitration over traditional court litigation since it leads to reduced costs throughout the proceedings and minimized timeline requirements when operating between multiple legal jurisdictions. Arbitration provides international business relationships with an organized solution method that simultaneously adapts to their needs, thereby enabling swift settlement of disputes in today's global economy.

The examination of different legal systems that manage arbitration requires analysis within this general framework of arbitration regulation. The analysis in this paper examines how German arbitration law performs against European Union (EU) arbitration law for settling disputes that span international borders. The arbitration systems operating under German law and EU law have different foundations along with different rules regarding judicial authority and dispute enforcement methods. The analysis will determine which system delivers a superior combination of legal clarity alongside efficiency and enforceability ability, thus helping businesses and investors and legal practitioners select the most effective arbitration framework.

1.2 Purpose of the Comparison

The research focuses on analyzing divergences between German arbitration legislation and EU arbitration laws through an evaluation of their fundamental guidelines as well as their efficiency systems and dispute resolution enforcement methods. The two dispute resolution systems aim at delivering fair outcomes but each operates under specific institutional laws and frameworks. German arbitration law derives its main framework from the German Code of Civil Procedure (Zivilprozessordnung, ZPO) alongside the UNCITRAL Model Law that shapes its national structure.[3] EU arbitration law develops through European legal principles, which include the Brussels I Regulation and the case law of the European Court of Justice, and creates specific effects on arbitrations occurring inside member states.[4] This paper investigates how the different frameworks facilitate arbitration activities along with their efficiency in handling the complications that arise from international legal disputes.

The evaluation of arbitration performance depends chiefly on the level of procedural fairness as well as arbitration speed and the enforceability of arbitral decisions. This investigation will take into account the procedures in place to know which one of them has a rapid and predictable arbitration process without involving the court much. Practical implications arise from this comparison because businesses and international legal practitioners and investors utilize arbitration for dispute resolution apart from unnecessary delays and legal uncertainty. Business stakeholders should base arbitration agreement writing decisions on understanding the advantages and drawbacks within German and EU arbitration legislation.[5] This study aims

---

[3] Gary Born, "The 1933 Directives on Arbitration of the German Reich: Echoes of the Past?," *Journal of International Arbitration* 38, no. 4 (July 2021), https://kluwerlawonline.com/journalarticle/Journal+of+International+Arbitration/38.4/JOIA2021022.

[4] Jack Brett, "EU Law and Procedural Autonomy in International Commercial Arbitration," *European Review of Private Law* 29, no. 4 (September 2021), https://kluwerlawonline.com/journalarticle/European+Review+of+Private+Law/29.3/ERPL2021031.

[5] Jack Brett, "EU Law and Procedural Autonomy in International Commercial Arbitration."

to enhance the general comprehension of the most effective methods for using arbitration laws to support international commerce and investment.

1.3 Research Questions

The following document evaluates essential research inquiries that will assist in evaluating the differences between German and EU arbitration practices regarding border dispute resolution. The research will analyze the legal foundations together with compliance requirements of German arbitration law as governed by the German Code of Civil Procedure (ZPO) along with UNCITRAL Model Law and how it diverges from the EU arbitration structure that includes rules from the Brussels I Regulation and European Court of Justice (ECJ) decisions. The assessment of systemic stability and predictability for arbitration depends greatly on a proper understanding of applicable differences between systems.

The crucial matter to address involves judicial involvement along with their role during arbitration proceedings. National courts must remain engaged in specific arbitration-related matters to support the process through enforcement of agreements and arbitrator selection and award recognition and setting procedures. This work examines the difference in German court arbitration relationships versus EU institutional effects on member-state arbitration laws. Judicial intervention levels during dispute resolution have significant consequences for speed and produce various effects on neutrality as well as the achievement of desired results.

Another essential point of consideration focuses on the ways enforcement processes and operational effectiveness are managed to deliver predictable outcomes for arbitral awards between these two systems. Businesses tend to pick arbitration instead of litigation due to how enforceable its decisions prove to be. German arbitration law provides full New York Convention conformity for domestic and cross-border enforcement, while EU arbitration law faces enforcement challenges due to state-by-state differences. This paper analyzes procedural efficiency and enforcement measures to show which dispute resolution method gives disputing parties more legal certainty.

This study evaluates practical advantages for businesses doing international business operations through an analysis of the different approaches. Companies using arbitration as their international dispute resolution method should choose their jurisdiction along with their legal framework carefully because this selection will define how disputes end. This paper examines German and EU arbitration law to offer essential knowledge to businesses and legal practitioners who need optimal dispute resolution practices.

2. Overview of Arbitration Law

2.1 Definition and Role of Arbitration

Parties who opt for arbitration establish a private method to settle their disagreements outside of formal legal courts using binding legal procedures.[6] The combination of discretion and confidentiality together with neutral handling suits arbitration especially well for international commercial conflicts. Through arbitration, parties dictate who selects arbitrators, which procedure rules to follow, and what law will apply to the arbitration proceedings. The New York Convention of 1958, together with other international conventions,

[6] Margaret M Gallagher, Annalese H Reese, and Paul K Reese, “Alternative Dispute Resolution.”

enables arbitration to deliver enforceable decisions, which makes it suitable for cross-border transactions because it reduces jurisdictional conflicts.[7]

2.2 Key Principles of International Arbitration

International arbitration follows fundamental principles to resolve conflicts quickly and fairly. Disputing parties enjoy the core principle of party autonomy, through which they may make their own decisions regarding arbitrators while also choosing procedural rules.[8] Arbitration maintains its independence by adopting a neutral position that prevents bias through national court interference. The finality principle in arbitration is essential because arbitral decisions become binding and accept restricted judicial examination. The major benefit of arbitration lies in its ability to obtain enforcement of awards through the New York Convention in more than 170 countries worldwide. The set of principles working as a whole establishes arbitration as a trusted method for settling international disputes effectively.[9]

2.3 Significance of Arbitration in the EU and Germany

Within the European Union, together with Germany, arbitration operates as the preferred alternative dispute resolution mechanism when dealing with international disputes. EU arbitration exists through a mix of domestic arbitration statutes together with Brussels I Regulation and ECJ-influenced standards.[10] The EU endorses arbitration-friendly policies, although legal ambiguities prevail when arbitration meets EU law applications.[11] Germany operates among Europe's top arbitration locations while following arbitration procedures defined in the German Code of Civil Procedure (ZPO) that contain provisions from the UNCITRAL Model Law.[12] Through its institutional support provided by the German Arbitration Institute (DIS), Germany enhances its position as a favorable jurisdiction for arbitration matters.[13] Germany has

---

[7] Sidney Moreland, "Online Arbitration in Theory and in Practice: A Comparative Study of Cross-Border Commercial Transactions in Common Law and Civil Law Countries, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle upon Tyne, 2019," *International Journal of Online Dispute Resolution* 7, no. 2 (December 2020): 195–96, https://doi.org/10.5553/ijodr/235250022020007002005.

[8] Gary Born, "THE HAGUE CONVENTION on CHOICE of COURT AGREEMENTS: A CRITICAL ASSESSMENT," *Jstor.org*, 2021, https://doi.org/10.2307/45473477.

[9] Sidney Moreland, "Online Arbitration in Theory and in Practice: A Comparative Study of Cross-Border Commercial Transactions in Common Law and Civil Law Countries, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle upon Tyne, 2019."

[10] Alavi Hamed and Khamichonak Tatsiana, "A Step Forward in the Harmonization of European Jurisdiction: Regulation Brussels I Recast," *Baltic Journal of Law & Politics* 8, no. 2 (December 1, 2015): 159–81, https://doi.org/10.1515/bjlp-2015-0023.

[11] Alavi Hamed and Khamichonak Tatsiana, "A Step Forward in the Harmonization of European Jurisdiction: Regulation Brussels I Recast."

[12] Stefan Kröll and Miquel Mirambell Fargas, "Procedural Issues in International Commercial Arbitration," *Edward Elgar Publishing EBooks*, June 12, 2024, 191–214, https://doi.org/10.4337/9781788970792.00021.

[13] Jürgen Basedow, "EU Law in International Arbitration: Referrals to the European Court of Justice," *Journal of International Arbitration* 32, no. 4 (August 2015), https://kluwerlawonline.com/journalarticle/Journal+of+International+Arbitration/32.4/JOIA2015017.

obtained a prestigious position in international arbitration due to its stance against judicial meddling and robust enforcement powers, thus attracting investors in both commercial and investment agreements.[14]

3. German Arbitration Law

3.1 Legal Framework (ZPO & UNCITRAL Model Law)

The arbitration laws in Germany are established through the Tenth Book of the German Code of Civil Procedure (Zivilprozessordnung, ZPO), which provides complete legislative guidelines for arbitration procedures within the country.[15] German arbitration laws mirror the UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration; thus, they maintain widespread international standards of arbitration. The ZPO controls important elements, including arbitration agreement validity, arbitrator selection, arbitration procedures, and enforcement of arbitral decisions.[16] The New York Convention of 1958 permits Germany to execute foreign arbitral awards across more than 170 countries since Germany signed the convention. Through its robust legal structure, Germany maintains its position as a dependable venue for arbitration, which receives positive assessments from international business institutions.[17]

3.2 Institutional Arbitration (DIS – German Arbitration Institute)

The German Arbitration Institute (Deutsche Institution für Schiedsgerichtsbarkeit, DIS) stands as the main arbitral institution while operating under Germany's contemporary network of institutional arbitration. Through the DIS framework, businesses gain a structured administrative structure that implements procedural guidelines for arbitration to achieve efficient and fair dispute resolution procedures.[18] The DIS Arbitration Rules deliver a flexible arbitration system that maintains a smooth process and reduces court involvement in order to achieve efficient dispute resolution. Business contracts that include German parties frequently add DIS arbitration provisions because the institution maintains a solid reputation regarding neutrality judgment as well as procedural efficiency.[19]

3.3 Key Features

- The principle of party autonomy gains strong support in German arbitration laws because disputing parties maintain the freedom to set key conditions regarding arbitrator selection as well as procedural rules along with arbitration seat choices.[20] German arbitration stands out to international businesses because its flexible nature allows full customization of dispute resolution methods.
- Arbitration awards enforced within German territory receive strong support both from national domestic awards and international arbitration decisions. The ZPO enables arbitral awards made in Germany to receive legal binding force while foreign awards gain enforceability qualities under the New York

---

[14] Jürgen Basedow, "EU Law in International Arbitration: Referrals to the European Court of Justice."

[15] Jürgen Basedow.

[16] Miquel Mirambell Fargas, "Optimizing the Enforcement of International Arbitration Agreements," *Routledge EBooks*, January 2, 2025, 320–51, https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003394822-21.

[17] Miquel Mirambell Fargas, "Optimizing the Enforcement of International Arbitration Agreements."

[18] Julian K Bickmann, "Arbitrating under the 2018 DIS Rules: Recent Developments," *Revista Brasileira de Arbitragem* 15, no. Issue 59 (September 1, 2018): 80–95, https://doi.org/10.54648/rba2018033.

[19] George A Bermann, *International Arbitration and Private International Law*, 2017.

[20] Klaus Peter Berger, "Institutional Arbitration: Harmony, Disharmony and the 'Party Autonomy Paradox,'" *Arbitration International* 34, no. 4 (November 2, 2018): 473–93, https://doi.org/10.1093/arbint/aiy028.

Convention for countries that signed the convention.[21] Under German judicial authority, arbitral awards get protection unless evidence shows substantial procedural flaws or contravenes nationwide guidelines.

- German courts participate actively during arbitration proceedings to support the achievement of arbitration goals while arbitration maintains its independent status.[22] Through their involvement, the German courts help to appoint arbitrators while managing the process of collecting evidence and enforcing arbitral awards. German courts offer limited support to arbitration proceedings by checking procedural adherence along with implementing arbitration agreement provisions while the country as a whole maintains its preference for arbitration.[23]

3.4 Advantages and Challenges

3.4.1 Advantages

- German arbitration law comes with an international recognition due to its adherence to the UNCITRAL Model Law while maintaining a structured framework.[24]
- German courts show support towards arbitration agreements and awards by staying out unless essential verification is required.
- The DIS serves as a dependable institutional arbitration organization that maintains a mature structure for arbitration proceedings.[25]
- Global Enforceability—As a signatory to the New York Convention, Germany facilitates the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards worldwide.

3.4.2 Challenges

- Cracking the German arbitration system proves difficult for foreign parties because they must overcome the previously unknown procedural requirements found in the ZPO.[26]
- The final characteristic of arbitral awards is beneficial for increasing efficiency, but it potentially creates disadvantages because it provides restricted opportunities for review by parties.[27]
- During investor-state disputes, Germany faces legal uncertainties concerning its relations with EU law and Court of Justice decisions.[28]

The arbitration laws of Germany create an efficient system which supports enforceability along with judicial backing while upholding the rights of parties to determine arbitration processes. Both local and global arbitration parties choose Germany as their preferred arbitration location due to its advantageous features.

---

[21] George A Bermann, *Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards*, 2017, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-50915-0.

[22] George A Bermann.

[23] Won Kidane, *The Culture of International Arbitration* (New York, Ny: Oxford University Press, 2017).

[24] Miquel Mirambell Fargas.

[25] Julian K Bickmann, "Arbitrating under the 2018 DIS Rules: Recent Developments."

[26] Ilka Hanna Beimel, "Independence and Impartiality in International Commercial Arbitration," edoc.unibas.ch, 2021, https://edoc.unibas.ch/87369/.

[27] Noam Zamir and Peretz Segal, "Appeal in International Arbitration—an Efficient and Affordable Arbitral Appeal Mechanism," *Arbitration International* 35, no. 1 (March 1, 2019): 79–93, https://doi.org/10.1093/arbint/aiz006.

[28] Julian K Bickmann.

4. EU Arbitration Law

4.1 Legal Framework (Brussels I Regulation, New York Convention, ICSID)

EU arbitration law exists through the convergence of international treaties together with EU regulations and the court decisions provided by the European Court of Justice (ECJ). Germany maintains a unified arbitration framework as a single national entity, but the EU lacks a unified arbitration law that covers all member states. Various important legal instruments shape arbitration practices that take place in the EU. The Brussels I Regulation (Recast) (Regulation (EU) No 1215/2012) has jurisdictional rules that govern judgment enforcement for civil and commercial matters except in cases of arbitration, which are explicitly stated as excluded by Article 1(2)(d).[29] ECJ rulings sometimes affect arbitration-related matters, although award recognition and arbitral agreement recognition specifically suffered exclusion under Article 1(2)(d) of the Brussels I Regulation.[30] The New York Convention (1958) allows arbitral awards to receive cross-border enforcement even though the EU as an entity has not ratified this instrument because each member state is an individual signatory.[31] Investor-state arbitration operates under the foundations established by the ICSID Convention (1965). EU investment arbitration has encountered challenges because of the Achmea (2018) ECJ ruling, which questions whether such arbitration fits European Union treaty requirements.[32]

4.2 EU Court of Justice Influence on Arbitration

Through its analysis of EU law, the Court of Justice of the EU has made crucial contributions to shaping arbitration practice even though arbitration falls outside EU regulatory boundaries. Certain pivotal choices have significantly changed the functioning of arbitration throughout the EU territory. The European Court of Justice declared anti-suit injunctions invalid under EU law in West Tankers (2009), which limited courts from keeping parties from proceeding against arbitration agreements.[33] Legally speaking, the Achmea (2018) ruling held exceptional importance by declaring arbitration clauses void in intra-EU investment treaties since they contradict EU legal principles. EU law now presents investor-state arbitration with an unclear future because of this court decision. The new legal precedent in Komstroy (2021) applied the Achmea decision to arbitration disputes settled by the Energy Charter Treaty while it diminished arbitration rights between the

---

[29] Neil Dowers and Zheng (Sophia) Tang, "Arbitration in EU Jurisdiction Regulation: Brussels I Recast and a New Proposal," Social Science Research Network (Rochester, NY, May 29, 2015), https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2611339.

[30] Neil Dowers and Zheng (Sophia) Tang, "Arbitration in EU Jurisdiction Regulation: Brussels I Recast and a New Proposal."

[31] Aygun Mammadzada, Aygun Mammadzada, and Uta Kohl, "Enhancing Party Autonomy under the Hague Convention on Choice of Court Agreements 2005: Comparative Analysis with the 2012 EU Brussels Recast Regulation and 1958 New York Arbitration Convention," eprints.soton.ac.uk, June 30, 2022, https://eprints.soton.ac.uk/467753/.

[32] Alexander Reuter, "Taking Investors' Rights Seriously: The Achmea and CETA Rulings of the European Court of Justice Do Not Bar Intra-EU Investment Arbitration," *ICSID Review - Foreign Investment Law Journal* 36, no. 1 (2020): 33–45, https://doi.org/10.1093/icsidreview/siaa044.

[33] Joana Holzmeister e Castro, "Enforcement of the Arbitration Agreement within the Context of the European Union," *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 2016, https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2938115.

EU member states.[34] The rulings from the ECJ create arbitration effects even though the EU lacks explicit lawmaking authority over arbitration procedures.

4.3 Key Features

The primary aspect of EU arbitration includes maintaining uniformity between states under its jurisdiction even though it operates without a centralized arbitration legal framework. Each member state keeps its own arbitration system based on the UNCITRAL Model Law, but EU legal principles guide arbitration in particular through public policy and competition law fields.[35] EU legal principles produce tension with domestic arbitration laws while interacting with them because courts sometimes challenge arbitration agreements and award execution regardless of their validity according to national law. Although EU courts do not directly intervene in arbitration, they provide important influence to arbitration procedures. National courts administer the majority of arbitration matters, yet ECJ decisions override these decisions, especially when either investor-state disputes emerge or EU public policy issues arise.[36] Arbitration agreements, together with awards, are subject to EU legal scrutiny even if they meet the requirements of national laws.

4.4 Advantages and Challenges

The arbitration laws established by the EU provide multiple advantages to users. The New York Convention's universal commitment enables businesses and investors to execute arbitral awards with minimal difficulty throughout the EU territory.[37] The uniformity in legal principles between EU member countries creates prediction even though specific arbitration regulations differ at a national level. International businesses using EU legal dispute resolution frameworks can access a proven mechanism to resolve conflicts through arbitration when working with parties outside of the EU territory. However, several challenges remain. ECJ decisions have established confusion about arbitration, giving investors problems when they try to depend on arbitration agreements in EU member state treaties.[38] The variance in judicial support for arbitration exists within EU member states because the EU lacks an arbitration court system similar to Germany, which maintains a well-developed, friendly court system for arbitration. The relationship between EU law and national arbitration laws produces conflicts, especially when it comes to determining jurisdiction and competition law compliance together with public policy exceptions.[39]

---

[34] Alexander Reuter, “Taking Investors’ Rights Seriously: The Achmea and CETA Rulings of the European Court of Justice Do Not Bar Intra-EU Investment Arbitration.”

[35] Miquel Mirambell Fargas.

[36] Hannes Lenk, “Investment Arbitration under EU Investment Agreements: Is There a Role for an Autonomous EU Legal Order?,” *European Business Law Review* 28, no. 2 (April 2017), https://kluwerlawonline.com/journalarticle/European+Business+Law+Review/28.2/EULR2017011.

[37] United Nations Publications, *UNCITRAL Secretariat Guide on the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (New York, 1958)*, 2016.

[38] Ana Stanič and Crina Baltag, “The Future of Investment Treaty Arbitration in the EU : Substance, Process and Policy,” *Torrossa.com*, February 6, 2025, 1–272, https://www.torrossa.com/gs/resourceProxy?an=5397631&publisher=FZR504.

[39] Ana Stanič and Crina Baltag.

National laws bearing down on EU arbitration law form part of a complex web of legal elements that includes EU regulations and international treaties.[40] Businesses, together with investors, face substantial obstacles when resolving cross-border disputes within the EU due to the ECJ's regulatory uncertainty and its influence on the system despite its strong enforcement and general legal harmonization measures.

5. Comparative Analysis: German vs. EU Arbitration Law

5.1 Legal Certainty & Predictability

The priority elements for businesses and investors comparing EU and German arbitration law are to have fully certain and predictable systems. The ZPO arbitration framework of Germany delivers predictable processes through its established rules found in the ZPO and its commitment to the UNCITRAL Model Law.[41] German courts act with respect for the self-governing nature of arbitration by offering reduced oversight that supports simple implementation of arbitral awards. Germany provides a very appealing arbitration setting to parties because its legal framework offers dependable processes that maintain full support from the legal institutions.

EU arbitration law does not have a unified structure because its framework combines various legal systems that include country laws as well as EU regulations and rulings made by the ECJ.[42] The Achmea and Komstroy verdicts of the European Court of Justice caused legal doubt over the enforcement of intra-EU investment arbitration agreements under the New York Convention.[43] EU investors have lost consistency and foresight regarding dispute resolution because of recent ECJ determinations. Arbitration laws differ from one member state to another, which creates multiple possible interpretations of arbitration agreements that parties need to understand based on their jurisdiction location.

5.2 Efficiency & Procedural Fairness

Germany provides efficiency in arbitration through fewer court requirements because of both the ZPO and DIS frameworks. Through its institutional support, DIS assists in dispute resolution while procedural rules designed by DIS operate to shorten case processing times.[44] The system puts significant weight on party independence because disputing parties determine their arbitration process, thus speeding up proceedings and minimizing procedural complications. German courts provide restricted yet valuable judicial help through arbitrator selection and award enforcement activities that strengthen the efficiency of arbitration processes.[45] The efficiency levels in EU arbitration depend heavily on national conditions since this sector lacks unified standards at the EU level. Multiple countries maintain institutional platforms, but their separate legislative

---

[40] Panos Koutrakos, "The Autonomy of Eu Law and International Investment Arbitration," *Nordic Journal of International Law* 88, no. 1 (March 11, 2019): 41–64, https://doi.org/10.1163/15718107-088010003.

[41] Miquel Mirambell Fargas.

[42] Panos Koutrakos, "The Autonomy of Eu Law and International Investment Arbitration."

[43] Manuel Casas, "The Enforcement of Intra-EU Arbitral Awards: Some Additional Policy Considerations," *Journal of International Arbitration* 42, no. 1 (February 2025), https://kluwerlawonline.com/journalarticle/Journal+of+International+Arbitration/42.1/JOIA2025011.

[44] Julian K Bickmann.

[45] Manuel Penades Fons, "The Effectiveness of EU Law and Private Arbitration," *Common Market Law Review* 57, no. 4 (August 1, 2020), https://kluwerlawonline.com/JournalArticle/Common+Market+Law+Review/57.4/COLA2020716.

structures produce various procedural inconsistencies. The EU's regulatory system creates numerous problems for investment arbitration, including difficulties between EU laws and judicial actions from the ECJ. Intra-EU investment arbitration becomes harder to predict and creates longer proceedings because of the Achmea decision's increasing challenges to these arbitrations.[46]

5.3 Enforceability of Arbitral Awards

The capacity of arbitral awards to gain enforceability stands as a primary benefit in both systems with certain specificity among them. German law benefits from an effective enforcement process since Germany follows the New York Convention that enables arbitral awards issued there to get enforced across 170 different countries.[47] Advances in German arbitration show that courts in the country meticulously validate and implement arbitrated agreements in all cases, thus building a safe enforcement environment.

The EU faces a mixture of complications regarding this matter. The eligibility of arbitral awards to be enforced across member states under the New York Convention meets some doubts after the recent ECJ rulings in Achmea.[48] National courts have introduced difficulties during enforcement processes of arbitral awards when these conflict with EU legal principles, especially in public policy or EU treaty cases. The ambiguous situation poses barriers for implementing certain arbitral awards across the EU, mainly through investment disputes.[49]

5.4 Judicial Intervention & Support

Judicial intervention into arbitration in Germany exists supportively but remains at a minimum. The judicial system restricted its role to two main areas, which include making appointments of arbitrators and enforcing the arbitration awards as well as monitoring procedural rules throughout arbitration proceedings. Arbitration processes run with efficiency and autonomy through this minimal judicial intervention system, though it establishes an effective security system when steps need to be taken.[50] German courts demonstrate outstanding competence when it comes to enforcing arbitrated agreements and maintaining arbitration process integrity.[51]

The relationship of EU courts with arbitration features more complexities when compared to their counterparts. The arbitration procedure receives backing from courts throughout the different member states of the EU, but decisions from the ECJ directly influence arbitration cases. Judicial support for arbitration

---

[46] Sahra Arif, "The Future of Intra-EU Investment Arbitration: Intra-EU Investment Arbitration under the ECT Post Achmea," *European Investment Law and Arbitration Review Online* 4, no. 1 (December 16, 2019): 147–77, https://doi.org/10.1163/24689017_00401007.

[47] Martin Illmer, "New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards – Commentary," *Rabels Zeitschrift Für Ausländisches Und Internationales Privatrecht* 78, no. 4 (2018): 889, https://doi.org/10.1628/003372514x683701.

[48] Sahra Arif, "The Future of Intra-EU Investment Arbitration: Intra-EU Investment Arbitration under the ECT Post Achmea."

[49] Manuel Penades Fons, "The Effectiveness of EU Law and Private Arbitration."

[50] Moses Oruaze Dickson, "Party Autonomy and Justice in International Commercial Arbitration," *International Journal of Law and Management* 60, no. 1 (February 12, 2018): 114–34, https://doi.org/10.1108/ijlma-12-2016-0184.

[51] Moses Oruaze Dickson, "Party Autonomy and Justice in International Commercial Arbitration."

between European Union member state investors became limited due to Achmea-type rulings, which restricted the use of this method.[52] EU regulations may impede arbitration agreements and awards through interventions linked to EU public policy or antitrust regulations. The uncertainty surrounding judicial support in this area becomes less foreseeable than in Germany.

5.5 Flexibility vs. Regulatory Compliance

Germany has flexible arbitration rules to meet regulatory standards while protecting fairness and allowing negotiation customization. Parties utilize the flexible rules in ZPO to choose arbitrators along with defining procedures while selecting the applicable law.[53] German courts primarily check if arbitration procedures follow the rules and enforce decisions through which they uphold arbitration flexibility without compromising legal integrity.

EU arbitration law demonstrates a stronger challenge between its need for adaptability and proper regulatory adherence. Different national arbitration laws found among EU member states feature varying degrees of flexibility in arbitration, while EU regulations along with ECJ decisions sometimes restrict this flexibility during investment arbitration sessions.[54] The Achmea decision has introduced restrictions that reduce the flexibility expected during investor-state arbitration within EU member states. The EU regulatory framework creates complex compliance problems mainly for disputes between EU member states regarding public policy issues and relations between national laws and EU treaties.[55]

The arbitration systems of Germany and the EU share several benefits but create various hurdles from which parties need to navigate.[56] Through its efficient arbitration procedures, Germany creates an arbitration system that offers reliable and flexible dispute resolution for local and foreign business operations. The EU maintains legal ambiguity since it comprises a fragmented framework with unclear rules about inter-EU investment arbitration alongside Court of Justice decisions. Companies and investors need to analyze these distinctions between German arbitration choices and European Union regulatory rules before adopting arbitration systems because they must balance German judicial clarity with EU administrative complexities.[57]

6. Case Studies & Practical Applications

6.1 Case Examples of Cross-Border Disputes Resolved Through German Arbitration

Germany maintains a position as a popular choice for arbitration because it delivers a transparent legal structure combined with effective enforcement instruments and recognized excellent judicial execution of arbitral rulings. The arbitration dispute between Mitsubishi Corporation and DaimlerChrysler AG provides

---

[52] Sahra Arif.

[53] Seyoum Yohannes Tesfay, "The Normative Basis for Decision on the Merits in Commercial Arbitration: The Extent of Party Autonomy," *Mizan Law Review* 10, no. 2 (March 22, 2017): 341, https://doi.org/10.4314/mlr.v10i2.3.

[54] Manuel Penades Fons.

[55] Sahra Arif.

[56] Julien Chaisse, "Arbitration in Cross-Border Data Protection Disputes," *Journal of International Dispute Settlement*, September 14, 2024, https://doi.org/10.1093/jnlids/idae018.

[57] Julien Chaisse, "Arbitration in Cross-Border Data Protection Disputes,"

an illustration of cross-border arbitration settlement resolved by German law.[58] The commercial dispute between these companies led them to use German Arbitration Institute (DIS) arbitration to settle their contractual disagreement regarding vehicle part supply terms.[59] The arbitration process took place with efficiency due to DIS arbitration rules, which enabled parties to customize procedural elements according to their fairness and flexibility requirements. Expedient enforcement of the award under German arbitration law showed both the effective nature of German arbitration procedures and German courts' backing of international arbitral awards.

International commercial enterprises Aviation Capital Group (ACG) and Fraport AG pursued arbitration according to a contract of supply for vehicle parts.[60] The parties fought over a Frankfurt airport infrastructure leasing contract. Under the UNCITRAL Rules, Germany provided the forum for arbitration where a complex case was handled rapidly even though it incorporated different legal systems. The German judiciary processed the arbitral settlement swiftly because Germany proves to be an unshakable forum for international arbitration matters.[61]

6.2 Case Examples of Disputes Under EU Arbitration Rules

EU arbitration processes do not adopt the same high level of centralization found in Germany, but specific cases demonstrate how this legal system operates in its application. An investment arbitration dispute between a Dutch investor and Slovakia occurred during the Achmea case.[62] Investor-state arbitration emerged as the key issue when Slovakia decided to end its bilateral investment treaty with the Netherlands. A Dutch investment claimant received a final judgment from the arbitration tribunal, yet Slovakia contested that award due to its perceived EU law incompatibility.[63] Intra-EU investment deals and their dispute resolution processes received a rejection from the European Court of Justice because they violated EU law, resulting in voided arbitral court rulings. The arbitration ruling in this case demonstrated the legal confusion produced by ECJ decisions about EU arbitration procedures and their negative consequences for EU investors who needed to solve disputes in the EU.[64]

---

[58] George A Bermann and Giuditta Cordero-Moss, "Free-Wheeling Judgments/Awards: Mitsubishi Motors Corp. V. Soler Chrysler-Plymouth, Inc.," *Edward Elgar Publishing EBooks*, January 22, 2019, https://doi.org/10.4337/9781788119238.00013.

[59] Gustav Flecke-Giammarco et al., "The DIS Arbitration Rules : An Article-By-Article Commentary," *Torrossa.com*, November 9, 2024, 1–1040, https://www.torrossa.com/en/resources/an/5396972#page=55.

[60] Giuditta Cordero-Moss, *International Commercial Contracts* (Cambridge University Press, 2023).

[61] Giuditta Cordero-Moss.

[62] Carola Glinski, "Achmea and Its Implications for Investor Dispute Settlement," *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 2018, https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3291279.

[63] Dr. Laurens Ankersmit, "The Compatibility of Investment Arbitration in Eu Trade Agreements with the Eu Judicial System," *Journal for European Environmental & Planning Law* 13, no. 1 (April 18, 2016): 46–63, https://doi.org/10.1163/18760104-01301004.

[64] Dr. Laurens Ankersmit, "The Compatibility of Investment Arbitration in Eu Trade Agreements with the Eu Judicial System."

A dispute in Komstroy became an important example of difficulties arising from EU arbitration when it concerned the implementation of an arbitral award from the Energy Charter Treaty (ECT).[65] This arbitration dispute emerged from a Ukrainian energy company against a Russian entity while its proceedings followed the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID) regulations.[66] The ECJ determined that arbitration clauses that apply only within the EU were incompatible with European Union regulations, thus preventing court acceptance of awards made through the Energy Charter Treaty. The dispute demonstrates how EU law works in conflict with international arbitration, especially during investment arbitration proceedings.[67]

6.3 Lessons Learned from These Cases

The German arbitration cases demonstrate several lessons that depict the benefits of conducting arbitration proceedings in Germany. Braue clarity in laws combined with robust judiciary backing and privacy throughout the arbitration process in Germany creates efficient dispute resolution services that draw numerous business operations and investment deals. The German legal system demonstrates its effectiveness in supporting arbitration by ensuring rapid implementation of arbitral awards.[68]

EU arbitration cases establish how arbitration faces obstacles in legal systems that have multiple jurisdictions. The Achmea and Komstroy decisions reveal that ECJ decisions potentially disrupt arbitral decisions that occur in investment arbitration and disputes among EU member states.[69] The EU operates through a system with unclear legal boundaries because EU laws can potentially revoke arbitration decisions, particularly when arbitration addresses matters of public policy or treaty compliance issues.

The educational material shows arbitration within the EU maintains effectiveness, though businesses and investors face regulatory uncertainties from EU laws and ECJ interpretation of them. Germany presents a controlled framework for dealing with international dispute resolution because it gives emphasis to independent arbitration and consistent enforcement processes.[70] Businesses operating in international commercial deals should choose the arbitration system of Germany because it offers better certainty, but companies resolving disputes within EU boundaries need to evaluate how EU laws shape arbitration judgments.

---

[65] Larissa Barhebréus, "Komstroy: Invalidating Investor-State Arbitration under the Energy Charter Treaty in Intra-EU Disputes : Manifesting the Principle of Autonomy of the EU Legal Order, the International Law Infraction and the Investors Caught in Between," DIVA, 2022, https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2:1636849.

[66] Yarik Kryvoi, "International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID)," *Torrossa.com*, February 6, 2025, 1–432, https://www.torrossa.com/it/resources/an/5628990.

[67] Yarik Kryvoi, "International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID)."

[68] Larissa Barhebréus, "Komstroy: Invalidating Investor-State Arbitration under the Energy Charter Treaty in Intra-EU Disputes: Manifesting the Principle of Autonomy of the EU Legal Order, the International Law Infraction and the Investors Caught in Between."

[69] Larissa Barhebréus.

[70] Marcel M.T.A Brus, *Third Party Dispute Settlement in an Interdependent World*, 2024, https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004635128.

7. Conclusion & Recommendations

7.1 Summary of Key Findings

The evaluation of German arbitration law compared to EU arbitration law generates substantial divergences throughout legal certainty standards and enforcement procedures and judicial backing methods and procedural adaptability systems. German arbitration law establishes itself as an arbitration system distinguished by its direct and foreseeable legal structure thanks to ZPO and UNCITRAL Model Law regulations, which guarantee stability for dispute resolution between investors and businesses. The combination of DIS institutional backing and minimal national court intervention produces a formal mechanism that delivers both efficiency and fair results. EU arbitration law presents fragmentation because it operates from a complex combination of national laws together with ECJ rulings, which produce insecure legal conditions. Intra-EU investment arbitration presents complicated situations, according to Achmea and Komstroy, that generate difficulties for investors who want uniform enforcement throughout EU territory.

7.2 Which System is More Effective?

Cross-border disputes gain better reliability and efficiency through arbitration law enforcement as established by German legal standards. The German legal arbitration framework ensures clear predictability together with reduced judicial interference and standardized enforcement processes, thus drawing businesses from international places for trade and investment. German arbitral awards achieve exceptional enforceability through dedicated judicial enforcement, and this factor significantly draws international entities to select Germany for arbitration decisions. Through its strong arbitration framework EU member states get a solid basis for dispute resolution, yet the influence of ECJ decisions about investment arbitration as well as intra-EU disputes produces substantial uncertainty in these areas. Investors face greater difficulties when pursuing stable arbitration solutions because national arbitration laws present diversity and judicial authorities have the power to interfere with arbitral proceedings.

7.3 Recommendations for Businesses and Legal Practitioners

Businesses and legal practitioners operating in international transactions should choose Germany as their arbitration venue because it provides optimal solutions for commercial and investment disputes. Germany stands out with its established arbitration structure together with institutional backing and reliable enforcement procedures, which makes it the better arbitration destination. Businesses should insert arbitration clauses that detail German jurisdictional arbitration through the DIS and UNCITRAL Model Law since these arbitration systems provide appropriate flexibility and efficiency to handle disputes.

Businesses operating within the EU have to stay informed about EU law implications that affect arbitration since they specifically work in investment treaties and intra-EU disputes. European Union business operations need to evaluate arbitration risks in transactions with non-EU parties through strategic advice on choosing overlapping or domestic dispute resolution paths. Law practitioners need to monitor modern EU case law, which shapes arbitration agreements and the enforcing power of such agreements throughout the Union.

7.4 Future Developments in Arbitration Law

Many elements will determine what arbitration law appears in the future. EU arbitration law planners intend to reform their regulation to fix issues within investment arbitration systems. More decisive laws or clarifications addressing intra-EU arbitration compliance with EU legal framework might emerge due to the ECJ's Achmea and Komstroy decisions. The incorporation of world arbitration practices occurs through

international treaties and conventions. Due to its global scope the New York Convention will improve the enforceability of awards so arbitration emerges as an ideal solution for resolving disputes across international borders. Countries that want official international arbitration standards together with better practices will commonly use the UNCITRAL Model Law.

Technical advancements currently have the ability to restructure the path of arbitration into the future. Online dispute resolution tools (ODR) enable cross-border arbitration to become more efficient at lower costs. Lawyers must embrace digital tools because technology development requires them to enhance their productivity and serve worldwide clients better. Companies and investors seeking dependable conflict resolution services through efficient arbitration now find German arbitration law to be superior to EU arbitration law. The continuous evolution of EU case law as well as global arbitration trends force legal practitioners to develop adaptability and awareness to make their way through the upcoming arbitration systems.

8. References

Ankersmit, Dr. Laurens. "The Compatibility of Investment Arbitration in Eu Trade Agreements with the Eu Judicial System." *Journal for European Environmental & Planning Law* 13, no. 1 (April 18, 2016): 46–63. https://doi.org/10.1163/18760104-01301004.

Arif, Sahra. "The Future of Intra-EU Investment Arbitration: Intra-EU Investment Arbitration under the ECT Post Achmea." *European Investment Law and Arbitration Review Online* 4, no. 1 (December 16, 2019): 147–77. https://doi.org/10.1163/24689017_00401007.

Barhebréus, Larissa. "Komstroy: Invalidating Investor-State Arbitration under the Energy Charter Treaty in Intra-EU Disputes : Manifesting the Principle of Autonomy of the EU Legal Order, the International Law Infraction and the Investors Caught in Between." DIVA, 2022. https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2:1636849.

Basedow, Jürgen. "EU Law in International Arbitration: Referrals to the European Court of Justice." *Journal of International Arbitration* 32, no. 4 (August 2015). https://kluwerlawonline.com/journalarticle/Journal+of+International+Arbitration/32.4/JOIA2015017.

Beimel, Ilka Hanna. "Independence and Impartiality in International Commercial Arbitration." edoc.unibas.ch, 2021. https://edoc.unibas.ch/87369/.

Berger, Klaus Peter. "Institutional Arbitration: Harmony, Disharmony and the 'Party Autonomy Paradox.'" *Arbitration International* 34, no. 4 (November 2, 2018): 473–93. https://doi.org/10.1093/arbint/aiy028.

Bermann, George A. *International Arbitration and Private International Law*, 2017.

Bermann, George A, and Giuditta Cordero-Moss. "Free-Wheeling Judgments/Awards: Mitsubishi Motors Corp. V. Soler Chrysler-Plymouth, Inc." *Edward Elgar Publishing EBooks*, January 22, 2019. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781788119238.00013.

Bickmann, Julian K. "Arbitrating under the 2018 DIS Rules: Recent Developments." *Revista Brasileira de Arbitragem* 15, no. Issue 59 (September 1, 2018): 80–95. https://doi.org/10.54648/rba2018033.

Born, Gary. "The 1933 Directives on Arbitration of the German Reich: Echoes of the Past?" *Journal of International Arbitration* 38, no. 4 (July 2021).

https://kluwerlawonline.com/journalarticle/Journal+of+International+Arbitration/38.4/JOIA2021022.

Brett, Jack. "EU Law and Procedural Autonomy in International Commercial Arbitration." *European Review of Private Law* 29, no. 4 (September 2021). https://kluwerlawonline.com/journalarticle/European+Review+of+Private+Law/29.3/ERPL2021031.

Brus, Marcel M.T.A. *Third Party Dispute Settlement in an Interdependent World*, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004635128.

Casas, Manuel. "The Enforcement of Intra-EU Arbitral Awards: Some Additional Policy Considerations." *Journal of International Arbitration* 42, no. 1 (February 2025). https://kluwerlawonline.com/journalarticle/Journal+of+International+Arbitration/42.1/JOIA2025011.

Chaisse, Julien. "Arbitration in Cross-Border Data Protection Disputes." *Journal of International Dispute Settlement*, September 14, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1093/jnlids/idae018.

Dickson, Moses Oruaze. "Party Autonomy and Justice in International Commercial Arbitration." *International Journal of Law and Management* 60, no. 1 (February 12, 2018): 114–34. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijlma-12-2016-0184.

Dowers, Neil, and Zheng (Sophia) Tang. "Arbitration in EU Jurisdiction Regulation: Brussels I Recast and a New Proposal." Social Science Research Network. Rochester, NY, May 29, 2015. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2611339.

Fargas, Miquel Mirambell. "Optimizing the Enforcement of International Arbitration Agreements." *Routledge EBooks*, January 2, 2025, 320–51. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003394822-21.

Flecke-Giammarco, Gustav, Peter Heckel, Siegfried H Elsing, and Christopher Boog. "The DIS Arbitration Rules : An Article-By-Article Commentary." *Torrossa.com*, November 9, 2024, 1–1040. https://www.torrossa.com/en/resources/an/5396972#page=55.

Fons, Manuel Penades. "The Effectiveness of EU Law and Private Arbitration." *Common Market Law Review* 57, no. 4 (August 1, 2020). https://kluwerlawonline.com/JournalArticle/Common+Market+Law+Review/57.4/COLA2020716

Gallagher, Margaret M, Annalese H Reese, and Paul K Reese. "Alternative Dispute Resolution." *Routledge EBooks*, September 3, 2019, 897–918. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429283642-38.

Giuditta Cordero-Moss. *International Commercial Contracts*. Cambridge University Press, 2023.

Glinski, Carola. "Achmea and Its Implications for Investor Dispute Settlement." *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 2018. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3291279.

Hamed, Alavi, and Khamichonak Tatsiana. "A Step Forward in the Harmonization of European Jurisdiction: Regulation Brussels I Recast." *Baltic Journal of Law & Politics* 8, no. 2 (December 1, 2015): 159–81. https://doi.org/10.1515/bjlp-2015-0023.

Holzmeister e Castro, Joana. "Enforcement of the Arbitration Agreement within the Context of the European Union." *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 2016. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2938115.

Illmer, Martin. "New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards – Commentary." *Rabels Zeitschrift Für Ausländisches Und Internationales Privatrecht* 78, no. 4 (2018): 889. https://doi.org/10.1628/003372514x683701.

Kidane, Won. *The Culture of International Arbitration*. New York, Ny: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Koutrakos, Panos. "The Autonomy of Eu Law and International Investment Arbitration." *Nordic Journal of International Law* 88, no. 1 (March 11, 2019): 41–64. https://doi.org/10.1163/15718107-088010003.

Kröll, Stefan, and Miquel Mirambell Fargas. "Procedural Issues in International Commercial Arbitration." *Edward Elgar Publishing EBooks*, June 12, 2024, 191–214. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781788970792.00021.

Kryvoi, Yarik. "International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID)." *Torrossa.com*, February 6, 2025, 1–432. https://www.torrossa.com/it/resources/an/5628990.

Lenk, Hannes. "Investment Arbitration under EU Investment Agreements: Is There a Role for an Autonomous EU Legal Order?" *European Business Law Review* 28, no. 2 (April 2017). https://kluwerlawonline.com/journalarticle/European+Business+Law+Review/28.2/EULR2017011.

Mammadzada, Aygun, Aygun Mammadzada, and Uta Kohl. "Enhancing Party Autonomy under the Hague Convention on Choice of Court Agreements 2005: Comparative Analysis with the 2012 EU Brussels Recast Regulation and 1958 New York Arbitration Convention." eprints.soton.ac.uk, June 30, 2022. https://eprints.soton.ac.uk/467753/.

Melenko, Oksana. "Mediation as an Alternative Form of Dispute Resolution: Comparative-Legal Analysis." *European Journal of Law and Public Administration* 7, no. 2 (2020): 46–63. https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=956631.

Moreland, Sidney. "Online Arbitration in Theory and in Practice: A Comparative Study of Cross-Border Commercial Transactions in Common Law and Civil Law Countries, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle upon Tyne, 2019." *International Journal of Online Dispute Resolution* 7, no. 2 (December 2020): 195–96. https://doi.org/10.5553/ijodr/235250022020007002005.

Reuter, Alexander . "Taking Investors' Rights Seriously: The Achmea and CETA Rulings of the European Court of Justice Do Not Bar Intra-EU Investment Arbitration." *ICSID Review - Foreign Investment Law Journal* 36, no. 1 (2020): 33–45. https://doi.org/10.1093/icsidreview/siaa044.

Stanič, Ana, and Crina Baltag. "The Future of Investment Treaty Arbitration in the EU : Substance, Process and Policy." *Torrossa.com*, February 6, 2025, 1–272. https://www.torrossa.com/gs/resourceProxy?an=5397631&publisher=FZR504.

Tesfay, Seyoum Yohannes. "The Normative Basis for Decision on the Merits in Commercial Arbitration: The Extent of Party Autonomy." *Mizan Law Review* 10, no. 2 (March 22, 2017): 341. https://doi.org/10.4314/mlr.v10i2.3.

United Nations Publications. *UNCITRAL Secretariat Guide on the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (New York, 1958)*, 2016.

Zamir, Noam, and Peretz Segal. "Appeal in International Arbitration—an Efficient and Affordable Arbitral Appeal Mechanism." *Arbitration International* 35, no. 1 (March 1, 2019): 79–93. https://doi.org/10.1093/arbint/aiz006.