Advances in Consumer Research
ISSN (Print): 0098-9258
ISSN(Online): 3079-1766

Vol. 2, Issue 2 (2025) *https://acr-journal.com/*

Confidentiality versus Transparency in Arbitration: A Legal Dilemma

Adv Pooja Kumari[1]

[1]Professor of Practice, School of Law, UPES, Dehradun
Email ID: poojapandeynautiyal@gmail.com

Cite this paper as: Adv Pooja Kumari, (2025) Confidentiality versus Transparency in Arbitration: A Legal Dilemma. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 2 (2), 276-284

KEYWORDS

Arbitration, Confidentiality, Transparency, Public Interest, Investment Arbitration, Legal Framework, Institutional Rules..

ABSTRACT

Arbitration has gained prominence as a preferred mechanism for dispute resolution, particularly in commercial and investment matters, due to its efficiency, flexibility, and enforceability. However, a persistent legal dilemma exists between the principle of confidentiality—a cornerstone of arbitration—and the demand for transparency, particularly in cases with implications of public interest. This paper critically examines the confidentiality-transparency paradox in arbitration, analyzing its implications from a legal researcher's perspective. Confidentiality in arbitration is often considered a defining feature that protects sensitive commercial information, preserves party autonomy, and encourages open negotiations. National legislations such as the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (India), the English Arbitration Act, 1996, and international frameworks like the UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration emphasize party discretion in maintaining confidentiality. However, this secrecy raises concerns, especially in investment arbitration and disputes involving state entities, where transparency is essential for public accountability, judicial consistency, and fairness. The growing call for transparency is evident in instruments like the UNCITRAL Rules on Transparency in Treaty-based Investor-State Arbitration (2014) and the ICSID Rules, which introduce mandatory disclosure norms. The paper explores judicial precedents and policy shifts that seek to balance these conflicting interests, assessing whether confidentiality should remain absolute or be subject to exceptions in matters of public interest, regulatory compliance, and enforcement proceedings. Further, it evaluates how emerging trends such as institutional arbitration rules (e.g., ICC, SIAC, LCIA) and technology-driven arbitration platforms are shaping this debate. By conducting a comparative analysis of global arbitration practices and legal frameworks, this research aims to propose a balanced approach that upholds the benefits of confidentiality while ensuring procedural fairness and legitimacy in arbitration proceedings. The study concludes with policy recommendations to harmonize these competing interests in arbitration law.

1. INTRODUCTION

Arbitration has increasingly become a preferred mode of dispute resolution due to its efficiency, flexibility, and enforceability. Unlike traditional court litigation, arbitration offers parties significant autonomy in structuring the dispute resolution process, including the choice of arbitrators, governing law, and procedural rules. One of arbitration's most attractive features is confidentiality, which protects sensitive information, preserves business relationships, and allows for discreet resolution of disputes. However, as arbitration becomes more widely used—especially in matters involving public interest, regulatory concerns, and state entities—the demand for greater transparency has intensified.

The conflict between confidentiality and transparency in arbitration presents a significant legal dilemma. On one hand, confidentiality is a cornerstone of arbitration, ensuring privacy for parties and preventing undue influence on proceedings. On the other hand, transparency is essential for promoting accountability, protecting the interests of third parties, and fostering public trust in the arbitration process. This tension has led to an ongoing debate about the extent to which arbitration

should remain confidential and whether greater transparency is necessary to uphold justice and fairness.

This paper explores the legal complexities, judicial perspectives, and policy considerations surrounding the balance between confidentiality and transparency in arbitration. It examines the rationale behind confidentiality, the arguments in favor of transparency, international approaches, and potential legal reforms to address this evolving challenge.

1.1 The Principle of Confidentiality in Arbitration

Confidentiality is often regarded as a defining characteristic of arbitration, distinguishing it from litigation, where court proceedings and judgments are generally public. The principle of confidentiality in arbitration serves several purposes:

- Protection of Business Secrets: Many arbitration disputes involve sensitive commercial information, trade secrets, or proprietary data. Confidentiality ensures that such information does not become publicly available, preserving competitive advantages for businesses.
- Encouraging Candid Communication: Parties in arbitration are more likely to engage in open discussions and settlement negotiations if they are assured that proceedings remain confidential. This enhances the likelihood of amicable resolutions.
- Preserving Reputation and Relationships: Confidentiality protects parties—particularly corporations and high-profile individuals—from reputational damage. It also helps maintain business relationships by avoiding public scrutiny and adversarial litigation.
- Minimizing External Influence: Unlike court cases, where media coverage or public pressure can impact judicial outcomes, confidential arbitration ensures that decisions are based solely on the merits of the case.

While these benefits underscore the importance of confidentiality, the principle is not absolute. The extent to which arbitration proceedings and awards remain confidential depends on contractual agreements, institutional rules, and national laws, which vary across jurisdictions.

1.2 The Growing Demand for Transparency in Arbitration

Despite the advantages of confidentiality, there is a growing movement advocating for greater transparency in arbitration, especially in disputes involving public interest, regulatory oversight, or state participation. Several arguments support the need for increased transparency:

- Ensuring Accountability and Fairness

In cases where government entities or public resources are involved, transparency is critical to ensuring that arbitration outcomes are fair, impartial, and free from undue influence. Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) cases, for instance, often involve public funds and policymaking, making transparency essential for democratic accountability.

- Promoting Legal Precedent and Consistency

Unlike judicial decisions, which are publicly available and contribute to the development of legal precedent, arbitration awards are typically confidential. This lack of transparency makes it difficult to ensure consistency in arbitral decisions, leading to concerns about unpredictability in arbitration jurisprudence.

- Protecting Third-Party Rights

Arbitration proceedings sometimes involve issues that affect third parties who are not directly involved in the dispute. Greater transparency can ensure that affected stakeholders—such as consumers, employees, or local communities—have access to information that may impact their rights and interests.

- Enhancing Public Trust in Arbitration

Critics argue that excessive confidentiality in arbitration creates a perception of secrecy and bias, undermining public confidence in the fairness of the process. By introducing transparency measures, arbitration can enhance its legitimacy and credibility as a reliable dispute resolution mechanism.

1.3 Legal and Institutional Approaches to Confidentiality and Transparency

The balance between confidentiality and transparency is shaped by arbitration laws, institutional rules, and international treaties. Different jurisdictions and arbitral institutions have adopted varying approaches to address this dilemma.

1. National Legal Frameworks

- In England, the Arbitration Act 1996 does not explicitly impose confidentiality but has been interpreted by courts to recognize an implied duty of confidentiality in arbitration. However, courts have also acknowledged exceptions where public interest demands disclosure.
- In India, the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, initially did not contain specific confidentiality provisions. However, the 2019 amendment introduced a new section mandating confidentiality in arbitration proceedings, except in cases where disclosure is necessary for enforcing an arbitral award.

- In France, arbitration proceedings are generally confidential in domestic disputes, but international arbitration cases do not automatically enjoy confidentiality, emphasizing a more transparent approach.

2. Institutional Rules on Confidentiality and Transparency

Major arbitration institutions have different policies regarding confidentiality:

- International Chamber of Commerce (ICC): The ICC Arbitration Rules do not mandate strict confidentiality but allow parties to agree on confidentiality clauses. The ICC has also taken steps to publish arbitral awards (in anonymized form) to promote transparency.
- London Court of International Arbitration (LCIA): The LCIA Rules recognize confidentiality as a default principle but allow disclosure in cases where it is required by law or public interest.
- UNCITRAL Rules on Transparency in Treaty-Based Investor-State Arbitration (2014): These rules specifically apply to investor-state disputes, emphasizing transparency by requiring the publication of key arbitration documents and opening hearings to the public.

1.4 Judicial Perspectives on Confidentiality vs. Transparency

Courts worldwide have played a critical role in determining the limits of confidentiality in arbitration. Some landmark cases illustrate the evolving judicial stance:

1. Esso Australia Resources Ltd v. Plowman (1995) – Australia
    - The Australian High Court ruled that while arbitration agreements may impose confidentiality between parties, information related to public interest cannot be entirely shielded from disclosure.
2. Ali Shipping Corporation v. Shipyard Trogir (1999) – UK
    - The English Court of Appeal upheld the principle of implied confidentiality in arbitration, but also acknowledged exceptions, such as legal obligations to disclose information.
3. Halliburton Co v. Chubb Bermuda Insurance Ltd (2020) – UK Supreme Court
    - This case reinforced the need for greater transparency in arbitrator appointments to prevent conflicts of interest, highlighting the growing judicial recognition of transparency in arbitration

1.5 Legal Frameworks Governing Confidentiality in Arbitration

Confidentiality is a fundamental principle of arbitration, offering parties a private forum to resolve disputes without public scrutiny. Unlike court proceedings, which are generally open to the public, arbitration is designed to protect sensitive business information, trade secrets, and commercial relationships. However, the extent of confidentiality in arbitration varies across jurisdictions and institutional rules. While some legal frameworks provide explicit confidentiality protections, others rely on party autonomy or judicial interpretations to uphold confidentiality.

This section examines the legal instruments and national laws that govern confidentiality in arbitration, with a focus on the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (India), the English Arbitration Act, 1996, and the UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration. Additionally, it explores the role of party autonomy in maintaining confidentiality and the limitations imposed by public interest considerations.

1.6 National Legal Frameworks on Confidentiality in Arbitration

1.6.1 India: The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996

India has taken significant steps to strengthen confidentiality in arbitration, particularly through amendments to the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996. Initially, the Act did not contain explicit provisions on confidentiality, leaving it to parties and institutional rules. However, the 2019 Amendment introduced Section 42A, which mandates confidentiality in arbitration proceedings.

Key Provisions of Section 42A:

- It imposes a statutory obligation on parties, arbitrators, and arbitral institutions to maintain confidentiality in arbitration.
- The confidentiality requirement applies to all aspects of arbitration, including pleadings, evidence, and arbitral awards.
- Exception: Disclosure is permitted only when necessary for the enforcement or implementation of an arbitral award or if required by law.

While this amendment reinforces confidentiality, it does not specify penalties for breaches, leading to concerns about enforceability. Additionally, it is unclear whether Section 42A applies to arbitration-related court proceedings, where information may be disclosed in judicial filings.

1.6.2 United Kingdom: The English Arbitration Act, 1996

Unlike India, the English Arbitration Act, 1996 does not explicitly impose confidentiality obligations. Instead, English courts have recognized an implied duty of confidentiality in arbitration through case law.

Key Judicial Precedents on Confidentiality in the UK:

1. **Ali Shipping Corporation v. Shipyard Trogir (1999)**
    - The English Court of Appeal held that arbitration proceedings are inherently confidential and that parties owe a duty of confidentiality to each other.
    - The duty applies to all documents, evidence, and awards in arbitration.
2. **Emmott v. Michael Wilson & Partners Ltd (2008)**
    - The court acknowledged that confidentiality in arbitration is not absolute and may be overridden by public interest considerations, such as legal obligations to disclose information.
3. **Halliburton Co v. Chubb Bermuda Insurance Ltd (2020)**
    - The UK Supreme Court emphasized transparency in arbitrator appointments while maintaining that arbitration proceedings remain confidential.

While English law upholds confidentiality through common law principles, exceptions have emerged where public interest, regulatory compliance, or third-party rights necessitate disclosure.

1.6.3 France: A Distinct Approach to Confidentiality

French arbitration law takes a **dual approach** to confidentiality:

- **Domestic arbitration** is automatically confidential under the French Civil Code.
- **International arbitration** is not inherently confidential unless agreed upon by the parties.

This approach reflects a growing global shift toward balancing confidentiality and transparency, particularly in cross-border disputes.

2. International Legal Frameworks on Confidentiality

2.1 UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration

The UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration, adopted by many jurisdictions, does not explicitly mandate confidentiality. Instead, it allows parties to determine confidentiality through arbitration agreements or institutional rules.

Key Provisions of the Model Law:

- It grants parties autonomy to agree on confidentiality clauses.
- It permits courts to override confidentiality where necessary for public interest or legal enforcement.
- It recognizes that arbitration-related court proceedings may require disclosure, potentially limiting confidentiality.

Because the Model Law is widely adopted, its flexible approach has influenced arbitration laws in many countries, allowing national courts to shape confidentiality rules through judicial interpretation.

2.2 International Arbitral Institutions and Confidentiality Rules

Confidentiality in arbitration is also governed by **institutional rules**, which vary across arbitral institutions:

a. **International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) Rules:**
    - The ICC does not impose automatic confidentiality but allows parties to agree on confidentiality provisions.
    - The ICC has taken steps to increase transparency, including publishing anonymized arbitral awards.

b. **London Court of International Arbitration (LCIA) Rules:**
    - The LCIA Rules recognize confidentiality as a default principle and require parties, arbitrators, and institutions to maintain confidentiality.
    - The rules permit disclosure when legally required or in the public interest.

c. **UNCITRAL Rules on Transparency in Treaty-Based Investor-State Arbitration (2014):**
    - These rules apply to investor-state disputes, where public interest concerns demand greater transparency.
    - They require publication of key arbitration documents and open hearings for investor-state cases.

While commercial arbitration institutions prioritize confidentiality, investor-state arbitration has shifted toward transparency due to the involvement of public funds and regulatory matters.

3. The Role of Party Autonomy in Confidentiality

A fundamental principle of arbitration is **party autonomy**, which allows parties to shape their dispute resolution process,

including confidentiality agreements.

a. Contractual Confidentiality Clauses

- Parties can expressly include confidentiality clauses in their arbitration agreements.
- These clauses define the scope of confidentiality, covering proceedings, evidence, and awards.

b. Confidentiality and Third-Party Involvement

- Confidentiality obligations may be challenged when third parties, such as regulatory authorities or government entities, are involved.
- Courts and arbitral tribunals may override confidentiality where disclosure is necessary for justice or regulatory compliance.

c. Enforceability of Confidentiality Agreements

- While party autonomy allows confidentiality agreements, courts may decline to enforce them in cases involving fraud, corruption, or public interest.
- Confidentiality clauses must align with national laws and institutional rules to be fully effective.

4. Limitations on Confidentiality: Public Interest Considerations

Despite strong legal frameworks supporting confidentiality, certain exceptions allow for disclosure:

a. **Legal and Regulatory Requirements:**
   - Disclosure may be required for compliance with laws, financial regulations, or anti-corruption investigations.

b. **Enforcement of Arbitral Awards:**
   - Parties seeking to enforce an arbitral award in court may need to disclose arbitration-related information, limiting confidentiality.

c. **Public Interest and Third-Party Rights:**
   - Investor-state disputes often require transparency to protect public funds and government policy decisions.
   - Cases affecting employees, consumers, or environmental concerns may justify limited disclosure.

d. **Judicial Review and Court Proceedings:**
   - Courts may publish judgments in arbitration-related cases, exposing elements of otherwise confidential arbitration.

2. THE TRANSPARENCY IMPERATIVE IN PUBLIC INTEREST ARBITRATION

Arbitration has traditionally been valued for its confidentiality, allowing parties to resolve disputes without public scrutiny. However, when disputes involve public interests such as investment arbitration and cases concerning state entities, the need for transparency becomes paramount. Unlike private commercial disputes, investment arbitration often impacts public funds, regulatory policies, and sovereign interests, making transparency essential for public accountability, legitimacy, and fairness. Over the years, there has been a growing shift from strict confidentiality toward a more transparent arbitration system, particularly in cases involving governments and public policies. The increasing public concern over regulatory sovereignty, environmental protection, and human rights issues has pressured international arbitration institutions to incorporate transparency measures.

The UNCITRAL Rules on Transparency in Treaty-Based Investor-State Arbitration (2014) represent a significant step in this transition. These rules mandate the disclosure of arbitration proceedings, publication of relevant documents, open hearings, and third-party participation through amicus curiae submissions. By ensuring that investment arbitration proceedings are accessible to the public, these rules help prevent secretive decision-making and undue corporate influence over state policies. The International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID) has also embraced transparency reforms, allowing for the publication of awards, open hearings, and third-party participation. While these measures mark significant progress, challenges remain in balancing transparency with the protection of sensitive commercial information, investor rights, and state sovereignty.

One of the primary concerns surrounding transparency in arbitration is the protection of confidential business information. Investment disputes often involve trade secrets, proprietary data, and other commercially sensitive details that, if disclosed, could undermine business interests. Transparency measures must therefore be designed carefully to ensure that necessary disclosures do not compromise the legitimate concerns of private investors. Similarly, governments may be reluctant to disclose arbitration details that could affect their foreign investment strategies or national security policies. Excessive disclosure might also deter foreign investors from engaging with states that have stringent transparency obligations. Additionally, arbitration proceedings involving state entities often span multiple legal frameworks, including national laws, investment treaties, and institutional rules, leading to inconsistencies in the application of transparency measures. A harmonized global approach is required to ensure clarity and uniformity in the treatment of transparency across different

legal systems. Another challenge is the potential for political and media influence in arbitration cases that attract significant public attention. While transparency enhances legitimacy, it also exposes arbitral proceedings to political pressures that could affect neutrality and fairness. Publicized arbitration cases involving governments and multinational corporations often receive intense media scrutiny, which can lead to misinterpretations and undue public influence on arbitral tribunals. This raises concerns about whether arbitration can maintain its impartiality in high-profile disputes. Despite these challenges, the move toward transparency in public interest arbitration is an essential reform to ensure fairness, consistency, and accountability. By promoting open hearings, public access to arbitration documents, and third-party participation, international institutions have made significant strides in improving the legitimacy of investor-state dispute resolution. However, a careful balance must be maintained to protect the core advantages of arbitration, such as efficiency and confidentiality, while ensuring that proceedings remain fair and open to public scrutiny when necessary. The continued development of international legal frameworks and institutional safeguards will be crucial in achieving this balance, making arbitration a more transparent yet effective mechanism for resolving public interest disputes.

Judicial Precedents and Institutional Arbitration Rules

The balance between confidentiality and transparency in arbitration has been shaped by judicial interpretations, policy developments, and institutional arbitration rules across different jurisdictions. Courts and arbitral institutions worldwide have played a crucial role in determining how confidentiality should be maintained while also addressing the increasing demand for transparency, particularly in disputes involving public interest. This section explores the approaches taken by various judicial systems, the policies adopted by leading arbitration institutions—such as the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), the Singapore International Arbitration Centre (SIAC), and the London Court of International Arbitration (LCIA)—and the impact of emerging trends, including technology-driven arbitration platforms, in reshaping the confidentiality-transparency debate.

Judicial Interpretations on Confidentiality in Arbitration

Different jurisdictions have taken varying stances on the issue of confidentiality in arbitration, leading to inconsistencies in its application. Some legal systems recognize confidentiality as an implicit obligation in arbitration proceedings, while others treat it as a default rule that can be overridden in certain circumstances, particularly when public interest considerations are involved.

United Kingdom: A Strong Presumption of Confidentiality

The English courts have historically upheld a strong presumption of confidentiality in arbitration. In Dolling-Baker v. Merrett (1990), the Court of Appeal held that arbitration proceedings are inherently private, and parties have an implied duty to maintain confidentiality. This principle was reinforced in Ali Shipping v. Shipyard Trogir (1998), where the court established that confidentiality extends to all arbitration documents, including pleadings, witness statements, and arbitral awards, unless disclosure is necessary for the protection of a party's legal rights. However, English courts have also recognized exceptions to confidentiality, such as in Emmott v. Michael Wilson & Partners Ltd. (2008), where disclosure was permitted to uphold the interests of justice.

Australia: A Shift Toward Transparency

In contrast to the English approach, Australian courts have leaned towards a more flexible interpretation of confidentiality. In Esso Australia Resources Ltd. v. Plowman (1995), the High Court of Australia ruled that arbitration proceedings are not inherently confidential, and disclosure may be required in cases involving public interest considerations. The court emphasized that certain arbitration-related information—such as pleadings and witness testimonies—may need to be disclosed to ensure accountability and fairness. This ruling marked a significant departure from the traditional notion of absolute confidentiality in arbitration.

India: A Balancing Act Between Confidentiality and Transparency

India has historically followed the English common law approach, treating confidentiality as an implied principle in arbitration. However, recent legislative and judicial developments have sought to balance confidentiality with transparency. The Arbitration and Conciliation (Amendment) Act, 2019, introduced Section 42A, which explicitly states that arbitration proceedings shall be confidential, except where disclosure is required for the enforcement of an award or by law. Indian courts have also supported limited disclosure in cases where the public interest is at stake, particularly in investment arbitration and disputes involving state entities.

Institutional Arbitration Rules and Their Approach to Confidentiality and Transparency

Leading arbitration institutions, such as the ICC, SIAC, and LCIA, have established their own rules on confidentiality and transparency, reflecting the evolving global standards in international arbitration. These institutional frameworks play a critical role in shaping arbitration practices by providing structured guidelines on how confidentiality should be maintained while also incorporating provisions for transparency where necessary.

ICC Arbitration Rules

The ICC Arbitration Rules recognize the importance of confidentiality but do not impose a blanket rule of secrecy. Under Article 22(3), tribunals have the discretion to take measures to protect trade secrets and confidential information while ensuring that proceedings remain fair. Additionally, the ICC has introduced measures to enhance transparency, particularly in investor-state disputes. The ICC Court of Arbitration also publishes anonymized summaries of arbitral awards, contributing to the development of arbitration jurisprudence without compromising the confidentiality of the parties involved.

SIAC Rules

The Singapore International Arbitration Centre (SIAC) Rules provide stronger confidentiality protections compared to the ICC. Article 39 of the SIAC Rules states that all matters relating to arbitration including proceedings, documents, and awards—shall be kept confidential unless disclosure is required by law or necessary to protect a party's legal rights. However, in investment arbitration and disputes involving public entities, SIAC has taken a more transparent approach, allowing limited disclosure to ensure public accountability.

LCIA Rules

The London Court of International Arbitration (LCIA) Rules also emphasize confidentiality but permit disclosures under specific circumstances. Article 30 of the LCIA Rules mandates that all arbitral awards, submissions, and proceedings remain confidential unless the parties agree otherwise, or disclosure is required by law. The LCIA has also incorporated provisions for third-party funding disclosure, enhancing transparency in cases involving external financial interests.

Emerging Trends and Technology-Driven Arbitration Platforms

As arbitration evolves in response to modern challenges, emerging trends and technological advancements are reshaping the way confidentiality and transparency are managed. The rise of technology-driven arbitration platforms, artificial intelligence (AI)-assisted dispute resolution, and online arbitration mechanisms have introduced new dimensions to the confidentiality-transparency debate.

Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) and Confidentiality Concerns

Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) platforms have gained prominence as efficient alternatives to traditional arbitration. However, the digitization of arbitration proceedings raises new concerns about data security and confidentiality. Cloud-based arbitration platforms store sensitive information that may be vulnerable to cyber threats, making data protection a critical issue. Institutions such as the Hong Kong International Arbitration Centre (HKIAC) have implemented cybersecurity protocols to safeguard confidential arbitration records, but global standards for data security in arbitration are still evolving.

Artificial Intelligence and Predictive Analytics in Arbitration

AI-powered tools are increasingly being used to assist arbitrators in case analysis, document review, and legal research. While AI enhances efficiency, it also raises concerns about the confidentiality of arbitration data. AI-driven arbitration platforms rely on large datasets, and the risk of inadvertent data breaches or unauthorized access to confidential information remains a challenge. Policymakers and arbitration institutions are actively exploring ways to integrate AI without compromising confidentiality.

Blockchain Technology for Confidentiality in Arbitration

Blockchain-based arbitration platforms have emerged as a potential solution for maintaining confidentiality while ensuring transparency where necessary. Blockchain technology allows for secure, tamper-proof record-keeping, ensuring that arbitration proceedings remain confidential and immutable. Some arbitration institutions are experimenting with blockchain to enhance data integrity and confidentiality while also allowing controlled transparency in public interest cases.

Policy Recommendations and Conclusion

The debate between confidentiality and transparency in arbitration presents a complex challenge that requires a nuanced and balanced approach. While confidentiality remains one of the defining features of arbitration, ensuring privacy and protecting sensitive business interests, the growing demand for transparency—particularly in public interest disputes—cannot be ignored. Achieving an equilibrium between these competing interests is essential for maintaining the legitimacy, efficiency, and fairness of arbitration proceedings. This section outlines key policy recommendations and legal reforms that can help harmonize confidentiality and transparency in arbitration while ensuring procedural fairness, regulatory compliance, and public trust in the process.

3. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BALANCING CONFIDENTIALITY AND TRANSPARENCY

Establishing Clear Legal Frameworks on Confidentiality

A major challenge in arbitration is the lack of uniformity in confidentiality provisions across different jurisdictions. Some legal systems recognize an implicit duty of confidentiality, while others allow disclosure in specific circumstances. To address this inconsistency, national arbitration laws should explicitly define the scope and limitations of confidentiality.

Legislators should consider adopting a model framework—like the UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration—that provides clear guidelines on when confidentiality must be maintained and when disclosure is necessary.

Implementing Transparency Provisions in Public Interest Cases

Investment arbitration and disputes involving state entities require greater transparency to ensure accountability and public trust. Institutions like the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID) and the UNCITRAL Rules on Transparency in Treaty-Based Investor-State Arbitration (2014) have introduced measures to enhance openness in investment arbitration. Similar provisions should be incorporated into national arbitration laws and institutional rules, ensuring that cases involving public funds, human rights, or environmental concerns are subject to limited but necessary disclosure.

Strengthening Institutional Arbitration Rules

Leading arbitration institutions such as the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), the London Court of International Arbitration (LCIA), and the Singapore International Arbitration Centre (SIAC) should continue refining their confidentiality and transparency rules. While most institutions provide confidentiality protections, they should also introduce standardized transparency guidelines for specific types of disputes, particularly those involving regulatory and public interest considerations. This approach will help align arbitration rules with evolving legal and ethical standards.

Encouraging Party Autonomy with Balanced Transparency Measures

Arbitration is based on the principle of party autonomy, allowing disputing parties to agree on confidentiality terms. However, arbitration agreements should also provide a mechanism for limited disclosure when necessary, ensuring that transparency does not undermine the legitimacy of the process. A tiered approach could be adopted, where parties retain confidentiality in commercial disputes while allowing measured transparency in cases where public interest is involved.

Incorporating Technological Safeguards for Confidential Arbitration

The increasing use of Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) and technology-driven arbitration platforms has raised new concerns about data security and confidentiality breaches. Arbitration institutions should establish strict cybersecurity protocols, including encryption measures, blockchain-based record-keeping, and AI-driven document management systems to ensure that confidential arbitration records remain protected from unauthorized access or leaks.

Judicial Guidance and Consistency in Interpretation

National courts play a crucial role in shaping the confidentiality-transparency balance through their interpretations of arbitration laws. Judicial precedents on confidentiality in arbitration have varied widely across jurisdictions, leading to legal uncertainty. Courts should adopt a more consistent approach by referring to international best practices and institutional rules. A harmonized judicial stance on confidentiality, especially in cross-border disputes, will enhance the predictability and effectiveness of arbitration proceedings.

Introducing Third-Party Funding (TPF) Disclosure Requirements

The increasing involvement of third-party funders in arbitration has raised concerns about transparency and conflicts of interest. Several jurisdictions and arbitration institutions, including ICSID and SIAC, have introduced mandatory disclosure requirements for third-party funding. Expanding these disclosure obligations across all major arbitration frameworks will ensure that parties are aware of financial interests that may influence proceedings, thereby enhancing fairness and transparency.

Enhancing Public Access to Redacted Arbitration Awards

One way to strike a balance between confidentiality and transparency is to publish redacted arbitration awards, ensuring that sensitive commercial information remains protected while contributing to the development of arbitration jurisprudence. Institutions like the ICC have started publishing anonymized summaries of awards, and this practice should be expanded across all major arbitration institutions.

4. CONCLUSION

The confidentiality-transparency debate in arbitration is an evolving issue that requires a careful, context-driven approach. While confidentiality remains a fundamental feature of arbitration, ensuring privacy and efficiency, the increasing demand for transparency, particularly in cases involving public interest, state entities, and regulatory concerns—necessitates legal and policy reforms. The recommendations outlined above propose a structured way to balance these competing principles without compromising the core advantages of arbitration. Legal reforms should focus on establishing clear confidentiality provisions while incorporating necessary transparency measures for investment arbitration and public-interest disputes. Arbitration institutions must refine their rules to provide a balanced approach that respects party autonomy while ensuring fair and accountable proceedings. Courts should adopt a consistent approach to interpreting confidentiality obligations, reducing uncertainty in arbitration laws. Additionally, advancements in technology-driven arbitration require the adoption

of robust cybersecurity protocols to protect confidential data. Ultimately, the goal is to create a well-regulated arbitration system that upholds confidentiality while maintaining transparency where required, fostering public trust, and ensuring the continued legitimacy of arbitration as a preferred dispute resolution mechanism. By implementing these reforms, arbitration can maintain its efficiency and effectiveness while adapting to the changing global landscape of dispute resolution.

REFERENCES

Books and Journal Articles

[1] Born, G. B. (2021). International Commercial Arbitration (3rd ed.). Kluwer Law International.

[2] Besson, S. (2017). Confidentiality in Arbitration: Theoretical and Comparative Perspectives. Journal of International Arbitration, 34(2), 381-403.

[3] Blackaby, N., Partasides, C., Redfern, A., & Hunter, M. (2015). Redfern and Hunter on International Arbitration (6th ed.). Oxford University Press.

[4] Brekoulakis, S. (2019). Confidentiality and Transparency in Commercial Arbitration: A Fine Balance? Arbitration International, 35(1), 27-48.

[5] Caron, D., & Caplan, L. (2013). The UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules: A Commentary (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

[6] Cremades, B., & Cairns, D. (2019). Transparency in Investment Arbitration. ICSID Review, 34(3), 567-589.

[7] Gaillard, E., & Savage, J. (2016). Fouchard, Gaillard, Goldman on International Commercial Arbitration. Kluwer Law International.

[8] Moses, M. L. (2017). The Principles and Practice of International Commercial Arbitration (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

[9] Park, W. W. (2020). Arbitration's Contradictions: Confidentiality versus Transparency. Boston College International & Comparative Law Review, 43(2), 245-280.

[10] Rogers, C. A. (2018). Regulating International Arbitrators: A Comparative Approach. The Yale Journal of International Law, 43(4), 89-123.

Legislation and International Rules

[11] Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (India).

[12] English Arbitration Act, 1996 (United Kingdom).

[13] French Code of Civil Procedure, Book IV on Arbitration (France).

[14] International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) Arbitration Rules (2021).

[15] London Court of International Arbitration (LCIA) Rules (2020).

[16] Singapore International Arbitration Centre (SIAC) Rules (2021).

[17] UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration (1985, with 2006 amendments).

[18] UNCITRAL Rules on Transparency in Treaty-based Investor-State Arbitration (2014).

[19] ICSID Rules and Regulations (2022).

Reports and Policy Papers

[20] International Bar Association (IBA). (2019). IBA Guidelines on Conflicts of Interest in International Arbitration. London: IBA.

[21] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2020). Transparency and Investment Arbitration: Legal and Policy Trends. Paris: OECD Publishing.

[22] United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). (2018). Transparency in Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS): A Global Perspective. Geneva: UNCTAD.

[23] World Bank. (2021). Enhancing Transparency in International Arbitration: Policy Challenges and Legal Considerations. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

[24] World Trade Organization (WTO). (2022). State Dispute Settlement and Transparency Reforms in International Arbitration. Geneva: WTO.

Case Law and Judicial Precedents

[25] Halliburton Company v. Chubb Bermuda Insurance Ltd. [2020] UKSC 48 (United Kingdom Supreme Court).