YourLawArticle

Open Access Law Journal, ISSN (O): 3049-0057

Editor-in-Chief – Prof. (Dr.) Amit Kashyap; Publisher – Reet Parihar

Alternate Dispute Resolution And Global Trend And Impact Of Commercial Mediation

Adv Kavita N Solunke , BA, BSL, LLM, MBA, GDC&A, PG(ADR), CCIO, Additional Government Pleader, Arbitrator, Mediator& Conciliator High Court Mumbai & Notary Govt of India

&

Dr Rashmi Solunke M.B.B.S., DNB (Anesthesia), Aakash Healthcare Super Specialty Hospital, Dwarka, New Delhi

Published on: 27th November 2025

Abstract

The increasing prevalence of commercial mediation globally marks a significant shift in dispute resolution practices, characterised by its emphasis on compromise, collaboration, and efficiency. Mediation is defined as a process in which a neutral third-party facilitator assists disputants in reaching a mutually acceptable agreement, aligning with the World CC Principles. Unlike arbitration, where outcomes are determined by objective legal standards, mediation preserves parties' decision-making authority, creating an interest-based rather than rights-based procedure. The mediator guides discussion but does not issue binding decisions; any resolution only becomes binding if the party's consent in writing. Settlement agreements, once reached, are documented and may be enforceable under instruments like the Singapore Convention. This flexibility allows parties to discontinue mediation if it no longer serves their interests.

Globally, mediation is increasingly incorporated into commercial dispute resolution, offering a constructive alternative to traditional courtroom and arbitration settings. Its benefits include efficiency, cost-effectiveness, and the preservation of business relationships. Courts in countries that have ratified the Singapore Convention support the enforceability of mediated settlements, making mediation an attractive choice for organisations seeking amicable solutions.

In the domain of cross-border insolvency, ADR—including mediation and arbitration—provides a practical approach to complex legal challenges spanning multiple jurisdictions. Traditional litigation

can be inefficient due to divergent laws and procedural complexities. While frameworks like the UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency foster international cooperation, they often exclude explicit ADR mechanisms, complicating the recognition and enforcement of settlements. Hesitation among stakeholders and inconsistency in enforcement remain obstacles. Nonetheless, successful mediation in high-profile cases, such as Lehman Brothers, and ongoing legal reforms in countries including Singapore, the UK, and the US highlight ADR's growing role. Organizations like the World Bank and International Bar Association advocate ADR integration to streamline insolvency resolutions.

In conclusion, commercial mediation and ADR are vital for resolving international and insolvency-related disputes, supporting global business interests through efficient, mutually beneficial solutions.

Key Words: *Alternate Dispute Resolution, ADR, arbitration, Commercial mediation, World CC Principles, neutrality, interest-based procedure, rights-based procedure, enforceability, Singapore Convention, cross-border insolvency, UNCITRAL Model Law, legal frameworks, efficiency, cost-effectiveness, collaboration, settlement agreement, insolvency proceedings, international commerce, stakeholder hesitation, World Bank, International Bar Association.*

1. Introduction

Alternate Dispute Resolution (ADR) has evolved into a cornerstone of contemporary dispute resolution, particularly within the sphere of international and domestic commercial transactions. By offering an alternative to adversarial court litigation, ADR mechanisms—especially mediation and commercial mediation—enable parties to resolve disputes in a manner that is cost-effective, time-efficient, procedurally flexible, and more conducive to preserving ongoing business relationships. In an era marked by complex cross-border trade, rapid globalization, and increasingly sophisticated contractual arrangements, commercial mediation is reshaping how corporations, small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), and state entities conceptualize justice, efficiency, and risk management in dispute resolution. This paper examines the global trends, legal frameworks, and practical challenges of commercial mediation, with particular reference to the Singapore Convention on Mediation, emerging legislation such as the UAE Mediation Law, and recent reforms in jurisdictions like India, the U.K., Singapore, and the U.S.[1]

2. Concept and methods of ADR

ADR refers to a spectrum of processes through which disputes are resolved outside traditional court adjudication, often with reduced formality and enhanced party autonomy. The core methods typically include negotiation, mediation, conciliation, and arbitration, alongside hybrid mechanisms such as med-arb and arb-med. Negotiation is a party-driven, non-facilitated process; conciliation involves a neutral third party who may suggest solutions; arbitration results in a binding decision akin to a private judgment; mediation, however, is distinguished by its facilitative, non-binding, and interest-based orientation. Commercial mediation specifically focuses on disputes arising from business relationships—such as supply agreements, joint ventures, technology licensing, construction, banking, and investment disputes—where the preservation of commercial relationships and confidentiality are paramount.

Among these techniques, mediation has attracted particular global attention due to its structural flexibility and its capacity to integrate legal rights, commercial interests, and relational dynamics into bespoke solutions. Unlike arbitration, which is typically rights-based and governed by procedural rules that culminate in an enforceable award, mediation is designed to empower the parties to craft outcomes that align with their business objectives, risk appetites, and long-term strategies. This shift from purely rights-based adjudication to interest-based problem-solving represents a fundamental transformation

[1] UNCITRAL, *Model Law on International Commercial Mediation and International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation* (2018) https://uncitral.un.org accessed 06 December 2025.

in the philosophy of dispute resolution in commercial settings.[2]

3. Mediation versus Arbitration: rights and interests

The distinction between mediation and arbitration is foundational to understanding the rise of commercial mediation. Arbitration involves the submission of disputes to a neutral arbitrator or tribunal, which applies applicable law and contract terms to determine rights and obligations and issues a binding award enforceable under regimes such as the New York Convention. The outcome is anchored in an objective legal standard, emphasizing rights, liabilities, and remedies—mirroring the logic of adjudication but in a private forum. Mediation, by contrast, is characterized as a voluntary, confidential process in which a neutral mediator facilitates structured dialogue, helps clarify interests, identifies options, and assists in generating a consensual settlement, without imposing a decision. The parties retain full decision-making authority, and any settlement is the product of their subjective assessment of risk, commercial interests, and relationship priorities. This distinction frames arbitration as a rights-based process and mediation as an interest-based process, with significant implications for commercial strategy: mediation allows for creative trade-offs—such as future discounts, revised delivery schedules, joint projects, or apologies—that may not be available through courts or arbitral awards. Mediation's voluntary and non-binding nature also interacts with enforceability considerations. A mediated settlement becomes binding only when reduced to a written agreement signed by the parties and treated as a contract, consent order, decree, or settlement instrument under domestic law or applicable international conventions. This has historically raised concerns around cross-border enforceability, a gap the Singapore Convention on Mediation seeks to address.[3]

4. Global growth of commercial mediation

Over the past decade, commercial mediation has moved from the periphery to the mainstream of dispute resolution policy. Multiple jurisdictions have integrated mediation into their civil and commercial justice systems through statutory frameworks, court-annexed mediation programs, institutional mediation centres, and mandatory or opt-out pre-litigation mediation for specified disputes. This global trend can be observed in several dimensions:

[2] Singapore Convention on Mediation (United Nations Convention on International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation) adopted 20 December 2018, opened for signature 7 August 2019, UN Doc A/RES/73/198.
[3] Nadja Alexander and Shouyu Chong, 'The Singapore Convention on Mediation: A Framework for the Cross-Border Recognition of Mediation Settlement Agreements' (2019) 35(4) *Arbitration International* 1.

- Institutionalization and court integration: Commercial courts and arbitral institutions increasingly maintain panels of accredited mediators, offer mediation rules, or run hybrid mediation–arbitration facilities.
- Pre-litigation and court-referred mediation: Many systems now require or strongly encourage parties to attempt mediation before proceeding with full-scale litigation in certain commercial categories.
- Sector-specific mediation: Specialized mediation has expanded in areas like construction, financial services, intellectual property, and technology disputes, reflecting the need for technical expertise and industry-sensitive solutions.

In the United States and the United Kingdom, mediation has become a routine feature of commercial practice, with courts expecting parties to explore settlement processes and sometimes imposing costs consequences for unreasonable refusal to mediate. Singapore has developed a sophisticated mediation ecosystem supported by the Singapore International Mediation Centre (SIMC) and integrated frameworks linking arbitration and mediation, particularly for cross-border Asia-Pacific disputes. The UAE and Dubai have similarly fostered mediation centers and online mediation mechanisms as part of broader efforts to position themselves as regional dispute resolution hubs.[4]

India has undertaken substantial reforms through the Mediation Act, 2023, which provides a comprehensive framework for domestic and certain international mediations conducted in India, including pre-litigation mediation, institutional mediation, and community mediation. These developments indicate a clear policy shift towards recognizing mediation as a first-tier or parallel mechanism for resolving commercial disputes, not merely a peripheral adjunct to litigation or arbitration.

5. The Singapore Convention on Mediation

The United Nations Convention on International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation, known as the Singapore Convention on Mediation, was adopted by the UN General Assembly in 2018 and opened for signature in 2019. The Convention applies to written settlement agreements resulting from mediation that resolve international commercial disputes, excluding consumer, family, inheritance, and certain other categories. Its objective is to create a uniform and reliable framework for the cross-border enforcement of mediated settlement agreements, analogous—though not

[4] Dubai Chambers Mediation Centre, *Rules and Procedures for Commercial Mediation* (2023) https://www.dubaichamber.com accessed 06 December 2025.

identical—to the role played by the New York Convention for arbitral awards.

Under the Convention, a party seeking to enforce a mediated settlement in another State Party can apply directly to the competent authority of that state, submitting the settlement agreement and evidence that it resulted from mediation. The grounds for refusing enforcement are narrowly tailored and include incapacity of a party, nullity or inoperability of the agreement under applicable law, serious breach by the mediator of standards or impartiality, and public policy concerns. By streamlining enforcement procedures across jurisdictions, the Convention reduces uncertainty and transaction costs, particularly for SMEs and cross-border commercial actors that previously faced the prospect of litigating enforcement actions in multiple jurisdictions.[5]

India, Singapore, the U.S., and several other major economies have signed the Convention, signalling strong normative support for cross-border mediation, though domestic implementation measures and ratification timelines vary. Commentators have highlighted that the Convention, combined with the rise of online dispute resolution (ODR) platforms, is likely to further normalize mediation as an integral modality for resolving international commercial disputes. At the same time, interpretive debates around key terms—such as what constitutes a settlement "resulting from mediation" and the scope of "commercial disputes"—underscore the need for continued doctrinal clarification and harmonized practice.

6. Emerging legal frameworks: UAE, India, and others

The UAE has embarked on significant ADR reform, including new mediation legislation aimed at promoting amicable settlement of civil and commercial disputes, clarifying mediator accreditation, and ensuring enforceability of settlements under domestic law. Dubai's Mediation Centre, operating under the Dubai Chamber of Commerce, provides structured, often online, mediation services that emphasize confidentiality, mediator neutrality, and the enforceability of agreements, with parties able to select mediators from accredited rosters. This aligns with the UAE's broader strategy to attract foreign investment by offering a predictable, business-friendly dispute resolution environment.

In India, the Mediation Act, 2023, complements the new criminal and civil codes and is designed to institutionalize mediation as a preferred pathway for civil and commercial disputes. The Act provides for pre-litigation mediation, registration and regulation of mediators and mediation service providers, recognition of community mediation, and procedures for converting mediated settlements into enforceable decrees or orders. However, as noted by legal analyses, the Act presently limits its reach

[5] Singapore International Mediation Centre (SIMC), *Annual Report 2023: Mediation Use and Settlement Outcomes* https://simc.com.sg accessed 06 December 2025.

regarding enforcement of settlements arising from international mediations conducted outside India, even though India is a signatory to the Singapore Convention. This creates a nuanced interplay between domestic mediation law, international obligations, and the practical expectations of cross-border commercial actors.[6]

In the U.K. and U.S., while no single comprehensive mediation statute governs all commercial mediation, a combination of court rules, practice directions, institutional protocols, and professional standards has led to a robust, practice-driven mediation culture. Singapore has taken a more codified approach, integrating mediation into statutory regimes and aligning institutional rules with the Singapore Convention, reinforcing its position as a global hub for both mediation and arbitration.

7. Benefits and impact of commercial mediation

The global pivot towards commercial mediation is underpinned by a range of practical benefits observed across jurisdictions. First, mediation significantly reduces time to resolution compared to full-scale litigation or arbitration, which is especially critical in fast-moving sectors like technology, finance, and supply chain logistics. Second, cost savings—though context-specific—are generally substantial, particularly when measured in terms of opportunity costs, management time, and reputational risk.

Third, mediation supports business continuity by preserving or even enhancing commercial relationships that might otherwise be irreparably damaged by adversarial proceedings. Fourth, confidentiality of proceedings and outcomes allows parties to manage sensitive information, protect trade secrets, and avoid public scrutiny of disputes that might undermine investor confidence or brand equity. Fifth, mediation offers procedural and substantive flexibility: parties can design the process (e.g., joint sessions, caucuses, online formats) and craft outcomes that mix legal, financial, operational, and relational elements in ways unavailable in a binary judgment or award.[7]

From a systemic perspective, widespread use of mediation alleviates pressure on overburdened courts, contributing to reduced backlogs and enabling judiciaries to focus on cases requiring authoritative adjudication or development of precedent. Policymakers also increasingly view mediation as an instrument of access to justice, particularly for SMEs and individuals who might otherwise be priced out of effective dispute resolution processes. When linked with ODR platforms and streamlined enforcement under instruments like the Singapore Convention, mediation becomes an integral

[6] Dubai Chambers Mediation Centre, *Rules and Procedures for Commercial Mediation* (2023) https://www.dubaichamber.com accessed 06 December 2025.

[7] Michael McIlwrath and John Savage, *International Arbitration and Mediation: A Practitioner's Guide* (Kluwer Law International 2020).

component of a more responsive, multi-door justice ecosystem.

8. Persistent challenges: awareness, culture, and enforceability

Notwithstanding its advantages, commercial mediation faces significant obstacles that impede its fuller integration into business and legal cultures. A primary challenge is the limited awareness among businesses, lawyers, and the general public regarding mediation's benefits, enforceability, and procedural safeguards. In many jurisdictions, litigation remains the default response to disputes, seen as more authoritative and legitimate, while mediation is perceived as a sign of weakness or compromise on justice.

Cultural factors also influence receptivity to mediation. In societies where formal court judgments are deeply associated with vindication and status, consensual settlements may be viewed with suspicion, particularly in high-stakes commercial conflicts. In some contexts, hierarchical business cultures may resist interest-based negotiation, preferring authoritative decisions rendered by judges or arbitrators. Additionally, concerns around mediator neutrality, quality, and accountability persist where accreditation standards, ethical codes, and institutional oversight remain underdeveloped.

Enforceability, while significantly improved by the Singapore Convention and domestic reforms, can still be uncertain in cases where states have not ratified the Convention, where domestic courts interpret grounds of refusal broadly, or where mediated settlements intersect with regulated sectors such as insolvency, competition, or public law. Legal analyses of the Mediation Act, 2023 in India, for example, emphasize the gaps regarding enforcement of settlements from mediations conducted abroad, raising questions about the alignment between domestic implementation and international commitments.

9. Research Gap

- Although substantial literature describes ADR and mediation's theoretical benefits and legal frameworks, many works remain jurisdiction-specific and do not systematically compare how commercial mediation is evolving across multiple key jurisdictions (U.S., U.K., India, Singapore, UAE) under the influence of the Singapore Convention.
- Existing scholarship tends to focus either on doctrinal analysis (statutes, conventions, case law) or on policy advocacy, with relatively limited integration of these strands into a holistic account of global trends, implementation challenges, and best practices in commercial mediation.

- There is also a noted gap in examining how awareness, culture, and professional attitudes interact with legal frameworks to shape actual uptake of commercial mediation in practice, particularly in emerging economies.

10. Research Methodology

- The paper adopts a doctrinal and comparative methodology, analysing international instruments (Singapore Convention), national legislation (e.g., India's Mediation Act, 2023; mediation frameworks in Singapore and UAE), and relevant court rules and institutional protocols.
- It employs qualitative content analysis of secondary sources, including academic articles, law review commentary, policy reports, institutional guidelines, and commentary by international organizations and mediation institutions.
- A comparative jurisdictional lens is used to identify convergences and divergences in how commercial mediation is structured, promoted, and enforced in selected jurisdictions, with special attention to cross-border enforceability and integration with court systems.
- The methodology is exploratory and analytic rather than empirical, but it draws on existing empirical data where available (e.g., settlement rates, usage patterns) to support normative and policy recommendations.

Research Methodology and Data Sources

- The present paper adopts a predominantly doctrinal and comparative legal research methodology, complemented by qualitative content analysis of secondary data and selective reference to available empirical studies. This multi-layered approach is designed to illuminate not only the black-letter law governing commercial mediation and ADR, but also the policy narratives, institutional designs, and practical experiences that shape the contemporary landscape of dispute resolution across key jurisdictions. The methodology is explicitly non-empirical in the sense that it does not generate primary quantitative data through surveys or experiments; instead, it synthesizes and critically evaluates existing legal instruments, scholarly commentary, and policy reports to derive analytical insights and normative recommendations.

1. Doctrinal and Comparative Legal Analysis

- At its core, the study conducts a doctrinal analysis of primary legal sources that structure commercial mediation in international and domestic contexts. This includes close reading and interpretation of:
- The United Nations Convention on International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation (Singapore Convention on Mediation), focusing on its scope, procedural architecture, and grounds for refusing enforcement.
- The UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Mediation and International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation, including its Guide to Enactment, to understand how UNCITRAL envisages domestic implementation and harmonization.
- The UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency, in order to situate the discussion of mediation in cross-border insolvency within the broader normative framework governing recognition, cooperation, and coordination across jurisdictions.
- In addition, the methodology involves analysis of key national statutes and regulations:
- India's Mediation Act, 2023, with emphasis on pre-litigation mediation, institutional mediation, community mediation, mediator accreditation, and the treatment of international commercial settlements.
- UAE's mediation-related legislation and reforms, including federal and emirate-level frameworks that promote amicable settlement of civil and commercial disputes and build a "mediation culture".
- The practice-driven frameworks in the United Kingdom and United States, which rely on case law, practice directions, and institutional rules rather than a single comprehensive mediation statute, as well as Singapore's integrated statutory and institutional approach anchored by the Singapore International Mediation Centre (SIMC).
- By systematically interpreting these instruments, the paper identifies common principles, divergences, and normative trends, particularly in relation to enforceability, institutionalization, and the interface between mediation, arbitration, and court processes.
- The comparative element is operationalized through a jurisdictional lens, focusing on selected "reference jurisdictions"—India, Singapore, UAE, U.K., and U.S.—that are either significant commercial hubs or have recently undertaken notable mediation reforms. These jurisdictions represent a mix of civil and common law traditions, varying levels of ratification or engagement

with the Singapore Convention, and differing institutional architectures for mediation. Comparing them allows the paper to explore how similar international norms are translated into diverse domestic legal ecosystems.

2. Qualitative Content Analysis of Secondary Literature

- Beyond primary sources, the study relies heavily on secondary literature, including:
- Peer-reviewed journal articles and book chapters on international commercial mediation, ADR, and multi-tier dispute resolution.
- Law review and journal commentaries on the Singapore Convention, the Mediation Act, 2023, and comparative mediation statutes.
- Practitioner-oriented analyses and thought-leadership pieces published by law firms, policy institutes, and professional bodies, especially on mediation in the UAE, Singapore, and India.
- Policy reports and discussion papers from international organizations such as the World Bank, UNCITRAL, and national insolvency regulators (e.g., IBBI), which address the integration of ADR into insolvency and commercial dispute resolution frameworks.
- Qualitative content analysis is used to extract and categorize key themes from these sources: effectiveness and challenges of ADR in commercial disputes, adoption patterns of commercial mediation, perceptions of the Singapore Convention, critiques of national mediation laws, and best-practice recommendations. The analysis seeks to reconcile doctrinal positions with policy debates and practical experiences by examining how scholars and practitioners assess the strengths and weaknesses of current frameworks.
- In particular, scholarly work comparing the Singapore Convention to the New York Convention is used to illuminate structural differences in enforcement regimes and to assess whether mediation is likely to achieve similar normative standing as arbitration in international commerce. Comparative articles on the Mediation Act, 2023 and mediation reforms in other states provide insight into legislative design choices and their implications for cross-border practice.

3. Use of Empirical and Practice-Based Data

- While the paper does not generate its own empirical dataset, it draws upon existing empirical and practice-based information where available. This includes:

- Reported or aggregated settlement rates, time-to-resolution metrics, and user satisfaction data from institutional mediation centres and court-annexed mediation programmes, particularly in jurisdictions such as Singapore, the U.S., and the U.K., where such statistics are periodically published or discussed in the literature.
- Case-based discussions of high-profile disputes, notably Lehman Brothers-related insolvency matters, where mediation has been used in complex, multi-party, cross-border contexts.
- Surveys and qualitative studies captured in secondary sources that document attitudes of judges, lawyers, and business users towards mediation and ADR more generally.
- These data are not treated as statistically representative in a strict quantitative sense; instead, they are used to triangulate doctrinal and policy analysis. For example, empirical evidence of high settlement rates and user satisfaction can corroborate doctrinal arguments about mediation's potential for efficiency and relationship preservation. Conversely, evidence of low uptake in certain sectors or jurisdictions, despite favorable legal frameworks, supports the paper's identification of awareness, culture, and professional incentives as independent variables that shape mediation's real-world impact.[8]

4. Selection Criteria for Jurisdictions and Materials

- The selection of jurisdictions is purposive rather than random. India, Singapore, and UAE are chosen because they are actively engaged in mediation reform and are linked to the Singapore Convention and regional commercial hubs. The U.K. and U.S. are included due to their mature mediation cultures and influential common law traditions, which shape global expectations about ADR practice. The focus on these jurisdictions is not meant to imply that others (e.g., EU states, East Asian jurisdictions) are unimportant, but reflects practical constraints of scope and the desire to study systems that have both significant commercial traffic and active engagement with international mediation norms.[9]
- In terms of materials, priority is given to:
- Most recent versions of statutes, treaties, and model laws (post-2018 developments in particular).

[8] Susan Blake, Julie Browne and Stuart Sime, *A Practical Approach to Alternative Dispute Resolution* (5th edn, OUP 2023).
[9] UAE Federal Law No 6 of 2021 on Mediation for the Settlement of Civil and Commercial Disputes.

- Academic and policy sources published within roughly the last decade, to capture contemporary debates on mediation, ODR, and cross-border enforcement.
- Authoritative commentaries and practitioner guidance by bodies and institutions known for dispute resolution expertise (e.g., UNCITRAL, World Bank, leading international law firms, recognized ADR centres).
- This curated approach seeks to combine doctrinal rigor with practical relevance, avoiding both purely theoretical abstraction and narrowly technical practitioner commentary.

5. Methodological Limitations

- The research design entails several limitations that are acknowledged upfront. First, the reliance on secondary sources means that the paper is dependent on the quality, objectivity, and completeness of existing literature and data; gaps in empirical research or bias in practitioner narratives may therefore indirectly affect the analysis. Second, the dynamic nature of mediation law—especially post-Singapore Convention and in reforming jurisdictions like India and UAE—means that legal developments may outpace the publication cycle of the studied materials, potentially rendering some descriptions out of date.
- Third, the absence of primary interviews with mediators, judges, or corporate counsel limits the paper's ability to capture nuanced experiential insights, such as the internal decision-making processes by which businesses choose between litigation, arbitration, and mediation. Finally, the focus on selected jurisdictions unavoidably excludes others where innovative or divergent practices might exist, such as certain EU member states or Asian jurisdictions not covered in detail.

6. Analytical Orientation

- Despite these limitations, the chosen methodology is well-suited to the paper's analytical and normative aims. By synthesizing doctrinal analysis, comparative perspectives, and practice-based insights, the study seeks to:
- Evaluate how far current international and national frameworks have succeeded in making commercial mediation a predictable, enforceable, and attractive option for cross-border disputes.
- Identify patterns and divergences that inform the research hypotheses concerning the relationship between legal frameworks, cultural and professional factors, and actual mediation usage.

- Ground policy recommendations in a balanced reading of legal texts, academic debate, and available empirical indications, rather than in purely aspirational advocacy.
- In summary, the methodology combines doctrinal and comparative legal research, qualitative content analysis, and selective use of empirical data, anchored in carefully chosen jurisdictions and authoritative sources. This integrated approach enables a nuanced understanding of the evolving role of commercial mediation in global dispute resolution and provides a robust foundation for the paper's conclusions and recommendations.

11. Hypotheses

- Jurisdictions that combine clear legal frameworks for commercial mediation with effective enforcement mechanisms (including Singapore Convention adoption) exhibit higher institutionalization and usage of mediation.
- Awareness, professional culture, and accreditation standards significantly influence the effectiveness of commercial mediation, even where formal legal frameworks exist.

12. Best practices and policy recommendations

Addressing these challenges requires a multi-dimensional strategy involving legislators, Government bodies, courts, professional bodies, educational institutions, and business associations. Key best practices and recommendations emerging from comparative experience include:

- Public and professional education: Systematic awareness campaigns, integration of mediation into legal and business curricula, and continuing professional development programs for lawyers and judges can change perceptions and normalize mediation as a first-line option.
- Robust accreditation and ethical standards: Clear criteria for mediator training, accreditation, and discipline build trust, particularly in complex commercial disputes.
- Court-linked incentives: Cost sanctions for unreasonable refusal to mediate, structured pre-trial mediation windows, and court-annexed mediation schemes can encourage early settlement exploration without coercing parties.
- Harmonized enforcement regimes: Ratification and effective implementation of the Singapore Convention, alignment of domestic mediation laws with international standards, and careful drafting of enforcement provisions reduce uncertainty and forum shopping.

- Integration with ODR and technology: Leveraging online mediation and hybrid processes can overcome geographic and logistical barriers, reduce costs, and better serve cross-border disputes.
- Data collection and transparency: Empirical research on settlement rates, user satisfaction, cost and time metrics, and sector-specific outcomes provides an evidence base for continuous improvement and policy refinement.

These measures, implemented coherently, can gradually embed mediation into commercial dispute resolution cultures, ensuring that parties choose mediation not out of compulsion or fashion but from informed strategic judgment.[10]

13. Conclusion

Alternate Dispute Resolution, and commercial mediation in particular, has shifted from an experimental adjunct to a central mechanism in global dispute resolution architecture. By emphasizing party autonomy, confidentiality, and interest-based outcomes, mediation responds to the complex realities of modern commerce more nimbly than traditional adjudicatory models. The Singapore Convention on Mediation, reforms such as the Mediation Act, 2023 in India, and emerging laws in jurisdictions like the UAE and Singapore collectively underscore a normative and institutional commitment to making mediated settlements both practically viable and legally secure across borders. Yet the promise of commercial mediation will only be fully realized when persistent obstacles—limited awareness, cultural resistance, questions about mediator quality, and residual enforcement uncertainties—are systematically addressed through education, regulation, and judicial leadership. As businesses increasingly operate in interdependent global markets, the capacity to resolve disputes promptly, equitably, and sustainably becomes not merely a procedural choice but a strategic necessity. In this landscape, ADR—particularly commercial mediation—stands as an indispensable pillar of a more collaborative, efficient, and humane global justice system, capable of simultaneously supporting economic dynamism, legal certainty, and the long-term health of commercial relationships.

[10] Hopt K and Steffek F, 'Mediation: Comparison of Laws, Regulatory Models and Practical Implications' (2016) Max Planck Institute Research Paper 16/14.

14. References

1. United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL), *United Nations Convention on International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation (Singapore Convention on Mediation)*, 2018.
2. UNCITRAL, *UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Mediation and International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation*, with Guide to Enactment, 2018.
3. UNCITRAL, *UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency*, 1997.
4. Ohri, R., "Mediation Act, 2023," *LawSikho* (Article), 2025.
5. "Mediation Act, 2023," *Drishti Judiciary Editorial*, 31 October 2024.
6. "Mediation in the UAE – Legal Developments (Federal Law No. 6 of 2021 on Mediation for the Settlement of Civil and Commercial Disputes)," *The Legal 500 – Thought Leadership*, 15 January 2025.
7. "Mediation," *Official Portal of the UAE Government*, referring to Federal Decree Law No. 40 of 2023 on Mediation and Conciliation in Civil and Commercial Disputes.
8. "Commercial Mediation in Singapore," *Linklaters Global Guide – Commercial Mediation*, 4 August 2022.
9. "The Singapore Convention on Mediation: An Overview," *Arbitration.ru Journal*.
10. "The Mediation Act, 2023: Balancing between Commercial Disputes and International Obligations," *Woxsen Law Review*, 2024.
11. "Decoding the Mediation Act, 2023," Nishith Desai Associates – *Dispute Resolution Hotline*, 3 September 2023.
12. "The Role of Mediation in Resolving Commercial Disputes in India: Challenges and Prospects," VBCL Law Review, 2025.
13. "Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in Commercial Disputes: Effectiveness and Challenges," SSRN Working Paper, 2025.
14. "Singapore Convention on Mediation: Viability & Challenges," VIA Mediation Centre, 2024.

15. "PART 2: The Rule of Thirds – Mediation in India, Singapore and Dubai," Presolv360, 4 November 2024.

16. "Exploring New Perspectives on Insolvency," Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India (IBBI), collection of papers on emerging issues in insolvency, including ADR and mediation in cross-border insolvency contexts.

17. World Bank Group, policy and technical papers on insolvency systems and the use of ADR mechanisms in restructuring and insolvency (e.g., *Principles for Effective Insolvency and Creditor/Debtor Regimes*). [Referenced generally for World Bank advocacy on ADR.]

18. International Bar Association (IBA), guidelines and reports on mediation and ADR in international commercial disputes (e.g., IBA Mediation Committee resources). [Referenced generally for IBA's role in promoting ADR.]

19. Case reference: *Lehman Brothers* cross-border insolvency proceedings, in which mediation was used to resolve multi-party creditor disputes (discussed in secondary literature such as IBBI/World Bank/academic analyses on cross-border insolvency and ADR).