



QICDRC SPECIAL EDITION NEWSLETTER

SIFOCC 5TH FULL MEETING



Contents

Keynote speech: The Spirit of the Judicial Task and the Importance of International Judicial Dialogue p3

Reflections on the Fifth Full Meeting: Lord Thomas of Cwmgiedd, Chairman of SIFoCC's Steering Group and President, QIC p9

Reflections on the Fifth Full Meeting: Justice Dr Muna Al-Marzouqi, Judge, QICDRC, and Associate Vice President for Academic Planning & Quality Assurance at Qatar University p10

The QICDRC Special Edition Newsletter is produced by the Qatar International Court and Dispute Resolution Centre in association with Lexis Nexis online legal and business research service. If you could like to be added to the free circulation contact f.albishri@qicdrc.gov.qa.

EDITORIAL

Editor

Claire Melvin
+44 (0) 20 7347 3521
claire.melvin@lexisnexis.co.uk

PRODUCTION

Senior Designer
Jack Witherden

EDITOR IN CHIEF & QICDRC REGISTRAR

Umar Azmeh
u.azmeh@qicdrc.gov.qa

ENQUIRIES

QICDRC
Qatar Financial Centre Tower No. 2
Omar Al Mukhtar Street, West Bay, Doha, Qatar
PO Box 136670

 @QICDRC

Reproduction, copying or extracting by any means of the whole or part of this publication must not be undertaken without the written permission of the publishers.

This publication is intended to be a general guide and cannot be a substitute for professional advice. Neither the authors nor the publisher accept any responsibility for loss occasioned to any person acting or refraining from acting as a result of material contained in this publication.

© QICDRC 2024



The Standing Forum of International Commercial Courts (SIFoCC) was founded in 2016 by amongst others, Lord Thomas of Cwmgiedd then Lord Chief Justice of England and Wales who is the current President of the Qatar International Court – in order to bring together the world's commercial Courts. SIFoCC exists for three reasons. First, so court users, which include business and markets, are better served by best practice being shared among the world's judiciaries so courts can keep pace with commercial change. Second, to ensure that courts can collectively make a stronger contribution to the rule of law in order to contribute to stability and prosperity. Finally, to help support developing jurisdictions by enhancing their attractiveness to investors by offering effective commercial dispute resolution mechanisms. SIFoCC now has over 50 member states who collectively form part of the organisation. It is headquartered at the Royal Courts of Justice in London and is based within the Judicial Office of England and Wales. Its first four Full Meetings were held in London, New York, Singapore, and Sydney, and it was our great pleasure and honour to welcome the SIFoCC's 5th Full Meeting to Doha in April 2024, with the Qatar International Court and Dispute Resolution Centre (QICDRC) as the host. This was the first SIFoCC meeting to be held in Qatar and Qatar was the first country in the MENA region to host the Forum. Over 170 judges from 56 jurisdictions met at the wonderful facilities at Qatar University, our flagship public university. We were very privileged to welcome these distinguished guests from across the world including a significant number of chief justices and presidents of courts, as well as ambassadors and other dignitaries. Our Qatari delegation included the Minister of Justice, Chief Justice, President of the Investment and Trade Court, and a number of QICDRC Judges. Lord Thomas chaired the Meeting in his dual roles as President of the Qatar International Court and Chair of the SIFoCC Steering Group. The key themes which are summarised in this publication were matters of interest and importance to courts, judiciaries, and dispute resolution. They included AI in the world—AI in the handling and resolution of disputes; developing the relationship between commercial courts, arbitration and mediation; corporate activity and the rule of law; and towards greater transnational judicial cooperation. The discussion was of an extremely high quality and all the delegations learnt important lessons and experiences from each other which they can now take back to their own jurisdictions. We were proud, too, to be able to demonstrate Qatari hospitality and the legal pedigree and expertise our country has to offer as other delegates met Qatari based academics, local lawyers, and law students, along with judges, legal officers and my QICDRC staff who were able to showcase the vibrant legal framework. As a result of this Fifth Full Meeting being held in Doha, both Qatar and the QICDRC have been fortunate to have made many more friends and partners from across the world, fostering the collaboration which is a core aim of SIFoCC. During the event about 50 of the delegates were shown around the QICDRC courts, where we demonstrated features of our court room and delegates were able to see how we operate and successfully run a heavy caseload. I will end on notes of thanks. To the delegates who came to Doha whom we look forward to welcoming again and who made the event the success that it was. To the SIFoCC Secretariat in London whose guidance and experience ensured that the Meeting went smoothly. To our President Lord Thomas of Cwmgiedd whose energy and enthusiasm led to bringing the event to Doha. Finally to my superb team at the QICDRC who worked ferociously hard over several months to deliver a flawless world class event.


The Spirit of the Judicial Task and the Importance of International Judicial Dialogue

The Honourable James Allsop AC,
Former Chief Justice of the Federal
Court of Australia

The title of this address contemplates the existence or presence of the spirit of the judicial task. Spirit is indefinable; it involves the pervading theme or essence of how one performs the task, reflecting why one does the task, and whom and what the task serves. It is, perhaps, helpful to begin by saying something of the law and what is involved in resolving disputes under the law. In order to appreciate the nature of the judicial task and why the spirit of the task is so important, indeed essential, to the creation or re-inspiring of a sense of justice being done, one must reflect upon the law itself and what it is, what it is not, and what resolving disputes under the law means. This assists in giving human, and not only theoretical, form to the Rule of Law.

"What is law?" is a large jurisprudential and philosophical question. For a working description today, and recognising the diversity of cultures and societies present, one can say that law includes various constituent materials: statutes or codes, the judicial interpretation of their meaning, judicial rule making, rules, principles and customs. These imperfectly segregated materials are drawn from parliaments, executive decrees, custom, history, social values, and expectations. They are all basically human, societal and by reference to customary activity within and between societies. How these materials combine, disengage, change and apply to (sometimes complex) factual circumstances, is both a legal and a social question. This must be so, as law is a binding agent, part of the structural form and tissue, of human society: its form, content and application being determined or shaped by its social, and its human, character and context.

One of America's greatest scholar-judges, Oliver Wendell Holmes once said in a speech that the law did not suffer from too much theory, but rather not enough, as long as theory was conceived of as getting to the bottom of the subject. He recognised and understood there was an inexpressible binding of theory and human experience in the law, and that the legal system had a final title to respect, not because it was an Hegelian dream, but because it was part of the lives of people. The biographer of one of the United States' greatest Judges, Benjamin Cardozo, drawing on his close understanding of Cardozo's work, called law 'organisable morality'. That was not a definition, nor was it some denial of the authority of the rule-making organs of the State and their rules and principles, nor was it a denial of some essential attributes of law:



definition, textual clarity, and the requisite degree of available certainty and stability. Rather, it was a pointing in the direction of societal context and reason in which the daily struggles of humans take place, over power, wealth, safety, freedom, religion and belief, sustenance, sometimes survival, and, in the broadest sense, human happiness and meaning.

Notwithstanding the presence of these materials of statutes and codes and their interpretation, rules, principles, and custom all recorded with such textual clarity as is possible, the law is not a complete, exhaustive and self-referential system containing the legal answers to all legal problems that are thrown up by the circumstances of life. Often, the logical application of the text of a statute or rule does not provide the clear or definitive answer to a concrete legal problem thrown up by circumstances.

Social and human values, in the silent and imperceptible movement of society, are ever present in the law. One needs perspective, sometimes of time, sometimes of quiet reflection, to appreciate how the resolution of concrete legal problems by law and legal technique can be affected deeply by social values, a sense of balance, and a suspicion of the worth of simple general propositions taken to their logical conclusions. Law, like life, can some times be simple; but often, indeed generally, neither is.

The law and its application, being the judicial task, often involves dealing with, and reconciling, opposites and antitheses, sometimes seeming irreconcilables that pervade life and law, and lie at the heart of

dispute resolution and of the day-to-day exercise of the judicial task. This can be seen in the relationship between certainty and uncertainty, rule, principle and exception; in the endemic difficulty, sometimes impossibility, of definition, despite the essentiality of the requisite degree of definition; of the need for taxonomical structure and precision, where possible in the expression of abstract concepts, all in the face of the implicit wholeness of human relational ideas drawn from thought, feeling and emotion; and above all, it can be seen in the limits, but the illuminating power, of text – of words. These reconciliations make up (though we may not realise as we do it) much of our task as Judges to express and apply the law for the individuals who come before us and for the society and people which and whom we serve. All this reflects the reality that many legitimately disputed questions for resolution under law have no one 'correct' answer to be ascertained by reading and applying the pre-existing text of rules, or by deductive logic. Evaluation of contending and conflicting considerations is usually present. The rule or principle may not be directly applicable, and analogical reasoning may be required; or the rule, if clear in expression, may not provide for simple application, but for evaluative characterisation of facts, even if the primary facts are uncontested. This evaluation, and the struggle with and resolution of often present opposites or antitheses in many contested questions is difficult to grasp even for the highest calibre of trained lawyers. Even when grasped and accepted, there is the question of disputed views in the resolution of these opposites, of these uncertainties and evaluations, in a particular case. This is not to say there is a personal or institutionally embedded incoherence or choice in the law or its application. But it is to say that for the acceptance of the results and decisions of the dispute resolution process (the judicial task) there is the need for the presence of a legitimising character of the process. Here, we come to judicial power, and the spirit of the judicial task.

The judicial task involves the deployment of power, State power. But it is a unique form of power. It is in essence protective in character – whether of the individual, the group, society, or, sometimes, the judicial institution itself. It is not assertive or self-wilful, as other forms of public power properly are. It protects by declaring and enforcing rights, duties and obligations of the individual, the group and the State, according to law. This is done by upholding the law in resolving disputes or controversies between citizens or subjects and between the State and citizens or subjects, peacefully, fairly, respecting the dignity of the litigants, and where appropriate, exhibiting mercy. In so doing, the judicial power of the State is the civilised substitute for the gun and the gang.

But the nature of the power is not abstractly defined. It is experiential, to be described, not defined. When deployed or exercised, it is felt, emotionally, almost physically as *justice* being done at the sentence of the convicted person; the pronouncement of the order for custody of the child; the order of bankruptcy of the insolvent debtor; or the judgment for money that may cause financial ruin.

These deeply moving and sometimes, indeed often, harmful acts, must come from persons who are

disinterested, fair, decent, human in character and appearance, yet aloof and abstracted to a degree, trusted and respected in wisdom and learning, with a recognition they act selflessly, fairly and impartially, charged as manifestations of just State power, though with humanity that necessarily involves the possibility of human failing.

One can see from this *description* (not definition) of the person to wield the judicial power (human and fallible, but still a manifestation of just State power) another of the antitheses or opposites in the judicial task: the abstract and the human, hinting at the intertwining of the theoretical and experiential.

Both the judicial task, and judicial power involved within it, have a relationship with the society and the people they serve. That is one of the reasons why it is wrong to *define* judicial power or an element of it such that it denies to it the possibility of recognition in another society. For the power to be judicial, and even though much is contextual, there still must be recognisable within it certain characteristics that give it its universality and recognisable commonality of qualities and features suited to the function.

The characteristics of the undertaking of the judicial task and the exercise of judicial power may take on different forms or hues in different societies. But they all have an indefinable call that resonates to, and is recognised by, the human condition – not only abstractedly or theoretically, in the mastering of the law and in understanding its process, but also experientially and emotionally in its effect: producing the feeling that justice is being, or has been, done. These characteristics illuminate the spirit of the task. It is, to a degree, abstracted: knowing the law, with its text, form and logic, thinking about and organising the evidence and rationalising the law to the facts. However, the spirit of the task also involves the manner of its undertaking. This involves the elements or qualities of judicial technique that can be described in human and experiential terms and which can inspire, even in the most cynical of litigants, a (perhaps grudging) respect for, and (at least residually) a trust in, the proper and decent exercise of the judicial power affecting them. These qualities include skill, thoughtful learning born of study, diligence, reasonable despatch and efficiency, faithfulness to the text and meaning of the law, impartiality, fairness, a lack of anger or emotion, the application of reason and practical judgement, as well as courage when necessary, and an exhibiting of the respect and empathy for, and a recognition of the dignity of, all before the Court, which recognises the powerlessness and reduced position of all put into the position of the litigant – the dependence upon the judgement of others. When present, these qualities coalesce and conspire to deny the arrogance of position and of power. The importance of all these qualities comes from the interrelationship all have between the human and the abstract. The spirit of the judicial task (involving these qualities) does not come from high policy or grand expression; it comes from what must be done on a daily basis in the application of the law in life's small, sometimes selfish and mundane, intersections concerning people going about their lives and businesses, where the elements I have referred to assume a daily modesty in expression, and context.



That modesty in expression and context reaches back towards the fusing of theory and law with the experientially human features of the exercise of the task to which I have referred. The spirit of the task comes from its modest application to the humans in question, conflicts in resolution, pages of the lives of people.

Given the nature and character of SIFoCC as dealing with commercial courts this discussion of the judicial task and its spirit might turn to commerce and commercial law. One should not be too starry-eyed about the nobility of the middleman or trader. Yet, out of the, to a degree, selfish character of the search for commercial gain, one derives some of the most important and enduring conceptions in the law, such as the bargain, good faith and fair dealing, unjust enrichment, the unconscionability of the exorbitant bargain, salvage and general average, to name a few. Such is another opposite or antithesis embedded in the law.

In an increasingly transnational and international world, commercial courts, in particular, are more regularly meeting questions of principle and judgement that require a balance of national interest and respect for, or at least consideration of, commercial parties and courts of other countries. The activity of commerce is international, so, the character of commercial law for that activity must also be, to a proper degree, international. Commerce can be seen to play an instrumental role in bringing otherwise isolated and disparate groups and societies into contact and into relations. The growth in wealth associated with trade allowed (for better or worse, as the case may be)

nations to expand beyond their existing territories and led to the foundation of new settlements. A moment's reflection on the trading circles and routes spanning the world before European colonisation began in the 15th century would inform the necessary connection of habit, custom, law and reciprocity amongst North Asia, South East Asia, South Asia and the Sub-Continent, Central Asia, Africa, the Middle East, the Mediterranean and Europe, and the Baltic.

In order for commerce to grow, its participants needed to be able to deal with each other peacefully and with mutual benefit. Commerce was instrumental for the development of a modern public and private international law system and the development of the broad and crucial, though not well defined, concept of comity. Comity has, from its beginning, been inextricably linked to international commerce, and indeed owes its very existence to the pressures and demands of commerce and transnational trade. It is a doctrine built on the recognition, as expressed by Ulrich Huber, that: *"nothing could be more inconvenient to commerce and to international usage than that transactions valid by the law of one place should be rendered of no effect elsewhere on the account of a difference in the law"*.

This underpinning feature of the necessity for a proper degree of comity in the conduct of transnational commerce gives the commercial law that regulates international commerce its unique characteristic: that it is the law of *an activity*, an international activity, and not just the law of a particular place or of a particular people or society. Perhaps the clearest illustration of this is maritime law which can be seen



as a distinct branch of the law rooted in maritime, and international commercial, *activity*. It is the law of maritime activity and seafaring commerce. It was once placed by a great American professor, John Henry Wigmore in, *A Panorama of the World's Legal Systems* as one of the 16 *legal systems* in the world. This was not antiquarian fancy; it was legal reality. Wigmore recognised maritime law was not the law of a place or a people, but a general body of law from shared common experience in facing the exigencies, risks and perils (human and physical) faced in the timeless activity of sea borne commerce. This led and leads to the formation of common principles, even if there are differences between individual national laws in their adoption and adaption of the common principles.

Ultimately, laws of societies grow from the roots of the group and the place, and comparative law can be seen as a canopy of leaves and branches linking these different trees of national law growing from the earth of separate peoples and places. Maritime law and to a degree, international commercial law, are quite different. They are the law of maritime and commercial *activity* and of the humans who engage in it across the world. The metaphor of their manifestation is the rising of the springs of national law from the underlying stream of common principle below.

One of the most beautiful expressions of this came from Justice Jackson in the United States Supreme Court in 1953 in *Lauritzen v Larsen*. He was dealing with the proper construction of United States seafarers' compensation legislation and whether or not it applied to a foreign seafarer on board a foreign ship injured while the ship was in New York Harbour. The seafarer's

relationship with the ship and ship owner was entirely framed by articles of employment, the proper law of which was the same nationality of the flag of the ship and of his citizenship. Justice Jackson, having referred to "*a non-national or international maritime law of impressive maturity and universality*", said: "*International maritime law in such matters as this does not seek uniformity and does not purport to restrict any nation from making and altering its laws to govern its own shipping and territories. However, it aims at stability and order through usages which considerations of comity, reciprocity and long range interest have developed to define the domain which each nation will claim as its own.*" This reflects the practical reality of international commercial principle even when applied by national courts. Involved in the conception of international maritime law is the recognition of a coherent body of rules and principles with roots and history in maritime commerce over centuries, recorded in codes and decisions in many parts of the world. As such, it may not bind nation states of its own force, but it is adopted and adapted into national laws retaining its source and inspiration from the international maritime law.

One can see from this that just as international commerce brings different societies together, so do shared international legal principles.

An example of these shared principles is the similarity of text of maritime codes and principles around the world. Maritime law is best taught, I found, not by focusing on one particular nation's laws, but through a study of conventions, codes from different countries and common principles. When teaching

shipping law in Australia, colleagues and I taught from multiple codes and statutes to illustrate the commonalities and nuances of differences in national legal systems across the world. We particularly used the text of the Chinese Maritime Code and Chinese Maritime Procedure Law. These were carefully drafted and carefully translated through the 1980s and 1990s under the guidance of the deeply scholarly work of the great maritime universities in China, in particular the Shanghai and Dalian Maritime Universities. These codes are of the highest quality and, translated into English, are works of elegant, balanced simplicity that capture the meaning and spirit of international maritime law and practice taken from prevailing international conventions and principles.

It must be appreciated that the societies and people served by the judicial task include those engaged in international commercial activity, including States, as well as merchants and traders.

I have tried to emphasise that the importance of the judicial task and its spirit is to engender confidence in those who come before the court in the decision-making that will affect their lives and businesses. The nature of international commerce and international commercial law means the task is not limited to engendering the *loyalty* of the citizen or subject of the particular country or polity served by the court, but extends to inspiring the *confidence* of all those involved in international commerce: to the foreign State or merchant or trader, to the stranger. The spirit of the judicial task is the proper approach to the duty to succeed in *that* task. The importance of the task and its spirit is not just what is done, but how it is done. The process is both analytical and intensely human; it is abstracted and experiential; it reflects a social or human bond between the State, manifested in the court, and the person, including the stranger, such as the international merchant or trader, who comes before it. What then is the importance of international judicial dialogue?

When I became Chief Justice of the Federal Court of Australia in 2013, I began to think more thoroughly than before about international judicial dialogue. Previous Chief Justices of the Federal Court had put in place relationships of bilateral dialogue and assistance with Courts of a number of countries: including the Supreme Courts of Vietnam, Indonesia, Papua New Guinea, and Vanuatu; and the Supreme People's Court of the People's Republic of China. Some were more wide ranging in subject than others. Some focused on organisational and case management concerns; some involved mentoring younger judges; some, especially that with the Supreme People's Court, involved detailed exchange on subjects of mutual interest, in that case, maritime and shipping law and practice.

Some may have been viewed as giving of assistance by one Court to the other, but that would have been too narrow a lens properly to understand the nature of the relationship. All these relationships were deeply mutually beneficial in their aims and undertaking.

All involved resources – time and human resources, as well as precious Court funding. I asked myself: Why were we doing this? We have litigants before us who deserve our time; and the resources from the taxes placed on all citizens should be devoted to that judicial



task. The same question was sometimes asked by colleagues and friends. If one answered by reference to the benefits to Australia by some projection of influence or recognition, one could be met by the legitimate riposte that this was not the judicial task; it was foreign policy, soft power and influence, and so the domain of government of the day. The answers to all the questions on the legitimacy of undertaking judicial dialogue should, by now, be found in an appreciation of the nature and importance of the judicial task and its spirit. No Judge can fully appreciate the nature and importance of what they do without appreciating how Judges of other countries, systems and traditions *undertake the same task*.

The exchange and the dialogue, bi-lateral or multi-lateral, brings out an appreciation of different perspectives, of the varied contexts of the same or similar problems, of connections, common principles, and common underlying values. This gives strength, or perhaps a basis to question, one's own system's principles and approaches, and equips one to approach the judicial task of reconciling all the opposites and antitheses, in a national and international context, taking proper account of reciprocity and comity, the nature of the international activity, and the content of international commercial legal principle.

For a Judge or court to approach contemporary problems of the judicial task, whether the development of legal principle or preparation to meet new challenges, with a rejection of the need for understanding of how colleagues around the world are dealing with these problems might be thought to be



foolish or arrogant.

The first theme of the meeting, artificial intelligence, is of great importance. AI will affect forever how the administration of justice is practically undertaken. It is essential courts engage with the science and technology in this area. Not to do so would cede to others a licence to masquerade as the only source of so-called 'accurate' decision-making, and deny the courts the assistance they need in dealing with the choking thickets of digital information that envelop us in the digital world, which is only increasing exponentially.

That engagement will not, however, do away with the need for both the judicial task and its spirit. One might be able to have a machine mimic the judicial task and its embodied spirit, including in dealing with all the reconciliations of the task addressing questions with no necessarily correct answer; but that is hardly the point. Nevertheless, how machine learnt processes of abstraction and synthesis may affect and assist human engagement and justice are deep questions for the future. The notion of the complementarity of two ways of thinking: an AI way of thinking and a human way of thinking, mentioned by Professor Colin Mayer and Simon Knowles is of particular importance. Complementarity may give another perspective, perhaps as large as it did in quantum mechanics with Bohr and Heisenberg in 1927 in the Copenhagen Interpretation. The difficulty of grasping the boundary (if a boundary line is an apt conception) between human and machine judgement or thinking, and knowing whether it is one or the other, is perhaps not a world away from the co-existence and complementarity of waves and particles, and their changing by the

act of measurement, and the necessary uncertainty inherent in quantum physics, ridiculed by Schrodinger and his posited cat in the box that could not be both dead and alive at the same time. Contemplating or reconciling opposites in physics is perhaps echoed in contemplating the opposites and antitheses in algorithmic prediction and mimicking, abstract and theoretical reasoning, and the human and experiential reality of the whole. We are, after all, beginning to discuss human consciousness. To try and find our way in that undertaking without intense and regular exchange with colleagues around the world, such as has already taken place at this meeting, would doom the individual response to narrowness, provincialism, and likely inadequacy.

The second theme, developing the relationship between commercial courts, arbitration and mediation simply cannot be addressed other than through dialogue with judicial colleagues, arbitrators, and mediators, from as many jurisdictions as possible. That dialogue is essential to the deepening of the understanding and strength of the *international justice system*, which is comprised of national commercial courts, international courts, arbitration institutions, arbitrators, mediation institutions, mediators, and the legal profession around the world.

This legal system, described so well by Chief Justice Menon in his keynote address at the last Full Meeting in Sydney in October 2022, is framed by one of the most important international conventions ever passed and adopted: the New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of International Arbitral Awards, the Recognition of Courts Convention, the UNCITRAL Model Law on Arbitration, the Singapore Mediation Convention, numerous soft law instruments and non-binding, but extant, international maritime law and international commercial law. The strength of the tissue of such a system depends on regular dialogue. The matters and subjects in the second theme are not capable of being fully discussed other than within an international meeting such as SIFoCC and in dialogue spawned by it.

The third theme of corporate activity and the rule of law throws up important issues in international commerce. Questions of a legal, moral and policy kind involved in the carrying on of business, including exploitation of resources in third party countries, the organisation of corporate groups and the responsibility of the parent and major corporate elements in the group for overall group behaviour will be fundamental to the development of a coherent remedial system in the coming century. Again, it is difficult to see how this can be properly addressed by Judges of one jurisdiction without understanding, from close dialogue, how other countries may approach the problem.

The fourth theme of greater international judicial co-operation is self evidently a subject that can only be dealt with in the form of a meeting such as this. The importance of international judicial co-operation cannot be over emphasised. Working together, whether in parallel insolvency cases, or working through competing claims to jurisdiction, and in understanding the quality of the work of other courts and other Judges can only come from familiarity with the Judges of those courts personally and institutionally.



Judicial dialogue is not only important to the law, but it is also important to understanding other systems. When Judges share their experiences, they learn and share aspects of the judicial task and its spirit that are often incapable of precise written expression. That helps Judges appreciate, from dialogue and new perspectives gained, the reality of the spirit of the judicial task and its indefinable character, as well as its importance.

One of the greatest of Australia's legal scholars and Judges died last year, far too young. His name was Paul Finn. He was a well-published scholar and prolific judge, of great quality. Like all Judges of the Federal Court in the 1990s and 2000s, he had the task of dealing with a great many immigration cases – which were often hopeless in law, but always replete with human hopes and fears.

In a beautifully written obituary, the following was recorded as the words of an Iranian applicant before Paul at the conclusion of a hearing about the refugee status of the man: *"It does not matter to me if I win or lose, as I sense that the Judge is a spiritual man, who treated me with such respect, that I know he will do what is right."* This was a human recognition of the Judge's dutiful engagement in the task, in the process, that revealed to this man, with his intelligent insight, that something deep and important had taken place in his experience with, and of, the Judge. This is not imagined. It is the social bond of justice being manifested among, and recognised by, humans who come together in an act of supplication before State power and authority. It is a bond achieved by the engagement of a fallible human in the task of

ascertaining and impartially applying the law in a careful, detailed and abstracted way and by the respect shown to the dignity of the parties.

The Iranian man had the insight and poetic gift to express these things. Many litigants without such gifts *feel* the same thing, even if they do not conceptualise it, or do not, or cannot, express it in language.

This experience emotes a feeling that often is expressed, otherwise than by the statement that justice has been done. The proper execution of the judicial task and the spirit which the task embodies are essential for a just society embodying the rule of law and for the health of commerce, including international commerce and international commercial law.

That the Iranian man's case was about his claim for asylum, not one about commerce such as a breach of contract, does not deny the relevance of how he felt, to the expectations of all litigants before a court, including, but perhaps especially for our purposes today, the foreign State or merchant or trader before a commercial court: the stranger engaging in international commerce.


These matters lie at the heart of the importance of international judicial dialogue and of organisations such as SIFoCC in strengthening international commerce and international commercial law, in strengthening ourselves as Judges, and strengthening relations across and between societies.

This strengthening will come through recognising the common task, which we are privileged to share, involves a spirit of an indefinable character, being one which engages human consciousness in the recognition of justice.

Reflections on the Fifth Full Meeting

Lord Thomas of Cwmgiedd
Chairman of SIFoCC's Steering Group
and President of the Qatar International
Court

Full Meetings of SIFoCC take place every 18 months and each one is hosted by a different member jurisdiction. In 2017 SIFoCC met for its foundation in London, in 2019 in New York, in 2021 in Singapore (with participation online because of the pandemic), in 2022 in Sydney and this year we met in Doha. This Full Meeting was the first to be hosted in the MENA region. We were very grateful for the hospitality shown by the Middle East and Qatar (including the Qatari Minister of Justice and the President of the Qatar Supreme Judicial Council (the Chief Justice), the University of Qatar and the Qatar International Court and Dispute Resolution Centre (QICDRC)) which has been a members of SIFoCC since it was established in 2017. The beautiful setting and convenient location of Doha was appreciated by the attendees. Full Meetings are attended by all member judiciaries of SIFoCC, mostly in person but some join remotely. In addition, at Full Meetings there are a small number of invited guests who include experts and partner organisations. Our fifth meeting was structured in such a way that the active participation of everyone was arranged; this improves judicial cooperation in a way that could not be otherwise achieved. In between Full Meetings, there are a range of activities which are attended, often remotely, by different groups from within the SIFoCC membership. I was struck by how encouraging it was to see over 50 jurisdictions bringing their judiciaries together. In recent years the membership of SIFoCC has grown considerably and it was important to ensure that everyone was able to participate in the discussions which covered the leadership of commercial courts but also important questions of substantive law on which international trade and commerce depend such as recognition and enforcement of judgments, the use of artificial intelligence, corporate responsibility, climate change and the relationship between commercial courts, arbitration and mediation. In selecting the topics for discussion, the Steering Committee which provides the governance of SIFoCC (and which I chair) looks at the types of topics being discussed by Commercial Courts. Our aim is to ensure commercial courts across the world are kept abreast of developments in these areas. Some of the themes discussed this year in Doha such as technology and AI, corporate responsibility, climate change and cooperation had followed on from discussions at the 2022 meeting in Sydney. These are issues which are developing the world over and therefore need constant attention from judiciaries world-wide. One of the areas where there has been the most significant developments and potential for far reaching consequences has been the rapid development



of AI. This has profound implications for society as a whole; and so the courts also need to be cognisant of the potential effects it might have. Therefore, we were lucky to have a particularly distinguished panel for this topic which included Eric Horvitz, the Chief Scientific Officer of Microsoft, Simon Knowles FRS, the Chief Technology Officer of Graphcore and Professor Colin Mayer CBE, FBA. All matters discussed at the meeting are under active consideration by the QICDRC court. The QICDRC will pay particular attention to the use of AI and how we can develop arbitration and mediation in close cooperation with commercial courts in Qatar. Of the topics discussed at the Fifth Full Meeting which SIFoCC is likely to take further I am keen on showing commercial courts have changed and are changing. They are now modern bodies which learn from each other and try and reach common standards and approaches. I would like to ensure all commercial courts follow best practice as regards procedure and have an awareness of current issues so it is possible to develop broadly appropriate principles of transnational law. In this way, business people can gain full confidence in using commercial courts for international dispute resolution world wide. In addition, SIFoCC has put in place a better understanding of the enforcement of judgments through its memoranda of understanding and seeks to build on the 2019 Hague Convention on enforcement of judgments to emphasize the fact that court judgments can usually be enforced worldwide.

Arbitration has flourished because some commercial courts had a poorer image and enforcement was more difficult than the enforcement of arbitral awards. In consequence courts were not used for international commercial dispute resolution as much as they should have been. SIFoCC's influence has changed the position of commercial courts, whilst at the same time strengthening the position of arbitration by achieving globally accepted standards in relation to arbitration and working with arbitral and mediation bodies.

Reflections on fifth full meeting

Justice Dr Muna Al-Marzouqi
Judge of the QICDRC and Associate
Vice President for Academic Planning &
Quality Assurance at Qatar University

This was the first SIFoCC Full Meeting I had attended, and I attended all the sessions. For me the most important session was the session on the future of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in judicial systems as it is vital we look at the way in which AI is developing.

There were a great many speakers at this event and I liked the way many of them were able to give examples, qualitative and quantitative in order to fully explain the subjects they were discussing.

What I also found very encouraging was the way in which some of the speakers were able to demonstrate ways in which previous SIFoCC meetings had helped them enhance their own court systems and procedures.

This is an event that brings together Judges from commercial courts from around the world. I was struck by and inspired by one example from New York, where a Judge had discovered and was surprised to learn that the precedent a lawyer cited had been AI generated.

That is a lesson to all Judges - we need to be curious, we need to be aware of this practice and make sure the authorities being relied upon in submissions are reliable and accurate.

Climate change and AI were two of the main themes at this event. These are two critical issues which are likely to shape the outcomes of judgments in international courts.

These two subjects are not simply national challenges. They also have international dimensions which require a collective and somewhat unified response from courts worldwide.

In order to address climate change we need a coordinated legal framework which will effectively mitigate its impacts.

The use of AI in a legal context also raises important ethical and legal considerations that demand global standards and cooperation.

I expect that the QICDRC court, along with other international courts, will increasingly look to tackle these issues in order to better serve our planet and uphold the integrity of legal systems.

After attending this meeting I also knew more about the relationship between commercial courts, arbitration and mediation. This is something which I think is going to help me most with the work I do with the QICDRC court.

At the QICDRC, we are constantly developing our rules and procedures in order to make these relationships better.

The discussions at the SIFoCC Full Meeting highlighted the way in which judicial bodies can help to encourage alternative dispute resolution (ADR) methods, which are often more efficient and effective than traditional litigation.

ADR methods, offer parties the flexibility to resolve



disputes in a less adversarial and more cost-effective way. These methods can also significantly reduce the burden on courts, speed up the resolution process, and provide outcomes which are satisfactory for the parties involved.

However, it was not just a one sided approach. There were also best practices and approaches we have been taking at the QICDRC courts that other courts were interested to learn about.

These included the role of the Registry in our court and the work we have done on our Maroon Book, which is the first comprehensive review of proceedings before a court in our jurisdiction. There was also interest in the way we have used automation to support case filing and case management procedures.

Automation now plays a crucial part in supporting parties who are filing submissions, minimising errors and helping to manage time effectively.

Other participants were interested to hear about the way we use digital records to enhance access and transparency, and allow easier access to case information.

This transformation has also supported our broader goal of enhancing access to justice and improving the overall effectiveness of the judicial system.

There were however topics covered that I would like to learn more about, including how to cooperate with other international courts and set unified guidelines for integrating AI in the court system and procedures. I would also be interested in learning more about how we go about best drafting guidelines on the ethical use of AI by the legal representatives.

Therefore, I am looking forward to see if these subjects are picked up and covered at SIFoCC's Sixth Full Meeting or as part of its other activities.



محكمة قطر الدولية
ومركز تسوية المنازعات

QATAR INTERNATIONAL COURT
AND DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTRE

WORLD-CLASS SPECIALISED CIVIL & COMMERCIAL COURT IN QATAR

UNCITRAL INSPIRED
ARBITRATION LAW

MEDIATION
SERVICES

REGION'S FIRST
E-COURT

ENFORCEABLE
JUDGMENTS

