Editorial 91:4

As the year draws to a close, it is useful to take stock of both past achievements and future plans. This issue's lead article perfectly achieves that goal, as it is the first iteration of a new initiative that aims to celebrate and amplify some of *Arbitration*'s most influential pieces. Over the last few months, we have been soliciting responses to some of our most popular articles so as to generate new thinking on issues of interest to our readership. We are pleased to have Jeff Waincymer kickstart that initiative by providing a new perspective on issues initially raised by Hamish Lal, Brendan Casey, Josephine Kaiding, and Léa Defranchi in their 2020 article, *Abuse of Document Production in International Arbitration: Remedies When the Adverse Inference Falls Short*.

This issue's emphasis on the new perspectives on existing issues is also evident in Yuhang Wu's article, which focuses on the principle of arbitral independence and impartiality in disputes involving the metaverse. While the term 'metaverse' sounds like something out of a superhero movie, it is used here to describe technologies relating to virtual realities, including NFT marketplaces and crypto-currency. This fascinating look into the future of dispute resolution highlights how new technologies challenge existing paradigms of procedural justice.

Technology-related concerns are also addressed by Ewuwuni Onnoghen-Theophilus, who writes on the tension between the ICCA-IBA Roadmap to Data Protection in International Arbitration and Nigeria's data protection laws. In so doing, Ms Onnoghen-Theophilus provides insights that may be useful to other countries considering whether to adopt the paradigm proposed by ICCA and the IBA.

Other articles in this issue also take new looks at existing problems. Thus, Mario Silva's article on reforming investor-state arbitration takes a new and comparative look at various international and intergovernmental initiatives in investment arbitration to determine how well those efforts balance protection for investors with concerns about sovereignty and systemic integrity.

Akanksha Oak considers how the enforcement of mediated settlements in the United States might be improved via certain innovations adopted in India regarding the nature of a mediated settlement. In so doing, Ms Oak describes how such changes might help the United States come into closer compliance with the standards reflected in the Singapore Convention on Mediation.

'Editorial 91:4'. *Arbitration: The Int'l J. of Arb., Med. & Dispute Mgmt* 91, no. 4 (2025): 337–338.

© 2025 Chartered Institute of Arbitrators

Joost van Dam applies a somewhat novel methodology to address ongoing questions about decisions to set aside or refuse to recognize arbitral awards. He undertakes a robust empirical approach to the issue, drawing on more than 500 court decisions to identify the grounds most frequently relied upon by Dutch courts faced with these issues. His article not only provides scholars and practitioners with robust, empirical data on the behaviour of Dutch judges, it also provides academics with a useful roadmap in how to conduct similar studies in other countries.

We are also pleased to publish the text from this year's Roebuck Lecture. In his remarks, Sir Robin Knowles discusses how high-value claims and awards can affect the likelihood of settlement in commercial and investment disputes. Among other things, Sir Robin expresses concern about the unpredictability and consequences of such awards, leading to a call for collaboration and integration between all forms of international dispute resolution, meaning litigation, arbitration and mediation.

We hope these articles, along with two book reviews from Gordon Blanke, will provide useful and interesting reading as 2025 draws to a close.

S.I. Strong,
Editor,
Email: stacie.strong@emory.edu.