



**The Journal of Robotics,
Artificial Intelligence & Law**

Editor's Note: Principles for Principals

Victoria Prussen Spears

My AI Wrote a Check That I Must Cash: Principles for Principals

James A. Sherer, Caleb Mabe, Emily Fedeles Czebiniak, Noam Kleinman, and
Ayyah Saleh

Board Considerations for Public Companies Engaging with Digital Assets

Peter I. Altman, James Joseph Benjamin Jr., John Patrick Clayton, and John C. Murphy

The Silicon Arbiter: AI-Generated Arbitration Awards and the Federal Arbitration Act—
Part II

David L. Evans

Use of Artificial Intelligence in Arbitral Institutions

Jeremy Andrews, James Wagner, Ishan Wad, and Patton Lu

The AI M&A Playbook: Contracting for the Unknown

C. Craig Lilly and Bryan C. Sykes

How the Adaptation of Artificial Intelligence Tools Is Impacting the Practice of Law

Seth M. Pavsner

Securities and Exchange Commission Staff Unveils a Playbook for Tokenized Securities

Andrew P. Blake, Sonia Gupta Barros, Teresa Wilton Harmon, Kate L. Lashley,
Peter Y. Malyshev, Andrew J. Sioson, Charles A. Sommers, and Lilya Tessler

The EU's Product Liability Directive: What It Means for Aviation and Aerospace
Companies

Jamie L. Lanphear, Patrick E. Bradley, Daniel Kadar, and Gregory Speier

- 319 Editor’s Note: Principles for Principals**
Victoria Prussen Spears
- 323 My AI Wrote a Check That I Must Cash: Principles for Principals**
James A. Sherer, Caleb Mabe, Emily Fedeles Czebiniak,
Noam Kleinman, and Ayyah Saleh
- 343 Board Considerations for Public Companies Engaging with Digital Assets**
Peter I. Altman, James Joseph Benjamin Jr., John Patrick Clayton,
and John C. Murphy
- 349 The Silicon Arbiter: AI-Generated Arbitration Awards and the Federal Arbitration Act—Part II**
David L. Evans
- 365 Use of Artificial Intelligence in Arbitral Institutions**
Jeremy Andrews, James Wagner, Ishan Wad, and Patton Lu
- 371 The AI M&A Playbook: Contracting for the Unknown**
C. Craig Lilly and Bryan C. Sykes
- 377 How the Adaptation of Artificial Intelligence Tools Is Impacting the Practice of Law**
Seth M. Pavsner
- 381 Securities and Exchange Commission Staff Unveils a Playbook for Tokenized Securities**
Andrew P. Blake, Sonia Gupta Barros, Teresa Wilton Harmon,
Kate L. Lashley, Peter Y. Malyshev, Andrew J. Sioson,
Charles A. Sommers, and Lilya Tessler
- 387 The EU’s Product Liability Directive: What It Means for Aviation and Aerospace Companies**
Jamie L. Lanphear, Patrick E. Bradley, Daniel Kadar, and
Gregory Speier

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Steven A. Meyerowitz

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

Victoria Prussen Spears

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

Jennifer A. Johnson

Partner, Covington & Burling LLP

Paul B. Keller

Partner, Allen & Overy LLP

Garry G. Mathiason

Shareholder, Littler Mendelson P.C.

James A. Sherer

Partner, Baker & Hostetler LLP

Elaine D. Solomon

Partner, Blank Rome LLP

Edward J. Walters

Chief Strategy Officer, vLex

John Frank Weaver

Director, McLane Middleton, Professional Association

START-UP COLUMNIST

Jim Ryan

Partner, Morrison & Foerster LLP

THE JOURNAL OF ROBOTICS, ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE & LAW (ISSN 2575-5633 (print) /ISSN 2575-5617 (online) at \$495.00 annually is published six times per year by Full Court Press, a Fastcase, Inc., imprint. Copyright 2026 Fastcase, Inc. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact Fastcase, Inc., 729 15th Street, NW, Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20005, 202.999.4777 (phone), or email customer service at support@fastcase.com.

Publishing Staff

Publisher: David Nayer

Production Editor: Sharon D. Ray

Cover Art Design: Juan Bustamante

Cite this publication as:

The Journal of Robotics, Artificial Intelligence & Law (Fastcase)

This publication is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

Copyright © 2026 Full Court Press, an imprint of Fastcase, Inc.

All Rights Reserved.

A Full Court Press, Fastcase, Inc., Publication

Editorial Office

729 15th Street, NW, Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20005

<https://www.fastcase.com/>

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to THE JOURNAL OF ROBOTICS, ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE & LAW, 729 15th Street, NW, Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20005.

Articles and Submissions

Direct editorial inquiries and send material for publication to:

Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.,
26910 Grand Central Parkway, #18R, Floral Park, NY 11005, smeyerowitz@
meyerowitzcommunications.com, 631.291.5541.

Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to attorneys and law firms, in-house counsel, corporate compliance officers, government agencies and their counsel, senior business executives, scientists, engineers, and anyone interested in the law governing artificial intelligence and robotics. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the Editorial Content appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please contact:

David Nayer, Publisher, Full Court Press at david.nayer@clio.com or at
202.999.4777

For questions or Sales and Customer Service:

Customer Service

Available 8 a.m.–8 p.m. Eastern Time

866.773.2782 (phone)

support@fastcase.com (email)

Sales

202.999.4777 (phone)

sales@fastcase.com (email)

ISSN 2575-5633 (print)

ISSN 2575-5617 (online)

Use of Artificial Intelligence in Arbitral Institutions

Jeremy Andrews, James Wagner, Ishan Wad, and Patton Lu*

In this article, the authors discuss recent artificial intelligence initiatives from AAA-ICDR, Ciarb, LCIA, ICC, SIAC, HKIAC, DIAC, SCC, and VIAC.

Arbitration stakeholders are finding ways to harness artificial intelligence (AI) in order to cut down on administrative inefficiencies, bolster parties' advocacy, and even entirely decide cases. Experimentation with AI usage in arbitration and other forms of dispute resolution is a trend set to continue. We expect as arbitral institutions integrate AI technology into their procedures that parties, advocates, and arbitrators themselves will embrace this developing technology in helping to define and execute their case strategy, driving efficiencies of time and cost. Below are some recent AI initiatives that various arbitral institutions are promulgating.

International Centre for Dispute Resolution of the American Arbitration Association

AI Arbitrator

In 2025, the International Centre for Dispute Resolution of the American Arbitration Association (AAA-ICDR) released an AI arbitrator tool, which is among the most advanced and pivotal uses of AI technology in dispute resolution. This opt-in tool, which is also accompanied by a separate set of arbitration rules, aims to “blend cutting-edge AI-powered technology with time-tested judgment to help parties transform how disputes are handled.” With the capability to evaluate merits of a claim, generate recommendations for a dispute's resolution, and even draft full awards, the tool is currently used solely for documents-only construction disputes—cases without live witnesses or complex factual issues. The AI arbitrator tool was trained using actual arbitrator reasoning

from more than 1,500 AAA-ICDR construction cases and further calibrated with human input.

Parties adopting the tool submit their claims and evidence to the system. The AI summarizes the parties' submissions, which the parties themselves have an opportunity to validate. Then, the AI analyzes the information and drafts a proposed award. Finally, an AAA-trained arbitrator reviews, revises, and finalizes the award to be distributed among the parties.

The AAA-ICDR reports early testing of its AI Arbitrator tool showed 20-25 percent faster resolution times and 35 percent or greater cost savings. In 2026, the AAA-ICDR expects to expand this tool's capabilities to be able to arbitrate cases of varying subject matter and with higher amounts in dispute.¹

AAA ClauseBuilder AI

The AAA ClauseBuilder AI tool is a ChatGPT-style tool that allows parties to draft arbitration and mediation clauses tailored to their dispute resolution preferences. This tool allows parties to suggest preferences like number of arbitrators, their required qualifications, seat of arbitration, law governing the arbitration, discovery procedures, confidentiality requirements, and rights of appeal. By having access to this tool, parties working without the benefit of external legal advice will be better equipped to design arbitration clauses suitable for their needs. However, as the tool itself notes, parties should consult a lawyer before incorporating a clause generated by the ClauseBuilder into their contract. Doing this will help avoid the unintended consequences of an inappropriate provision.

AAAI Chatbook

In January 2025, the AAA-ICDR launched Chatbook, designed to serve as an AI handbook or frequently asked questions to "enhance workflow for advocates, students and self-represented parties," acting as a guide for users on preparing and presenting AAA cases. The tool, based upon a practitioner text, is designed to allow users to ask questions and receive quick, personalized answers on topics ranging from clause drafting through to addressing

post-award steps. A separate Chatbook for labor arbitration—also based on a practitioner text—is also available and further Chatbooks are expected in future.

Chartered Institute of Arbitrators

The UK-based Chartered Institute of Arbitrators (Ciarb) has positioned itself at the forefront of institutional thinking on AI in arbitration. It has published a detailed and highly practical guideline addressing how AI may be used by parties and tribunals in arbitral proceedings. For example, the Ciarb guidance contains a template party agreement concerning the extent to which AI ought to be used in an arbitration as well as a template procedural order concerning how AI may be deployed by the tribunal in its decisions. Substantively, the guideline also grapples with both the benefits and risks of AI, emphasizes the importance of disclosure of AI usage, affirms the tribunal's power to regulate and limit AI tools, and stresses that arbitrators must preserve their independent judgment at all times. Given the Ciarb's role as a leading thought center on arbitral developments, this guide is increasingly influential and is intended for use by practitioners and tribunals in England and Wales when addressing AI-related procedural issues.

London Court of International Arbitration

In contrast, the London Court of International Arbitration (LCIA) has not published an official AI code governing the use of AI in arbitration. However, the LCIA community is actively engaging with AI topics by publishing casework reports, conferences, and hosting institutional events that focus on technology, efficiency, and procedural innovation. In practice, parties arbitrating under the LCIA rules may look to draw on external frameworks, particularly the Ciarb guidelines, for reference when considering how to regulate the use of AI in proceedings. As a result, while LCIA arbitrations currently lack institution-specific AI guidance, they can be shaped by emerging soft law instruments and proactive case management at the election of parties and the discretion of tribunals.

Other Arbitral Institutions

International Chamber of Commerce

The International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) has taken a more recent but highly visible step into the AI space. In 2025, the ICC Commission on Arbitration and ADR (alternative dispute resolution) established a Task Force on AI in International Dispute Resolution to develop best practices and institutional thinking on AI. While the Task Force's outputs are still awaited, its creation reflects the ICC's recognition that AI will play a significant role in the future of international arbitration.

Singapore International Arbitration Centre

The Singapore International Arbitration Centre (SIAC) has adopted a more indirect but structurally significant approach. In 2025, SIAC revised the procedural provisions of its seventh edition rules that concern technology and enforcement. These revisions, general SIAC practice, and commentator outputs indicate that SIAC's clear receptiveness to the managed and supervised use of AI in dispute resolution. As a result, arbitrations conducted under SIAC rules are procedurally well equipped to accommodate increased AI adoption, even in the absence of explicit AI-specific guidance.

Hong Kong International Arbitration Centre

The Hong Kong International Arbitration Centre (HKIAC) has not yet issued a dedicated institutional guideline governing the use of AI in arbitral proceedings. Nevertheless, HKIAC has demonstrated a pragmatic and innovation-oriented engagement with AI and legal technology, particularly through initiatives and technology partnerships.

For instance, HKIAC has also partnered with Jus Mundi in 2025 to make its Case Digest freely accessible and to leverage AI tools to generate procedural decision summaries, reflecting an institutional commitment to data-driven transparency and legal innovation. This initiative enhances practitioners' access to procedural jurisprudence

and signals HKIAC's openness to AI-assisted knowledge management in arbitration practice.

Dubai International Arbitration Centre

Dubai International Arbitration Centre (DIAC) has adopted a more institutionally proactive and technology-forward approach, although it has not yet issued a formal AI code comparable to the Ciarb or Stockholm Chamber of Commerce (SCC) guidance (see below). DIAC's strategy has focused on institutional integration of AI and innovation partnerships, positioning Dubai as a leading global hub for tech-enabled dispute resolution.

In 2025, DIAC also announced a strategic partnership with Jus Mundi to integrate AI tools into its internal case management processes. Under this collaboration, DIAC's case management team is trained on AI-driven research and workflow tools to enhance procedural efficiency, consistency, and quality; and DIAC decisions on challenges are to be published via Jus Mundi's platform to promote transparency and knowledge-sharing. DIAC is also committed to produce a series of joint thought-leadership initiatives with Jus Mundi, aimed at promoting dialogue on innovation in dispute resolution.

Stockholm Chamber of Commerce

The SCC was among the earlier institutions to issue formal guidance on AI, publishing short guidance in 2024 on its use in cases administered under SCC rules. This guide covers topics including confidentiality, tool quality/oversight, integrity of proceedings, and the nondelegation of decision-making to AI. Importantly, the SCC guidance encourages tribunals to take an active role in managing AI-related issues, reinforcing the expectation that technological innovation must remain compatible with fundamental arbitral principles.

Vienna International Arbitration Centre

In 2025, the Vienna International Arbitration Centre (VIAC) published a note on the use of AI in arbitral proceedings that

broadly aligns with emerging international best practices. Much like other institutions' guides, VIAC's guide recommends that parties conduct due diligence on AI tools and encourages tailored procedural orders. Notably, VIAC expressly disclaims liability for the use of AI by parties or arbitrators. At the same time, it calls on arbitral institutions to take a proactive role in developing practical guidance on the responsible integration of AI into arbitration proceedings.

In Summary

- AAA-ICDR has released an AI Arbitrator tool, which is claimed to be among the most advanced and pivotal uses of AI technology in dispute resolution. The tool is currently used solely for documents-only construction disputes.
- Ciarb has published a detailed and highly practical guideline addressing how AI may be used by parties and tribunals in arbitral proceedings.
- While not all arbitration institutions have specific AI guidance, procedures can be shaped by emerging soft law instruments and proactive case management at the election of parties and the discretion of tribunals.

Notes

* The authors, attorneys with Faegre Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP, may be contacted at jeremy.andrews@faegredrinker.com, james.wagner@faegredrinker.com, ishan.wad@faegredrinker.com, and patton.lu@faegredrinker.com, respectively.

1. Further information on the tool can be found at <https://www.adr.org/ai-arbitrator/>.