

# THE DIGITAL MEDIATOR: POLICY FRAMEWORKS FOR INTEGRATING ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE INTO ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION

Zill E Rukh Mushtaq

Bachelor of Laws, University of the Punjab, Lahore & Bachelor's in Pakistan Studies, Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad. Accredited Mediator & Associate Arbitrator (UK) Associate Partner @FARZIL LAW

[zill.rh35@gmail.com](mailto:zill.rh35@gmail.com)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20701535>

## Keywords

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR), Generative AI, Fifth Party Agent, Algorithmic Sandboxing, Automation Bias, The Singapore Convention, Punjab ADR Act 2019.

## Article History

Received: 18 April 2026

Accepted: 30 May 2026

Published: 15 June 2026

Copyright @Author

Corresponding Author: \*

Zill E Rukh Mushtaq

## Abstract

The international landscape of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) finds itself on the cusp of a great technological paradigm shift. A successful mediation is always anchored entirely on the human element, such as a mediator's ability to utilize emotional intelligence, empathy, and neutrality. However, the emergence of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) and its predictive power has firmly established itself in the mediation room. Algorithms are no longer passive "fourth party" instead, they have evolved into an active "fifth party agent" capable of guiding negotiations and suggesting settlement options independently. This paper examines the profound policy and regulatory gap created by AI advancement by focusing on procedural disclosure gap and algorithmic-ingestion paradox. While analyzing how the Large Language Models, (LLM) clashes with the key mediation principles under the EU AI Act, The UNCITRAL Model Law and domestic frameworks like Punjab ADR Act 2019 are also put to the test. What happens when a settlement under the Singapore Convention is mediated by an algorithm? This paper argues that the answer should worry us. Consequently, this paper argues that the integrity of the process cannot be compromised just for the sake of expeditious computational output. It proposes the solution by step-by-step framework positioned on algorithmic sandboxing, transparent disclosure rules, a mandatory human-in-the-loop standard to uphold the integrity of digital justice.

## A. INTRODUCTION:

### The Emerging Paradigm of AI in ADR

While the corridors of traditional courtrooms have waited centuries to get systematic legal reforms, the private sphere of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) has undergone a profound technological revolution. Historically, the efficacy of mediation relied entirely upon the human element of a mediator allowing the neutral to utilize emotional intelligence, contextual neutrality, and subjective evaluation. However, the exponential expansion of Generative Artificial

Intelligence (AI) and predictive analytics has irreversibly entrenched itself in the dispute resolution arena. Technology has no longer remained the passive "Fourth Party" to flourish communication, instead it has become an active participant to the process.

On the surface, these tools appear to offer genuine efficiency gains. Yet this convenience comes at a cost – one that strikes directly at the ethical foundations that make mediation work in the first place. It means if they are left unchecked and unregulated, they can cause a serious, irreversible

harm to the absolute confidentiality and public trust due to limitation of a machine to look into the emotional and moral aspects of the complex human psychology that is the core of mediation process. Therefore, this paper underscores the urgent need for lawmakers and international policymakers to take necessary steps to uplift the integrity of mediation by establishing legally enforceable regulatory frameworks to govern the digital mediator.

### B. IDENTIFYING THE LEGISLATIVE AND RESEARCH GAP:

A meticulous examination of prevailing legal jurisprudence reveals a profound lacuna in debate surrounding technology and dispute resolution. While ethical use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) is widely debated by the legal fraternity within the ambit of formal litigation, the increasing use of Generative AI within the private, consensual realm of Alternative Dispute Resolution remains largely under-theorized. As a corollary, the current literature exhibits lacuna regarding the empirical and procedural application of AI within the advanced frameworks of mediation. Academic commentary tends to orbit the philosophical—fairness, neutrality, transparency – while leaving the practicing mediator without any concrete procedural guidance on what to actually do when an algorithm enters the room.

This academic and regulatory lacuna has left two profound research gaps that this paper intends to address:

- **The Procedural Disclosure Gap:** Traditional legal frameworks fail to address *how* and *when* a mediator should disclose his reliance on AI to the parties to the dispute. To date, there are no statutory frameworks and judicial precedents available determining the use of Algorithms to analyze confidential financial data or forecast settlement trajectories violates the key principle of informed party consent.
- **The Confidentiality-Ingestion Clash:** End-to-end confidentiality is the essence of mediation. While the proceedings of mediation are kept secret and private, Generative AI works indifferent and contrary to the sole requirements of the mediation. Traditionally, all

communication in the mediation room are designated as “privileged”. Cloud-based-machine-learning consumes the sensitive corporate information to train itself for the future commercial algorithms that causes a serious threat to the confidentiality and compromises the integrity of the process. Current researchers seldom discussed this aspect of the AI algorithms. As a corollary, even recent international statutes has a serious lacuna in discussing this very aspect of agentic AI; for instance, UNCITRAL Technical notes on Online Dispute Resolution, remains too vague on the hyper-advance capabilities of agentic AI. This is the stage where this paper intervenes and identifies the exact statutory lacuna to be filled.

### METHODOLOGY:

This paper adopts a doctrinal legal methodology, drawing upon primary sources including international conventions, domestic statutes, and institutional frameworks. Secondary sources including peer-reviewed scholarship, practitioner commentary, and empirical studies on AI in dispute resolution are also analyzed. A comparative approach is employed to evaluate the regulatory responses of the EU, UNCITRAL, and Pakistan.

### C. THE ANATOMY OF AI-DRIVEN DISPUTE RESOLUTION MECHANISMS:

In order to evaluate the necessary legislative intervention, one must first understand the technological face of AI and its application in modern Alternative Dispute Resolution. **Ethan Katsh** originally coined the term “*Fourth party*” to describe the involvement of technology within Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) as a passive tool. This passive fourth party has profoundly facilitated the communication, hosted documents and scheduled session. This has shifted the paradigm fundamentally, ushering the algorithmic revolution in the field. With advanced large language models (LLMs) and predictive deep learning, AI has elevated to the rank “*Fifth party*” that is capable of actively guiding the dispute resolution trajectories.

The mediator of this modern world has to pass through three distinct layers of algorithm:

- **Predictive Risk Analytics:** By feeding robust precedential decision, commercial arbitral awards, and collective settlement frameworks, deep algorithms can precisely predict the probability of litigation outcomes. This helps the disputing parties to predict and allocate the risks which make them willing to compromise.

- **Natural Language Processing (NLP) and Sentiment Design:** Technologically advanced mediation platforms are capable of tracking information like textual and verbal data during the digital sessions. These platforms examine the hidden psychological barriers and emotions by comparing it with the historical conflict resolution patterns in order to timely forecast likely outcomes while signaling human neutral when a party is approaching their absolute reservation point.

- **Automated Evaluative Engines:** Beyond the simple assistance, modern AI systems utilise game-theoretic method to independently generate settlement options. After thoroughly observing and analyzing the parties it suggests the best offers that can suit for both the parties based on their financial position. It can even perform complex financial calculations that an expert of the field can perform which means it removes the need to retain an independent financial expert.

This changes the simple automation into the more technologically advanced agentic intervention shifting the dynamics of mediation room. When an algorithm labels its output as mathematically optimal, parties rarely question it. This unquestioning acceptance is precisely what psychologists call *automation bias* – a trap that strips the mediation process of its fundamental human character. Instead of engaging in organic, human-led discussions to find a settling point, parties rely blindly upon the AI's output as infallible verdict as these proposed solutions are merely numerical. This ignores the principles of fairness, dignity and mutual respect that are the essence of successful mediation. Hence these AI software are no longer neutral.

#### D. THE ALGORITHMIC CLASH WITH CORE MEDIATION TENETS:

The integration of agentic AI into the mediation room has occurred absent any deliberate legislative mandate – a regulatory lacuna that demands urgent remedy. Traditional mediation rests upon three foundational principles: confidentiality, neutrality, and party autonomy. These principles are not merely procedural aspirations; they constitute the structural conditions without which consensual dispute resolution loses both its legitimacy and its enforceability. As the analysis below demonstrates, agentic AI systems threaten all three simultaneously, exposing a failure of existing regulatory frameworks that seriously compromises the integrity of the mediation process. To understand the need for future legislative intervention, we must thoroughly decode how these modern machine learning mechanics directly undermines these foundational principles.

1. **The Confidentiality-Ingestion Paradox:** End-to-end confidentiality is universally recognised as the core of the mediation room. Under the statutory authority of UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Mediation, any oral statements, documents, and settlement offers are strictly kept confidential and closed from the public exposure. Parties can therefore speak candidly, knowing that nothing disclosed in that room can later be deployed against them in court.

However, agentic AI tools primarily based on the computable data that is fundamentally incompatible with this legal duty. Large Language Models (LLMs) not merely process the data; it depends upon the ingestion to refine their predictive efficiency. In modern digital mediation, the mediator feeds the algorithmic engines with the corporate financial and patents blueprints, and employment disputes to suggest a suitable, mutually beneficial settlement options, that confidential data is uploaded to the cloud servers, where it moves beyond the control of the disputing parties. Under standard machine learning protocols, unless it is restricted by the host, the injected data is stored in the central model to train it for the future disputes.

Traditional mediation bounds the mediator to non-disclosure agreements and professional code of ethics whereas a digital mediator has to rely on the algorithms that are incapable of un-learning the sensitive information it absorbed. It means that the secret corporate information ingested to AI in the proceedings of Case A, can influence the settlements vectors in Case B. This compromises the principle of confidentiality that represents the leakage of privileged information making the mediation process ineffective and legally compromised.

**2. The Empathy Gap and the Decoupling of Justice:** The second major issue with algorithmic processing of data is emotional intelligence and procedural justice. Supporters of modern mediation often are of view that the dispute is like a mathematical equation to be balanced. However, in efficacious mediation, empathy de-escalates the emotional gridlock and addresses directly the non-legal, factors of dispute resolution frameworks such as human dignity, mental agony, and pivotal power of genuine apology.

Generative AI lacks the power to feel the psychological empathy. It works merely by turning the complex human crises into binary variables and standardized legal parameters. When an algorithm based machine driven engine suggests a settlement option based purely on mathematical optimization, it completely isolates the dispute resolution from the human experience. It ignores the probability of a party to decline a monetarily superior offer because they want a mere validation or acknowledgement of harm, subjective factor that a machine learning system dismisses as irrelevant noise.

The involvement of AI can lead to a mediation that is more mechanical and unemotional just like a rigid arbitration. While the algorithms are incapable of understanding the human psychological parameters, they treat the inputs as numerical data that reduces the consensual power of the parties as they are not being guided by a neutral who can differentiate between human emotions, instead they are processed like a mathematical information that the parties do not understand.

## E. LEGAL JURISPRUDENCE AND COMPARATIVE POLICY FRAMEWORKS:

Before developing a policy framework aligned with the required regulations governing this autonomous agent, a person must consult all relevant international and national statutes on the subject. A complete doctrinal analysis is required to get an effective legislative solution. The outdated statutes are incapable of providing a roadmap for regulating advanced algorithms. As a result, there is an urgent need for a coordinated legal framework for ADR.

**1. The European Union AI Act and the Risk-Based Classification:** Among the legislative instruments available on the regulation of AI, *EU AI Act, 2024*, constitutes the most ambitious attempt to govern AI through a risk-based classification hierarchy. Under the Article 6, Annex III, of EU AI Act, those algorithms that are used in the “Administration of Justice” are referred as “High-Risk AI System. This highlights a serious threat to the judicial decision-making by significantly influencing them and compromising integrity on fundamental rights.

This compels the developers of AI algorithms and legal industry to strictly adhere to the conformity standard, but it creates the hurdles in the process when it is applied to mediation. The EU Act promises the procedural transparency and human oversight. But the “Fifth party” intervention issue sustains. Even transparency is required by the Act but still lacks the statutory framework to limit the “*automation bias*” in any private commercial dispute. Therefore, EU AI Act remains too generic on the empathy gap and confidentiality breach.

**2. UNCITRAL Frameworks and the Cross-Border Enforcement:** UNCITRAL Model law has made a profound contribution to the field of international commercial mediation. This 2018 Model Law on International Commercial Mediation, alongside the Singapore Convention, has brought procedural consistency to cross-border mediation process that simply did not exist before. But here is the problem: neither instrument anticipated the digital mediator.

This framework represents a significant legislative milestone but the main issue with this framework

is that it presumes the mediator as a neutral human, not an algorithmic platform. It regulates the mediation process effectively but fails to cover the use of AI in ADR and its role in holding appointments as a co neutral. Scholarly commentary has further analyzed that cognitive AI can induce structural confidentiality breach that renders the settlement challengeable under Article 5 of the Singapore Convention on grounds of “procedural unfairness”. These laws were drafted with a human mediator firmly in mind. That assumption now urgently needs revisiting.

**3. The Domestic Landscape: Punjab ADR Act 2019:** Developing countries like Pakistan, legal framework is continuously integrating the digital tools but the challenge still remains intact. The domestic legal framework has continuously advanced the system through enactment of laws like *Electronic Transaction Ordinance 2002*, and the *Punjab Alternative Dispute Resolution Act, 2019*.

But these statutes are unable to deal with the cognitive nature of AI, they merely talk about the incorporation of it in the system only, not on its regulation. The Punjab ADR act of 2019 only talks about the human neutrality, his qualification and professional code of conduct. It is incompetent to deal with the concept of “algorithmic sandboxing.” For instance, a local corporate business uses a cloud-based algorithmic system to calculate the fiduciary risks that is not sandboxed, local judiciary is left with no statutory mechanism or forensic criteria to determine whether or not a matter falls under *Sec 13, Punjab ADR Act, 2019*. This creates a big lacuna in the framework to deal such type of violation of any of its statutory provisions.

#### F. PROPOSED STATUTORY ROADMAP AND POLICY INTERVENTIONS:

This paper proposes three distinct statutory interventions. Together, they form a tri-partite framework designed to bring algorithmic accountability into the mediation process without stifling the innovation that makes digital ADR genuinely invaluable. This tri-partite framework can give a more effective legislative blueprint for the international bodies and domestic legislatures.

#### 1. Principle of Algorithmic Sandboxing and Mandatory Section 13 Exclusions:

Confidentiality-ingestion paradox is this paper's central finding. The fix is not complicated. Sandboxing refers to the segregation of the AI system from external data networks during mediation proceedings, thereby preventing the bleed of privileged information from Case A into Case B. Section 13, Punjab ADR Act 2019 is the natural legislative vehicle for this reform.. This Act can be further amended to incorporate a technological proviso under section 13 that will make the process of dispute resolution less challengeable on the grounds of unfairness of the process.

This domestic legislature must clearly prescribe that AI-controlled tool or Large Language Model (LLM) must not breach confidentiality by storing the confidential data like party disclosure, settlement offers, or emotional patterns to itself for the future mediations or for the forecast of future mediations outcomes. If in any case, the institutional provider fails to uphold these standard in mediation, the settlement agreement will be considered voidable on the grounds of confidentiality breach.

#### 2. Mandatory Bi-Lateral Disclosure and Opt-In Autonomy:

Party autonomy is completely dependent on the absolute technological transparency. Institutions like UNCITRAL Model Law must incorporate a “*Doctrine of mandatory algorithmic disclosure.*” It means that before initiating any mediation, parties must be provided with the properly written acknowledgement brief which must explicitly state:

- This system is capable of evaluating the responses of the parties.
- This system will compare the data of the dispute with the data of past mediations.
- There can be “automation bias” on the part of system.

The professional of digital dispute resolution must incorporate a “Algorithmic Opt-In clause” in the settlement agreement. This will ensure that parties are consciously utilizing an automated system that is aiding the process while preserving their fundamental right to self-determination.

**3. The "Human-in-the-Loop" Operational Standard:** This third reform is quite straightforward. Keep a human presence in the process, not as a passive observer but as an active participant. "Human-in-the-loop" is already an established concept in AI governance. Applying it to mediation is not radical. It is overdue.

The results that are generated by the algorithms during the mediation will be considered advisory. Accomplished, neutral human presence should be mandatory under the statute that will limit the algorithms from completely influencing the process and clarify things between the parties and the dispute resolution specialist. That hybrid configuration will ensure core principles of the mediation such as emotional nuance, mutual compromise, and human empathy are intact throughout the process of mediation.

#### Conclusion:

The incorporation of Generative Artificial Intelligence into the Alternative Dispute Resolution framework encounters a profound irony: the more we use AI to facilitate and streamline our processes, there will be more threat to the ethical foundation of ADR that make the dispute resolution possible. With the advancement in Automation from being a passive "fourth party" to an active "fifth party" that is more capable and autonomous to take actions on its own, Generative AI has rendered the available international statutes like EU AI Act, UNCITRAL Model Law and domestic laws such as Punjab Alternative Dispute Resolution Act, inconsistent with the requirements of the advanced level automated algorithms.

Hence, this paper has clearly demonstrated that we cannot depend upon the advanced cognitive technology just for the sake of expeditious procedural and administrative efficiency. The leakage of sensitive data by automation consumption, possible psychological traps of automation bias, immense empathy gap, are not mere marginal deficiencies, they are the huge threat to the integrity of justice. If these issues are left unchecked, they will ultimately undermine the legal credibility of the process and will turn it into an objectionable system that will compromise the

enforcement mechanism of its universal acceptance under the international conventions such as the Singapore Convention.

At its heart, dispute resolution has never been about numbers. It is about humans, their dignity, their grievances, and their need to feel genuinely heard. No algorithm, however sophisticated, can replicate that. The addition of automation to the mediation process does not mean leaving our human responsibility. By utilizing the framework proposed in this paper, especially algorithmic sandboxing, disclosure of AI protocols, and a human-in-the-loop framework, the world can safely regulate the predictive power of algorithms without compromising the soul. Automation is a very powerful tool but it remains a mere instrument. The future of digital justice is not algorithmic. It is a humanly guided process with the support of law, informed by technology, and anchored in the irreplaceable dignity of the people in mediation room

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY:

##### A. BOOKS

- Ashley, Kevin D, Artificial Intelligence and Legal Analytics: New Tools for Law Practice in the Digital Age (Cambridge University Press 2017) 189-214.
- Cloke, Kenneth, Mediating Dangerously: The Frontiers of Conflict Resolution (Jossey-Bass 2001).
- Cortés, Pablo, The New Regulatory Framework for Consumer Dispute Resolution (Oxford University Press 2016).
- Crawford, Kate, Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence (Yale University Press 2021) 198-204.
- Eubanks, Virginia, Automating Inequality: How High-Tech Tools Profile, Police, and Punish the Poor (St Martin's Press 2018).
- Fisher, Roger, Ury, William and Patton, Bruce, Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In (3rd edn) (Penguin Books 2011) 40-55.
- Goleman, Daniel, Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More Than IQ (Bloomsbury 1996).

- Hartzog, Woodrow, *Privacy's Blueprint: The Battle to Control the Design of New Technologies* (Harvard University Press 2018) 89-104.
- Katsh, Ethan and Rabinovich-Einy, Orna, *Digital Justice: Technology and the Internet of Disputes* (Oxford University Press 2017) 44-58.
- Katsh, Ethan and Rifkin, Janet, *Online Dispute Resolution: Resolving Conflicts in Cyberspace* (Jossey-Bass 2001) 17-19.
- Lodder, Arno and Zeleznikow, John, *Enhanced Dispute Resolution Through the Use of Information Technology* (Cambridge University Press 2010) 134-196.
- O'Neil, Cathy, *Weapons of Math Destruction: How Big Data Increases Inequality and Threatens Democracy* (Crown Publishers 2016) 102-118.
- Russell, Stuart and Norvig, Peter, *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach* (4th edn) (Pearson 2021) 867-894.
- Schmitz, Amy J and Rule, Colin (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Online Dispute Resolution* (Oxford University Press 2019).
- Sourdin, Tania, *Judges, Technology and Artificial Intelligence: The Artificial Judge* (Edward Elgar Publishing 2021) 201-247.
- Susskind, Richard, *Online Courts and the Future of Justice* (Oxford University Press 2019) 254-291.
- B. JOURNAL ARTICLES**
- Ali, Shahla, 'Increasing Access to Justice Through Multi-Door Courthouse Structures and the Singapore Mediation Convention' (2019) 19 *Pepperdine Dispute Resolution Law Journal* 411-433.
- Bex, Floris and others, 'A Hybrid Formal-Procedural Model of Mediation' (2014) 22 *Artificial Intelligence and Law* 103-131.
- Brown, Tom B and others, 'Language Models Are Few-Shot Learners' (2020) 33 *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 1877-1901.
- Katz, Daniel Martin, Bommarito, Michael J and Blackman, Josh, 'A General Approach for Predicting the Behavior of the Supreme Court' (2017) 12(4) *PLOS ONE* e0174698.
- Nolan-Haley, Jacqueline, 'Mediation: The "New Arbitration"' (2012) 17 *Harvard Negotiation Law Review* 61-84.
- Riskin, Leonard, 'Understanding Mediators' Orientations, Strategies, and Techniques: A Grid for the Perplexed' (1996) 1 *Harvard Negotiation Law Review* 7-51.
- Rule, Colin, 'Online Dispute Resolution and the Future of Justice' (2020) 1 *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 101-119.
- Sela, Ayelet, 'Can Computers Be Fair? How Automated and Human-Powered Online Dispute Resolution Affect Procedural Justice in Mediation and Arbitration' (2018) 33 *Ohio State Journal on Dispute Resolution* 91-148.
- Skitka, Linda, Mosier, Kathleen and Burdick, Mark, 'Does Automation Bias Decision-Making?' (1999) 51 *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies* 991-1006.
- Smuha, Nathalie, 'The EU Approach to Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI' (2019) 6 *Computer Law Review International* 97-106.
- Tyler, Tom, 'Procedural Justice, Legitimacy, and the Effective Rule of Law' (2003) 30 *Crime and Justice* 283-357.
- Wahab, Mohamed Abdel, 'The Global Information Society and Online Dispute Resolution: A New Dawn for Dispute Resolution' (2004) 21 *Journal of International Arbitration* 143-168.
- Welsh, Nancy A, 'Making Deals in Court-Connected Mediation: What's Justice Got to Do with It?' (2001) 79 *Washington University Law Quarterly* 787-861.
- Zeleznikow, John, 'Can Artificial Intelligence and Online Dispute Resolution Enhance Efficiency and Effectiveness in Courts' (2017) 8 *International Journal for Court Administration* 30-45.

**C. REPORTS, POLICY DOCUMENTS & INSTITUTIONAL MATERIALS**

American Bar Association Task Force on Research, Law, and Technology, Report and Recommendations on Online Dispute Resolution (American Bar Association 2021) 34-38.

Article 29 Data Protection Working Party, Guidelines on Automated Individual Decision-Making and Profiling (WP251rev.01) (European Commission 2018) 10-14.

Financial Conduct Authority, Regulatory Sandbox (Feedback Statement FS15/02) (Financial Conduct Authority 2015) 3-7.

Future of Life Institute, Analysis of the EU AI Act (Future of Life Institute 2024) 22-27.

Information Commissioner's Office (UK), Guidance on AI and Data Protection (ICO 2020) 44-56.

OECD, OECD Principles on Artificial Intelligence (OECD Publishing 2019).

UNCITRAL, Technical Notes on Online Dispute Resolution (United Nations 2017).

World Economic Forum, AI Governance: A Holistic Approach to Implement Ethics into AI (White Paper) (World Economic Forum 2019) 14-19.



UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Mediation 2018 (UN Doc A/73/17 – Articles 7, 9, 10, 12).

Uniform Mediation Act 2001 (USA) (Sections 4-6).

**D. LEGISLATION & INTERNATIONAL INSTRUMENTS**

Electronic Transactions Ordinance 2002 (Pakistan) (Ordinance No LI of 2002).

EU AI Act 2024 (Regulation (EU) 2024/1689) ([2024] OJ L 2024/1689 – Article 6, Annex III, Articles 9-15, Articles 13-14, Article 50).

General Data Protection Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (Articles 5(1)(b), 5(1)(c), 17).

Punjab Alternative Dispute Resolution Act 2019 (Punjab Act No XIII of 2019 – Sections 4-8, 13).

Singapore Convention on Mediation 2019 (United Nations Convention on International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation) (UN Doc A/RES/73/198 – Articles 1-5).