P-ISSN: 2709-6254	Journal of Development and Social Sciences	April-June 2025, Vol. 6, No. 2
O-ISSN:2709-6262	https://doi.org/10.47205/jdss.2025(6-II)37	[439-449]

Journal of Development and Social Sciences
www.jdss.org.pk

RESEARCH PAPER

Resolving Cross Border Construction Disputes: The Evolving Role of alternate Dispute Resolution

Dr. Sanaullah Aman

CEO, Saarosh ADR Center, Office #929, Street 81, I-8/3, Islamabad, Pakistan & International Accredited Mediator & Arbitrator

***Corresponding Author:** drsanaullahaman@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper examines how ADR has become a critical tool in resolving international construction disputes. It analyzes ADR's transformation from a secondary option to a central strategy, emphasizing the impact of institutional frameworks, enforceability advancements, and technology. Cross-border construction projects face legal and cultural complexities. Traditional methods like litigation and arbitration present limitations—such as high costs, delays, lack of expertise, and enforcement challenges—prompting a shift toward flexible ADR methods like mediation, conciliation, and dispute boards. A doctrinal review of legal literature, institutional reports (UNCITRAL, ICC, FIDIC), and case law is used. Sources are scholarly and thematically analyzed. ADR techniques now supplement or precede litigation and arbitration. Benefits include flexibility, expertise, cost savings, and enforceability (e.g., Singapore Convention). Challenges include uneven recognition and need for skilled neutrals. It is recommended to promote ADR training, clear clauses, online platforms, and further research on ADR's cross-border effectiveness.

KEYWORDS Cross-Border Construction Disputes, Alternative Dispute Resolution, Arbitration, Mediation, Dispute Boards, Singapore Convention, Multi-Tier Dispute Clauses

Introduction

Cross-border construction disputes involve parties from different countries working on large-scale projects under multiple legal systems. These disputes are complex due to jurisdictional issues, diverse laws, and technical and financial intricacies. Stakeholders—including developers, contractors, and financiers—often face challenges related to delays, defects, force majeure, and payment defaults. Legal complications arise from overlapping laws: contract law, the law of the arbitration seat, and enforcement law. Procedural hurdles include gathering evidence across borders, dealing with foreign witnesses, and navigating varying enforcement rules.

Litigation in national courts is often inadequate. Judges may lack technical expertise, and foreign judgments are hard to enforce without treaties. Arbitration, favored for its neutrality and enforce-ability under the New York Convention (1958), allows parties to choose experts and procedures. However, over time, arbitration has become costly and formal, resembling litigation.

In response, Alternate Dispute Resolution (ADR)—including mediation, conciliation, and dispute boards—offers a flexible, efficient alternative. Supported by institutions like FIDIC and the ICC, and enforceable under the Singapore Mediation Convention (2018), ADR is now central to resolving international construction disputes.

Literature Review

Scholarly commentary on cross-border construction dispute resolution has expanded, reflecting efforts by practitioners and academics to assess both traditional and evolving mechanisms. This review first examines litigation and arbitration, then traces the rise of ADR in construction.

Traditional Dispute Resolution and Its Limitations

Historically, international construction disputes relied on litigation and arbitration. Litigation offers a familiar court process but, as Smith, McCarthy, and Ho (2023) observe, national courts often lack expertise in complex engineering matters. Judges may struggle with technical evidence, and enforcement of judgments across borders remains difficult. Born (2021) highlights that, without global treaties, parties must seek enforcement through local courts in each jurisdiction. While Brussels I Recast has eased enforcement within the EU (Mills, 2018), procedural barriers remain. Outside such frameworks, enforcement may require new lawsuits or reliance on limited treaties like the Hague Choice of Court Convention (García, 2019). These issues, scholars agree, make litigation unsuitable for complex transnational projects.

International Arbitration and Its Critique

Arbitration became the preferred alternative due to its neutrality, procedural flexibility, and enforcement under the New York Convention (United Nations, 1958). Pappas (2015) and early surveys noted its efficiency, use of technical experts, and global enforceability. Yet recent studies (Smith et al., 2023; Queen Mary University of London & White & Case, 2015) point to rising costs, delays, and procedural complexity—challenges that now undermine arbitration's original appeal.

First, rising costs have become a major concern.[2] Arbitration now often rivals or exceeds litigation in expense, contrary to original expectations. Several factors contribute to escalating costs: multi-member tribunals charge hefty fees (each arbitrator charging daily rates), and parties frequently insist on detailed document production akin to court discovery. Construction cases, given their technical and factual density, can involve dozens of experts on topics like engineering delays or complex financial quantification; each expert's time and report add significant expense. Additionally, arbitration often entails international travel for hearings (to neutral seats), logistics for physical and electronic evidence management, and high administrative fees by arbitral institutions. Academia has noted that these accumulations make arbitration "the new litigation" in terms of cost and formality. One analysis of the Med-Arb phenomenon points out explicitly that arbitration is increasingly "viewed as too costly, too inefficient, and effectively, the 'new litigation'". Such costs threaten arbitration's attractiveness, with some observers warning that, if unchecked, they could push parties back toward national courts or incentivize even greater use of ADR.[3]

Second, procedural delays are endemic. Construction disputes inherently involve voluminous documentation and complex chronology. In practice, arbitrators often order multiple rounds of witness statements, expert reports, and hearings. Preliminary procedural meetings and interim applications (e.g. for urgent relief or discovery) can protract matters further. International coordination—scheduling hearing sessions across time zones with parties and witnesses from different continents—also introduces delays. The combination is that large construction arbitrations can take three, four, or more years from filing to award. Legal scholars have documented how arbitration's promise of speed has eroded under procedural complexity. The extensive formalities and litigation-style

tactics adopted in modern arbitration (sometimes called "arbitration creep") mean that the process often forfeits arbitration's traditional efficiency.[4]

Third, limited review and appeal heighten party anxiety. The New York Convention strongly favors finality: it provides only a few narrow grounds (public policy, arbitrability, due process) on which enforcement of an arbitral award can be refused. While finality prevents serial appeals, commentators note that it also removes a critical safety valve. In construction disputes involving huge projects and substantial sums, any error in law or fact in an arbitral award can have dramatic consequences, and parties have virtually no recourse beyond enforcement challenges on technical grounds. Legal analysts thus criticize arbitration's rigid finality: the very feature celebrated as an advantage (swift closure) can become a liability when a party feels an award is fundamentally wrong or unfair.[5] The phenomenon of arbitration creep compounds this by making arbitration as adversarial as litigation, so that parties incur the same risks of "the same mistakes" being made, only without the appellate oversight available in courts. In other words, arbitration's initial promise of efficiency and finality is compromised when the process mirrors complex litigation and leaves no regular avenue for correction.

Fourth, the formalization of arbitration has diluted its original informality. In theory, parties could craft streamlined arbitrations (e.g. a sole arbitrator, limited document exchange). In practice, many complex construction cases default to three-arbitrator tribunals, voluminous pleadings, and extensive legal argumentation. Observers have documented a trend of arbitration becoming more "legalized," losing the hallmarks of flexible dispute resolution. One prominent commentator notes that as both arbitration and mediation have become more structured and adversarial, mediation advocates offer Med-Arb hybrid processes to combine "finality" with "flexibility," but in doing so the core values of each are compromised. The literature refers to this as "arbitration creep," where arbitration proceedings mimic court litigation in length and cost. In this light, parties seeking more truly "alternative" methods have turned increasingly to other forms of dispute resolution.

The Emergence and Evolution of ADR. In response to these limitations, ADR techniques have steadily gained prominence in international construction. Early use of ADR often meant negotiated settlement or informal mediation. Over time, more structured methods took hold, many under institutional frameworks. FIDIC, a leading source of model construction contracts, introduced dispute adjudication boards (DABs) in its 1987 and 1999 editions (and evolved them into Dispute Avoidance/Adjudication Boards in 2017) as a contractual requirement. The concept of standing dispute boards, already present in North American practice (e.g. DRBs under CCDC contracts), spread worldwide. Academics and practitioners have noted that multilateral development banks (like the World Bank) and owners of large infrastructure projects have come to demand DBs for major projects, recognizing their success in early issue resolution. Simultaneously, mediation gained acceptance; traditional dispute boards and arbitrations were increasingly supplemented by optional mediation clauses, often following regional or national legislative encouragement (for instance, the EU adopted a mediation directive in 2008, and countries worldwide have variously mandated or incentivized mediation in civil cases).

Scholarly analyses trace ADR's rise in engineering. Pioneering work on mediation and conciliation (e.g. Commonwealth Legal Bureau studies) and on expert determination (leveraging insights from valuation practice) laid conceptual foundations. More recent institutional measures have cemented ADR's status. In 2002, UNCITRAL promulgated a Model Law on International Commercial Conciliation, highlighting the process's distinct role from arbitration. In 2017–2018, UNCITRAL hosted negotiations that produced the Singapore Convention on Mediation (2018), setting a framework for cross-border enforcement of mediated settlement agreements. The momentum behind that Convention reflects a consensus: just as the 1958 New York Convention underpinned arbitration's

global success, a treaty for mediation was seen as necessary to elevate mediation's stature internationally. By early 2020, 52 states had signed the Singapore Convention, illustrating widespread institutional endorsement of mediation as a cross-border tool.

In short, the literature shows an evolving ADR landscape: from once-rare mediation and avoidance boards to a complex menu of ADR options built into modern contracts. Studies and reports (such as the Global Construction Disputes Reports by Arcadis) document ADR's growing usage and effectiveness, and legal treatises increasingly include chapters on construction ADR mechanisms. This paper builds on that body of work by integrating these developments and focusing on why ADR's role is becoming fundamental in resolving today's international construction disputes.

Material and Methods

This research uses a doctrinal and analytical approach, based on a thorough review of scholarly legal literature, institutional publications, and authoritative practice materials on dispute resolution in international construction. Key ADR and cross-border themes were identified, and sources were systematically gathered around them.

Only credible legal and academic sources were used: peer-reviewed journals, legal treatises, institutional documents (e.g., UNCITRAL, ICC, FIDIC rules), conventions, model laws, and judicial decisions. Non-academic sources (e.g., blogs, newsletters, Wikipedia) were excluded.

Sources were organized by topic: (a) litigation and arbitration critiques; (b) ADR processes like mediation and dispute boards; (c) evaluations of ADR's advantages and limitations; and (d) institutional and technological developments. Materials included the Queen Mary Arbitration Survey (2015), articles from the Harvard Negotiation Law Review, and official legal texts.

Results and Discussion

The Diverse Landscape of ADR Mechanisms in Construction

Mediation. Mediation is a facilitated negotiation process in which a neutral third-party (the mediator) assists disputing construction parties in reaching a voluntary settlement. In practice, parties begin by selecting a mediator, often by agreement or from an institutional list. The mediator's role is not to decide the dispute but to guide dialogue: opening joint sessions and private "caucuses," helping each side clarify its interests, and exploring settlement options. In international construction, mediators often have specialized knowledge of construction law or engineering, and may be chosen for linguistic or cultural compatibility. The process typically involves each party presenting its position, followed by joint or separate meetings with the mediator who works to narrow differences. Throughout, confidentiality is maintained: mediation communications and offers are generally protected by "without prejudice" rules in most jurisdictions. This confidentiality is especially valued in construction, where settlement often hinges on preserving professional reputations and sensitive commercial information (such as proprietary designs or cost structures). Thus, mediation allows parties to negotiate openly while shielding concessions from becoming public or used in later proceedings. Mediated solutions can also be creative and tailored: unlike a court, a mediator can help craft remedies beyond legal relief, such as structured payments, future work guarantees, or joint ventures.

The practical utility of mediation in construction has grown dramatically. Parties report high settlement rates in mediation (often exceeding 70% of cases resolved) and shorter timelines compared to litigation or arbitration. Crucially for enforceability, the

2018 UN Convention (Singapore Convention) now provides an international treaty framework for mediated settlement agreements. Under this Convention, a settlement agreement arising from international mediation (when signed and arising from cross-border mediation) is enforceable in each contracting state much like an arbitral award, subject only to limited defenses. In other words, mediators and lawyers have a new tool: a mediated deal can be "treated like an award" across borders. As Ullman and Ziyaeva observe, the Singapore Convention "has the potential to reshape the global dispute resolution landscape by raising cross-border mediation's standing on the international stage in the same way that the [New York] Convention facilitated the growth of international arbitration". While the Convention is still in its early days (as of 2020, only a handful of states had ratified it), its existence has already influenced contract drafters: settlement agreements are now often executed to comply with the Convention's formality requirements. In sum, mediation in construction disputes is widely recognized for preserving relationships and confidentiality, and its legitimacy has been greatly enhanced by the Singapore Convention.

Conciliation

Conciliation is similar to mediation but involves a more active neutral. The conciliator may propose solutions or assess legal outcomes, unlike a purely facilitative mediator. In construction, conciliation appears in civil law systems and older contracts like FIDIC, which required a three-member panel before arbitration. Though mediation and conciliation are often used interchangeably, academic sources note that conciliators play a more evaluative role. Conciliation appeals to parties who want expert input without finality. However, its usage has declined in international contracts, replaced by mediation or dispute boards. Still, ICC Conciliation Rules exist. Its strength lies in expert advice; its weakness is non-binding outcomes unless agreed upon.

Dispute Boards/Adjudication Boards (DBs/DABs)

DBs are key in international construction ADR. A one- or three-member panel is appointed at project start (per FIDIC/ICC rules) to prevent and resolve disputes. DBs visit sites, monitor progress, and intervene early. They issue recommendations (DRBs) or decisions (DABs), which are binding unless challenged promptly. Their rulings are often final until arbitration. DBs offer expertise, trust, and lower costs. Over 35 countries use similar adjudication models. Still, DBs require fees and qualified members, and enforcement lacks a treaty like the New York Convention. DB decisions are enforceable as contract terms, and arbitration rules often recognize prior DB findings.

Expert Determination / Neutral Evaluation

Expert determination involves appointing a neutral to resolve technical or valuation disputes, with a binding outcome by contract. Often used for cost or quantity issues, it is faster and cheaper than arbitration. Neutral evaluation serves similarly but may be non-binding, aimed at aiding settlement. The expert is chosen for technical skill, making parties trust the outcome. There's no appeal, and review is rare unless there's fraud or error. Despite this, contracts widely adopt it for specific issues. The 2017 Arcadis report ranked it second globally after negotiation.

Hybrid ADR Mechanisms

Hybrid or multi-tier processes are common. In med-arb, mediation is followed by arbitration—often with the same neutral. This saves time and encourages settlement but raises confidentiality concerns. Arb-med-arb pauses arbitration for mediation, preserving

tribunal independence. Multi-tier clauses may require negotiation, then mediation, then DBs, and finally arbitration. Each step allows early resolution. As noted, combining ADR forms—like "mediation-arbitration" or "dispute boards-arbitration"—offers real benefits. Hybrid ADR ensures less formal options are used before formal processes, leveraging the strengths of each method.

Advantages of ADR in Cross-Border Construction Disputes

Across the literature, several distinct advantages of ADR over traditional litigation/arbitration recur. Each merit flows both from intrinsic attributes of ADR and from its suitability to the international construction environment.

Flexibility and Party Autonomy. ADR empowers parties to tailor the process to their needs. They can choose neutrals with specific technical or linguistic abilities, agree on a timetable, and limit the scope of dispute referred. This contrasts with court litigation, which is bound by procedural rules and limited in venue, and arbitration, which, while flexible in some respects, often defaults to standard forms. For instance, parties in mediation can structure the session to focus on commercial interests rather than strict legal arguments, and may even include non-party advisors (like financiers or insurers) in sessions. Similarly, in arbitration the ability to draft clauses (e.g. agreeing that the tribunal may award specific performance or interest) illustrates autonomy, but many contracts require even more bespoke approaches. ADR clauses are by nature highly customizable: a multi-tier clause is essentially an exercise of party autonomy in designing a dispute resolution pathway. Scholarly commentators emphasize that such autonomy is particularly valuable in construction, where the complexity of projects calls for creative procedures. For example, FIDIC's Adjudication Board procedure is itself a product of parties (and international organizations) deciding how best to integrate an ADR mechanism into contracts. In sum, ADR's adaptability enables parties to reflect the scale, location, and nature of their project in the dispute resolution architecture – an advantage repeatedly noted in the literature.

Confidentiality. ADR processes are typically confidential, which is crucial in protecting sensitive project information. In international projects, disclosure of proprietary data or dispute details can harm reputations or competitive positions. Both arbitration and litigation are often confidential between parties (though arbitration tribunals may or may not hold hearings in private), but court proceedings are generally public. ADR, especially mediation and negotiation, is conducted off-the-record. Experts and boards also usually operate privately. Confidentiality encourages candor and efficient negotiation: parties may make settlement offers knowing those proposals cannot later be used against them if talks fail. The preservation of confidentiality is often cited as a key reason businesses prefer ADR. Current legal frameworks reflect this. For example, the Uniform Mediation Act (adopted in many U.S. jurisdictions) protects mediator communications from disclosure, and some scholars even debate whether mediation deserves a special privilege under international practice.[6] In any case, confidentiality is a widely acknowledged advantage in construction, where the news of disputes might unsettle lenders or regulators. By contrast, an adjudication or arbitration record could be accessible if challenged in court, and the prospect of public litigation is generally unwelcome.

Cost and Time Efficiency. ADR is widely viewed as more cost-effective and faster than full-scale litigation or arbitration. The mechanisms discussed eliminate or abbreviate many procedural steps. Mediation typically takes days or weeks and can be scheduled soon after dispute arises; the only fees are mediator fees (often far lower than tribunal costs) and minimal legal preparation. A successful mediation resolves the dispute entirely. Dispute Boards resolve issues on-site during the project, avoiding the months or years of claims-handling typical in post-completion arbitration. Even when formal hearings occur,

the scope is limited to what the board perceives, minimizing wider discovery. Expert determination similarly resolves narrow technical issues in a matter of weeks at expert rates rather than lawyer and tribunal time. All these factors cut down total dispute costs.

Comparative analyses have shown that multi-tier ADR clauses can significantly reduce the number of cases reaching arbitration: as a result, only the smaller share of disputes (often more complex claims) incur full arbitration costs. In addition, because ADR can begin early (e.g. negotiation right after an event or mediation soon after notice of claim), parties often settle while financial stakes and tensions are still moderate. In contrast, arbitration might not commence until much later. In a construction context, delayed resolution itself incurs cost inflation (ongoing financing charges, price escalations). Thus, ADR offers time and cost efficiencies by preempting drawn-out proceedings. The literature supports this empirically: disputes settled through ADR are often concluded in months rather than years. For example, a leading ADR guide notes that complex construction arbitration "can take in excess of a year, even years," while expert determination and mediation usually conclude more quickly.[7] In sum, ADR's procedural economy translates directly into financial savings, which is particularly valuable in industries where the cost of capital is high and delays are punitive.

Preservation of Commercial Relationships. Construction projects often involve long-term relationships: a contractor may work on multiple phases for the same owner, or joint ventures may outlive a single contract. ADR, especially mediation and DB processes, is designed to be collaborative rather than adversarial. Parties remain engaged in discussions rather than fighting through litigation. Mediators and dispute boards emphasize interest-based solutions and mutual understanding. The literature frequently remarks that ADR helps preserve working relationships and future business ties. For example, dispute board members become familiar figures on the site, and their involvement tends to build trust that disputes will be dealt with fairly. After a mediation settlement, parties often report being able to proceed amicably with their contract or future dealings. This is harder to achieve after a contentious court case or an acrimonious arbitration award. As one commentary put it, ADR offers a forum "more creative and tailored" to the parties' ongoing business needs, which is particularly important in construction's networked environment. In sum, ADR's cooperative ethos protects valuable commercial relationships that could otherwise be destroyed by traditional adversarial litigation.

Access to Specialized Expertise. ADR allows parties to select neutrals with deep technical and cultural expertise relevant to their project. Arbitration also permits expert arbitrators, but in ADR this is even more pronounced. For instance, dispute board members usually include experienced engineers or project managers alongside legal experts. An expert determination explicitly appoints a specialist (such as a civil engineer or quantity surveyor) to assess technical issues. Mediators or conciliators in construction are often chosen for industry knowledge or familiarity with local practices. Moreover, because ADR processes are more informal, neutrals can take a more inquisitorial or guided approach (e.g. inspecting a site or reviewing plans in mediation). In the cross-border context, this expert specialization is particularly valuable: a mediator fluent in the parties' languages or aware of cultural business norms can navigate misunderstandings that might confound a court. Professionals have noted that this confluence of legal and technical skills in one forum is a major benefit. For example, FIDIC's model clause for Dispute Boards explicitly contemplates appointment of engineers of "experience and impartiality" to address claims. Institutional ADR guidelines frequently recommend neutrals with project management expertise. In sum, ADR's flexible neutral selection yields decisions grounded in the project's realities.

Capacity for Innovative and Tailored Solutions. ADR proceedings can produce creative remedies unavailable in formal adjudication. In mediation and negotiation, the

parties themselves shape the outcome, often agreeing on solutions that go beyond monetary awards. For instance, a mediator might help contractors secure future work or arrange phased payments tied to project milestones. Such inventive settlement terms might be acceptable in business but not within the narrow remedies of contract law. ADR thus encourages holistic problem-solving. Even in dispute board decisions, the panel can craft orders that account for project schedules and joint performance, rather than delivering a simple win/lose judgment. The literature notes this as an important ADR advantage: parties have the autonomy to realize mutual gains (e.g. substituting performance for cash damages) that keep projects viable. Particularly in cross-border projects where political and community factors play a role, ADR can incorporate non-legal factors (like local employment commitments) into a resolution.

Enhanced Enforceability for Mediation Settlements. Historically, a weakness of mediated agreements was that they were simply contracts; enforcing them internationally could be as difficult as enforcing any other contract. The Singapore Convention addresses this: it essentially provides that a mediated settlement agreement, if it meets formal requirements, is enforceable in signatory states like an arbitral award, with limited defenses (e.g. fraud or incapacity). This removes a major obstacle to mediation: the fear that a settlement reached in one country might not be honored elsewhere. ADR advocates emphasize that the Convention "streamlines" enforcement, much as the New York Convention did for arbitration. As a result, parties may feel more confident using mediation, knowing the settlement has near-universal potential for enforcement. Over time, this is expected to make mediation even more attractive for cross-border construction claims.

In summary, ADR's advantages in the international construction context are multi-faceted and well-supported by scholarly and practical analysis. Its flexibility, confidentiality, cost/time savings, preservation of relationships, expertise, and novel remedies all address specific shortcomings of traditional methods in cross-border projects.

Challenges and Considerations for ADR in Cross-Border Contexts

Enforceability Landscape. The Singapore Mediation Convention helps but applies only to signatory states. Outside it, enforcement relies on private international law or domestic rules. DRB recommendations or expert decisions often lack binding force unless converted into awards or contract terms. Courts differ in treatment. Ambiguities in mediated settlements may lead to enforcement issues. Drafting settlements to meet Convention standards is vital, but enforcement remains uncertain across jurisdictions.

Selecting Qualified Neutrals. ADR depends on neutral expertise. Construction neutrals must bridge legal, technical, and cultural divides. Lack of neutrality or experience can damage credibility. Institutional rosters help, but mismatches still occur. Cultural sensitivity is key. Parties should set qualifications in contracts and use institutions to appoint neutrals. Ongoing ethics training and oversight are essential for credibility.

Drafting Enforceable ADR Clauses. Poor clause drafting undermines ADR. Jurisdictions vary on enforceability, especially for multi-tier clauses. Best practice uses clear, mandatory language and defines procedure, costs, and applicable law. Cross-document alignment in complex contracts is vital. Courts sometimes dispute clause validity. Standard templates (e.g., ICC, FIDIC) help, but harmonization is lacking. Legal advice and precision in drafting remain critical.

Party Reluctance and Understanding. Mistrust or unfamiliarity breeds reluctance. Some public or smaller entities see ADR as alien or risky. Legal systems may prefer courts. Cultural resistance and fear of power imbalance persist. Education and mandatory ADR

laws help address these concerns. Institutions provide ethical safeguards, but aligning expectations and ensuring informed participation is ongoing work.

Ethical Standards and Professional Practice. ADR demands neutrality, independence, and confidentiality. Ethical lapses erode trust. Institutions like CIArb, RICS, and IMI provide codes and training. Enforcement is mostly self-regulated. Hybrid roles sometimes raise impartiality concerns. National differences in regulation require care. Continued training, transparent practices, and global ethics frameworks strengthen ADR credibility.

Driving Factors in the Evolution of ADR

Increased Institutional Support for ADR. International bodies have promoted ADR's growth. UNCITRAL's 2002 Model Law and the 2018 Singapore Convention offer legal models and enforcement for mediation. Arbitral institutions (ICC, LCIA, SIAC) now offer ADR services, with ICC Dispute Board Rules and model clauses widely used. Contracts like FIDIC's 2017 editions include DAABs as standard. These efforts make ADR accessible and institutionalized.

Technological Advancements and ODR. Digital tools have enhanced ADR, especially post-COVID-19. ODR platforms allow global mediation and secure exchange. AI and smart contracts aid early dispute alerts. UNCITRAL supports ODR adoption. The Singapore–Japan COVID-19 Protocol exemplifies online ADR response. Though digital challenges exist, technology has broadened ADR's reach.

Integration into Project Management and Contracts. ADR is now built into contracts. Multi-tier clauses requiring negotiation, then ADR, then arbitration, promote early resolution. DBs are appointed from project start, enabling real-time dispute management. FIDIC's "Dispute Avoidance" reflects this shift. Scholars view ADR as part of risk and contract management.

Shift from Reactive to Proactive Dispute Prevention. ADR emphasizes early resolution. DBs prevent conflicts before escalation. Transparency and collaboration are key. Reports show early ADR settlements exceed 90%. ADR is now part of project governance and attracts positive insurer and financier attention.

Preference for Multi-Tiered Clauses. Multi-step clauses (e.g. med-arb, DB-arb) allow proportional responses. Courts uphold these unless arbitration is conditional. Scholars like Fortún and Iglesia detail common clause structures. ADR's flexibility resolves simple disputes cheaply, saving arbitration for last.

In sum, institutional, technological, and contractual shifts have made ADR essential to resolving cross-border construction disputes.

Conclusion

The evidence shows that Alternate Dispute Resolution has moved from the periphery to the core of cross-border construction dispute resolution. This transformation is underpinned by ADR's inherent advantages and by systematic developments in law and practice. Traditional litigation has proven too rigid and jurisdiction-bound for complex international projects, and arbitration—while still a vital option—faces growing criticism for cost, delay, and procedural formalism. In contrast, ADR methods offer flexibility, confidentiality, efficiency, and expertise tailored to construction's needs. Our analysis confirms that ADR in its various forms effectively addresses the multifaceted challenges of cross-border construction conflicts. For example, mediation and conciliation enable

parties to preserve relationships and craft creative outcomes, while dispute boards provide early, project-embedded resolution by technical experts. Expert determination resolves narrow technical issues swiftly. Moreover, the enforceability gap that once limited ADR has narrowed considerably: the Singapore Mediation Convention grants mediated settlements legal backing on par with arbitration awards, and organizations worldwide actively endorse ADR mechanisms.

In summary, ADR's growing prominence rests on its capacity to handle the complexities of international construction better than traditional mechanisms. Its flexibility allows processes to be molded to the project and parties involved, ensuring appropriate procedural autonomy. ADR's confidential, cooperative nature helps maintain business partnerships across borders. The time and cost savings, plus the integration of specialized knowledge, directly benefit mega-projects with narrow profit margins. Importantly, as institutions like UNCITRAL and ICC have recognized, ADR is not just a stop-gap measure but a fundamental approach to dispute management. This paper's core argument is thus reaffirmed: ADR has become indispensable for navigating global construction conflicts. Its rise has been driven by practical success and by deliberate legal innovation—eventually making ADR as much a part of construction contracts as provisions on scope or payment. Looking forward, ADR's role will likely continue to expand. The infrastructure of international commerce now embraces ADR more fully than ever: treaties like the Singapore Convention have institutionalized its use, and technology has eliminated many past obstacles. At the same time, the collaborative philosophy of ADR aligns with the proactive risk management favored in modern projects. In short, ADR's evolution reflects a broader legal and economic shift towards solutions that combine legal rigor with pragmatic flexibility. The key merits of ADR—party autonomy, professional expertise, and institutional support—suggest that it will remain at the forefront of cross-border construction dispute resolution in the years to come.

Recommendations

Based on the analysis, the following recommendations are proposed:

- First, owners, contractors, and advisors should promote ADR awareness and specialized training. Universities and institutions (e.g., IBA, CIArb) must integrate ADR into curricula. Practical training (e.g., ICC or SIAC online courses) and simulated ADR workshops should be encouraged to build confidence and reduce misconceptions.
- Second, policymakers and institutions should ensure enforceable ADR clauses. Legislatures should adopt laws validating multi-tier clauses. Courts must uphold mandatory ADR steps. Countries should ratify the Singapore Convention. Collaborative bodies (e.g., ICC, UNCITRAL) should develop model clauses tailored for international use.
- Third, contract drafters should adopt dispute boards from project inception. DBs must be treated as risk management tools, not optional. Stakeholders should integrate DBs, early warning systems, and clear procedural guidelines into contracts.
- Fourth, ADR institutions should invest in Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) tools. Secure, user-friendly platforms will reduce costs and expand access, especially in low-value or geographically dispersed cases. Ethics and confidentiality rules should adapt to online settings.
- Fifth, further empirical research is essential. Comparative studies on ADR outcomes, dispute board effectiveness, and mediation post-Singapore Convention will guide future practices. Global ADR surveys focused on construction are needed to fill data gaps and adapt to new challenges.
- Together, these steps will enhance ADR's effectiveness and global acceptance in construction disputes.

Bibliography

Chapman, P. H. J. (2006). *Dispute boards*. FIDIC.

FIDIC. (1999). *Conditions of contract for construction* (Amended 2017 ed.).

ICC World Chambers Federation. (2015). *ICC dispute board rules*. International Chamber of Commerce.

Pappas, B. A. (2015). Med-arb and the legalization of alternative dispute resolution. *Harvard Negotiation Law Review, 20*, 157–182.

Queen Mary University of London, & White & Case LLP. (2015). *2015 international arbitration survey: Improvements and innovations in international arbitration*. https://www.arbitration.qmul.ac.uk/media/arbitration/docs/2015_International_Arbitration_Survey.pdf

Smith, M. C., McCarthy, H., & Ho, J. (2023). Alternative dispute resolution in construction and infrastructure disputes. In M. C. Smith (Ed.), *Guide to construction arbitration* (5th ed., pp. 337–362). Globe Law and Business.

Ullman, A. B., & Ziyaeva, D. M. (2020). The Singapore Mediation Convention and its potential impact on mediation in the Americas. In *Arbitration review of the Americas 2021*. Dentons. https://www.dentons.com

United Nations. (1958). *Convention on the recognition and enforcement of foreign arbitral awards* (New York Convention), June 10, 1958, 330 U.N.T.S. 38.

United Nations. (1980). *United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods* (CISG), Apr. 11, 1980, 1489 U.N.T.S. 3.

United Nations. (1985). *UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration*.

United Nations. (2002). *UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Mediation and International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation*.

United Nations. (2018). *Convention on International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation* (Singapore Convention), June 20, 2018, 57 I.L.M. 626.