

2022 Arbitration Institutions Status Table

The following table presents a non-exhaustive list of arbitral institutions that either have incorporated the HCCH Principles into their own institutional rules or are advertising or facilitating their use in other ways. The Table is based on information provided by the institutions and is updated on a yearly basis.

The third survey on the HCCH Principles reveals increasing awareness and wider use of the HCCH Principles among international arbitral institutions and tribunals. The survey further explores the practice in relation to the law applicable in the absence of parties' choice of law in arbitration proceedings and generates positive results in relation to the necessity for an international legal instrument to assist arbitrators, in the absence of parties' choice of law, in determining the applicable law to the merits of the dispute.

Arbitration institutions wishing to provide relevant information for this table are invited to contact the Permanent Bureau of the HCCH at secretariat@hcch.net.

Last update: 01-03-2022

State	Arbitration institution	Reference to the HCCH Principles		Where parties have made a choice of law:		In the absence of parties' choice of law:			Necessity of an international legal instrument to assist arbitrators in determining the applicable law in the absence of a choice of law
				Institutional rules allow parties to select the applicable law, thus being consistent with the HCCH Principles		Institutional rules provide a provision addressing the approach that the arbitral tribunals should employ in determining the law or "rules of law" applicable to the merits of the dispute			
		Institution makes an explicit reference to the HCCH Principles	Reference to the HCCH Principles by arbitral tribunals in determining applicable law	Institutional rules allow parties to select the applicable law or "rules of law"	Arbitral tribunals generally respect parties' choice of a non-State law	Arbitral tribunals would, according to the institutional rules, be obliged to employ conflict of law analysis to determine the law applicable to the dispute	There are consideration(s) that have been taken into account by arbitral tribunals when employing conflict of law analysis to determine the law applicable to the dispute	Arbitral tribunals would, according to the institutional rules, be authorised to apply a substantive law or "rules of law" directly to the dispute, without employing conflict of law analysis	

-	Cour Commune de Justice et d'Arbitrage de l'OHADA (CCJA)	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
China	Shenzhen Court of International Arbitration (SCIA)	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
China	Beijing Arbitration Commission (BAC / BIAC)	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
China	Shanghai International Arbitration Center (SHIAC)	No	No	Yes	Yes	(-) ¹	(-) ¹	(-) ¹	Yes
Colombia	Centre of Arbitration and Conciliation of the Chamber of Commerce of Bogotá (CBB)	Yes	No	(-) ²	(-) ²	(-) ¹	(-) ¹	(-) ¹	No

¹ Arbitral institution answered “No” to initial question (“In the absence of parties' choice of law, institutional rules provide a provision addressing the approach that the arbitral tribunals should employ in determining the law or “rules of law” applicable to the merits of the dispute”), and therefore did not answer sub-questions.

² Arbitral institution answered “No” to initial question (“Where parties have made a choice of law, institutional rules allow parties to select the applicable law, thus being consistent with the HCCH Principles”), and therefore did not answer sub-questions.

Costa Rica	Centro Internacional de Conciliación y Arbitraje (CICA)	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Egypt	Cairo Regional Centre for International Commercial Arbitration (CRCICA)	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Finland	Arbitration Institute of the Finland Chamber of Commerce (FAI)	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Hong Kong SAR, China	Hong Kong International Arbitration Centre (HKIAC)	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	N/A
Hungary	The Arbitration Court of the Hungarian Chamber of Commerce	N/A	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Lithuania	Vilnius Commercial Arbitration Court (VKAT)	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	(-) ¹	(-) ¹	(-) ¹	No
Mongolia	Mongolian International National Arbitration Centre (MINAC)	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Pakistan	Center for International Investment and Commercial Arbitration (CIICA)	No	No	(-) ²	(-) ²	(-) ¹	(-) ¹	(-) ¹	Yes
Peru	Centro de Arbitraje de la Cámara de Comercio de Lima (CCL)	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Philippines	Philippine International Center for Conflict Resolution (PICCR)	No	No	Yes	Yes	(-) ¹	(-) ¹	(-) ¹	Yes

Slovenia	Ljubljana Arbitration Centre at the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Slovenia (LAC)	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Spain	Corte de Arbitraje de la Cámara Oficial de Comercio e Industria de Madrid	No	No	Yes	Yes	(-) ¹	(-) ¹	(-) ¹	No
Thailand	Thailand Arbitration Center (THAC)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Turkey	Istanbul Arbitration Centre (ISTAC)	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Uzbekistan	Tashkent International Arbitration Centre (TIAC)	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes