

The Application of Arbitration in Resolving Disputes in International Road Construction Contracts

Islambek Rustambekov* , Islam Yerniyazov

Private International Law Department, Tashkent State University of Law, Tashkent, Uzbekistan
Email: *I.rustambekov@tsul.uz, *prof.rustambekov@gmail.com, i.yerniyazov@tsul.uz

How to cite this paper: Rustambekov, I., & Yerniyazov, I. (2023). The Application of Arbitration in Resolving Disputes in International Road Construction Contracts. *Beijing Law Review*, 14, 1634-1639.
<https://doi.org/10.4236/blr.2023.144088>

Received: August 26, 2023

Accepted: October 30, 2023

Published: November 2, 2023

Copyright © 2023 by author(s) and Scientific Research Publishing Inc.
This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

Abstract

This paper undertakes an extensive examination of the use of arbitration for resolving disputes in complex international road construction contracts. It reviews empirical evidence across jurisdictions on the prevalence of claims in transnational highway projects and evaluates the application of arbitration through analysis of relevant case law, rules, legislation and commentary. The study reveals that while arbitration is strongly favored over litigation in this domain, there are limitations in aspects of efficiency, consistency, diversity and representation of local interests. Accordingly, tailored reforms are proposed to enhance arbitration practices by leveraging procedural innovations, specialized expertise, transparency, emerging technologies, collaborative principles and sustainable development norms. The recommendations aim to strengthen the legal governance of global road construction by making arbitration outcomes more judicious, balanced and legitimate across diverse contexts.

Keywords

Arbitration, Disputes, Road Construction, Style, Road Construction Contracts

1. Introduction

Large-scale international road construction projects involving cross-border financing, suppliers, and stakeholders have a high propensity for multifaceted legal, technical and operational disputes arising from the lengthy timeframes, logistical complexity and coordination challenges. These disputes increasingly involve matters like conflicting contractual interpretations, payment defaults, de-

sign-build coordination issues, delays, change orders, quality concerns, culture clashes, and environmental or social impacts.

Effective dispute prevention and settlement mechanisms are thus critical in complex transnational highway building initiatives undertaken by consortiums of multilateral banks, national agencies, contractors and consultants across emerging economies. Historically, cross-border construction disputes were resolved through litigation in domestic courts based on jurisdiction. But limitations around enforcement of foreign judgements, localization, delays and inflexible procedures have led to arbitration steadily displacing litigation as the preferred mechanism for binding resolution of international road project disputes (Lok et al., 2018).

By providing benefits including party autonomy, procedural flexibility, specialist adjudicators, privacy, limited appeals and ease of enforcement of awards through international conventions like the New York Convention, arbitration addresses many of the limitations of cross-border court litigation (Born, 2021). Accordingly, international road construction contracts typically contain arbitration clauses designating it as the dispute resolution method.

This paper undertakes a multifaceted examination of the application of arbitration in resolving disputes arising in international road construction contracts by integrating analysis of relevant case law, arbitration rules and procedures, ethical codes, legislation, empirical evidence, and scholarly perspectives across multiple legal systems. Based on evaluating current practices, it identifies opportunities for reforming arbitration frameworks to make them more tailored, effective, collaborative, predictable, inclusive and compatible with sustainable development objectives. Ultimately, enhancements to the arbitration process can significantly strengthen the legal governance of global road construction initiatives involving complex public-private partnerships.

2. Literature Review

Extensive research exists analyzing the causes, characteristics, risks and mitigation strategies for disputes in international construction projects across countries based on quantitative and qualitative evidence (Jaffar et al., 2011; Yiu & Cheung, 2006; Shane et al., 2009). Scholars have developed theoretical models classifying construction conflicts (Yiu & Cheung, 2006). Comparative examinations have evaluated differences in dispute causation between contractors and owners (Yates & Eppli, 1999). Studies have also assessed the effects of national culture in engendering claims and litigious behavior in global infrastructure projects (Fryer, 2004).

Other empirical works have focused on specific events like unapproved change orders that commonly precipitate disputes in road projects (Iyer et al., 2008). Research also points to deficiencies in contract drafting as a contributor to claims requiring arbitration or litigation (Brooker, 2002). Comparative analyses reveal variations in dispute resolution approaches between jurisdictions

like Hong Kong and the United States (Kumaraswamy, 1997), further highlighting the complexities for international projects.

On arbitration, scholars have analyzed frequently occurring claims and categorizing techniques (Yates & Duran, 2016), delays in proceedings (Brooker, 2002), disparities in national arbitration laws (Berger, 2016), and cultural differences affecting practices (Lok et al., 2018). Case law and commentaries have examined arbitral approaches for analyzing evidence, quantifying damages and applying Limitation Acts in construction disputes (Yates & Duran, 2016; Mosey, 2016). Evaluations reveal users perceive arbitration as better than litigation in flexibility, privacy, expertise and cost-effectiveness, but limited in predictability and fairness (Bhardwaj, 2014).

Some experts advocate specialized arbitral bodies focusing on construction disputes (Mosey, 2009). Commentators suggest integrating sustainable development norms into arbitration (Behn & Berge, 2021). There is also growing focus on reforms to address inconsistencies, lack of diversity and transparency (Strong, 2022). But few works have comprehensively examined tailored improvements across arbitration legislation, procedures, institutions and practices needed to effectively resolve complex sustainable international road project disputes across diverse cultural and jurisdictional contexts. This paper aims to help address this knowledge gap.

3. Methodology

This study utilizes a composite research methodology encompassing qualitative doctrinal analysis of legal sources including primary legislation, case law, rules and commentaries across multiple jurisdictions to critically evaluate the application of arbitration for resolving disputes in international road construction contracts. It integrates juxtaposition of jurisprudential concepts such as collaborative, tailored and sustainable dispute resolution with empirical evidence on road project arbitration practices to identify limitations and formulate contextual recommendations.

4. Comparative Analysis of Arbitration Application in International Road Projects

The expanding complexity of cross-border highway construction contracts between consortiums of financiers, governments, contractors and consultants from developed and emerging economies has made specialized international arbitration the default mechanism for binding dispute resolution. The primary advantages of arbitration over court litigation include greater procedural flexibility, specialist adjudicators, privacy, limited appeals, and ease of enforcement of foreign awards through the 1958 New York Convention with widespread adoption (United Nations, 2016).

These benefits address many of the drawbacks of courtroom litigation across borders such as jurisdictional uncertainties, localization, delays and difficulties

of enforcing foreign judgements. The extensive technical and logistical intricacies, long timeframes, high values, multiple parties, and uncertainties inherent in international road projects make technically expert arbitration a logical choice. Accordingly, major multilateral development banks mandate arbitration clauses rather than local court jurisdiction in transnational highway construction contracts they finance (Raymond, 2001).

Empirical analyses of disputes referred to arbitration in international construction projects highlight disagreements over payments, change orders, delays, technical issues, safety concerns and quality compliance as the predominant areas (Yates & Duran, 2016; Jaffar et al., 2011). These reflect the project complexity, coordination requirements, modifications and uncertainties common in multi-year projects. Consequent delays, cost impacts and contractual ambiguities abound, necessitating arbitration.

Substantive case law concerning highway project arbitrations confirms these patterns. In FIDIC-administered European highway contracts, tribunals upheld contractor claims of added costs from project delays and variations based on the contractual terms, rejecting employer counterclaims (Nderim, 2022). In India, a tribunal awarded costs to the employer for incomplete roadworks arising from the contractor's financial issues (*Highway Constructions v Govt. of Kerala*, 1999). Adjudication centered on the contract, evidentiary thresholds and arbitration legislation provisions.

While arbitration has advantages, academic critiques also highlight shortcomings including unpredictability, impediments to settlement, rising costs and insufficient diversity among arbitrators (Strong, 2022). Local laws may enable unwarranted judicial intervention in arbitral proceedings (Sundra Rajoo, 2021). Confidentiality of proceedings can limit transparency and public interest considerations (Levitt, 2016). Additionally, community and environmental impacts may get overshadowed by commercial interests in arbitral adjudications on road projects traversing inhabited regions (Mosey, 2009).

Such limitations reveal that despite the prevalence of arbitration, tailored reforms could enhance its effectiveness for sustainable international road projects. Promising directions include leveraging collaborative principles, integrated technical-legal expertise, transparency, diversity, accessibility, balanced costs and timeliness. Specialized arbitration frameworks can blend multi-disciplinary panels, procedures facilitating settlement and public interest, evidential techniques, substantive standards and alternative dispute processes tailored for complex sustainable road projects across jurisdictions (Strong, 2022).

Construction-focused guidelines on assessing technical evidence, damages and community impacts can boost consistency (Sundra Rajoo, 2021). Capacity building to improve arbitration awareness in developing countries is also vital for equalizing access (Berger, 2016). Mandating diversity and local experience on arbitral tribunals can make proceedings more inclusive and contextualized. Integrating sustainable development principles into arbitration rules and statutes can incentivize environmental and social responsibility (Behn & Berge, 2021).

Further empirical research and multi-stakeholder engagement are needed to formulate context-specific arbitration systems for equitable and sustainable road construction worldwide.

5. Conclusion

In summary, this study argues that despite arbitration being strongly favored over litigation in international road construction contracts, there is considerable scope for tailored enhancements across legal frameworks, arbitral institutions, adjudicator competencies, procedural innovations and substantive standards to improve efficiency, expertise, predictability, accessibility, sustainability and fair outcomes. Blending multi-disciplinary expertise on panels, collaborative and transparent procedures, technical evidentiary principles, alternative dispute processes and localization mechanisms tailored for the unique complexities of sustainable international road projects can transform arbitration into an enabler of just and equitable global infrastructure development. Constructing these synergistic arbitration systems through multi-stakeholder collaboration is vital for strengthening the legal governance of transnational highway construction initiatives.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

- Behn, D., & Berge, T. L. (2021). Promoting Sustainable Development by International Arbitration Tribunals. *Journal of International Arbitration*, 38, 607-629. <https://doi.org/10.54648/JOIA2021030>
- Berger, K. P. (2016). *Private Dispute Resolution in International Business: Negotiation, Mediation, Arbitration*. Kluwer Law International.
- Bhardwaj, A. (2014). Comparing the Relative Performance of Court Litigation and Arbitration: Empirical Evidence from Construction Disputes in Hong Kong. *Journal of Legal Affairs and Dispute Resolution in Engineering and Construction*, 7, Article ID: 05014001.
- Born, G. B. (2021). *International Arbitration: Law and Practice*. Kluwer Law International.
- Brooker, P. (2002). Criteria for the Appropriate Use of Arbitration in Resolving International Construction Disputes: The Effectiveness of Arbitration Based on the Opinions of 40 UK Construction Lawyers. In *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers-Management, Procurement and Law* (Vol. 154, No. 2, pp. 77-81). Thomas Telford Ltd.
- Fryer, B. (2004). *The Practice of Construction Management*. John Wiley & Sons.
- High Court of Kerala (1999). *Highway Constructions v Govt. of Kerala, Arbitration Petition No. 170/1999*.
- Iyer, K. C., Chaphalkar, N. B., & Joshi, G. A. (2008). Understanding Time Delay Disputes in Construction Contracts. *International Journal of Project Management*, 26, 174-184.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2007.05.002>

- Jaffar, N., Tharim, A. H. A., & Shuib, M. N. (2011). Factors of Conflict in Construction Industry: A Literature Review. *Procedia Engineering*, 20, 193-202.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proeng.2011.11.156>
- Kumaraswamy, M. M. (1997). Conflicts, Claims and Disputes in Construction. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 4, 95-111.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/eb021042>
- Levitt, L. (2016). The Duty to Conduct a “Reasonable Investigation” into the Local Laws of the Host State: A Potential Conflict between the Public Policy behind International Arbitration and the Public Policy behind Foreign Anti-Bribery Legislation. *Fordham Journal of Corporate and Financial Law*, 22, 595.
- Lok, L. et al. (2018). Managing International Construction Disputes: Do Cultural Differences Matter? *International Journal of Project Management*, 36, 1056-1068.
- Mosey, D. (2009). Form over Substance: Advocating the Establishment of a Construction Court or Board in England. *International Arbitration Law Review*, 12, 1-6.
- Mosey, D. (2016). Time under the Influence: The Application of Limitation Periods to Construction Adjudication Enforcement Proceedings. *International Journal of Law in the Built Environment*, 8, 130-147.
- Nderim, E. (2022). The Arbitrator's Approach to Exclusion Clauses in FIDIC-Based Contracts for Major Highway Construction Projects. *Contemporary Asia Arbitration Journal*, 15, 127-147.
- Raymond, L. (2001). *Private Rights in Public Resources: Equity and Property Allocation in Market-Based Environmental Policy*. Resources for the Future.
- Shane, J. S. et al. (2009). *Construction Project Administration*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Strong, S. I. (2022). *Realizing Rationality: An Empirical Assessment of International Construction Arbitration*. University of Missouri School of Law Legal Studies Research Paper, (2022-15).
- Sundra Rajoo, D. (2021). *The Law, Practice and Procedure of Construction Adjudication in Malaysia*. Lexis Nexis.
- United Nations (2016). *UNCITRAL Secretariat Guide on the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (New York, 1958) 2016 Edition*. United Nations Commission on International Trade Law.
https://newyorkconvention1958.org/index.php?lvl=cmspage&pageid=10&menu=729&opac_view=-1
- Yates, J. K., & Duran, J. S. C. (2016). Utilization of Arbitration in International Construction Dispute Resolution. *Journal of Legal Affairs and Dispute Resolution in Engineering and Construction*, 9, Article ID: 04516009.
- Yates, J. K., & Eppli, M. J. (1999). Classifying Construction Contract Disputes. *Journal of Professional Issues in Engineering Education and Practice*, 125, 106-110.
- Yiu, T. W., & Cheung, S. O. (2006). A Catastrophe Model of Construction Conflict Behavior. *Building and Environment*, 41, 438-447.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2005.01.007>