

SHAPING THE FUTURE OF DISPUTE RESOLUTION & IMPROVING ACCESS TO JUSTICE



ONLINE VOTES (July 2017-August 2017)





Delegate Information – Online Voting In what country are you based? (680/732 voters)



Demographic Results - Which is your category of stakeholder?

(If your regular practice involves several of these options, please select the one in which you have primarily been involved).

(732 voters)

Party (user of dispute resolution services): A business person or in-house counselinvolved in commercial disputes (122) 16.67%

Advisor: An external lawyer or consultant to a party (195) 26.64%

Adjudicative Provider: A judge, arbitrator, or organisation providing their services (84) 11.48%

Non-Adjudicative Provider: A conciliator, mediator or organisation providing such services (219) 29.92%

Influencer: A researcher, educator, employee/representative of government, or any other person not in categories 1-4 above (112) 15.30%

Session 1 Question 1 - Group Results

What outcomes do <u>parties most often</u> want before starting a process in commercial and/or civil dispute resolution?

(Please rank your 3 preferred answers in order of priority: '1st choice' = 3 points, '2nd choice' = 2 points, '3rd choice' = 1 point).

(3480 points: maximum no. of possible points per answer = 1740 points)

2. Financial (e.g. damages, compensation, etc.) (1089) 61.00%

1.Action-focused (e.g. prevent action or require an action from one of the parties) (987) 55.00%

4.Psychological (e.g., vindication, closure, being heard, procedural fairness) (564) 32.00%

5.Relationship-focused (e.g. terminate or preserve a relationship) (503) 28.00%

3. Judicial (e.g. setting a legal precedent) (316) 18.00%

Other (21) 1.00%

Session 1 Question 1 - Cross sorted Results

AVG Rank	Party (user of dispute	Advisor: An external lawyer	Adjudicative Provider: Ajudge,	Non-Adjudicative Provider: A	Influencer: A researcher,
1	2.Financial (e.g. damages, compensation, 62%	2.Financial (e.g. damages, compensation, 64%	2.Financial (e.g. damages, compensation, 67%	2.Financial (e.g. damages, compensation, 61%	2.Financial (e.g. damages, compensation, 62%
2	1.Action-focused (e.g. prevent action 61%	1.Action-focused (e.g. prevent action 60%	1.Action-focused (e.g. prevent action 54%	1.Action-focused (e.g. prevent action 54%	1.Action-focused (e.g. prevent action 55%
3	5.Relationship-focused (e.g. terminate or 33%	3.Judicial (e.g. setting a 26%	4.Psychological (e.g., vindication, closure, 28% 5.Relationship-focused (e.g. terminate or	4.Psychological (e.g., vindication, closure, 45%	4.Psychological (e.g., vindication, closure, 40%
4	3.Judicial (e.g. setting a 24%	5.Relationship-focused (e.g. terminate or 25%	3.Judicial (e.g. setting a 22%	5.Relationship-focused (e.g. terminate or 31%	5.Relationship-focused (e.g. terminate or 26%
5	4.Psychological (e.g., vindication, closure, 19%	4.Psychological (e.g., vindication, closure,	Other 1%	3.Judicial (e.g. setting a 8%	3.Judicial (e.g. setting a 16%
6	Other 2%	Other 1%		Other 1%	Other 1%

Session 1 Question 2 - Group Results

When parties are choosing which type(s) of dispute resolution process(es) to use, which of the following has the most influence?

(Please rank your 3 preferred answers in order of priority: '1st choice' = 3 points, '2nd choice' = 2 points, '3rd choice' = 1 point).

(3372 points: maximum no. of possible points per answer = 1686 points)

1.Advice (e.g. from lawyer or other advisor) (961) 55.00%

3.Efficiency (e.g. time/cost to achieve outcome) (902) 52.00%

2.Confidentiality expectations (475) 27.00%

5. Predictability of outcome (406) 23.00%

6.Relationships (e.g. preventing conflict escalation) (396) 23.00%

4.Industry practices (219) 13.00%

Other (13) 1.00%

Session 1 Question 2 - Cross sorted Results

AVG Rank	Party (user of dispute	Advisor: An external lawyer	Adjudicative Provider: Ajudge,	Non-Adjudicative Provider: A conciliator,	Influencer: A researcher, educator,
1	3.Efficiency (e.g. time/cost to 55%	1.Advice (e.g. from lawyer 66%	3.Efficiency (e.g. time/cost to 60%	1.Advice (e.g. from lawyer 55%	1.Advice (e.g. from lawyer 55%
2	1.Advice (e.g. from lawyer 50%	3.Efficiency (e.g. time/cost to 51%	1.Advice (e.g. from lawyer 55%	3.Efficiency (e.g. time/cost to 54%	3.Efficiency (e.g. time/cost to 51%
3	6.Relationships (e.g. preventing conflict 29%	2.Confidentiality expectations 33%	6.Relationships (e.g. preventing conflict 24%	2.Confidentiality expectations 29%	6.Relationships (e.g. preventing conflict 26% 2.Community expectations
4	2.Confidentiality expectations 28%	5.Predictability of outcome 21%	5.Predictability of outcome 22%	6.Relationships (e.g. preventing conflict 26%	5.Predictability of outcome 25%
5	5.Predictability of outcome 27%	6.Relationships (e.g. preventing conflict 15%	2.Confidentiality expectations 21%	5.Predictability of outcome 25%	4.Industry practices 17%
6	4.Industry practices 11%	4.Industry practices 13%	4.Industry practices 17%	4.Industry practices 10%	
7		Other 1%	Other 2%	Other 1%	

Session 1 Question 3 - Group Results

When <u>lawyers</u> (whether in-house or external) make recommendations to <u>parties</u> about procedural options for dispute resolution, which of the following has the most influence?

(Please rank your 3 preferred answers in order of priority: '1st choice' = 3 points, '2nd choice' = 2 points, '3rd choice' = 1 point).

(3306 points: maximum no. of possible points per answer = 1653 points)

1. Familiarity with a particular type of dispute resolution process (1003) 59.00%

5. The type of outcome requested by the party (e.g. money, an injunction, etc.) (729) 43.00%

3.Impact on costs/fees the lawyer can charge (682) 40.00%

4. The party's relationships with the other party(ies) or stakeholders (502) 30.00%

2.Industry practices (357) 21.00%

Other (33) 2.00%

Session 1 Question 3 - Cross sorted Results

AVG Rank	Party (user of dispute	Advisor: An external lawyer	Adjudicative Provider: Ajudge,	Non-Adjudicative Provider: A conciliator,	Influencer: A researcher, educator,
1	1.Familiarity with a particular 59%	1.Familiarity with a particular 57%	1.Familiarity with a particular 64%	1.Familiarity with a particular 62%	1. Familiarity with a particular 65%
2	3.Impact on costs/fees 44%	5.The type of outcome 48%	5.The type of outcome 44%	5.The type of outcome 47%	3. Impact on costs/fees 46% 5.The type of outcome
3	4.The party's relationships with 39%	3.Impact on costs/fees the 38%	3.Impact on costs/fees the 36%	3.Impact on costs/fees the 42%	39%
4	5.The type of outcome 38%	₩Ttp:.party's relationships 29%	2.Industry practices 29%	4.The party's relationships with 29%	4.The party's relationships 30%
5	2.Industry practices 19%	2.Industry practices 26%	4.The party's relationships 26%	2.Industry practices 17%	2.Industry practices 20%
6	Other 1%	Other 2%	Other 2%	Other 3%	Other 1%

Session 1 Question 4 - Group Results

What role do parties want <u>providers</u> to take in dispute resolution processes?

(Please rank your 3 preferred answers in order of priority: '1st choice' = 3 points, '2nd choice' = 2 points, '3rd choice' = 1 point).

(3288 points: maximum no. of possible points per answer = 1644 points)

5. The parties initially do not have a preference but seek guidance from the providers regarding optimal ways of resolving their dispute (973) 58.00%

2.The providers decide on the process and the parties decide how the dispute is resolved (740) 44.00%

1.The parties decide how the process is conducted and how the dispute is resolved (the providers just assist) (581) 35.00%

4. The providers decide on the process and how the dispute is resolved (478) 28.00%

3.The parties decide on the process and the providers decide how the dispute is resolved (467) 28.00%

Other (49) 3.00%

Session 1 Question 4 - Cross sorted Results

AVG Rank	Party (user of dispute	Advisor: An external lawyer	Adjudicative Provider: Ajudge,	Non-Adjudicative Provider: A conciliator,	Influencer: A researcher, educator,
1	5.The parties initially do 52%	5.The parties initially do 53%	5.The parties initially do 59%	5.The parties initially do 68%	5.The parties initially do 60%
2	3.The parties decide on 42%	1.The parties decide how 39%	2.The providers decide on 42%	2.The providers decide on 57%	2.The providers decide on 41%
3	2.The providers decide on 40%	2.The providers decide on 38%	3.The parties decide on 35%	1.The parties decide how 34%	1.The parties decide how 38%
4	1.The parties decide how 37%	4.The providers decide on 37%	4.The providers decide on 33%	4.The providers decide on 21%	4.The providers decide on 29%
5	4.The providers decide on	3.The parties decide on 31%	1.The parties decide how 24%	3.The parties decide on 16%	3.The parties decide on 28%
6	Other 1%	Other 1%	Other 7%	Other 4%	Other 3%

Session 1 Question 5 - Group Results

What role do parties typically want <u>lawyers</u> (i.e., in-house or external counsel) to take in dispute resolution processes?

(Please rank your 3 preferred answers in order of priority: '1st choice' = 3 points, '2nd choice' = 2 points, '3rd choice' = 1 point).

(3192 points: maximum no. of possible points per answer = 1596 points)

5. Speaking for parties and/or advocating on a party's behalf (803) 49.00%

4. Working collaboratively with parties to navigate the process. May request actions on behalf of a party (786) 48.00%

3.Participating in the process by offering expert opinions, not acting on behalf of parties (573) 35.00%

2.Acting as advisors and accompanying parties but not interacting with other parties or providers (538) 33.00%

1.Acting as coaches, providing advice but not attending (297) 18.00%

6.Parties do not normally want lawyers to be involved (151) 9.00%

Other (44) 3.00%

Session 1 Question 5 -	AVG Rank	Party (user of dispute	Advisor: An external lawyer	Adjudicative Provider: Ajudge,	Non-Adjudicative Provider:	Influencer: A
Cross sorted Results	1	4.Working collaboratively with parties 44%	5.Speaking for parties and/or 53%	5.Speaking for parties and/or 68%	5.Speaking for parties and/or 52%	4.Working collaboratively with parties 48%
					4. Working collaboratively with parties 52%	
	2	3. Participating in the process 43%	4.Working collaboratively with parties 48%	4. Working collaboratively with parties 55%	3. Participating in the process 31%	3. Participating in the process 46%
					2.Acting as advisors and 31%	
	3	2.Acting as advisors and 38%	2.Acting as advisors and 40%	3. Participating in the process 25%	I.Acting as coaches, providing 18%	5.Speaking for parties and/or 44%
	4	5. Speaking for parties and/or 36%	3.Participating in the process 36%	2.Acting as advisors and 17%	6.Parties do not normally 13%	2.Acting as advisors and 36%
	5	I.Acting as coaches, providing 28%	I.Acting as coaches, providing 16%	I.Acting as coaches, providing 13%	Other 3%	I.Acting as coaches, providing 19%
				6.Parties do not normally 13%		
	6	6.Parties do not normally 10%	6.Parties do not normally 5%	Other 10%		6.Parties do not normally 7%
	7	Other 1%	Other 1%			

Session 2 Question 1 - Group Results

What outcomes do providers tend to prioritise?

(Please rank your 3 preferred answers in order of priority: '1st choice' = 3 points, '2nd choice' = 2 points, '3rd choice' = 1 point).

(3042 points: maximum no. of possible points per answer = 1521 points)

1.Action-focused (e.g. prevent action or require an action from one of the parties) (937) 60.00%

2.Financial (e.g. damages, compensation, etc.) (874) 56.00%

5.Relationship-focused (e.g. terminate or preserve a relationship) (461) 29.00%

4.Psychological (e.g., vindication, closure, being heard, procedural fairness) (393) 25.00%

3. Judicial (e.g. setting a legal precedent) (348) 22.00%

Other (29) 2.00%

Session 2 Question 1 - Cross sorted Results

AVG Rank	Party (user of dispute	Advisor: An external lawyer	Adjudicative Provider: Ajudge,	Non-Adjudicative Provider: A conciliator,	Influencer: A researcher, educator,
1	I.Action-focused (e.g. prevent action 63%	I.Action-focused (e.g. prevent action 65%	I.Action-focused (e.g. prevent action 68%	I.Action-focused (e.g. prevent action 55%	I.Action-focused (e.g. prevent action 64%
2	2.Financial (e.g. damages, compensation, 59%	2.Financial (e.g. damages, compensation, 60%	2.Financial (e.g. damages, compensation, 62%	2.Financial (e.g. damages, compensation, 50%	2.Financial (e.g. damages, compensation, 62%
3	5.Relationship-focused (e.g. terminate or 33%	3.Judicial (e.g. setting a 28%	4.Psychological (e.g., vindication, closure, 25%	5.Relationship-focused (e.g. terminate or 43%	4.Psychological (e.g., vindication, closure, 29%
4	3.Judicial (e.g. setting a 31%	5.Relationship-focused (e.g. terminate or 24%	5.Relationship-focused (e.g. terminate or 24%	4.Psychological (e.g., vindication, closure,	3.Judicial (e.g. setting a 28%
5	4.Psychological (e.g., vindication, closure, 14%	4.Psychological (e.g., vindication, closure, 21%	3.Judicial (e.g. setting a 19%	3.Judicial (e.g. setting a 14%	5.Relationship-focused (e.g. terminate or
6		Other 3%	Other 1%	Other 3%	

Session 2 Question 2 - Group Results

In my own experience, the <u>outcome</u> of a commercial and/or civil dispute is <u>determined</u> primarily by:

(Please rank your 3 preferred answers in order of priority: '1st choice' = 3 points, '2nd choice' = 2 points, '3rd choice' = 1 point).

(3048 points: maximum no. of possible points per answer = 1524 points)

- 1.Consensus: the parties' subjective interests (879) 56.00%
- 4.Rule of Law: findings of fact and law or other norms (817) 52.00%
- 3.Equity: general principles of fairness (748) 48.00%
- 2.Culture: based cultural and/or religious norms (319) 20.00%

5. Status: deferring to authority/hierarchies (239) 15.00%

Other (46) 3.00%

Session 2 Question 2 - Cross sorted Results

AVG Rank	Party (user of dispute	Advisor: An external lawyer	Adjudicative Provider: Ajudge,	Non-Adjudicative Provider	Influencer: A
1	4.Rule of Law: findings 56%	4.Rule of Law: findings 58%	4.Rule of Law: findings 73%	I. <u>Consensus</u> : the parties' subjective 69%	4.Rule of Law: findings 56%
2	I.Consensus: the parties' subjective 55%	3. <u>Equity:</u> general principles of 56%	I.Consensus: the parties' subjective 48% 3.Equity: general principles of 48%	3. <u>Equity:</u> general principles of 45%	3. <u>Equity:</u> general principles of 50%
3	3.Equity: general principles of 47%	I.Consensus: the parties' subjective 54%	2. <u>Culture</u> : based cultural and/or 17%	4.Rule of Law: findings 40%	I.Consensus: the parties' subjective 49%
4	2. <u>Culture</u> : based cultural and/or 23%	2. <u>Culture</u> : based cultural and/or 18%	5. <u>Status:</u> deferring to authority/hierarchies 12%	2. <u>Culture</u> : based cultural and/or 23%	2. <u>Culture</u> : based cultural and/or 22% 5. <u>Status</u> : deferring to authority/hierarchies 22%
5	5. <u>Status</u> : deferringto authority/hierarchies 17%	5. <u>Status</u> : deferringto authority/hierarchies 12%	Other 2%	5. <u>Status</u> : deferringto authority/hierarchies 16%	Other 1%
6	Other 2%	Other 2%		Other 6%	

Session 2 Question 3

What is achieved by participating in a <u>non-adjudicative process</u> (<u>mediation or conciliation</u>) (whether voluntary or involuntary - e.g. court ordered)?

(Please rank your 3 preferred answers in order of priority: '1st choice' = 3 points, '2nd choice' = 2 points, '3rd choice' = 1 point).

(3036 points: maximum no. of possible points per answer = 1518 points)

- 4.Reduced costs and expenses (673) 43.00%
- 1.Better knowledge of the strengths/weaknesses of the case or likelihood of settlement (659) 42.00%
- 3.Improving or restoring relationships (636) 41.00%
- 5. Retaining control over the outcome (598) 38.00%
- 2.Compliance (e.g. avoiding cost sanctions, meeting contractual obligations) (331) 21.00%
- 6.Tactical/strategic advantage (e.g. delay) (123) 8.00%

Other (16) 1.00%

Session 2 Question 3 -	AVG Rank	Party (user of dispute	Advisor: An external lawyer	Adjudicative Provider: Ajudge,	Non-Adjudicative Provider:	Influencer:
Cross sorted Results	1	3.Improving or restoring relationships 49%	I.Better knowledge of the 55%	4.Reduced costs and expenses 55%	5.Retaining control over the 60%	3.Improving or restoring relationships 44%
	2	I.Better knowledge of the 47%	3.Improving or restoring relationships 39%	I.Better knowledge of the 45%	4.Reduced costs and expenses 47%	4.Reduced costs and expenses 42% 1.Better knowledge of the 42%
	3	4.Reduced costs and expenses 43%	4.Reduced costs and expenses 38%	3.Improving or restoring relationships 38%	3.Improving or restoring relationships 41%	5.Retaining control over the 38%
	4	5.Retaining control over the 25% 2.Compliance (e.g. avoiding cost 25%	2.Compliance (e.g. avoiding cost 28% 5.Retaining control over the 28%	5.Retaining control over the 35%	I.Better knowledge of the 32%	2.Compliance (e.g. avoiding cost 23%
	5	6.Tactical/strategic advantage (e.g. delay) 10%	6.Tactical/strategic advantage (e.g. delay) 12%	2.Compliance (e.g. avoiding cost 17%	2.Compliance (e.g. avoiding cost 16%	6.Tactical/strategic advantage (e.g. delay) 9%
	6		Other 1%	6.Tactical/strategic advantage (e.g. delay) 7%	6.Tactical/strategic advantage (e.g. delay) 3%	Other 2%
	7			Other 3%		

Session 2 Question 4 - Group Results

Who is primarily responsible for ensuring parties understand their process options, and the possible consequences of each process before deciding which one to use?

(Please rank your 3 preferred answers in order of priority: '1st choice' = 3 points, '2nd choice' = 2 points, '3rd choice' = 1 point).

(2964 points: maximum no. of possible points per answer = 1482 points)

2.External lawyers (781) 51.00%

4.In-house lawyers (647) 42.00%

1.Adjudicative Providers: judges and arbitrators or their organisations (505) 33.00%

5.Non-Adjudicative Providers: mediators and conciliators or their organisations (505) 33.00%

6.Parties (non-legal personnel) (291) 19.00%

3.Governments/ministries of justice (218) 14.00%

Other (17) 1.00%

Session 2 Question 4 - Cross sorted Results

AVG Rank	Party (user of dispute	Advisor: An external lawyer	Adjudicative Provider: Ajudge,	Non-Adjudicative Provider:	Influencer: A researcher,
1	4.In-house lawyers 51% 2.External lawyers 51%	2.External lawyers 60%	2.External lawyers 63%	5.Non-Adjudicative Providers: mediators 54%	2.External lawyers 50%
2	I.Adjudicative Providers: judges and 36%	4.In-houselawyers 51%	I.Adjudicative Providers: judges and 46%	2.External lawyers 45%	4.In-house lawyers 44%
3	5.Non-Adjudicative Providers: mediators 27%	I.Adjudicative Providers: judges and 36%	4.In-houselawyers 45%	4.In-house lawyers 33%	I.Adjudicative Providers: judges and 34%
4	6.Parties (non-legal personnel) 21%	5.Non-Adjudicative Providers: mediators 26%	5.Non-Adjudicative Providers: mediators 19%	I.Adjudicative Providers: judges and27%	5.Non-Adjudicative Providers: mediators 27%
5	3.Governments/ministries of justice 14%	6.Parties (non-legal personnel) 14%	6.Parties (non-legal personnel) 15%	6.Parties (non-legal personnel) 24%	3. Governments/ministries of justice 24%
6		3. Governments/ministries of justice 13%	3. Governments/ministries of justice 11%	3. Governments/ministries of justice 13%	6.Parties (non-legal personnel) 21%
7		Other 1%	Other 1%	Other 3%	

Session 2 Question 5 - Group Results

Currently, the most effective dispute resolution processes usually involve which of the following?

(Please rank your 3 preferred answers in order of priority: '1st choice' = 3 points, '2nd choice' = 2 points, '3rd choice' = 1 point).

(2898 points: maximum no. of possible points per answer = 1449 points)

4.Non-adjudicative dispute resolution methods (mediation or conciliation) (646) 43.00%

2.Combining adjudicative and non-adjudicative processes (e.g. arbitration/litigation with mediation/conciliation) (637) 43.00%

5.Pre-dispute or pre-escalation processes to prevent disputes (575) 39.00%

3.Encouragement by courts, tribunals or other providers to reduce time and/or costs (450) 30.00%

1.Adjudicative dispute resolution methods (litigation or arbitration) (384) 26.00%

6.Technology to enable faster, cheaper procedures, (e.g. Online Dispute Resolution, electronic administration, remote hearings) (200) 13.00%

Other (6) 0.00%

Session 2 Question 5 - Cross sorted Results

AVG Rank	Party (user of dispute	Advisor: An external lawyer	Adjudicative Provider: Ajudge,	Non-Adjudicative Provider:	Influencer:
1	2.Combining adjudicative and non-adjudicative 51%	2.Combining adjudicative and non-adjudicative 45%	2.Combining adjudicative and non-adjudicative 48%	4.Non-adjudicative dispute resolution methods	2.Combining adjudicative and non-adjudicative 46%
2	5.Pre-dispute or pre- escalation processes 43%	I.Adjudicative dispute resolution methods 40%	5.Pre-dispute or pre- escalation processes 42%	5.Pre-dispute or pre- escalation processes 44%	I.Adjudicative dispute resolution methods 35%
3	4.Non-adjudicative dispute resolution 40%	3.Encouragement by courts, tribunals 36%	4.Non-adjudicative dispute resolution	2.Combining adjudicative and non-adjudicative 37%	4.Non-adjudicative dispute resolution 34% 5.Pre-dispute or pre-escalation processes 34%
4	3.Encouragementby courts, tribunals 29%	5.Pre-dispute or pre- escalation processes 34%	3.Encouragementby courts, tribunals 30%	3.Encouragementby courts, tribunals 29%	3.Encouragementby courts, tribunals
5	I.Adjudicative dispute resolution methods 25%	4.Non-adjudicative dispute resolution	I.Adjudicative dispute resolution methods 29%	6.Technology to enable faster, 12%	6.Technology to enable faster, 20%
6	6.Technology to enable faster, 13%	6.Technology to enable faster, 14%	6.Technology to enable faster,	I.Adjudicative dispute resolution methods 11%	Other 1%
7			Other 1%		

Session 3 Question 1- Group Results

What are the main obstacles or challenges <u>parties</u> face when seeking to resolve commercial and/or civil disputes?

(Please rank your 3 preferred answers in order of priority: '1st choice' = 3 points, '2nd choice' = 2 points, '3rd choice' = 1 point).

(2874 points: maximum no. of possible points per answer = 1437 points)

- 4.Insufficient knowledge of options available to resolve disputes (750) 51.00%
- 2. Financial or time constraints (714) 48.00%
- 1.Emotional, social, or cultural constraints (602) 41.00%
- 5. Uncertainty (e.g. unpredictable behaviour or lack of confidence in providers) (443) 30.00%
- 3.Inadequate range of options available to resolve disputes (328) 22.00%

Other (37) 3.00%

Session 3 Question I - Cross sorted Results

AVG Rank	Party (user of dispute	Advisor: An external lawyer	Adjudicative Provider: Ajudge,	Non-Adjudicative Provider:	Influencer:
1	2.Financial or time constraints 55%	2.Financial ortime constraints 55%	2.Financial ortime constraints 58%	4.Insufficient knowledge of options 64%	4.Insufficient knowledge of options 55%
2	I.Emotional, social, or cultural 40% 4.Insufficient knowledge of options 40%	I.Emotional, social, or cultural 46%	4.Insufficient knowledge of options 51%	I.Emotional, social, or cultural 45%	2.Financial ortime constraints 50%
3	5.Uncertainty (e.g. unpredictable behaviour 33%	4.Insufficient knowledge of options 45%	5.Uncertainty (e.g. unpredictable behaviour 42%	2.Financial ortime constraints 40%	I.Emotional, social, or cultural 39%
4	3.Inadequate range of options 28%	3.Inadequate range of options 28%	I.Emotional, social, or cultural 30%	5.Uncertainty (e.g. unpredictable behaviour 30%	5.Uncertainty (e.g. unpredictable behaviour 31%
5	Other 4%	5.Uncertainty (e.g. unpredictable behaviour 24%	3.Inadequate range of options 16%	3.Inadequate range of options 17%	3.Inadequate range of options 25%
6		Other 1%	Other 4%	Other 4%	

Session 3 Question 2 - Group Results

To improve the <u>future</u> of dispute resolution and access to justice, which of the following <u>processes and</u> tools should be prioritised?

(Please rank your 3 preferred answers in order of priority: '1st choice' = 3 points, '2nd choice' = 2 points, '3rd choice' = 1 point).

(2868 points: maximum no. of possible points per answer = 1434 points)

5.Pre-dispute or pre-escalation processes to prevent disputes (623) 42.00%

4.Non-adjudicative dispute resolution methods (mediation or conciliation) (604) 41.00%

2.Combining adjudicative and non-adjudicative processes (e.g. arbitration/litigation with mediation/conciliation) (577) 39.00%

3.Encouragement by courts, tribunals or other providers to reduce time and/or costs (516) 35.00%

6.Technology to enable faster, cheaper procedures, (e.g. Online Dispute Resolution, electronic administration, remote hearings) (308) 21.00%

1.Adjudicative dispute resolution methods (litigation or arbitration) (225) 15.00%

Other (15) 1.00%

Session 3 Question 2 - Cross sorted Results

AVG Rank	Party (user of dispute	Advisor: An external lawyer	Adjudicative Provider: Ajudge,	Non-Adjudicative Provider:	Influencer:
1	2.Combining adjudicative and non-adjudicative 46%	2.Combining adjudicative and non-adjudicative 42%	2.Combining adjudicative and non-adjudicative 45% 5.Pre-dispute or pre- escalation processes 45%	4.Non-adjudicative dispute resolution 58%	2.Combining adjudicative and non-adjudicative 44%
2	5.Pre-dispute or pre- escalation processes 43%	3.Encouragement by courts, tribunals 40%	4.Non-adjudicative dispute resolution 38%	5.Pre-dispute or pre- escalation processes 51%	5.Pre-dispute or pre- escalation processes 43%
3	4.Non-adjudicative dispute resolution 36%	4.Non-adjudicative dispute resolution 36%	3.Encouragementby courts, tribunals 33%	3.Encouragement by courts, tribunals 35%	3.Encouragement by courts, tribunals 35%
4	3.Encouragement by courts, tribunals 35%	5.Pre-dispute or pre- escalation processes 34%	I.Adjudicative dispute resolution methods	2.Combining adjudicative and non-adjudicative 32%	4.Non-adjudicative dispute resolution
5	6.Technology to enable faster, 22%	6.Technology to enable faster, 25%	6.Technology to enable faster, 16%	6.Technology to enable faster, 18%	6.Technology to enable faster, 25%
6	I.Adjudicative dispute resolution methods 18%	I.Adjudicative dispute resolution methods 23%	Other 2%	I.Adjudicative dispute resolution methods 4%	I.Adjudicative dispute resolution methods
7				Other 2%	

Session 3 Question 3 - Group Results

Which of the following areas would most improve dispute resolution and access to justice?

(Please rank your 3 preferred answers in order of priority: "1st choice' = 3 points, '2nd choice' = 2 points, '3rd choice' = 1 point).

(2838 points: maximum no. of possible points per answer = 1419 points)

3.Legislation or conventions that promote recognition and enforcement of settlements, including those reached in mediation (726) 50.00%

5.Use of protocols promoting non-adjudicative processes before adjudicative processes (e.g. opt-out) (604) 42.00%

2.Cost sanctions against parties for failing to try non-adjudicative processes (e.g. mediation or conciliation) before litigation/arbitration. (526) 36.00%

1.Accreditation or certification systems for dispute resolution providers (484) 33.00%

4.Quality control and complaint mechanisms applicable to dispute resolution providers (448) 31.00%

Other (50) 3.00%

6.Rules governing third party fundig (0) 0.00%

Session 3 Question 3 - Cross sorted Results

AVG Rank	Party (user of dispute	Advisor: An external lawyer	Adjudicative Provider: Ajudge,	Non-Adjudicative Provider:	Influencer:
1	3.Legislation or conventions that 54%	3.Legislation or conventions that 49%	3.Legislation or conventions that 57%	5.Use of protocols promoting 52%	3.Legislation or conventions that 59%
2	5.Use of protocols promoting 40%	2.Cost sanctions against parties 42%	5. Use of protocols promoting 42%	3.Legislation or conventions that 45%	5.Use of protocols promoting 38%
3	4.Quality control and complaint 37%	5.Use of protocols promoting 37%	2.Cost sanctions against parties 35%	2.Cost sanctions against parties 39%	4.Quality control and complaint 35%
4	I.Accreditation or certification systems 36%	4.Quality control and complaint 35%	I.Accreditation or certification systems 30% 4.Quality control and complaint 30%	I.Accreditation or certification systems 35%	I.Accreditation or certification systems 33%
5	2.Cost sanctions against parties 33%	I.Accreditation or certification systems 34%	Other 5%	4.Quality control and complaint 25%	2.Cost sanctions against parties 31%
6	Other 1%	Other 3%		Other 5%	Other 3%

Session 3 Question 4 - Group Question

Which stakeholders are likely to be most resistant to change in dispute resolution practice?

(Please rank your 3 preferred answers in order of priority: '1st choice' = 3 points, '2nd choice' = 2 points, '3rd choice' = 1 point).

(2838 points: maximum no. of possible points per answer = 1419 points)

- 2.External lawyers (921) 63.00%
- 1.Adjudicative Providers: judges and arbitrators or their organisations (598) 41.00%
- 3.Governments/ministries of justice (465) 32.00%
- 4.In-house lawyers (402) 28.00%
- 6.Parties (non-legal personnel) (284) 20.00%
- 5.Non-Adjudicative Providers: mediators and conciliators or their organisations (145) 10.00%

Other (23) 2.00%

Session 3 Question 4 - Cross sorted Results

AVG lank	Party (user of dispute	Advisor: An external lawyer	Adjudicative Provider: Ajudge,	Non-Adjudicative Provider:	Influencer:
1	2.External lawyers 50%	2.External lawyers 61%	2.External lawyers 75%	2.External lawyers 74%	2.External lawyers 63%
2	I.Adjudicative Providers: judges and 48% 3.Governments/ministries of justice 48%	I.Adjudicative Providers: judges and 34% 3.Governments/ministries of justice 34% 4.In-house lawyers 34%	3. Governments/ministries of justice 41%	I.Adjudicative Providers: judges and 48%	I.Adjudicative Providers: judges and 46%
3	4.In-house lawyers 19%	6.Parties (non-legal personnel) 26%	I.Adjudicative Providers: judges and 30%	4.In-house lawyers 31%	4.In-house lawyers 26%
4	5.Non-Adjudicative Providers: mediators 18%	5.Non-Adjudicative Providers: mediators 9%	4.In-house lawyers 25%	3. Governments/ministries of justice 24%	3. Governments/ministries of justice 25%
5	6.Parties (non-legal personnel) 16%	Other 1%	6.Parties (non-legal personnel) 18%	6.Parties (non-legal personnel) 16%	6.Parties (non-legal personnel) 24%
6	Other 1%		5.Non-Adjudicative Providers: mediators 10%	5.Non-Adjudicative Providers: mediators 6%	5.Non-Adjudicative Providers: mediators 12%
7			Other 1%	Other 1%	Other 4%

Session 3 Question 5 - Group Results

Which stakeholders have the potential to be most influential in bringing about change in dispute resolution practice?

(Please rank your 3 preferred answers in order of priority: '1st choice' = 3 points, '2nd choice' = 2 points, '3rd choice' = 1 point).

(2790 points: maximum no. of possible points per answer = 1395 points)

1.Adjudicative Providers: judges and arbitrators or their organisations (605) 42.00%

3.Governments/ministries of justice (577) 40.00%

2.External lawyers (458) 32.00%

4.In-house lawyers (422) 30.00%

5.Non-Adjudicative Providers: mediators and conciliators or their organisations (356) 25.00%

6.Parties (non-legal personnel) (351) 25.00%

Other (21) 1.00%

Session 3 Question 5 - Cross sorted Results

AVG Rank	Party (user of dispute	Advisor: An external lawyer	Adjudicative Provider: A judge,	Non-Adjudicative Provider:	Influencer:
1	3. Governments/ministries of justice 49%	2.External lawyers 45%	I.Adjudicative Providers: judges and 50%	I.Adjudicative Providers: judges and 46%	3. Governments/ministries of justice 40%
2	I.Adjudicative Providers: judges and 45%	I.Adjudicative Providers: judges and 39%	2.External lawyers 40%	3. Governments/ministries of justice 45%	I.Adjudicative Providers: judges and 38%
3	6.Parties (non-legal personnel) 30%	4.In-house lawyers 37%	3.Governments/ministries of justice 36%	5.Non-Adjudicative Providers: mediators 30%	6.Parties (non-legal personnel) 34%
4	4.In-house lawyers 28%	3.Governments/ministries of justice	4.In-house lawyers 35%	2.External lawyers 28%	5.Non-Adjudicative Providers: mediators 29%
5	5.Non-Adjudicative Providers: mediators 25%	5.Non-Adjudicative Providers: mediators 27%	6.Parties (non-legal personnel) 19%	4.In-house lawyers 26%	2.External lawyers 28%
6	2.External lawyers 23%	6.Parties (non-legal personnel) 21%	5.Non-Adjudicative Providers: mediators	6.Parties (non-legal personnel) 24%	4.In-houselawyers 27%
7		Other 3%	Other 1%	Other 1% 	Other 3%

Session 4 Question 1- Group Results

Who has the greatest responsibility for taking action to promote better access to justice?

(Please rank your 3 preferred answers in order of priority: '1st choice' = 3 points, '2nd choice' = 2 points, '3rd choice' = 1 point).

(2790 points: maximum no. of possible points per answer = 1395 points)

- 3.Governments/ministries of justice (912) 64.00%
- 1.Adjudicative Providers: judges and arbitrators or their organisations (736) 51.00%
- 2.External lawyers (425) 30.00%
- 5.Non-Adjudicative Providers: mediators and conciliators or their organisations (263) 18.00%
- 4.In-house lawyers (253) 18.00%
- 6.Parties (non-legal personnel) (190) 13.00%

Other (11) 1.00%

Session 4 Question 1 - Cross sorted Results

AVG Rank	Party (user of dispute	Advisor: An external lawyer	Adjudicative Provider: Ajudge,	Non-Adjudicative Provider:	Influencer:
1	3.Governments/ministries of justice 57%	3.Governments/ministries of justice 57%	3.Governments/ministries of justice 68%	3.Governments/ministries of justice 77%	3. Governments/ministries of justice 65%
2	J.Adjudicative Providers: judges and 51%	J.Adjudicative Providers: Judges and 49%	J.Adjudicative Providers: judges and 52%	J.Adjudicative Providers: judges and 57%	I. Adjudicative Providers: judges and 54%
3	2.External lawyers 32%	2.External lawyers 42%	30%	2.External lawyers 23%	2.External lawyers 24% 5.Non-Adjudicative Providers: mediators 24%
4	6.Parties (non-legal personnel) 24%	4.In-house lawyers 25%	5.Non-Adjudicative Providers: mediators 20%	5.Non-Adjudicative Providers: mediators 19%	6.Parties (non-legal personnel) 16%
5	4.In-houselawyers 20%	5.Non-Adjudicative Providers: mediators 18%	4.In-house lawyers 19%	4.In-house lawyers 12% 6.Parties (non-legal personnel) 12%	4.In-house lawyers 14%
6	5.Non-Adjudicative Providers: mediators	6.Parties (non-legal personnel) 10%	6.Parties (non-legal personnel) 9%	Other 1%	Other 2%
7			Other 2%		

Session 4 Question 2

What is the most effective way to improve <u>parties'</u> understanding of their options for dispute resolution?

(Please rank your 3 preferred answers in order of priority: '1st choice' = 3 points, '2nd choice' = 2 points, '3rd choice' = 1 point).

(2802 points: maximum no. of possible points per answer = 1401 points)

2.Education in business and/or law schools and the broader business community about adjudicative and non-adjudicative dispute resolution options (821) 57.00%

3. Procedural requirements for all legal personnel and parties to declare they have considered non-adjudicative dispute resolution options before initiating arbitration or litigation (531) 37.00%

1.Creating collaborative dispute resolution centres or hubs to promote awareness (521) 36.00%

5.Requiring parties to attempt non-adjudicative options (i.e., mediation or conciliation) before initiating litigation or arbitration (511) 36.00%

4.Providing access to experts to guide parties in selecting the most appropriate dispute resolution process(es) (401) 28.00%

Other (17) 1.00%

Session 4 Question 2 - Cross sorted Results

AVG Rank	Party (user of dispute	Advisor: An external lawyer	Adjudicative Provider: Ajudge,	Non-Adjudicative Provider:	Influencer:
1	2.Education in business and/or 56%	2.Education in business and/or 62%	2.Education in business and/or 65%	2.Education in business and/or 55%	2.Education in business and/or 58%
2	I.Creating collaborative dispute resolution 44%	3.Procedural requirements for all 42%	3.Procedural requirements for all 41%	5.Requiring parties to attempt 46%	1.Creating collaborative dispute resolution 39%
3	5.Requiring parties to attempt 38%	I.Creating collaborative dispute resolution 37%	I.Creating collaborative dispute resolution 33% 5.Requiring parties to attempt 33%	3. Procedural requirements for all 36%	4.Providing access to experts 38%
4	3.Procedural requirements for all 34%	5.Requiring parties to attempt 30%	4.Providing access to experts 27%	I.Creating collaborative disputeresolution 34%	3. Procedural requirements for all 36%
5	4.Providing access to experts 27%	4.Providing access to experts 28%	Other 1%	4.Providing access to experts 26%	5.Requiring parties to attempt 29%
6		Other 1%		Other 3%	

Session 4 Question 3 - Group Results

To promote better access to justice, where should <u>policy makers</u>, <u>governments and administrators focus</u> their attention?

(Please rank your 3 preferred answers in order of priority: '1st choice' = 3 points, '2nd choice' = 2 points, '3rd choice' = 1 point).

(2790 points: maximum no. of possible points per answer = 1395 points)

- 3.Pre-dispute or early stage case evaluation or assessment systems using third party advisors who will notbe involved in subsequent proceedings (712) 50.00%
- 2.Making non-adjudicative processes (mediation or conciliation) compulsory and/or a process parties can "opt-out" of before adjudicative processes can be initiated (673) 47.00%
- 1.Legislation or conventions promoting recognition and enforcement of settlements including those reached in mediation (640) 45.00%
- 5.Use of protocols promoting non-adjudicative processes (mediation or conciliation) before adjudicative processes (458) 32.00%
- 4.Reducing pressures on the courts to make them more efficient and accessible (284) 20.00%

Other (23) 2.00%

Session 4 Question 3 - Cross sorted Results

AVG Rank	Party (user of dispute	Advisor: An external lawyer	Adjudicative Provider: Ajudge,	Non-Adjudicative Provider:	Influencer:
1	3.Pre-dispute or early stage 62%	I.Legislation or conventions promoting 53%	3.Pre-dispute or early stage 55%	2.Makingnon-adjudicative processes (mediation 53%	2. Making non-adjudicative processes (mediation 50% 2. Pre-dispute or early stage 50%
2	2. Making non-adjudicative processes (mediation 43%	3.Pre-dispute or early stage 49%	2.Making non-adjudicative processes (mediation 52%	5.Use of protocols promoting 47%	I.Legislation or conventions promoting 46%
3	5.Use of protocols promoting 28%	2.Making non-adjudicative processes (mediation 43%	I.Legislation or conventions promoting 45%	3.Pre-dispute or early stage 46%	5.Use of protocols promoting 29%
4	4.Reducing pressureson the 23%	4.Reducing pressureson the 28%	5.Use of protocols promoting 26%	I.Legislation or conventions promoting 42%	4.Reducing pressureson the 24%
5		5.Use of protocols promoting 25%	4.Reducing pressureson the 19%	4.Reducing pressureson the 11%	Other 1%
6		Other 2%	Other 2%	Other 2%	

Session 4 Question 4 - Group Results

Which of the following will have the most significant impact on future policy-making in dispute resolution?

(Please rank your 3 preferred answers in order of priority: '1st choice' = 3 points, '2nd choice' = 2 points, '3rd choice' = 1 point).

(2772 points: maximum no. of possible points per answer = 1386 points)

2.Demand for increased efficiency of dispute resolution processes, including through technology. (806) 57.00%

1.Demand for certainty and enforceability of outcomes (664) 47.00%

4.Demand for increased transparency (456) 32.00%

6.Demand for processes that allow parties to represent themselves, without lawyers (295) 21.00%

5.Demand for increased uniformity and standardisation (284) 20.00%

3.Demand for increased rights of appeal/oversight of adjudicative providers (243) 17.00%

Other (24) 2.00%

Session 4 Question 4 - Cross sorted Results

AVG Rank	Party (user of dispute	Advisor: An external lawyer	Adjudicative Provider: Ajudge,	Non-Adjudicative Provider:	Influencer:
1	2.Demand for increased efficiency 57%	2.Demand for increased efficiency 60%	2.Demand for increased efficiency 58%	2.Demand for increased efficiency 61%	2. Demand for increased efficiency 51%
2	I.Demand for certainty and 44%	I . Demand for certainty and 48%	I .Demand for certainty and 55%	I.Demand for certainty and 50%	4.Demand for increased transparency 43%
3	4.Demand for increased transparency 33%	4.Demand for increased transparency 38%	4.Demand for increased transparency 32%	6.Demand for processes that 30%	I.Demand for certainty and 41%
4	3.Demand for increased rights 24%	3.Demand for increased rights 21%	3.Demand for increased rights 19% 5.Demand for increased uniformity	4.Demand for increased transparency 24%	5.Demand for increased uniformity 27%
5	5. Demand for increased uniformity 20% 5. Demand for processes that 20%	5.Demand for increased uniformity 17%	6.Demand for processes that 16%	5.Demand for increased uniformity 21%	6.Demand for processes that 22%
6	Other 2%	6. Demand for processes that 14%	Other 1%	3.Demand for increased rights 13%	3.Demand for increased rights 13%
7		Other		Other	Other

Session 4 Question 5 - Group Results

What <u>innovations/trends</u> are going to have the most significant influence on the <u>future</u> of dispute resolution?

(Please rank your 3 preferred answers in order of priority: '1st choice' = 3 points, '2nd choice' = 2 points, '3rd choice' = 1 point).

(2772 points: maximum no. of possible points per answer = 1386 points)

3.Greater emphasis on collaborative instead of adversarial processes for resolving disputes (745) 53.00%

1. Changes in corporate attitudes to conflict prevention (626) 44.00%

2.Enhanced understanding regarding how people behave and resolve conflict (e.g. from brain and social sciences) (487) 34.00%

5.Harmonisation of international laws and standards for dispute resolution systems (335) 24.00%

6.Technological innovation (e.g. on-line dispute resolution) (311) 22.00%

4.Greater emphasis on personal wellbeing and stress reduction of parties (251) 18.00%

Other (17) 1.00%

Session 4 Question 5 - Cross sorted Results

AVG Rank	Party (user of dispute	Advisor: An external lawyer	Adjudicative Provider: Ajudge,	Non-Adjudicative Provider:	Influencer:
1	3.Greater emphasis on collaborative 59%	3.Greater emphasis on collaborative 48%	3.Greater emphasis on collaborative 56%	3.Greater emphasis on collaborative 60%	3.Greater emphasis on collaborative 43%
2	I.Changes in corporate attitudes 46%	I.Changes in corporate attitudes 45%	I.Changes in corporate attitudes 47%	I.Changes in corporate attitudes 46%	1.Changes in corporate attitudes 42%
3	2.Enhanced understanding regarding how 33%	2.Enhanced understanding regarding how 39%	5.Harmonisation of international laws 33%	2.Enhanced understanding regarding how 36%	2.Enhanced understanding regarding how 40%
4	4.Greater emphasis on personal 22%	5.Harmonisation of international laws 24%	2.Enhanced understanding regarding how 24% 6.Technological innovation (e.g. on-line 24%	5. Harmonisation of international laws 22% 5. Technological innovation (e.g. on-line 22%	6.Technological innovation (e.g. on-line 29%
5	5.Harmonisation of international laws 21%	6.Technological innovation (e.g. on-line 22%	4.Greater emphasis on personal 15%	4.Greater emphasis on personal 14%	5.Harmonisation of international laws 27%
6	6.Technological innovation (e.g. on-line	4.Greater emphasis on personal	Other 2%	Other 1%	4.Greater emphasis on personal
7	Other 1%	Other 1%			Other 1%