



Comparative insights 2024 arbitration statistics from leading institutions

February 2026

ReedSmith

Contents

Key takeaways	3
Caseload and global reach	4
Seats, laws, and language of arbitration	6
Key industries and market trends	8
Tribunal formation, diversity, and challenges	10
Procedural pathways and case management	12
Conclusion	14
Key contacts	15

Key takeaways

- Global strength in caseloads: All institutions reviewed reported robust activity. The International Chamber of Commerce International Court of Arbitration (ICC) remains the largest in terms of parties and jurisdictions; the London Court of International Arbitration (LCIA) continues to show strong international uptake, particularly from Africa; the Hong Kong International Arbitration Centre (HKIAC) had a record year; the Singapore International Arbitration Centre (SIAC) posted its third-highest caseload; the Dubai International Arbitration Centre (DIAC) posted over 250 cases for the third consecutive year; and the International Centre for Dispute Resolution (the international division of the American Arbitration Association) (ICDR) remains a key forum for transatlantic disputes.
- Seats matter: London, Hong Kong, Singapore, New York, and Paris remain dominant arbitral hubs, while the United Arab Emirates (UAE) broke into ICC's top five seats for the first time, confirming the growing importance of the GCC and wider Arab region for arbitration.
- Sectoral trends are distinct: Construction and energy disputes dominate the ICC and DIAC; the LCIA, HKIAC, and SIAC remain strong in trade, commodities, and finance; and the ICDR saw a notable share of technology disputes. Interestingly, cryptocurrency disputes featured as a discrete top-10 category for HKIAC.
- Procedural tools are widely but unevenly used: SIAC leads on expedited and emergency measures, the ICC shows high settlement and withdrawal rates, and the ICDR reports significant cost savings with sole arbitrator panels. The LCIA continues to prioritize flexibility over formal tracks, while focusing on cost-effectiveness in high-value cases. HKIAC handles cases efficiently by consolidating related disputes, especially those involving multiple contracts or parties, into single arbitrations. DIAC reported that all four emergency arbitrators ordered emergency relief, and that parties are relying on its recently revamped provisions relating to joinder, consolidation, and claims under multiple contracts.
- Diversity improving: The ICC, the LCIA, and DIAC appointed women to nearly half of Court-appointed tribunals. HKIAC and SIAC each reported around 35%, and the ICDR around 25%, diverse panels. Progress is steady, but more remains to be done.

Each year, arbitral institutions release statistical reports that shed light on global arbitration trends. In this note, we review the **2024 statistics released by the ICC, the LCIA, HKIAC, SIAC, DIAC, and the ICDR**, six of the world's most significant arbitral institutions. The comparative analysis highlights how users' choices of forum, seat, governing law, and procedural tools are evolving worldwide. It helps to identify common developments and regional distinctions that matter for arbitration users when planning their dispute resolution clauses and strategies.

Caseload and global reach

The 2024 statistics confirm that international arbitration remains in exceptionally robust health, with all leading institutions reviewed reporting strong case numbers and diverse global participation. The figures also demonstrate that while overall case volumes have stabilized, each institution is consolidating its particular geographic and sectoral strengths.

At the global level, the ICC continues to set the benchmark for scale and reach, administering 841 new cases in 2024 and involving parties from 136 jurisdictions across pending cases. Although this represents only a marginal dip compared with 2023, the aggregate value of pending disputes surged to an unprecedented \$354 billion. This indicates that users are increasingly turning to the ICC for high-value, complex disputes that demand global enforceability.

The LCIA also maintained consistent activity, with 362 referrals, including 318 arbitrations, broadly in line with its 2023 figures. The institution's caseload is distinguished by its overwhelming international character – 95% of arbitrations involved at least one foreign party – and its increasing traction among African users, with Kenya accounting for nearly 8% of all parties in 2024. More than a third of LCIA cases involved claims exceeding \$10 million, reaffirming its reputation for handling substantial, complex disputes, particularly in commodities and finance.

The ICDR similarly reported a year of steady growth, handling 811 new international cases involving parties from 87 countries. Its total claim and counterclaim value jumped from \$3.5 billion in 2023 to \$4.8 billion in 2024, reflecting not just volume but also the growing financial stakes of disputes being referred. The fact that over 60% of parties to ICDR cases hail from North America highlights the continuing importance of the region to the institution.

In Asia, HKIAC reported a total of 503 newly submitted cases, slightly more than in 2023 and roughly on par with recent years. However, while the number of cases remained stable, the total amount in dispute in all arbitration cases increased to approximately \$13.6 billion, a record high for the institution. 76% of all arbitrations were international in nature, involving at least one party not from Hong Kong. Overall, parties from 53 jurisdictions participated.

SIAC registered 625 new cases, slightly down from 2023 but still the institution's third-highest caseload on record. With 91% of disputes classified as international, SIAC remains a pre-eminent choice for cross-border arbitration. The emergence of South Korea as its leading foreign user for the first time demonstrates how regional dynamics – here, a cluster of related disputes – can shape annual statistics, while the total value of claims at nearly \$12 billion reflects the institution's growing role in large-scale commercial disputes.

DIAC registered 295 cases (in 33 of which it was the appointing authority only). Despite a slight dip in case numbers from 2023, the aggregate value of disputes rose sharply to AED 9.7 billion (approximately \$2.6 billion), underscoring an increasing shift toward higher-value, likely more complex matters. While UAE parties continue to dominate DIAC arbitrations at 71%, DIAC's global footprint expanded, with parties from 53 jurisdictions and notable growth from India, China, Saudi Arabia, and Russia.

Taken together, the 2024 data show a maturing international arbitration market: overall case numbers are no longer spiking year on year, but institutions are deepening their market share in particular regions and sectors. For clients, the key message is that the choice of institution remains highly strategic, not only for quality of administration but also for aligning with regional usage patterns, industry profiles, and value thresholds.

Institution	New cases filed	Jurisdictions represented	International %	Total value of disputes	Year-on-year comparison
ICC	841 (including 10 in which the ICC acted as appointing authority only)	136	69% (cross-border)	\$102bn (new) \$354bn (pending)	Caseload broadly consistent with 2023 (870 new cases filed under the ICC Arbitration Rules and 20 cases where the ICC served as appointing authority). Pending disputes value reached a record high.
LCIA	362 referrals, 318 of which were arbitrations	101	95%	36% involved claims of more than \$10m	Caseload broadly in line with 2023 (377 referrals, 327 arbitrations).
HKIAC	503 (352 of which were arbitrations)	53	76.4%	\$13.6bn	Slight increase in number of cases; record-high total dispute value
SIAC	625 (585 administered, 40 ad hoc)	72	91%	\$11.86bn	Down from 2023 (663 cases); still third-highest caseload ever
DIAC	295 total cases (262 arbitrations, 33 as appointing authority)	53	29%	AED 9.7bn (approx. \$2.6bn)	Case numbers slightly down from 355 in 2023, but value up 75% (from AED 5.5bn)
ICDR	811	87	The ICDR is the international division of the AAA and administers only international cases	\$4.8bn	Slight increase on 2023 (798 cases). Value of disputes rose from \$3.5bn to \$4.8bn.

At the global level, the ICC continues to set the benchmark for scale and reach, administering **841 new cases**; parties from **136 jurisdictions**; pending disputes hit a record **\$354 billion**.

Seats, laws, and language of arbitration

The 2024 figures highlight both the consolidation of established arbitral hubs and some noteworthy shifts that underline changing market dynamics.

The ICC continues to demonstrate the widest geographic spread, with 107 different seats across 62 countries. Cities in the UK, France, Switzerland, and the United States retained their longstanding positions as leading choices, but the most striking development was the UAE breaking into the top five for the first time, with 38 cases seated there. This underscores the UAE's growing stature as a regional arbitration hub, building on institutional reforms and the global recognition of its arbitral framework.

On governing law, English law remained the clear favorite, followed by the laws of a U.S. state (with New York accounting for 50%), then Swiss, Brazilian, and French law.

Language usage also reflected the ICC's global reach: English dominated (77%), but Spanish, French, Portuguese, and German were all used, and bilingual awards were rendered in other languages, including Mandarin.

The LCIA maintained its firmly London-centric identity, with 89% of cases seated in London and English law applied in 78%. This concentration continues to reinforce London's position as a global arbitration center, especially in certain industries (addressed below), and highlights how closely the LCIA's identity is tied to English legal traditions.

The ICDR reported New York, Miami, and Los Angeles as its most frequent seats, reflecting its transatlantic and transpacific caseload. Unlike the other institutions, the ICDR did not provide detailed information on governing law or languages of arbitration, though its caseload profile suggests a predominance of English language usage.

For HKIAC arbitrations, Hong Kong law remained the most commonly selected governing law, followed by English law then Chinese law. In total, 15 different governing laws were applied across disputes, underscoring HKIAC's highly international caseload. Language data indicated a predominance of English (79.3% of cases), followed by Chinese (15.9% of cases) and bilingual English and Chinese (4.3% cases). The figures consolidate Hong Kong's position as a top-tier arbitral seat in the Asia-Pacific, balancing international accessibility with the advantages of proximity to Mainland China.

SIAC, by contrast, illustrates the growing centrality of Singapore in Asia-Pacific arbitration. Singapore law was applied in more than half of all cases (53%). English law was the second most common governing law at 27%, with Indian law also significant at 5%. The figures confirm Singapore's attraction as both a neutral seat and governing law for disputes involving Asian parties, while also showing the continued importance of English law as a global commercial law of choice.

DIAC continues its role as a dual-seat hub for the region, with Dubai selected as the seat in 51% of cases and the DIFC in 48%, reflecting the increasing sophistication of parties who leverage either civil- or common-law frameworks depending on the nature of their contracts. The underlying substantive laws likewise demonstrate a blend of local grounding and international engagement: while UAE law remained the most frequently chosen, English law governed 15% of all cases, and disputes involving Saudi law nearly doubled year on year, mirroring rising transactional activity across the Gulf. English continued to dominate proceedings, serving as the language of arbitration in 95% of DIAC cases. This convergence of predictable seats, increasingly international governing laws, and near-universal use of English positions DIAC as a globally accessible arbitral venue.

Across institutions, a key conclusion is the reinforcement of established hubs – London, Hong Kong, Singapore, New York, and Paris remain dominant – with new entrants gaining ground, most notably the UAE. For governing law, English law continues to dominate globally, though the ICC figures demonstrate that parties are increasingly comfortable with applying local laws such as Brazilian, Mexican, or Qatari, depending on the commercial context. Language use remains highly dependent on institutional footprint, with the ICC standing out as the most multilingual forum.

On governing law, English law remained the clear favorite, followed by the laws of a U.S. state (with New York accounting for 50%), then Swiss, Brazilian, and French law.

Institution	Total seats	Top seats	Top governing laws	Languages reported
ICC	107 seats across 62 countries	London (96 cases or 13.4%), Paris (90 cases or 12.6%), Switzerland (83 cases), United States (72 cases), UAE (38 cases)	English (125 cases or 15%), U.S. state (69 cases), Swiss (60 cases), Brazilian (44 cases), French (42 cases)	English dominant (77%), Spanish (36 awards), French (26 awards), Portuguese (18 awards), German (eight awards)
LCIA	21 seats across 15 jurisdictions	London (89%)	English (78%)	n/a
HKIAC	n/a	Hong Kong (97.1%)	Hong Kong, English, Chinese	English (79.3%), Chinese (15.9%), Bilingual English- Chinese (4.3%)
SIAC	n/a	n/a	Singapore (53.2%), English (27.4%), Indian (5.3%)	n/a
DIAC	Four seats across the UAE and Turkey	Dubai (51%), DIFC (48%), Abu Dhabi and Istanbul (one case each)	UAE/Dubai (majority), English (15%), Saudi (3.8%)	English (95%), Arabic (5%), and one bilingual case (English/Arabic)
ICDR	n/a	New York, Miami, Los Angeles	n/a	n/a

Key industries and market trends

The 2024 sectoral statistics show that while arbitration remains the forum of choice for construction and energy disputes worldwide, each institution is carving out a distinct industry profile that reflects both its user base and regional strengths.

The ICC maintained its traditional dominance in large-scale infrastructure disputes, with construction and engineering accounting for 23% of its caseload and energy disputes for a further 20%. These two sectors alone comprised almost half of all ICC filings, underscoring the institution's role in managing high-value, technically complex projects across multiple jurisdictions. Transport, finance, and technology disputes also featured prominently, reflecting the breadth of the ICC's global docket.

The LCIA, by contrast, continues to be a key venue for commodity trading and finance disputes. Transport/shipping and commodities together represented 29% of its cases, while banking and finance accounted for 17%. Energy and resources made up a further 10%, and construction 8%. This distribution reflects London's historical role as a hub for international trade and finance, as well as the LCIA's reputation for resolving disputes in these areas with efficiency and cost predictability.

HKIAC in 2024 maintained a particularly diversified caseload, with commercial disputes leading at 14.5%, followed by sale of goods (13.9%), corporate (13.6%), maritime (12.2%), construction (9.7%), shareholder (9.4%), financial (7.7%), professional services (4.5%), insurance (4.0%), and cryptocurrency (3.1%) disputes, forming the top 10 categories. The inclusion of cryptocurrency among its top principal dispute types for the first time highlights Hong Kong's growing prominence as a forum for digital asset and fintech-related arbitrations, building on its recognition of crypto assets as property and its pro-arbitration framework for blockchain-related contracts.

SIAC demonstrated the most diverse portfolio, with commodities trade disputes leading at 29%, followed by commercial (19%), corporate (12%), maritime and shipping (11%), and construction and infrastructure (11%). This spread highlights SIAC's appeal as a forum for a wide range of Asia-Pacific disputes, from commodities trade and shipping to cross-border corporate ventures. Notably, SIAC's caseload shows less concentration in a single sector compared to the ICC or LCIA, which may reflect the region's wide spectrum of commercial activity.

DIAC's caseload reflects the economic drivers of the wider region, with construction and real estate disputes accounting for 58% of all cases, underscoring the continued momentum of large-scale commercial, residential, and mixed-use development projects across the Gulf.

Energy-sector disputes rose to nearly 10% of the caseload, overtaking banking and finance and highlighting the rapid expansion of regional power, utilities, and renewables sectors. A marked shift in contract profiles also emerged: while construction contracts remained dominant at 41%, sale and purchase agreements surged to 25% (up from 9% in 2023) indicating broader adoption of DIAC clauses in mainstream commercial transactions. The fact that over 70% of disputes stemmed from contracts concluded within the last six years, and more than 36% from contracts signed since 2022, points to adoption of the DIAC Rules in arbitration agreements concluded following Dubai Decree No 43.

The ICDR stood out in 2024 for its heavy involvement in technology-related disputes, which accounted for 150 of its cases, making it the leading sector. Construction (71 cases), financial services (45), and real estate (35) followed, alongside disputes in entertainment and life sciences. This is a striking divergence from the other institutions and highlights the ICDR's attraction for disputes arising from the technology sector, likely due to its strong North American presence and cross-border tech supply chains.

Taken together, the statistics show that institutional choice may be influenced as much by industry profile as by geography. Parties in construction and energy disputes gravitate toward the ICC or DIAC for those based in the Middle East; commodity and finance disputes continue to cluster in the LCIA (although SIAC is also popular for commodity disputes); cryptocurrency disputes ranked among the top 10 categories at HKIAC; and technology and innovation-driven disputes are increasingly prominent with all the major institutions. For clients, a practical takeaway is that awareness of these institutional "specializations" can inform strategic decisions on drafting arbitration clauses, particularly in industries where certain institutions have developed a deep bench of arbitrators and experience.

Institution	Top sector 1	Top sector 2	Top sector 3	Other key sectors
ICC	Construction/ engineering (23.2%)	Energy (20.5%)	Transport (6.3%)	Finance, telecoms/tech, health/ pharma, business services
LCIA	Transport/ commodities (29%)	Banking/ finance (17%)	Energy/ resources (10%)	Construction, technology, health care, professional services
HKIAC	Commercial (14.5%)	Sale of goods (13.9%)	Corporate (13.6%)	Maritime, construction, shareholder dispute, financial, professional services, insurance, cryptocurrency
SIAC	Trade (29%)	Commercial (19%)	Corporate (12%)	Maritime/shipping, construction
DIAC	Construction/real estate (58%)	Energy (10%)	Retail/ consumer goods (8%)	Transport/logistics, manufacturing/industrial, banking/finance, professional services, technology/telecoms
ICDR	Technology (150 cases)	Construction (71)	Financial services (45)	Real estate, entertainment, life sciences, energy, food/beverage

The ICDR stood out in 2024 for its heavy involvement in technology-related disputes, which accounted for **150 of its cases**, making it the leading sector. Construction (71 cases), financial services (45), and real estate (35) followed, alongside disputes in entertainment and life sciences.

Tribunal formation, diversity, and challenges increased

The 2024 statistics reveal continued emphasis by arbitral institutions on broadening their pools of arbitrators and ensuring greater diversity, while also shedding light on how tribunal challenges are handled in practice.

The ICC confirmed or appointed 1,020 arbitrators from 91 jurisdictions. Parties were responsible for the majority of appointments (57%), followed by the ICC Court (27%) and co-arbitrators (16%). The split between tribunal sizes was relatively balanced, with 57% of cases decided by three-member panels and 43% by sole arbitrators. Diversity showed incremental improvement: women accounted for 28.6% of all confirmations and appointments overall, and represented 44% of ICC Court appointments, indicating the Court's active role in redressing imbalance. Age demographics also shifted, with nearly 40% of appointees under 50, reducing the historic dominance of older arbitrators. In terms of challenges, 33 were filed, with seven accepted – a relatively high acceptance rate compared to other institutions.

The LCIA reported 455 appointments of 318 different arbitrators, with appointments split between parties (46%), the LCIA Court (38%), and co-arbitrators (15%). Tribunal sizes were broadly similar to the ICC, with 54% three-member tribunals and 46% sole arbitrators. Women represented 33% of all appointments and 45% of Court appointments, again showing the Court's stronger track record in promoting gender balance compared to party or co-arbitrator nominations. The LCIA also stood out for appointing first-time arbitrators in 16% of cases. Ten arbitrator challenges were filed in 2024, but all were either rejected or withdrawn, underlining the LCIA's high threshold for removal.

HKIAC appointed 199 arbitrators from 30 different geographical backgrounds or nationalities. The appointments comprised 59.8% sole arbitrators (119), 25.6% coarbitrators (51), 12.1% presiding arbitrators (24), and 2.5% emergency arbitrators (5). Of these appointments, 34.7% were women and 36.7% were arbitrators not previously appointed by HKIAC within the past three years. Notably, the proportion of female arbitrators designated by parties increased to 19.1% (from 12.8% in 2023), and coarbitrator nominations Tribunal formation, diversity, and challenges increased to 25.4% (from 19.2%). In relation to challenges, five arbitrator challenges were filed, unchanged from 2023, with only one upheld, further reinforcing confidence in the integrity, independence, and diversity of HKIAC-appointed tribunals.

SIAC appointed arbitrators to 151 sole arbitrator tribunals and 32 three-member tribunals, with women making up 35% of appointments. Arbitrators came from over 43 jurisdictions, reflecting SIAC's broadening international reach. Tribunal challenges remained rare: only two were filed, with one upheld and one rejected. This suggests confidence in the appointment process, as well as parties' relative satisfaction with tribunal constitution.

DIAC's Arbitration Court constituted 214 tribunals and appointed 388 arbitrators, a remarkable 170% increase from the previous year. Sole-arbitrator tribunals remained the majority at 59%, reflecting both party preferences and the DIAC Rules' default mechanism, while three-member tribunals accounted for 41%. Diversity continued to be a defining feature of DIAC appointments: 47% of all Court-appointed arbitrators were women, sustaining near-parity for a second consecutive year and significantly outperforming party nominations, where only 15% of appointees were female. Arbitrators came from 46 nationalities, underscoring DIAC's growing global reach and commitment to broadening its pool. Challenges to arbitrators remained limited: just four were filed, with two upheld and two rejected.

The ICDR reported a split of 38% sole arbitrators versus 62% three-member tribunals in international cases awarded in 2024 involving at least \$3 million. Its gender diversity statistics showed that 25% of panels were diverse, and 28% of appointments overall went to diverse candidates. Importantly, nearly half (47%) of the ICDR's panel members were drawn from outside the United States, reinforcing its international character despite its U.S. base. In terms of challenges, 37 were filed, with 84% of arbitrators confirmed and 16% removed, representing one of the higher proportions of successful challenges compared with peer institutions.

Across institutions, three trends stand out. First, Court-appointed arbitrators are consistently more diverse than those nominated by parties, suggesting that institutional initiatives remain critical to change.

Second, there is a gradual generational shift with younger arbitrators entering the pool, though the average age still hovers in the mid-50s. Third, the frequency and outcome of challenges to arbitrator nominations or appointments vary widely: the LCIA rarely entertains them, the ICC accepts a modest number, and the ICDR reports a comparatively higher rate of removal.

For clients, the message is clear: party-driven nominations remain less diverse than institutional appointments, and users who prioritize diversity or fresh perspectives should pay close attention to how institutions exercise their appointment powers. Meanwhile, the data on challenges highlight differences in institutional cultures – something that may influence strategy when considering whether to contest an arbitrator.

Institution	Arbitrator selection	Tribunal configuration	Women arbitrators	Other diversity metrics	Challenges
ICC	Parties (57%), Court (27%), co-arbitrators (16%)	57% three-member; 43% sole	28.6% overall; appointed by the ICC (44%), the parties (39%), co-arbitrators (17%)	91 different nationalities; 40% under age 50	33 challenges, seven accepted
LCIA	Parties (46%), LCIA Court (38%), co-arbitrators (15%)	54% three-member; 46% sole	33% overall; appointed by the Court (45%)	16% first-time appointees (gender parity)	10 challenges, all rejected/ withdrawn
HKIAC	n/a	n/a	34.7% overall; appointed by the parties (19.1%), co-arbitrators (25.4%), HKIAC (34.7%)	30 different geographical origins or nationalities; 36.7% not previously appointed by HKIAC within the past three years	Five challenges (one upheld, two dismissed, one agreed to be resigned, one pending)
SIAC	Parties (44%), SIAC (48%), co-arbitrators (8%)	151 (82.5%) sole; 32 (17.5%) three-member	35% overall	Arbitrators from 43 jurisdictions	Two challenges (one upheld, one rejected)
DIAC	388 arbitrators appointed in total: 43% appointed directly by the DIAC Arbitration Court; remainder nominated by parties or co-arbitrators	59% (127) sole ; 41% (87) three-member	33% overall; appointed by the Court (47%), co-arbitrators (38%), the parties (15%)	Arbitrators from 46 nationalities; DIAC avoids repeat appointments and applies nationality restrictions (e.g., UAE nationals cannot serve as sole arbitrator or chair where a UAE party is involved)	Four challenges (two upheld, two rejected)
ICDR	n/a	38% sole; 62% three-member (in \$3m-plus cases)	25% diverse panels; 28% diverse appointments	47% panel members outside U.S.	37 challenges (84% upheld, 16% rejected)

Procedural pathways and case management

The 2024 statistics highlight the growing reliance by users on procedural mechanisms designed to make arbitration faster, more efficient, and more cost-effective. While uptake remains uneven across institutions, the data show a gradual shift away from “one-size-fits-all” arbitration toward a more tailored case management culture.

The ICC continues to see significant use of its expedited procedure, with 152 cases administered under this track in 2024. Emergency arbitration was less common, with 17 applications filed: three were granted in full, two partially granted, and 12 dismissed. The average duration of proceedings was 26 months (median 22 months), representing a slight improvement from prior years. Importantly, settlement and withdrawal remain a defining feature of ICC practice, with 391 cases withdrawn before award – 92% on a consensual basis. These figures confirm the ICC’s dual reputation as both a forum for large, complex disputes and an institution where early resolution is frequently achieved.

The LCIA remains distinct in its approach to expedited procedures. It does not have a formal expedited track for smaller matters, but instead relies on its usual procedural rules to allow swift resolution. In 2024, the LCIA received 15 applications for expedited tribunal formation, of which only one was granted. Emergency arbitration was similarly rare: four applications, with one granted. The LCIA also received 16 applications for early determination, with only one granted and one still pending. Despite the limited uptake of these tools, the LCIA continues to emphasize cost-effectiveness, particularly in high-value disputes exceeding \$100 million. Multi-party and multi-contract disputes are also significant: 18% of cases involved more than two parties, 3% more than one contract, and 13% gave rise to consolidation applications.

SIAC leads the way in procedural innovation, with parties making active use of its toolkit. In 2024, SIAC received 143 expedited procedure applications, of which 66 were accepted. It also accepted all 21 emergency arbitrator applications filed that year. On early dismissal, 13 applications were made: seven were allowed to proceed, with one granted in full and two partially granted. In total, SIAC tribunals issued 167 awards in 2024. The consistently high uptake of these procedures reinforces Singapore’s reputation as a forum where efficiency and speed are not only promised but delivered.

HKIAC continues to strike a dynamic balance between procedural flexibility and swift case resolution, leveraging its full suite of case management tools. In 2024, out of 134 arbitrations involving multiple parties or contracts, 51 were efficiently consolidated into single proceedings under multiple contracts. The institution handled 24 expedited procedure applications, approving 13, rejecting nine and leaving two pending at year-end. It also accepted five emergency arbitrator requests and three early determination applications, two of the latter applications advancing directly to awards. Demonstrating its strength as an institution for resolving China-related disputes, HKIAC also processed 40 applications under the Hong Kong–Mainland China interim measures arrangement, seeking preservation of assets, evidence, or conduct valued at approximately \$1.2 billion.

DIAC’s users rely on the full suite of mechanisms available under the 2022 Rules. The center handled 16 preliminary jurisdictional objections, 12 consolidation requests, five joinder applications, and 20 multi-contract claims, reflecting the complexity of modern regional project structures and the prevalence of multi-party, multi-agreement disputes. Emergency relief activity continued at pace, with five applications for emergency arbitrators, four of which proceeded to appointment, with all four resulting in emergency interim measures, reinforcing DIAC’s capacity to deliver swift protective relief. Moreover, the DIAC Arbitration Court conducted 34 *prima facie* jurisdiction reviews.

The ICDR likewise promotes efficiency, with 172 cases using its expedited procedure in 2024. While its emergency relief statistics are presented on a longer historical basis, they reveal that between 2006 and 2024, 45% of emergency applications were granted. Cost and duration data are particularly instructive: for claims above \$1 million, median tribunal fees were \$13,600 for settlements and \$139,000 for awards. Strikingly, 49% of ICDR settlements closed before any arbitrator compensation was incurred, underlining the potential cost savings when parties resolve disputes early in the process.

Institution	Complex arbitration	Expedited	Emergency arbitration	Early dismissal	Settlements/withdrawals
ICC	Multiple respondents (57%), multiple claimants (28%), multiple claimants and respondents (15%)	152 cases	17 applications (three granted, two partial, 12 dismissed)	n/a	391 withdrawals; 92% consensual
LCIA	18% involved more than one party 3% involved more than one contract 13% received consolidation applications	No expedited procedure 15 applications for expedited tribunal formation (one granted)	Four applications (one granted)	16 applications (one granted, one still pending)	Not reported
HKIAC	38% involved multiple parties or contracts 14% proceeded under a single arbitration under multiple contracts Seven applications for consolidation (four granted, three rejected) Two applications for joinder (one granted, one pending)	24 applications (13 granted, nine rejected, two pending at year-end)	Five applications	Three applications (one rejected, two allowed to proceed by the tribunal)	Not reported
SIAC	101 applications for consolidation (64 granted); 13 applications for joinder (four granted)	143 applications (66 accepted)	21 applications (all accepted)	13 applications (seven allowed, one granted in whole, two in part)	Not reported
DIAC	Parties filed 20 multi-contract claims, 12 consolidation requests, and five joinder applications	Not reported	Five applications received; four emergency arbitrators appointed, with all four granted interim relief	n/a	Not reported
ICDR	n/a	172 applications for expedited procedure	45% granted (2006-2024)	n/a	49% of settlements closed before incurring arbitrator compensation

Conclusion

The 2024 statistics underscore robust and geographically diverse caseloads across arbitral institutions. The ICC continues to dominate in scale and breadth, while SIAC leads in the availability and use of its expedited toolkit (which has been enhanced by the Streamlined Procedure introduced with the SIAC 2025 Rules), and continues to grow its Asia-Pacific base. The LCIA's commodity-heavy caseload reflects its traditional strengths and growing African footprint. HKIAC reinforces its reputation as a premier Asian forum for high-value, complex commercial and financial disputes, particularly those involving multiple parties or China-related matters. DIAC's figures highlight its rise as the leading institution in the Middle East, with high caseloads, rapidly increasing dispute case values, and a widening global user base driven by construction, real estate, and energy-related activity. The ICDR stands out for its technology disputes and transatlantic coverage.

For clients, three clear themes emerge: first, choice of seat and institution remains strategic, with London, Hong Kong, Singapore, New York, and now the UAE critical hubs; second, procedural tools are increasingly relied upon, particularly expedited and emergency measures; and third, diversity and transparency are improving, though recent progress remains slow.

Key contacts



Antonia Birt
Partner, Dubai
+971 (0)4 709 6328
abirt@reedsSmith.com



Elizabeth Farrell
Partner, London
+44 (0)20 3116 2921
efarrell@reedsSmith.com



Michael Chee
Associate, Singapore
+65 6320 5342
mchee@reedsSmith.com



Aurélie Lopez
Associate, Paris
+33 (0)1 76 70 40 49
alopez@reedsSmith.com



Matthew Townsend
Partner, Hong Kong
+852 2507 9728
matthew.townsend@reedsSmith.com



Matthew Harley
Counsel, Dubai
+971 (0)4 709 6300
mharley@reedsSmith.com



Michael Darowski
Partner, London
+44 (0)20 3116 2624
mdarowski@reedsSmith.com



Timothy Cooke
Partner, Singapore
+65 6320 5351
tcooke@reedsSmith.com



Andrew Tetley
Partner, Paris
+33 (0)1 76 70 40 57
atetley@reedsSmith.com



Eugenie Rogers
Partner, Dallas
+1 469 680 4233
eugenie.rogers@reedsSmith.com



Selin Kim
Associate, Hong Kong
+852 2507 9762
selin.kim@reedsSmith.com



Safia Abdalla
Dubai
+971 (0)4 709 6367
sabdalla@reedsSmith.com

