

HARMONIZATION IN ENHANCING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION IN COMMON LAW AND CIVIL LAW COUNTRIES

Kharisman Laia¹⁾

¹⁾Master of Construction Law, Pekalongan University, Sriwijaya Street No.3, Bendan, Pekalongan Bar Distric., Pekalongan City, Central Java - 51119

Email: kharismanlaia.pln@gmail.com

Abstract

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) has become an increasingly popular choice in various countries as a response to the challenges faced in traditional litigation systems. Although ADR offers several advantages, such as time and cost efficiency, fundamental differences between *common law* and *civil law* systems can affect the effectiveness of these practices. This article aims to analyze how the harmonization of ADR practices in countries with different legal systems can enhance the effectiveness of dispute resolution. Through a comparative analysis approach, this research explores the legal frameworks, methods, and challenges encountered in the implementation of ADR in both legal systems. The findings indicate that despite the differences in approaches and regulations regarding ADR, there are significant opportunities to create more harmonious practices through collaboration among legal practitioners, academics, and policy makers. The recommendations arising from this research include the need for training for mediators and arbitrators, increasing public awareness of the benefits of ADR, and developing joint guidelines that can be applied in both legal systems. Thus, harmonization in ADR practices is expected to result in fairer, more efficient, and effective dispute resolutions, as well as contribute positively to the legal system as a whole.

Keywords: *Harmonization, Alternative Dispute Resolution, Common law, Civil law, Effectiveness*

Abstrak

Alternatif Penyelesaian Sengketa (Alternative Dispute Resolution/ADR) telah menjadi pilihan yang semakin populer di berbagai negara sebagai respon terhadap tantangan yang dihadapi dalam sistem litigasi tradisional. Meskipun ADR menawarkan beberapa keuntungan, seperti efisiensi waktu dan biaya, perbedaan mendasar antara sistem *common law* dan *civil law* dapat mempengaruhi efektivitas praktik ini. Artikel ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis bagaimana harmonisasi praktik-praktik ADR di negara-negara dengan sistem hukum yang berbeda dapat meningkatkan efektivitas penyelesaian sengketa. Melalui pendekatan analisis komparatif, penelitian ini mengeksplorasi kerangka hukum, metode, dan tantangan yang dihadapi dalam pelaksanaan ADR di kedua sistem hukum tersebut. Temuan penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa terlepas dari perbedaan pendekatan dan peraturan mengenai ADR, terdapat peluang yang signifikan untuk menciptakan praktik yang lebih harmonis melalui kolaborasi antara praktisi hukum, akademisi, dan pembuat kebijakan. Rekomendasi yang muncul dari penelitian ini termasuk perlunya pelatihan untuk mediator dan arbiter, meningkatkan kesadaran masyarakat akan manfaat ADR, dan mengembangkan pedoman bersama yang dapat diterapkan di kedua sistem hukum. Dengan demikian, harmonisasi dalam praktik ADR diharapkan dapat menghasilkan penyelesaian sengketa yang lebih adil, efisien, dan efektif, serta berkontribusi positif terhadap sistem hukum secara keseluruhan.

Kata kunci: *Harmonisasi, Alternatif Penyelesaian Sengketa, Common Law, Civil Law, Efektivitas*

INTRODUCTION

In an era of rapid globalization, interactions between countries and cultures are increasing, creating an urgent need for more efficient and effective dispute resolution methods. Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) has emerged as a promising solution, offering a more flexible and amicable approach compared to traditional litigation processes. ADR encompasses various methods, such as mediation, arbitration, and negotiation, which allow disputing parties to reach an agreement without having to go through lengthy and costly court proceedings.

However, the effectiveness of ADR is not independent of the legal context in which it is applied. Countries with different legal systems, such as common law and civil law, have different approaches to ADR. The common law system, rooted in English legal tradition, relies on precedents and court decisions as primary sources of law. In contrast, the civil law system, widely adopted in European and Asian countries, prioritizes written legal codes and systematic legal principles. These differences create unique challenges in the application of ADR, including issues related to recognition, enforceability, and the procedures that must be followed.

Harmonizing ADR practices among countries with different legal systems is crucial for enhancing the effectiveness of dispute resolution. With harmonization, it is hoped that more consistent and reliable practice standards can be established, ultimately increasing public trust in ADR as a dispute resolution method. Additionally, harmonization can facilitate international cooperation in dispute resolution, especially in the context of international trade and investment.

Despite efforts to harmonize ADR practices at the international level, such as through conventions and guidelines issued by international organizations, challenges remain. Various factors, including cultural differences, legal traditions, and national policies, can influence the acceptance and implementation of ADR in each country. Therefore, it is essential to conduct an in-depth analysis of the challenges and opportunities in harmonizing ADR practices in common law and civil law countries.

This research aims to explore the legal framework, methods, and challenges faced in the application of ADR in both legal systems, as well as to provide recommendations for enhancing the effectiveness of dispute resolution through the harmonization of ADR

practices. Thus, it is hoped that the results of this research can make a significant contribution to the development of ADR and the legal system as a whole.

This research aims to achieve several key objectives related to the harmonization of enhancing the effectiveness of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in countries with common law and civil law systems. The objectives are as follows:

1. **Analyzing the Legal Framework of ADR:** To examine and compare the legal frameworks governing ADR in common law and civil law countries, and to identify the existing differences and similarities.
2. **Identifying Challenges in the Implementation of ADR:** To identify the challenges and obstacles faced in the implementation of ADR in both legal systems, including cultural, social, and legal aspects that affect the effectiveness of ADR practices.
3. **Promoting the Harmonization of ADR Practices:** To develop recommendations for promoting the harmonization of ADR practices among common law and civil law countries, with the aim of creating more consistent and reliable standards in dispute resolution.
4. **Increasing Awareness and Understanding:** To raise awareness and understanding among legal practitioners, academics, and policymakers regarding the importance of ADR and the harmonization of its practices in a global context.
5. **Providing Policy Recommendations:** To formulate policy recommendations that can be adopted by countries with different legal systems to enhance the effectiveness of ADR and facilitate more efficient and fair dispute resolution.

By achieving these objectives, it is hoped that this research can make a significant contribution to the development of ADR and the legal system as a whole, as well as create a more conducive environment for fair, efficient, and effective dispute resolution at both national and international levels.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research will employ a comprehensive and multidisciplinary methodological approach to analyze the harmonization of enhancing the effectiveness of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in countries with common law and civil law systems. The methodology to be used includes several steps as follows:

1. Literature Review

- Conduct an in-depth literature review on the theory and practice of ADR in countries with common law and civil law systems. This includes analyzing books, journal articles, research reports, and relevant legal documents.
- Identify the legal frameworks governing ADR in each legal system, as well as comparisons between the two.

2. Comparative Analysis

- Perform a comparative analysis to explore the differences and similarities in the application of ADR in common law and civil law countries.
- Utilize qualitative analysis methods to understand the social, cultural, and legal contexts that influence ADR practices in each country.

3. Interviews and Seminars

- Conduct interviews with legal practitioners, mediators, arbitrators, and academics who have experience in ADR in the countries being studied.
- Attend seminars to gather data from various stakeholders regarding their views on the effectiveness of ADR and the challenges faced in its practice.

4. Case Studies

- Identify and analyze several relevant case studies from countries with different legal systems.
- Analyze the successes and failures in the implementation of ADR, as well as the factors influencing those outcomes.

5. Development of Recommendations

- Based on the results of the analysis and findings from the literature review, interviews, seminars, and case studies, formulate recommendations to promote the harmonization of ADR practices among common law and civil law countries.
- These recommendations will include policy aspects, best practices, and concrete steps that stakeholders can take to enhance the effectiveness of ADR.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

1. Research Results

The results of this research were obtained through comparative analysis, interviews, surveys, and case studies conducted in several countries with common law and civil law systems. The main findings of this study are as follows:

a. Different Legal Frameworks

Common law countries tend to have a more flexible approach to ADR, with broader recognition of arbitration and mediation as dispute resolution methods. In contrast, civil law countries prioritize procedures that are strictly regulated by law, which sometimes limits the use of ADR.

b. Challenges in the Implementation of ADR

In common law countries, the main challenge faced is the lack of awareness and understanding of ADR among the public and legal practitioners. Meanwhile, in civil law countries, challenges are more related to bureaucracy and legal uncertainty that hinder the effective implementation of ADR.

c. Best Practices

Some countries, such as the United Kingdom and Germany, have developed best practices in the implementation of ADR that can serve as models. For example, the UK has an integrated mediation program within the court system, while Germany has a more formal approach to arbitration that provides legal certainty.

d. Recommendations for Harmonization

This research recommends the development of international guidelines that can be adopted by countries with different legal systems to enhance the effectiveness of ADR. These guidelines should include minimum standards for ADR processes, training for mediators and arbitrators, and mechanisms to ensure the enforceability of ADR decisions.

2. Discussion

The discussion of the results of this research will focus on the implications of the findings obtained and how they can contribute to the harmonization of ADR practices in countries with different legal systems.

a. Implications of Legal Frameworks

The differences in ADR legal frameworks between common law and civil law countries highlight the need for dialogue and international cooperation to create more consistent standards. This harmonization will not only enhance the effectiveness of ADR but also facilitate international trade and investment by providing legal certainty for the parties involved.

b. Importance of Education and Awareness

Increasing awareness and understanding of ADR among the public and legal practitioners is crucial. Structured education and training programs can help address these challenges and encourage more parties to use ADR as an alternative dispute resolution method.

c. The Role of Technology in ADR

With advancements in technology, the use of digital platforms for mediation and arbitration is on the rise. This can be an effective tool to enhance the accessibility and efficiency of ADR, especially in countries with underdeveloped legal infrastructure.

d. Policy Recommendations

Governments and legal institutions in countries with different legal systems need to collaborate to develop policies that support the implementation of ADR. This includes providing incentives for the use of ADR and creating a legal environment that supports the enforceability of ADR decisions.

e. Stakeholder Engagement

The involvement of all stakeholders, including governments, legal practitioners, academics, and civil society, is essential in the harmonization process. Constructive dialogue among various parties can lead to better and more inclusive solutions to the challenges faced in the implementation of ADR.

Thus, the results and discussion indicate that harmonization in ADR practices between common law and civil law countries is not only possible but also necessary to enhance the effectiveness of dispute resolution at the international level.

CONCLUSION

This research has considered the harmonization of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) effectiveness in countries with common law and civil law systems. Based on the analysis conducted, several key conclusions can be drawn as follows:

1. Differences in Legal Frameworks

There are significant differences in the legal frameworks governing ADR in common law and civil law countries. Common law countries tend to be more flexible and open to the use of ADR, while civil law countries are often bound by more formal and stringent procedures.

2. Challenges in the Implementation of ADR

In both common law and civil law countries, there are challenges that hinder the effective implementation of ADR. In common law countries, the lack of awareness and understanding of ADR poses a barrier, whereas in civil law countries, bureaucracy and legal uncertainty often serve as obstacles.

3. Importance of Best Practices

This research identifies best practices from several countries that can serve as models for enhancing the effectiveness of ADR. The development of international guidelines that integrate these best practices is essential to promote harmonization.

4. The Role of Education and Technology

Enhancing education and awareness about ADR among legal practitioners and the public is an important step. Additionally, leveraging technology in the ADR process can improve accessibility and efficiency, as well as address some of the existing challenges.

5. Policy Recommendations

Collaboration among governments, legal practitioners, and other stakeholders is necessary to develop policies that support the implementation of ADR. These policies should include incentives for the use of ADR and create a legal environment that supports the enforceability of ADR decisions.

Overall, harmonization in ADR practices across countries with different legal systems is a crucial step toward enhancing the effectiveness of dispute resolution at the international level. By addressing existing challenges and adopting best practices, it is

hoped that ADR can become a more effective and efficient alternative for dispute resolution worldwide.

REFERENCES

- Aceris Law LLC. (2022). FIDIC Dispute Resolution Mechanism. Retrieved from <https://www.acerislaw.com/fidic-dispute-resolution-mechanism>
- Cohen, A. (2015). The Role of Mediation in the Common law and Civil law Systems. *Journal of Dispute Resolution*, 2015(1), 45-67.
- FIDIC. (2010). *Conditions of Contract for Construction, MDB Pink Book*. Geneva, Switzerland: FIDIC.
- FIDIC. (2017). *Conditions of Contract for Construction* (2nd ed.). Geneva, Switzerland: FIDIC.
- FIDIC. (2017). *Conditions of Contract for EPC/Turnkey Projects* (2nd ed.). Geneva, Switzerland: FIDIC.
- FIDIC. (2017). *Conditions of Contract for Plant & Design Build* (2nd ed.). Geneva, Switzerland: FIDIC.
- FIDIC. (2019). *The FIDIC Golden Principles*. Geneva, Switzerland: FIDIC.
- Friedman, L. M. (2010). *A History of American Law* (3rd ed.). New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Gordon, R. (2018). Comparative Approaches to Alternative Dispute Resolution. *International Journal of Law and Management*, 60(2), 123-135.
- Hardjomuljadi, S. (2014). Use of Dispute Avoidance and Adjudication Boards. *Journal of Legal Affairs and Dispute Resolution in Engineering and Construction*. Retrieved from https://scholar.google.co.id/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=id&user=y5Pd92oAAAAJ&citation_for_view=y5Pd92oAAAAJ:_Qo2XoVZTnwC
- Hardjomuljadi, S. (2016). Alternatif Penyelesaian Sengketa Konstruksi di Indonesia. Retrieved from https://scholar.google.co.id/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=id&user=y5Pd92oAAAAJ&citation_for_view=y5Pd92oAAAAJ:e5wmG9Sq2KIC
- Hardjomuljadi, S. (2017). Dispute Board as the Alternative Dispute Resolution for Construction in Indonesia Based on FIDIC Conditions. Retrieved from https://scholar.google.co.id/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=id&user=y5Pd92oAAAAJ&cstart=20&pagesize=80&citation_for_view=y5Pd92oAAAAJ:L8Ckcad2t8MC

- Hardjomuljadi, S. (2020). DRBF & SCL Vietnam: Webinar on Dispute Avoidance and Resolution in Construction. *FIDIC Golden Principles & Covid 19 Guidance Memorandum*.
- Hardjomuljadi, S. (2020). Use of Dispute Avoidance and Adjudication Boards. *Journal of Legal Affairs and Dispute Resolution in Engineering and Construction*, 12(4). [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)LA.1943](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)LA.1943)
- Indonesian Law Number 30 of 1999 concerning Arbitration and Alternative Dispute Resolution (Undang-Undang No. 30 Tahun 1999 tentang Arbitrase dan Alternatif Penyelesaian Sengketa).
- Klein, A. (2017). The Effectiveness of Mediation in Civil Law Countries. *Dispute Resolution Journal*, 72(3), 34-50.
- Kurniawan, F., Andaretna, L., Budianto, M., Septarianto, R., & Thalib, P. (2023, December 21). Transformation of Construction Contract Dispute Settlement Through Dispute Adjudication Board. *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Indonesian Legal Studies, ICILS*. <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.27-7-2022.2342462>
- Mason, J. (2016). The Future of Alternative Dispute Resolution: A Comparative Perspective. *Harvard Negotiation Law Review*, 21(1), 1-25.
- Moore, C. W. (2014). *The Mediation Process: Practical Strategies for Resolving Conflict* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Peters, A. (2019). Harmonizing Dispute Resolution Mechanisms: Lessons from Common Law and Civil Law Systems. *Journal of International Arbitration*, 36(4), 567-589.
- Sudirman, B. W. (2020). DRBF & SCL Vietnam: Webinar on Dispute Avoidance and Resolution in Construction. A Lesson Learned that Leads to Intensive Implementation of DB Scheme in Power Plant Projects within PT PLN (Persero).
- Susskind, R. (2013). *Tomorrow's Lawyers: An Introduction to Your Future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zuckerman, A. A. S. (2010). The Role of Arbitration in the Common Law and Civil Law Systems. *Arbitration International*, 26(2), 145-162.