

Introduction and methodology

Introduction

Welcome to the *World Atlas of Arbitration*—a fresh and innovative addition to the landscape of arbitration publications. While the format may be new, we don’t claim full credit for inventing it. Our inspiration comes from the remarkable work of Professor Philip Wood and his *Maps of World Financial Law* (2008), which set a powerful precedent for global legal mapping. We also acknowledge the existence of other arbitration atlases—most of them regional in scope—and issue-specific maps that we encountered during the course of our research.

In the world of international arbitration, understanding the legal and cultural differences between jurisdictions is essential. These differences shape the perspectives of both parties and arbitrators and, if overlooked, could lead to surprises or even serious misunderstandings. The idea behind this Atlas was to create a tool that offers a global snapshot of key issues in international commercial arbitration—presented visually, in a way that makes complex data more accessible and comparative insights easier to grasp.

The *World Atlas of Arbitration* is a non-profit initiative, born out of our academic curiosity and professional enthusiasm for international commercial arbitration. The project was initially supported by our Prague-based law firm, JŠK, and made possible by a growing global network of jurisdictional contributors, country coordinators, and map curators. The printing, distribution, and continued development of the Atlas are now also supported by the generous contributions of sponsors from around the world.

We are also deeply appreciative of the support from many organisations and individuals who helped us with the project.

The first edition of the *World Atlas of Arbitration* in 2025 was both a beginning and an invitation: to explore, to compare and to continue deepening our collective understanding of international commercial arbitration around the globe. This 2026 edition is a substantial evolution with many new and improved maps.

The annual jurisdictional survey

This Atlas is built on a comprehensive jurisdictional questionnaire developed over several years. Each arbitration case we’ve worked on—and many books and surveys we’ve consulted—has contributed to the growing list of questions we are seeking to answer.

Old questions were also improved and new questions were conceived by a growing community of map curators. The 2026 survey was taken by over 330 jurisdictional contributors from 123 jurisdictions. Where jurisdictional data is missing, the editors have used data from the 2025 survey. In some countries, the answers by the jurisdictional contributors were kindly unified by country coordinators into a common position. The result is a dataset of over 30,000 entries, manually processed by the editors and map curators and converted into the colour-coded maps that form the heart of this Atlas.

All survey responses relate to the legal situation as at 1 January 2026.

The methodology

If a jurisdiction had only one respondent who either left a question unanswered or selected “not sure”, it appears on the map as “no jurisdictional input available”. When multiple respondents from the same jurisdiction disagreed, and we couldn’t reconcile the differences, the jurisdiction is marked as “uncertain/unsettled position”.

Where possible, conflicting responses were manually resolved through desktop research, expert consultations, and, occasionally, the help of AI tools. While we aimed to provide the most accurate answers, these methods are inherently approximate. In such cases, the final call was ours—not that of the jurisdictional contributors.

Some important warnings

Warning 1: No guarantee of accuracy.

This Atlas is based on a survey, not on academic or empirical legal research. Even if it were, real-life disputes are often resolved in ways that defy expectations. Neither the editors nor the jurisdictional contributors, country coordinators or map curators can be held liable if the actual outcome in a given case differs from the information presented here.

Warning 2: Significant generalisation was unavoidable.

Given the format of this Atlas, it was simply not possible to capture all the nuances and jurisdiction-specific details. The multiple-choice structure of the survey required us to phrase questions broadly and offer a limited set of answer options. Many contributors pointed out that none of the available answers fully reflected their jurisdiction’s legal position. We did our best to offer a diverse and thoughtful set of options and will continue refining them in future editions.

Users should understand from the visual format alone that jurisdictional exceptions, conditions and qualifications likely apply in many cases.

Warning 3: Many answers are untested and subjective.

A significant number of questions in the survey concern issues that have not yet been tested before national courts in most jurisdictions. As a result, many responses reflect the personal and professional opinions of the contributors—often just one per country. In jurisdictions with multiple respondents, we frequently observed fundamental disagreements among some great legal minds. These differences are an important reminder of the subjective nature of most of the maps in this Atlas.

A comparison between the 2026 and the 2025 surveys revealed many swings, where different answers were received from the same jurisdictions in 2026 and 2025. The large number of these changes could not be reasonably explained by the natural development of the law. Because 82 % of the 2026 survey respondents were new and did not take the 2025 survey, it is evident that answers largely depend on the subjective view of the contributors and may change, depending on who is answering the question.

No geopolitical positions taken (disputed territories)

Some borders around the world remain subject to dispute. While we may hold personal views on these matters, this Atlas is not the forum for expressing them. For consistency and practicality, we have based the underlying maps on the official position of the Czech Republic, our home country.

This choice does not reflect the views or endorsement of the editors, the jurisdictional contributors, country coordinators, map curators or any affiliated institutions. It is a purely technical decision and should not be interpreted as taking a stance on any geopolitical issue.

Arbitral institutions

In addition to national arbitration laws, this Atlas includes a few pages dedicated to arbitral institutions. These institutions play a vital role in international arbitration by providing the appointing authority and administrative support necessary for the efficient and fair resolution of cross-border disputes.

To compile this section, we began with a desktop survey of publicly available statistical data, along with an analysis and comparison of fee structures. Regarding the statistical data, we then reached out to the institutions themselves, inviting them to review and, if necessary, correct the collected data or provide further details. Many responded positively—some even shared additional information beyond what is publicly available. We sincerely commend this openness and hope our work encourages further transparency and data-sharing in the arbitration community.

We aimed to make the list of institutions shown—especially in the institutional map on the front endpaper—as broad and representative as possible. However, the selection is not exhaustive; it reflects both practical considerations and a degree of editorial discretion. If you believe another institution should be included in future editions, we would be happy to hear from you.

Our thanks to the global and growing community of collaborators

This Atlas is the result of our spirit of inquiry and our desire to contribute something both practical and academically valuable to the arbitration community. None of it, however, would have been possible without the extraordinary dedication of our jurisdictional contributors, country coordinators and map curators.

The survey was neither short nor simple. While contributors were free to skip questions, many chose instead to invest considerable time and effort, often undertaking additional research to provide the most accurate answers possible. We are deeply grateful for their commitment.

In the evolution of this living project, we also intend to rely increasingly on country coordinators and map curators. The role of **country coordinators** is to promote the survey within their respective jurisdictions and to reconcile any discrepancies in the responses received from those jurisdictions. The role of **map curators** is to ensure that the survey question relating to their map is formulated as clearly and effectively as possible, and to oversee the process of producing the map based on the survey responses.

A full list of contributors who agreed to have their names published appears at the end of this Atlas. Names of map curators are presented on the respective maps. Names of country coordinators are shown in bold in the list of jurisdictional contributors.

To all of them, we extend our sincere thanks.

The Atlas is distributed with the support of generous sponsors at various arbitration events. It is important to note that the sponsors and organisers of those events were not involved in the compilation of the Atlas and are not responsible for its contents. This remains true even if their lawyers contributed to the project as jurisdictional contributors, map curators, or country coordinators.

Roman Kramařík and Tomáš Král

July 2026

The editors

JUDr. Roman Kramařík, Ph.D. began his arbitration career as a stagiaire at the ICC in 1994. He later learned the art of professional advocacy in Big Law before leaving in 2004 to establish an independent Prague-based law firm, now known as JŠK. The firm has since grown into a respected full-service practice, where Roman remains a partner.



Roman acts regularly as both arbitrator and counsel, mostly in construction and infrastructure cases. A pioneer by nature, he wrote his Ph.D. thesis on e-cash and e-commerce back in 1998. He drafted and won the first Czech anti-dumping application, created the first Czech stock option plan, prepared the first Czech concession agreement and helped resolve a shareholders’ dispute by converting an oil refinery into several virtual processing refineries. Roman is an avid aviator and in 2018 became the first Czech pilot to solo circumnavigate the globe. No wonder he likes maps.

JUDr. Tomáš Král has always liked maps too—but ultimately chose law over geography. He earned his master’s degree in law from Charles University in Prague (2014 – 2019), where he later completed his *rigorosum* (JUDr.). His legal education was enriched by several internships, most notably at the Court of Justice of the European Union in Luxembourg (in the cabinet of Advocate General Dr. Michal Bobek). In 2018, he also took part in the Exchange Program in International and Comparative Business Law at Bucerius Law School in Hamburg. It was there, in the classroom of Prof. Dr. Stefan Kröll, that he first discovered the field of international commercial arbitration.



The “Doubting Tomáš” quickly turned theory into practice and is now a bar-admitted attorney at JŠK (alongside Roman), specialising in dispute resolution, including arbitration—both as counsel and tribunal secretary. In addition to domestic arbitration, his work focuses primarily on proceedings under the ICC Arbitration Rules.