Name of Country/Judiciary/Court	Name	Designation	Key Initiatives Implemented in 2025	Best Practices and/or Approach towards successful JDR	Challenges and Limitations
County Court of Victoria, Australia	Her Honour Judge Sharon Burchell	Head of the Commercial Division of the County Court and Chair of the ADR Committee	-Judicial mediations – where judicial officers act as mediators to help parties reach a settlement (working on a protocol following my meeting with the Chief Judge Laura Swain of the New York District Court in June 2025 and their ADR Program in the Southern District of New York District Court which tailors its training to judges and magistrates); -Early neutral evaluations (ENEs) where judicial officers provide an initial assessment of the case (proposed MOU with retired Magistrate Barry Braun to put in place a pilot for lower value claims (LVC) using the Magistrates Court oral reasons model), -Referrals to external providers (such as expanding our low bono mediation protocol with the Vic Bar and Law Institute of Victoria to a free mediation pilot following my meeting with the IDRN Secretariat, Chief Judge Boon Heng of the Singaporean District Court in January 2025 and their free mediation panel framework with 200 lawyers); -the arbitration list and LVC pilot (our student placement with Monash University to triage LVC suitable for referral to capped fee arbitration); -the proposed Self Represented Litigants (SRLs) mediation MOU with Monash University from 2 February 2026 where Monash law students will help SRLs to prepare for judicial mediation; and -developing a formal judicial mediation education program (working with the Judicial College of Victoria ("JCV") to formulate a formal judicial education program on dispute resolution, which is not currently offered). The proposed program for Judicial dispute resolution is designed for judicial officers with experience in mediation, this program will enhance skills and confidence in judicial dispute resolution as follows. The Civil Procedure Act 2010 (Vic) introduced the concept of a 'judicial resolution conference', enabling judicial officers to preside over the just, efficient, timely and cost-effective resolution of disputes with the consent of the parties. A wide range of dispute resolution processes are used in Victorian courts and tribunals from settlement conferences and mediation, through to conciliation and early neutral evaluation. Join dispute resolution experts and experienced judicial officers as they guide you in building your skills and confidence in this important area. You will have the opportunity to: • further develop practical and systematic skills relevant to all court and tribunal-based mediators • participate in cross-jurisdictional exchange and collaboration in relation to forms of dispute resolution, mediation techniques and ethical issues • discuss challenges for court and tribunal-based dispute resolution, including self-represented litigants, cultural issues, impartiality, personal security and vicarious trauma • compare the use of different dispute resolution approaches, including evaluative and facilitative models.	The County Court has been producing amendments to our Commercial Division Practice Note which came into operation on 1 September 2025. Relevant procedures involving judicial dispute resolutions modalities that have been amended as follows: •Section H.1 "Position papers" for mediation have been renamed "mediation papers" to de-emphasise the notion of parties having "positions" at mediation to move away from parties attending a mediation with entrenched positions and instead being open to the resolution of the matter. It introduces provision of "resolution papers" to mediators, in appropriate cases. The resolution paper must set out alternative settlement options that the party is willing to accept at mediation, and any other matters which may assist in achieving settlement. Unlike a mediation paper (formerly "position paper"), a resolution paper is provided only to the mediator and not exchanged with the other side. It is hoped that the preparation of a resolution paper will require each party, in advance of the mediation, to focus upon the ways in which the matter might be resolved. •Section H.4 sets out the practices of Early Neutral Evaluation. Rather than written reasons, the evaluator will now provide a high level and non-binding oral evaluation to parties at the conclusion of the hearing. The formal ENE procedure prescribed by the 2022 practice note was utilised rarely. The requirement of written reasons imposed a significant burden on the Court and almost always meant that the ENE could not be conducted and finalised in a single day. •Section T sets out the management of the Arbitration List. In light of the changes to the County Court costs scale, parties are strongly encouraged to consider arbitration in proceedings with lower value claims where parties are legally represented, the amount claimed is small and the legal costs may exceed the amount in dispute. Parties may also wish to consider whether arbitration may be useful in circumstances where parties have resolved some, but not all, of their issues at mediation. The residual areas of disagreement may be able to be resolved more quickly through arbitration than a trial. •Section U sets out the management of the Banking and Finance List and includes a new process for the initiation of proceedings, aiming to get parties to an initial mediation very early in the process before legal costs become a driver in impeding settlement. Many cases in the banking and finance list settle early. Often, there are limited or no defences available to a defendant in such cases. The referral of the proceeding to an early mediation is designed to facilitate its resolution before a significant number of procedural steps have been taken and the attendant costs incurred. This will reduce the costs burden on the parties, reduce the likelihood of costs incurred becoming an impediment to settlement, and also reduce the administrative burden on the Court.	- The Court's resources have been reduced such as operational staff and access to court rooms. - Culture change in the profession is required to see a trial as a last resort and that modalities labelled as "ADR" are legitimate dispute resolution mechanisms to facilitate the just, efficient, timely and cost-effective resolution of disputes. - The uptake of domestic commercial arbitration in Victoria remains modest and education of the profession is being undertaken to give confidence to parties and practitioners to re-establish arbitration as a fair, efficient, and trusted pathway for resolving commercial disputes in Victoria, particularly in an environment of increasing caseloads and constrained court resources. - No current dedicated judicial mediation training or ongoing mediation training provided to the judiciary or the ability to learn mediation skills in a safe space (ie, outside of private mediation accreditation bodies attended by practitioners and the general public).
Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (VCAT), Australia	Deputy President Carol Daicic	Head of the ADR Division of VCAT	The key initiative VCAT has implemented in 2025 is the announcement of the restructure of the whole VCAT into 5 new divisions, including for the first time a new ADR Division. The basis for this is that ADR will be the central tenet to guide our work in the future, with the aim that this will drive operational and cultural change at VCAT. The ADR Division is empowered to lead this change with the aim of resulting in fair, efficient and cheaper case resolution for parties. The type of ADR to be employed will include the expanded use of a new operating model improvement program for early case resolution by registrars / mediators as implemented by the new Rental Dispute Resolution Victoria at VCAT. There will be many other initiatives that will be implemented across VCAT as part of this ADR Strategy including mediation, early neutral evaluation, compulsory conferences, concurrent evidence, expert conclaves etc.	So far, there has been a lot of excitement generated by the creation of a new ADR Division. As the new Head of the ADR Division, I am currently interviewing members to take on new various leadership roles across VCAT who are ADR specialists. The ADR Leads will promote and support the embedding of ADR across VCAT divisions and practice areas in a consistent manner, as appropriate. Reporting and accountability lines will require those in leadership positions who manage the listing of matters will be accountable to the Head of ADR. Our plan for a cohesive and co-ordinated whole of VCAT approach to ADR is intended to lead to more productive outcomes and data capture, in accordance with our strategic plan, Towards Excellence.	VCAT currently practices ADR in an ad hoc manner across divisions. The challenge will be to bring together standards, practice notes and directions for creating processes which empower members and staff to employ ADR, as appropriate, along the lifecycle of a proceeding. Whilst setting up consistent processes will require significant investment, we consider it will be worthwhile. We also appreciate that ADR will need to be tailored to each relevant practice area and there may be limitations about the extent of ADR that can be deployed in some matters. Finally, this will all require a level of cultural change and training but if it is done well, we expect to see faster resolution of disputes and our external users having a positive experience at VCAT.
Supreme Court of Brunei Darussalam	Ms. Noor Amalina Azahuddin	Senior Registrar Magistrate	No new initiatives implemented in 2025	1. Institutionalise JDR within the courts (clear practice directions and rules) Court-led/court-directed mediation and practice directions make JDR a formal part of case management, not an optional add-on. 2. Early referral/case triage Identify cases suitable for JDR early (pre-trial conference/case management) to maximise settlement opportunity and reduce cost and delay. 3. Skilled judicial officers & accredited mediators Use trained judicial officers and mediators - provide continuous training and accreditation pathways to maintain quality. 4. Public & practitioner engagement Run outreach, seminars and training with the bar, institutions (e.g., BDAC), and business community so users understand benefits and processes.	1. Limited Awareness and Acceptance Public and practitioner mindset: Many litigants and some lawyers still view JDR as "secondary" to formal adjudication, preferring a court judgment over negotiated settlement. Cultural hesitation: Some parties perceive settlement as "losing face" or as an admission of weakness, which can reduce willingness to compromise. 2. Absence of Detailed Procedural Rules Existing practice directions provide general guidance, but there are limited procedural rules on JDR conduct, confidentiality, settlement recording, or post-settlement enforcement. This lack of clarity can deter parties or create uncertainty about the binding effect of outcomes. 3. Low Utilisation Rate Many cases still proceed directly to trial because lawyers are not incentivised to propose JDR, and/or parties are unaware it exists.
Ontario Superior Court of Justice, Canada	Justice Peter J Cavanagh	Judge of the Superior Court of Justice of Ontario	Judicial Dispute Resolution (JDR) is an essential function of the Ontario Superior Court of Justice. JDR helps the parties achieve resolution more quickly and at less expense. JDR assists the court in managing its trial resources and ensuring that resources are allocated fairly and efficiently. Most JDR hearings take place under statute or rules of court enacted by the appropriate lawmaking body. The hearings are integrated into the court's regular planning, scheduling, facilities and budgeting processes. The main initiative in 2025 within the JDR framework is the planned introduction of new rules of procedure governing civil disputes in Ontario. The Civil Rules Review was launched in 2024 on the initiative of Chief Justice Morawetz of the Ontario Superior Court of Justice and Attorney General of Ontario Doug Downey. A Working Group was formed and mandated to develop proposals for reforming Ontario's civil procedural rules. The Working Group released its Phase 2 Consultation Paper in April 2025. Public consultation followed and is complete. The proposed reforms are sweeping, and aim to strike a balance between ensuring litigation is fair, promoting early resolution of disputes, and providing citizens with timely and cost-effective access to justice. Judicial pre-trial conferences aimed at resolving cases before trial have contributed to a consistently high rate of resolution before trial, but strained judicial resources have led to long backlogs in some regions and long wait times for pre-trial conferences. In the Phase 2 Paper, the Working Group proposes to outsource the settlement portion of pre-trial conferences to mandatory mediation, subject to supervisory court discretion. The court would retain the discretion to order a judicial settlement conference where warranted. The Working Group has also proposed a model of binding judicial dispute resolution (similar to the process available in family law disputes) which would permit the parties to choose a summary process as an alternative to trial. The model envisages a single, one-day, hearing beginning with a judicial mediation and, if that is unsuccessful, a summary determination of the dispute. The model is considered suitable for cases where there are relatively narrow issues in dispute, no significant credibility issues, and where it is reasonable to expect that the dispute can be resolved or determined in a summary manner. There are many other bold reforms proposed in the Phase 2 Consultation Paper which are aimed at moving to a system of civil justice that is accessible, fair, efficient, and economically rational. For example, reduction in the number of procedural motions and limitations on oral discovery will reduce delays, lower costs to litigants, and free up judicial resources to be deployed more effectively to resolve civil disputes. Consultations are complete, and a final report from the Working Group is expected in early 2026.	JDR in the Ontario Superior Court of Justice has two broad objectives: to settle as many issues as possible, and to ensure that the subsequent hearings are as efficient as possible. In family matters, JDR is fundamental to the pre-trial case and settlement conference. In 2021, a pilot project began for family cases with a model of binding dispute resolution. A new procedural rule for JDR was introduced to the Family Law Rules to provide for binding dispute resolution. In civil cases, the current procedural rules require judicial pre-trial conferences which require the parties to file memoranda that will allow the presiding judge to understand the contentious issues and focus on these key issues in the limited time assigned. The constraints on judicial resources mean that time for pre-trial conferences is limited. Unfocussed memoranda result in higher risk that precious time will be squandered before the parties and the judge focus on the key obstacles to resolution. The proposed new procedural rules are intended to free up judicial resources, reduce costs and delays for litigants, and improve efficiencies in the civil process. The procedural reforms, including proposed reforms to pre-trial settlement conferences by providing for mandatory mediation, and consensual binding judicial dispute resolution, are, once implemented, expected to improve the effectiveness of JDR in civil cases. The effectiveness of JDR depends on the participation of judges who are trained in dispute resolution techniques. In Canada, training of judges is coordinated in large measure through the National Judicial Institute (NJI). The NJI offers a wide selection of programs in all areas of the law to allow judges to keep abreast of developments in the law. The NJI organizes twice-yearly conferences for Ontario judges on a wide range of topics. These topics include JDR in the Canadian context.	The main challenges and limitations encountered in executing JDR in Ontario are the constraints on judicial resources and the high costs and lengthy delays experienced by litigants under the current civil procedural model. These challenges have historically taxed the ability of judges to effectively execute JDR. The bold reforms proposed for the procedural rules in Ontario civil cases, once implemented, are expected to very significantly improve access to justice by litigants, reduce chronic delays in the judicial process, and expand the time available to judges to effectively execute JDR.

The Supreme People's Court of the People's Republic of China	Judge Xu Defang	Judge and Director of the Office for Guiding Litigation Service Development of the Supreme People's Court	In 2025, China's Judicial Dispute Resolution (JDR) adopt a series of measures in terms of policy support, institutional guarantee, scientific management, social participation, case guidance, and technological empowerment. Specifically: a. Policy Support The Communist Party of China has formulated the Suggestions for the 15th Five-Year Plan for National Economic and Social Development, which incorporates "vigorously promoting the source prevention, diversified resolution, and orderly settlement of disputes" into the "15th Five-Year Plan" framework, providing stable policy support for Chinese courts to advance mediation work. In February 2025, the CPC Central Committee issued the Opinions on Strengthening Trial Work in the New Era, which includes a special chapter on "strengthening the prevention and resolution of disputes". It requires promoting the integration of dispute resolution resources, emphasizing that "people's courts at all levels should strengthen guidance on mediation work, legally support lawyers, mediation organizations, etc. to play a front-end role in dispute resolution, and strengthen and standardize entrusted mediation and preliminary mediation", so as to provide a strong guarantee for Chinese courts to continuously strengthen the role of mediation in judicial dispute resolution. Meanwhile, in 2025, the Political and Legal Affairs Commission of the CPC Central Committee takes the lead in promoting the standardized construction of Social Governance Comprehensive Service Centers (hereinafter referred to as "Comprehensive Governance Centers"). Courts, procuratorates, public security organs, judicial administrative organs, letters and visits departments, competent authorities of industries such as human resources and social security, housing and urban-rural development, health, as well as mass organizations such as trade unions, women's federations, and law societies have all settled in the Comprehensive Governance Centers. This maximizes the integration of various dispute resolution resources such as people's mediation, administrative mediation, judicial mediation, and industry-specific and professional mediation, and implements dispute resolution in accordance with the "roadmap" of mediation, arbitration, administrative adjudication, administrative reconsideration, three-level handling of letters and visits, litigation, and legal supervision, facilitating the public to resolve disputes "by visiting only one place". The Supreme People's Court of China has issued the Guiding Opinions on People's Courts Participating in the Operation of Comprehensive Governance Centers, guiding primary courts to station litigation service teams in Comprehensive Governance Centers to provide services such as mediation guidance and litigation-mediation connection, striving to mediate as many cases as possible, file all eligible cases, adjudicate simple cases quickly, and resolve disputes substantially. At present, 99.9% of county-level administrative regions nationwide have built and put into operation Comprehensive Governance Centers. In the first three quarters, national Comprehensive Governance Centers resolved 6.334 million disputes with a success rate of 96.6%. b. Institutional Guarantee The Supreme People's Court of China, together with the Ministry of Justice and the All China Lawyers Association, has jointly issued model pleadings and answer documents, and implemented element-based model documents for 67 types of pleadings and answers, covering 9 fields including criminal (private prosecution), civil, commercial, intellectual property, maritime, administrative, environmental resources, state compensation, and execution, making litigation more convenient for the public. The model documents include a column of "willingness to dispute resolution methods", which fully explains the benefits of preliminary mediation and guides the public to prioritize mediation and other dispute resolution methods. c. Scientific Management To promote the integrated advancement of the case registration system and the deepening of diversified dispute resolution, and further standardize civil case registration and mediation work, the Supreme People's Court of China has changed "pre-litigation mediation" to "preliminary mediation" since January 1, 2025. For disputes brought to the court that meet the acceptance conditions, all cases shall be registered first, and then entrusted to a third party or organized by the court itself for mediation according to the parties' wishes. This adjustment, on the one hand, incorporates all cases brought to the court into trial management, fundamentally solving the problem of "prolonged mediation without registration"; on the other hand, it provides the parties with non-litigation dispute resolution channels such as mediation after registration, promoting more cases to be resolved before entering the trial procedure. In addition, the "civil mediation withdrawal rate" has been included in the trial index management system to improve the quality and efficiency of judicial dispute resolution through scientific management and evaluation mechanisms. From January to November 2025, people's courts nationwide conducted preliminary mediation for 6.065 million cases before trial, with 3.87 million cases successfully mediated. d. Social Participation The Supreme People's Court of China has actively promoted more social forces to participate in judicial dispute resolution, strengthened the coordination between people's courts and government departments, mass organizations, and other social forces, and enhanced diversified dispute resolution work. At present, the Supreme People's Court of China has established a "top-to-top" diversified dispute resolution mechanism with 17 central and state organs, including the Taiwan Affairs Office of the State Council, All-China Federation of Trade Unions, All-China Women's Federation, All-China Federation of Returned Overseas Chinese, China Council for the Promotion of International Trade, China Disabled Persons' Federation, All-China Federation of Industry and Commerce, National Development and Reform Commission, Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security, Ministry of Housing and Urban-Rural Development, Ministry of Veterans Affairs, People's Bank of China, National Financial Regulatory Administration, China Securities Regulatory Commission, and National Intellectual Property Administration. The All-China Women's Federation was added in 2025, and docking with China Federation of Literary and Art Circles is underway. For typed disputes such as labor disputes, road traffic disputes, construction projects, property services, financial consumption, securities and futures, goods trade, intellectual property, and price disputes, relevant industry-specific and professional m e. Case Guidance To leverage the leading and exemplary role of typical cases, on January 22, 2025, the Supreme People's Court of China established and launched the Diversified Dispute Resolution Case Database, which was officially opened to the public. As a database co-built with central and state organs, it mainly collects typical cases where various social entities successfully resolved disputes through non-litigation methods (such as mediation, arbitration, and administrative reconsideration). Its goal is to build a national-level case database that covers multiple dispute resolution methods, various dispute types, and meets the needs of different entities. As of December 15, 1,063 cases have been included, covering common and frequently occurring dispute areas. This better provides a "toolbox" for various entities to carry out mediation work and an "optimal option" for the public to choose mediation. In addition, in 2025, the Supreme People's Court of China, together with the All-China Federation of Industry and Commerce, the Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security, the National Financial Regulatory Administration, and the National Intellectual Property Administration, released a number of typical cases related to diversified dispute resolution in areas such as the private economy, labor and personnel, financial consumption, and intellectual property. f. Technological Empowerment The Supreme People's Court of China has uniformly built a national Integrated Case Handling and Management System. By December 2025, more than 3,500 courts at four levels across the country have been put into use, realizing "unified management via one network" for the entire process of judicial dispute resolution in national courts, which helps improve the efficiency of judicial dispute resolution.	From the perspective of China's judicial dispute resolution practice there are the following characteristics: a. Leverage the institutional advantage of the leadership of the Communist Party of China to more effectively coordinate various mediation resources and improve the efficiency of judicial dispute resolution. b. Strengthen multi-subject participation: Invite various entities to participate in dispute resolution, give full play to their functional, professional, and linkage advantages, and promote the diversified resolution of conflicts and disputes. c. Enhance the guiding role of courts: Improve the legal mediation capabilities of other mediation forces through regular training, promoting the front-end resolution of more disputes. d. Strengthen digital empowerment: Fully apply technologies such as artificial intelligence and big data to empower judicial dispute resolution. e. Strengthen legislative support: Currently, China is researching and advancing the legislative work of the Law on Promoting the Diversified Resolution of Conflicts and Disputes, aiming to address difficulties in diversified dispute resolution at the institutional level.	a. Chinese courts have always adhered to the principles of voluntary and legal mediation, conducting mediation only when the parties agree. However, in practice, courts face difficulties in explanation and guidance: some people (including lawyers) are unwilling to choose mediation, and the "more cases, fewer judges" dilemma in courts remains prominent. b. Most mediations in judicial dispute resolution are public welfare-based, and commercial mediation has not yet gained consensus. Most people or enterprises are reluctant to actively choose paid mediation, which affects the professionalization and sustainable development of mediation to some extent.

Dubai Courts	Ms. Alia Almajid	Director of Strategy and Institutional Performance Department	Dubai Courts have extensively implemented the Judicial Dispute Resolution (JDR) process as an integrated alternative dispute resolution mechanism across all major case types, including civil, commercial, real estate, personal status, inheritance, and even execution-related settlements. This comprehensive adoption reflects the Court's commitment to fostering early resolution, reducing litigation burdens, and ensuring fair and efficient outcomes for all litigants. Significant volumes of successfully resolved cases have been achieved through JDR across civil, commercial, real estate, family, inheritance, and execution disputes, with total settlement values reaching AED 36 billion in 2024. In the same year, inheritance cases achieved an exceptional 84% settlement rate, while personal status cases reached a 74% settlement rate. Overall, 1,222 files were referred to the Settlement Centre, of which 340 cases were successfully settled, reflecting a measurable impact in reducing case durations and alleviating judicial workload. 1. Amendment of the Legislative Framework for the Authentication and Approval of Settlement Agreements: A substantive legislative amendment was introduced to streamline the procedures for authenticating settlement agreements. Under this amendment, the authority to authenticate and approve settlement agreements was transferred from the supervising judge to the conciliators. Approved settlement agreements are now granted direct executive enforceability, thereby expediting dispute resolution and eliminating the need for additional judicial procedures. 2. Reduction of Judicial Fees for Settlement Agreements: The fees for authenticating settlement agreements were reduced from 6% of the claim value to a flat fee of AED 250, providing a practical and direct incentive for parties to pursue amicable settlement instead of litigation. 3. Strengthening the Role of the Conciliator as Case Manager Where Settlement is Not Reached: Where an amicable settlement cannot be achieved, the conciliator is empowered to act as a case manager by preparing a complete case file and submitting it to the supervising judge, who then issues a decision concluding the dispute. This legislative amendment has contributed to shortening dispute resolution timelines, simplifying workflows, and reducing bureaucracy. 4. Increase in the Rate of Amicable Settlements: The legislative and procedural amendments resulted in an increase in the amicable settlement rate to approximately 90%, reflecting the effectiveness of the new dispute resolution framework. 5. Development of the Technical System for Settlement Sessions and Electronic Signatures: The technical system was enhanced to enable the conduct of settlement sessions remotely and the use of electronic signatures on settlement agreements. This development reduced the time and effort required of litigants, improved operational efficiency, enhanced customer experience, and ensured business continuity. 6. Amendment of the Value-Based Jurisdiction for Certain Community Groups: The value-based jurisdiction rules were amended to exempt senior citizens, persons of determination, and social welfare beneficiaries, in facilitation of their access to justice and in consideration of humanitarian and social dimensions. This ensures expedited resolution of disputes in which they are parties and enables them to benefit from the Centre's simplified services and reduced fees. 7. Expansion of the Authority to Approve Settlement Agreements: The scope of authority was expanded to allow for the approval and authentication of voluntary settlement agreements and assistance in their drafting, regardless of the value-based jurisdiction of the dispute. This strengthens the Centre's role as a voluntary and central dispute resolution body and supports the stability and continuity of relationships. 8. Establishment of the Citizens' Housing Construction Contracts Dispute Resolution Centre: A specialized center was established to resolve disputes arising from citizens' housing construction contracts. This initiative is the result of a strategic partnership between Dubai Courts and Dubai Municipality, representing an unprecedented collaboration that integrates judicial expertise with specialized engineering competencies to address disputes of a mixed technical and legal nature. The initiative contributes to enhancing quality of life and community stability in the Emirate. 9. Enhancing Human Capital Efficiency and Professional Development: • Conciliators were enrolled in and affiliated with international Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) training programs organized by the International Mediation Center in Italy, to gain exposure to best international practices in mediation and dispute resolution, enhance professional competencies, and improve the quality of settlement outcomes. • Specialized conciliators with legal and engineering backgrounds were recruited, aiming to integrate legal expertise with specialized engineering competencies to address technically complex disputes. 9. Launch of the Expert Appointment Service through the Amicable Settlement of Disputes Centre: An expert appointment service was launched, enabling parties to assess their legal and technical positions through accredited expert reports prepared by experts registered on the Dubai Courts' roster of experts. These services cover various fields, including but not limited to engineering, accounting, mechanical, banking, and intellectual property and trademarks, with medical expertise provided through cooperation with government entities such as the Dubai Health Authority. 10. Media Presence and Community Awareness: Community awareness of amicable settlement was enhanced through media appearances on Sama Dubai Channel and by highlighting the role of settlements within society through the program "With the Community"	• Adopting a flexible legislative approach that supports amicable settlement as a principal pathway for dispute resolution, by granting the President of the Courts the authority to amend the Centre's value-based and subject-matter jurisdiction in line with emerging needs, without requiring legislative intervention. • Empowering the conciliator and granting an effective procedural role beyond a purely negotiative function, including the authority to propose solutions and approve settlement agreements. • Integrating technology, legislation, and professional capacity-building to ensure the efficiency, sustainability, and continuity of the system. • Simplifying procedures and reducing costs in a manner that enhances user confidence and encourages recourse to amicable settlement. • Establishing specialized centres and subject-matter jurisdictions to address disputes of a specific or specialized nature.	• The need to adapt to legislative and procedural transformations and to shift the prevailing culture among some stakeholders. • The expansion of jurisdictions and the consequent requirement for qualified and specialized human resources. • Managing the growing demand for amicable settlement while maintaining the quality of outcomes.

Judiciary of India	Justice Rajesh Bindal	Judge of Supreme Court of India	The year 2025 marked a significant phase in the continuing evolution of India's Judicial Dispute Resolution (JDR) framework. Building upon constitutional mandates, legislative reforms and long-standing judicial policy initiatives, the Indian judiciary undertook a series of targeted institutional, procedural and technological interventions aimed at enhancing access to justice, improving efficiency and promoting non-adversarial dispute resolution mechanisms. These initiatives reflect a sustained commitment to timely, participatory and technology-enabled justice delivery. The key initiatives undertaken during this period and the progress achieved therefrom are outlined below: a)Mediation Trainings by the Mediation and Conciliation Project Committee (MCPC), Supreme Court of India b)Revised Case Categorisation in the Supreme Court of India c)Establishment of a New Circuit Bench of the High Court of Bombay at Kolhapur d)e-MACT (Electronic Motor Accident Claims Tribunal) e)E-Summons under the e-Courts Project f)Artificial Intelligence-Based Judicial Initiatives For more details, see attachment.	The following are the best practices adopted: a)Lok Adalats b)Arbitration: The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 c)Mediation: enactment of the Mediation Act, 2023 d)Case Management e)Capacity Building of the Judicial Officers in the Lower Judiciary f)E-Courts Project g)The JustIS Mobile App (Justice Information System) h)The Virtual Justice Clock i)E-SCR (Electronic Supreme Court Reports) j)SUVAS (Supreme Court Vidhik Anuvaad Software) k)SUPACE (Supreme Court Portal for Assistance in Court's Efficiency) l)Use of Artificial Intelligence in Transcription & e-Filing m)Virtual Courts n)The National Service and Tracking of Electronic Processes (NSTEP) The Indian judiciary continues to witness an increase in the number of cases instituted, coupled with heightened public expectations for justice to be delivered efficiently, transparently and without undue delay. In this backdrop, the foregoing discussion has outlined the key best practices and institutional approaches adopted by the judiciary to strengthen Judicial Dispute Resolution (JDR) in India. These measures underscore the importance of maintaining the quality of adjudication while simultaneously promoting timely and participatory resolution of disputes. Taken together, these approaches advance the core objectives of reducing pendency, improving access to justice and reinforcing public confidence in the judicial system. For more details, see attachment.	Despite the progressive reforms and modernisation initiatives undertaken by the Indian judiciary, the effective implementation of Judicial Dispute Resolution mechanisms continues to face certain challenges and limitations. a)Pendency of Cases b)Infrastructure c)Challenges in the adoption of technology d)Criminal Law Reforms e)Delay in Execution of Decrees f)Judges to Population Ratio For more details, see attachment.
Judiciary of Ireland, High Court	High Court of Ireland	Enhancing the JDR process through planning, management, implementation, facilities, budgeting, technology and access to justice initiatives.	1. Ongoing judicial training, including specifically of relevance to JDR: case management, judgment writing, courtroom control, and access to justice by unrepresented parties and by litigants from minority communities, those with physical disabilities and those who are neurodivergent. Training is also routinely given on avoiding traumatisation in the courtroom – there is a high uptake on these training initiatives. 2. Work in improving public understanding of the courts including: regional sittings by the Supreme Court, the Court of Appeal and the High Court, broadcasts of Supreme Court hearings now available on the Supreme Court website and ongoing podcast series on relevant legal topics of public interest in which members of the judiciary participate. 3. IT training for all judges including in relation to the introduction of the AI platform Microsoft Copilot which is now available to Irish judges to assist in their work subject to compliance with relevant judicial guidelines on the responsible use of AI by the judiciary (guidelines drafted in June 2025 and published in 2025). 4. Ongoing modernisation efforts monitored by a judicial modernisation working group comprising judges from all jurisdictions (with advisory involvement from judges from outside Ireland). Notable achievements last year included a live demo of the courts portal for legal practitioners which is designed to improve the digitisation of legal processes; the roll out of digital dictation (BigHand) for all judges; and a project looking at the feasibility of AI-assisted real-time translation services in courtrooms. Work is ongoing on the introduction of a unified case management system designed to enable court users to file all court documents online and to enable the judiciary to have direct electronic access (including in court) to all papers filed in their cases. 5. Work has continued in 2025 on the upgrading and roll-out of video technology in all courtrooms to improve remote video access to court sittings across a broad range of case types including for prisoners, technical experts and vulnerable court users. This technology will improve our ability to present digital evidence and work is also ongoing in relation to the ability to generate transcripts of courtroom digital audio recordings. 6. Preparation of new, simplified and more user-friendly content for court users on our courts website, specifically designed to improve accessibility for court users with a disability.	1. Capture of relevant data to monitor user experience, performance improvements and proper allocation of judicial resources. 2. Ongoing cybersecurity training for judges as well as training on AI. We recognise the importance of using technology to improve access to justice and outcomes for parties and practitioners. 3. Continued focus on alternative dispute resolution and active encouragement of same by the judiciary. 4. Delivery of significant judgments by the High Court enforcing the mandatory provisions of the Mediation Act 2017 to ensure parties are properly informed of the benefits of mediation. 5. Focus on judicial welfare with a view to improving performance and sustainability in the role. 6. For most civil proceedings, before issuing proceedings the plaintiff's solicitors must file a declaration confirming that they have advised their clients as to the possibilities and benefits of mediation (this issue has been the subject of a number of recent judgments of the High Court). Also, before issuing most personal injuries claims, the plaintiff must embark on a statutory process designed to assess the value of the personal injuries quantum (on the assumption of full liability) - the assessment is by an independent statutory body. The process often leads to early settlements and is without prejudice to the parties' entitlement to litigate. 7. Parties can apply for adjournments for the purposes of mediation and the courts can and will grant such adjournments where appropriate and sometimes direct parties to undertake mediation on the court's own initiative. 8. The courts can impose costs sanctions where parties have unreasonably failed to consider alternatives such as mediation. There are statutory provisions and Rules of Court underpinning this power. 9. Consideration is being given to the use of JDR in certain family law proceedings by the judge in charge of the High Court's Family List.	1. We face challenges of large case numbers and limited judicial and other monetary resources which will need to keep pace with our growing population. 2. AI poses undoubted challenges in terms of the integrity of evidence and legal submissions – this is a risk we are monitoring actively. 3. There are significant resourcing issues to the introduction of JDR in the High Court.
Supreme Court of Jamaica	Justice Carole Barnaby	Puisne Judge	None	- Early Judicial Case Management Intervention - Effective case preparation - Early identification and communication of dispositive issues - Early consideration of suitability for mediation - Facilitation and encouragement of inter party settlement discussions	Save for formal third-party mediation in both civil and criminal proceedings (minor offences), JDR practices have not been institutionalised by the Judiciary of Jamaica. Nevertheless, judicial officers - many of whom have received mediation training and certification - do engage in judicial mediation and early neutral evaluation where appropriate. These interventions have proved valuable in the disposition of cases without the need for trial but their institutionalisation is hampered by resource insufficiencies, including human, technological and structural. That notwithstanding, representations continue to be made for improvements in these regards which should place the Judiciary of Jamaica in a position to consider institutionalisation of JDR modalities within the medium to long term.

Federal Court of Malaysia	The Right Honorable Dato' Abu Bakar Bin Jais	The President of the Court of Appeal	Court-annexed mediation has been expanded and extended to the appellate courts in various types of cases i.e construction, contract, divorce related matters, defamation, family law.	1. The implementation of feedback forms to parties involved in court mediation by the respective mediation centres on quality of services and areas to be improved i.e whether an agreement reached, the preference between mediation and court, the conduct of mediators et cetera. It is not mandatory for any parties to fill the said form and it is solely voluntary via QR. 2. Monthly statistics by mediation centres compiled by the Mediation Division pertaining to the performance and results of the mediations conducted. In addition, Court Annexed Mediation Committee is set up comprised from Federal Court, Court of Appeal and High Court Judges. Meeting are held on quarterly basis to discuss on the performance and objectives of Court Annexed Mediation. Inspection on the court mediation centers are also done periodically. 3. The establishment of Mediation Division and Mediation Centres coordinate everything smoothly whereby the Director of Mediation Division will hold quarterly meetings with all Court Annexed Mediation Centres pertaining to any relevant directives, instructions and performance of appointed mediators. 4. Training and accreditation enhance a mediator's competency and builds client trust. Training often includes simulation modules that replicate real mediation scenarios. This provides mediators with hands-on experience and better prepares them for actual cases. 5. Judges have been encouraged to send suitable cases for mediation before trial of the case commences i.e after the close of pleadings or at the case management stage (PTCM 3) for example, on non-fraud cases.	1. Training often includes simulation modules that replicate real mediation scenarios. This provides mediators with hands-on experience and better prepares them for actual cases. However, there is different/separate mediation advance training for legal officers versus superior court judges. 2. Voluntariness and willingness of parties to negotiate. Parties to a mediation may not necessarily want a settlement, particularly in cases that are referred to the Centre under the Court's direction. 3. Part settlements in mediated cases will be recorded as unsuccessful due to the administration process, which uses the same case number for both trial and mediation. There is no actual reflection on the number of cases that were partially effectively mediated. 4. Parties failed to turn up to mediation session when the matter is referred and thus will be a waste of judicial time. 5. No pre-action mediation implemented in Malaysia.
District Court of New Zealand	Judge Kevin Kelly	District Court Judge	1. In its 2022 report 'Improving Access to Justice', the Rules Committee proposed a number of changes to the civil justice framework so that disputes can be resolved more quickly and efficiently. One of these recommendations was to increase the monetary jurisdiction of the Disputes Tribunal from $30,000 to $70,000. In December 2024 the Government introduced legislation to raise the jurisdiction to $60,000. The Tribunal is a division of the District Court and provides a relatively quick and inexpensive way for people to settle civil disputes without incurring expensive legal fees. Dispute Tribunal processes seek to mediate disputes where able. 2. In 2023 the 'Wayfinding for Civil Justice' strategy was launched by the Chief Justice and Secretary for Justice. The strategy focuses on a number of outcomes to improve access to justice. This includes ensuring that dispute resolution is accessible and equitable. Funding was secured in 2024 to launch a pilot programme of initiatives from 2025. Initiatives include identifying a range of dispute resolution mechanisms available to consumers and legal assistance providers otherwise than through the courts and providing appropriate navigation tools to these services.	1. The Auckland Metro Courts have a largely centralised model for defended cases, managed by the Auckland District Court. A raft of actions were taken post COVID-19 to improve performance and the court experience. While implemented in 2024 this has become embedded in 2025. The model includes a civil duty judge being assigned each week, which judge also presided over scheduled list courts. Another judge is allocated to long-cause matters, and another judge is allocated to other Auckland Metro Courts. With judicial rosters now prepared nine months in advance, cases are able to get to a scheduled date, (including judicial settlement conferences) more easily than previously, reducing delays. Under the District Court Rules 2014, other than for relatively uncomplicated matters where trial time is unlikely to exceed one day, judicial settlement conferences are convened before a judge in order to give the parties an opportunity to negotiate a settlement of the claim or issue. The model adopted in the Auckland Metro Courts means these conferences are timelier than before. The model is being considered for use in other court locations. 2. During 2025 Te Kura Kaiwakawā (the Institute of Judicial Studies) provided training for District Court judges on judicial settlement conferences, a JDR process. This involved judges in 'mock' settlement conferences dealing with different case scenarios, along with best practice theory from expert independent mediators and judges with specific expertise and training in mediation.	Self-represented parties, particularly where the other party is legally represented, continues to be a challenge in JDR (As elsewhere).
Supreme Court of the Philippines	Justice Jose Midas P. Marquez	Associate Justice, Supreme Court	1. Integration of electronic filing and service in judicial dispute resolution processes. Trial courts began adopting electronic filing of all pleadings, motions, and other papers, as well as their service, in civil cases. (Interim Rule on the Electronic Filing and Service of Pleadings, Judgments, and Other Papers in Civil Cases, A.M. No. 19-10-20-SC, November 26, 2024) 2. Implementation of the Rule on Family Mediation (A.M. No. 24-02-06-SC). Currently, mediator-trainees in Family Mediation are undergoing their internship/immersion program and, thereafter, shall undergo their accreditation as Family Mediators. The two types of mediation under the said rule are as follows: (a) out-of-court dispute resolution process; and (b) mandatory court-annexed family mediation.	1. Conduct of continuous and targeted Judicial Dispute Resolution (JDR) training of judges in underserved areas. This includes a skills-based course on "Judicial Settlement Conference on Judicial Dispute Resolution for Judges," a specialized course aimed at enhancing the effectiveness of JDR judges in dispute resolution and improving the quality of settlement outcomes. Upon completion of their JDR training, newly-trained JDR judges are deployed and assigned to handle cases referred to JDR in their respective jurisdictions, improving access to dispute resolution and helping reduce case backlogs. To note, "JDR," in the Philippine context, refers to judge-led mediation. 2. Conduct of refresher courses for trained judges on JDR to maintain the quality and consistency of the JDR processes. The Philippine Judicial Academy, the training arm of the Philippine Judiciary, conducts regular training for JDR judges, covering topics specific to the current trends and approaches involving JDR. 3. Participation in the global promotion of mediation and judicial dispute resolution. The Supreme Court of the Philippines is a founding member of the Judicial Dispute Resolution Network (JDRN) and has consistently participated in its international meetings, sharing insights and drawing lessons from the experience of other jurisdictions. It is also a member of the Asian Mediation Association, a unique consortium of mediation centers across Asia, where the Philippines actively contributes its experience and innovations in ADR and mediation. Moreover, the Supreme Court, through its Philippine Mediation Division, is recognized as one of the leading mediation centers in Asia. Through these international conferences and activities, judges and officials are also given the opportunity to study and adopt best practices of other jurisdictions. 4. Conduct of expansion activities for widening mediation services and establishing Philippine Mediation Units (PMUs) in underserved areas in the country. Said expansion activities include the conduct of Orientation Conference with Stakeholders, Recruitment and Screening of Prospective Mediators and Staff, Basic Mediation Course, Pre-Internship Orientation and Internship Program, and Evaluation and Accreditation of Mediators. Currently, there are 152 PMUs in the country, 509 mediators, and 2200 judges trained in JDR. 5. Continuous recruitment and rigorous screening of prospective mediators and staff to support the effective implementation of the Court-Annexed Mediation (CAM), Mobile Court-Annexed Mediation, Family Mediation, Appellate Court Mediation, and Court of Tax Appeals Mediation. This process is a prerequisite for accreditation by the Philippine Supreme Court. Upon accreditation, mediators are directed and authorized to conduct mediation services within their respective areas and/or fields of practice. 6. Conduct of the following courses for mediators (current and trainees) and PMU staff: a. Basic Mediation Course (BMC) to equip mediator applicants with the necessary skills and foundational knowledge in the mediation practice. One BMC was conducted in 2025 with a total of 43 participants. b. Enhanced Refresher Courses to update Supreme Court-accredited mediators on new laws, rules and guidelines on mediation. Two refresher courses were conducted in 2025, with a total of 138 participants. c. Work Orientation and Skills Enhancement Seminar for PMU mediation staff to reinforce competencies in administrative and operational functions. d. Specialized training in family mediation for mediator applicants in family mediation, aimed at developing the necessary skills and knowledge specific to family mediation. One specialized training course was held in 2025, with 50 participants.	1. Decreasing number of accredited mediators in CAM. There has been a significant decline in the number of accredited mediators over the years, which can be attributed to the few cases referred for mediation or to low compensation rates for mediators. From a high of 746 accredited mediators in 2017, their number steadily decreased, leaving only 442 at the end of December 2024. Currently, there are 509 accredited CAM Mediators. 2. Decline in JDR case referrals and settlements. Introduced in 2003, the JDR program began to gain momentum in 2013, when referrals increased to 15,275 cases from 9,218 in 2012. The program reached its peak in 2016 with 22,767 referrals, largely because JDR was then mandatory in both criminal (civil aspect) and civil cases covered by CAM. A drastic drop in referrals started in 2018 when civil liability in some criminal cases was removed from the coverage of CAM. From a record high of 22,767 cases referred to JDR in 2016, resulting in 2,828 settled cases (a 31% success rate), the number of referred JDR cases plummeted to only 3,200 in 2018, with just 422 settled cases or a 27% success rate. Thereafter, in 2020, referral of civil cases to JDR was no longer mandatory, resulting in further decline of case referrals. In 2024, only 198 cases were referred to JDR, and out of the 206 cases that went through JDR proceedings, only 38 cases were settled, resulting in a success rate of 18%. 3. Concerns regarding cases that are no longer mandatorily referred to JDR. a. Under the 2020 Guidelines for the Conduct of CAM and JDR in Civil Cases, upon receipt of the mediator's report indicating that no settlement was reached in CAM, the referring judge shall determine if settlement is still possible and, if so convinced, refer the case to the JDR judge. Consequently, referral to JDR is "discretionary" under the present guidelines. As such, judges may opt to no longer refer civil cases to JDR, resulting in a significant decrease in the JDR statistics for 2024 up to the present. b. The Revised Guidelines for Continuous Trial of Criminal Cases, which took effect on September 1, 2017, has excluded the referral to CAM of the civil liability in several criminal cases, which also limited case referrals to JDR.

Qatar International Court and Dispute Resolution Centre (QICDRC), Qatar	Ms. Muna Nasser Al-Kaabi	Case Progression Manager	In 2025, the Qatar International Court and Dispute Resolution Centre (QICDRC) consolidated and operationalised its Legal Clinic, an initiative launched during 2024-2025 and the first of its kind in Qatar. It is designed to provide free early advice and assistance to any resident of the State of Qatar, or any company registered within the State of Qatar, in any civil or commercial matter. The Legal Clinic is designed to ensure that those who are unable to afford legal representation still have high quality access to justice. Applications are straightforward, are done through a dedicated form available on the QICDRC website, and require minimal documentation in order to ensure ease of use and wide reach. Once a request is deemed to be within the scope of the Legal Clinic, all within 24 hours, that Applicant is referred to one of eight panel law firms who are obliged to provide an initial consultation free of charge limited to 30-minutes within 3 working days of the referral from the QICDRC. The panel law firm is also obliged to provide the Applicant with confirmation of the advice provided at the session in writing. The panel law firms were chosen through a competitive process and comprise a mix of international law firms and Doha-based Qatari law firms. This was deliberately done to ensure that any type of civil and commercial legal problem - whether an esoteric point of Qatari civil law in relation to which a Doha-based firm could effectively assist, or a different type of legal problem more suited to a large international law firm - is adequately covered by the Legal Clinic. The combination of local and international law firms also ensures that - depending on whether the Applicant is most comfortable in Arabic or English - the QICDRC is able to provide the best possible service. The consultations are either provided in-person at the office of the panel law firm or remotely, depending on the preference of the Applicant. Since the launch of the Legal Clinic, the QICDRC has been able to assist numerous applicants with diverse legal problems, including employment, insurance, medical malpractice, assault, and immigration. Approximately 60% of the legal staff at the QICDRC are involved in working on the Legal Clinic, and the number of hours dedicated is in the region of 40-50 hours per month. This is a significant outlay in an organisation with fewer than 30 employees, and which is also the second busiest international commercial court of its kind in the world.	The QICDRC's approach to JDR is grounded in early intervention and preventive justice. The Legal Clinic plays a central role in this approach. In many cases, the Legal Clinic enables applicants to reassess their position following the initial consultation, resolve their dispute amicably, and pursue proportionate alternatives such as mediation or conciliation before matters escalate into formal litigation. Within active court proceedings, the QICDRC encourages settlement through two principal mechanisms; namely, informal encouragement of settlement by the Registrar/Judges (particularly where a dispute appears amenable to resolution without the need for full adjudication); or mediation directed to the QICDRC Mediation Centre once a case has been filed. Where a case appears that it is appropriate for mediation after it has been filed, the QICDRC will informally encourage parties to resolve the issue through mediation. At this stage, mediation is voluntary, but early judicial engagement has proven effective in facilitating dialogue and narrowing issues between parties. The QICDRC would then suggest mediation be conducted through the QICDRC Mediation Centre, although parties are free to conduct the mediation elsewhere. Court-directed mediation occurs when a judge receives the case documents (once pleadings are closed or during case management hearings), and similar to informal encouragement, the Registrar would flag this for the Judge(s) that the case appears to be appropriate for mediation. It is important to note that where the Court directs parties to mediation, the Court would bear the costs/fees of the mediation, provided the mediation is conducted through the QICDRC Mediation Centre. Importantly, in this scenario, mediation is conducted by the Judge(s) assigned to the case, and this has proven very effective and advantageous as the Judge(s) already on the case are familiar with the factual and procedural background and have already met with the parties. If the parties fail to reach a settlement agreement, the litigation proceeds seamlessly, and the Judge/Mediator would be replaced for the rest of the litigation.	While the QICDRC actively promotes JDR where appropriate, certain disputes are inherently too complex to be resolved through mediation. Additionally, the Legal Clinic (which has been very helpful to parties in resolving their disputes and reducing the burden on the Court) is limited to initial consultations. Any further advice or representation beyond the initial 30-minute consultation remains at the discretion of the panel law firm and may be offered on a paid basis. This can leave parties with limited means with unresolved disputes once the initial consultation concludes. Another challenge to JDR in the QICDRC is the volume and diversity of requests the Court receives for pro bono assistance. Requests frequently extend beyond civil and commercial matters or fall outside the Court's jurisdiction limiting the Court's ability to assist where possible. Jurisdiction can also be a challenge. Court-directed mediation that is free of charge is primarily available to parties within the Court's jurisdiction. Parties that do not fall within the QICDRC's jurisdiction may still access the QICDRC mediation services but are required to bear the applicable mediation and administrative fees. To assist parties further, the QICDRC publishes from time to time the details of any applicable fees.
Judiciary of Rwanda	Justice MUTABAZI Harrison	Judge and Inspector of Courts	The Judiciary of Rwanda has embarked on using ADR mechanisms in dispensing Justice. Namely using mediation in civil matters , victim-offender mediation in criminal matters as well as plea-bargaining.	- Online dispute mechanisms have been embarked on - developing practice directions to implement easily the mentioned - A vibrant awareness campaign has been embarked on	Budget constraints
Judiciary of Singapore	Judge-Advisor Vincent Hoong	Judge-Advisor (JDRN)	1. Implemented a pilot JDR initiative wherein parties are invited to consider whether they would like a 2nd round of mediation by another mediator after an unsuccessful mediation. Through this pilot, about two-thirds of the unsettled cases were settled by a 2nd mediator. 2. Judicial Officers newly posted to the Court Dispute Resolution Cluster, Community Court & Tribunals Cluster, Civil Courts and Office of the Registrar are required to attend basic mediation training conducted by the Singapore Mediation Centre as part of their induction programme.	1. Successful JDR may not always take place in a single sitting of mediation. At the Court Dispute Resolution Cluster in the State Courts, where parties have not come to a settlement after the first mediation, the mediator continues to follow up with parties in an asynchronous manner through email especially if parties are represented by solicitors to smoothen out the rough edges which eventually leads to a settlement. 2. Besides the Early Neutral Evaluation provided by the judicial officer managing the case to assist parties to resolve the dispute amicably, if not settled, upon parties exchanging their Affidavits of Evidence-In-Chief, the judicial officer handling the case management will revisit the prospects of parties resolving the dispute amicably.	JDR can be a time consuming and draining process for the judge-mediator. However, if parties resolve the dispute through JDR, parties save time and costs and with finality. In addition, the court also saves on limited trial and appellate resources. By ensuring JDR has the adequate resources, it will go towards optimising the court's limited resources.
Judiciary of England and Wales, United Kingdom	Lady Justice Sarah Asplin	Lady Justice of Appeal	1. Automatic reference of small claims to mediation extended to claims up to £10,000 and in the process of being made permanent. 2. Creation of standard orders for referral of claim to mediation by the judge. 3. Creation of standard guidance to litigants whose claim is referred to mediation by the judge. 4. Working group established to regularise the use of dispute resolution hearings in all suitable cases and to amend the Civil Procedure Rules in order to facilitate dispute resolution hearings. 5. Work towards including directions for a dispute resolution hearing in all standard directions orders.	See the initiatives set out in box 4, above. In order to embed the use of JDR, we have sought to regularise guidance and directions and make them available on the judicial intranet. We have also included aspects of JDR in our judicial training in order to encourage and equip judges to make properly reasoned decisions about whether to refer to mediation and provide the skills to enable them to conduct dispute resolution hearings, early neutral evaluation and judicial mediation. We have also embarked on a programme of education of the professions in relation to the use and benefits of ADR.	Attitude and culture have been a challenge, together with limited judicial resources.
United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (SDNY)	Judge Philip M. Halpern	United States District Judge	Collaboration with the Judiciary of Pakistan to enhance triage, case management, and settlement skills of judges in the Sindh district. This occurred through on-site training in Karachi with the Director of the ADR Program at the SDNY, and staff from the ADR Division of the New York State Unified Court System and the United States Department of Commerce Commercial Law Development Program.	SDNY Magistrate judge settlement practice groups so that Magistrate Judges can exchange information on best practices for settlement work. These discussions happen informally at monthly meetings of the SDNY Magistrate Judges and through occasional meetings facilitated by the Director of the ADR Program at the SDNY.	From the collaboration in Pakistan, several challenges emerged including: 1) establishing an efficient and effective mechanism to triage cases and determine which could benefit most from settlement efforts; 2) having sufficient time to conduct settlement conferences – particularly if the process encourages the parties' own decision-making and not a judicial proposal for settlement; 3) crafting language to be used by judges so that parties understand the differences between the settlement process and other court processes; 4) establishing a case management system to track referrals and outcomes. From the Magistrate Judge settlement practice groups a key challenge/limitation was the wide variety in approaches to practice including differences in pre-conference process (submissions, initial calls, etc.). On the one hand, these individualized approaches enabled the judges to tailor the settlement processes to their individual strengths and preferences. On the other hand, there is no consistency in process so counsel/parties need to be very clear about whose procedures they are following.
Judiciary of Zimbabwe	Honourable Mr Justice Luke Malaba	Chief Justice of Zimbabwe	In 2025, Zimbabwe made the significant decision to implement Court-Annexed Alternative Dispute Resolution, which is intended to incorporate Alternative Dispute Resolution into the judicial processes of the courts. In order to adequately prepare and implement the system, the following key initiatives have been taken: i. Setting up of an expanded and inclusive Court-Annexed Alternative Dispute Resolution Committee where every key stakeholder in the Justice, Law and Order sector is represented. The Committee is operational and its representation has ensured that all preparations made incorporate the diverse perspectives, concerns and interests of important key stakeholders. ii. The Committee has organised itself into two subcommittees, one in charge of implementation and the other of legislative drafting. The subcommittees have been essential in facilitating more specialised preparations such that as at now, there are working drafts of the relevant legislation and logistical and other incidental arrangements for implementation are on course. iii. We have benchmarked on Alternative Dispute Resolution with Namibia and intend to benchmark with more countries so as to benefit from their experiences in implementing Judicial Dispute Resolution. Our visit to Namibia was enriching and we have already incorporated some of the best practices that we learnt during that visit into our preparations	In the preparation stage that the Judiciary of Zimbabwe is in, the two key best practises for other jurisdictions which are desirous of implementing Judicial Dispute Resolution like ourselves that we have taken to ensure sustainability of JDR are: i. To be as inclusive of key stakeholders as possible when preparing to implement Judicial Dispute Resolution or Court-Annexed Alternative Dispute Resolution, in our case. The representation of all key players in both the civil and criminal legal justice system has been very important to the effectiveness of our preparations. As a result, within a relatively short space of time because of the buy-in of the stakeholders, we have already identified the first court to implement the system in which is the Family and Commercial Divisions of the High Court. ii. To be open to learning from those who have implemented Judicial Dispute Resolution in their judicial processes ahead of us. We are learning from the best practices, experiences and even mistakes of those who have successfully entrenched Judicial Dispute Resolution in their judicial processes. The Judiciary of Zimbabwe is therefore building its customised and home-grown system with the benefit of the experiences of other jurisdictions.	We have not encountered any challenges in executing Judicial Dispute Resolution as we are in the preparatory stages of implementing it.