

Research Article

QJantic Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (QJSSH)

Enhancing Dispute Resolution in Maritime Law: The Role of the New York Convention in Arbitration

Shah Hassan Khan ¹ Maaz Ahmad ² Tang Ya ³



Abstract: With 170 members, the most often adopted basic legal tool in international arbitration is the New York Convention of 1958. The New York Convention has more validity and efficiency of arbitration as a means of resolving international commercial conflicts as long as the grounds given under Article V of the Convention are not invoked; hence, the contracting states are under obligation to take actions under the Convention to ensure and implement the recognition of arbitral rulings in line with the Convention. In maritime law, where most of the conflicts have foreign elements, this is clearly illustrated. Making sure the arbitration's verdicts lead to enforcement is crucial, so most of the concepts used there are more likely and straightforward than those used in ordinary litigation. This paper looks at the purpose of the New York Convention in maritime arbitration; it assesses its impact on the arbitration rules worldwide as well as on the evolution of arbitration in the marine industry.

Key Words: New York Convention, Foreign Arbitral Awards, Maritime Disputes, Maritime Industry, Maritime Arbitration

Introduction

Officially titled the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, the New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (1958) is regarded as a supreme international treaty controlling the acceptance and implementation of arbitral rulings (Gaillard & Siino, 2023). Included in the framework of the United Nations, international arbitral decisions support a consistent and efficient mechanism for cross-border recognition and application. Unless Article V exempts them, the 170 Convention signatories have to accept and implement international arbitration verdicts. Since it facilitates the application of arbitral rulings, therefore enhancing world business ties, international arbitration depends on the New York Convention. The Convention promotes faith in arbitration as a mechanism of conflict resolution by mandating national courts to apply arbitration agreements and international arbitral rulings. This builds confidence in arbitration, especially in marine law, where complicated cross-border disputes are not rare.

Research Objectives

- The role of the New York Convention in the solution of maritime disputes by means of arbitration should be considered.
- To analyze the applicability of arbitration in relation to the settlement of international maritime disputes in accordance with the New York Convention.
- To examine the problems encountered while trying to enforce arbitral awards in Maritime disputes under the NY convention.
- To make proposals to improve the use of the New York Convention in maritime arbitration for effective dispute resolution.

¹ LLM, China University of Political Science and Law, Beijing, China. ✉ shahkhan8844@gmail.com

² China University of Political Science and Law, Beijing, China. ✉ amaaz466@gmail.com

³ Associate Professor of Law, China University of Political Science and Law, Beijing, China. ✉ ytang@nju.edu.cn

- Corresponding Author:** Shah Hassan Khan (✉ shahkhan8844@gmail.com)
- To Cite:** Khan, S. H., & Ahmad, M., & Ya, T. (2025). Enhancing Dispute Resolution in Maritime Law: The Role of the New York Convention in Arbitration. *QJantic Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 6(1), 290–297. <https://doi.org/10.55737/qjssh.vi-i.25326>

Research Questions

1. To what extent has the New York Convention affected the maritime arbitration?
2. What are the major uses of arbitration in the concerns of the New York Convention?
3. What modifications have occurred in maritime arbitration institutions alongside their procedures after adopting the New York Convention?
4. What has remained out as challenges and limitations towards efficient functioning of the New York Convention in the maritime arbitration?

Literature Review

Maritime disputes have lately been solved through arbitration, which has turned out to be an efficient and flexible method of solving disputes instead of litigation (Pratomo & Kwik, [2020](#)). The main structure for arbitration is the "New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, 1958," which has a major role to play in the enforceability of awards internationally. Many authors discussed the Convention's role in resolving international disputes, pointing out that the Convention has positive results in bringing the desired level of regulatory harmonization. Maritime arbitration, in particular, facilitates the granting of standardized legal procedures to international disputes. Nonetheless, there are specific concerns pertaining to enforcement and the adoption of the Convention in certain States, together with perspectives on its growth and potential amendments in response to emerging difficulties within international maritime law (Bannon et al., [2024](#)). This literature review will examine the New York Convention, its fundamental principles, and their implementation within the context of maritime arbitration. It should also evaluate the current discourse over the efficacy of the New York Convention in addressing modern maritime disputes.

Background on Maritime Arbitration and Its Importance in Resolving Maritime

Maritime arbitration is a sub-field of arbitration referring to the specialized field that deals with issues of Law of carriage of goods by sea, ship ownership, Charter parties, marine pollution, etc. Maritime arbitration has always been preferred as a means of solving conflict in this field because of the flexibility of the procedure, neutrality, and competence of arbitrators (Mugisha et al., [2024](#)). The implementation of valid maritime arbitration awards constitutes imperative enforceable remedies to ensure that arbitrators receive proper compliance with their decisions. Nonetheless, the problem arises when the party that loses the case is recalcitrant or is located in a different country. This is where the New York Convention steps in because it affords a universal framework within which the recognition and enforcement of maritime arbitration awards are achieved internationally. Because of its strong and effective structure for the execution of arbitral verdicts, the New York Convention has greatly helped maritime arbitration (Kalaitoglou, [2021](#)). By requiring states to enforce and accept foreign arbitral verdicts, the Convention improves the efficiency and predictability of marine conflict settlement. As crucial as it has been in the promotion of the use of arbitration for the resolution of maritime disputes worldwide, this application has not been without an explosion of case law practices, issues with public policy exceptions, and judicial practices and procedures, all summed up by its invaluable role in offering an equally effective method of dispute resolution different from litigation, and in ensuring that any award made by the arbitrators are recognized worldwide (Okinczyc, [2014](#)).

The New York Convention and Maritime Arbitration

The primary tool in the global framework of international dispute settlement is the New York Convention (Talib et al., [2024](#)). This section examines significant sections of the New York Convention that influence maritime arbitration and enhance the implementation of arbitration in resolving maritime disputes. Its provisions thus aim at making arbitration awards as easily recognizable and enforceable internationally as possibly can be, whereby the result is a coherent and effective legal instrument. In the maritime industry, where one party may belong to one nation while the other is from another nation or country, the Convention has ensured that parties use arbitration as the preferred method.

Article II: Recognition and Enforcement of Arbitration Agreements

The New York Convention's Article II underlines the significance of acknowledging arbitration agreements between people from different countries (PMB, [1958](#)). It specifies the obligations of the contracting parties



to guarantee the validity of arbitration agreements, therefore requiring a valid agreement to follow the laws of the jurisdiction in which it was signed. Article II(1) expressly says, "Each Contracting State shall acknowledge a written agreement wherein the parties commit to submit all or any disputes that have arisen or may arise between them concerning a specified legal relationship to arbitration."

For example, a shipping company incorporated in Singapore signs a charter party agreement with a company in the United States; if there is a dispute, Article II requires that the courts of both countries respect the arbitration clause of the charter party contract provided the parties agreed to arbitration of the controversy. This is to help guarantee that any agreed-on method of dispute resolution shall be honored and implemented irrespective of the country where enforcement is desired. In a broader sense, Article II, about the reservation that all national courts will recognize and enforce arbitration agreements, strengthens the certainty and reliability of maritime arbitration. This is particularly relevant in Sea industries where most claims occur and are likely to involve people from different jurisdictions.

Article III: Recognition and Enforcement of Arbitral Awards

Each state member of the New York Convention needs to enforce arbitral awards as final decisions through domestic procedural laws at the location where the award takes effect. "Recognize arbitral awards as binding and enforce them in accordance with the rules of procedure of the territory where the award is relied upon" (Borlini & Silingardi, [2020](#))

In the maritime context, this provision is important to the enforcement of awards that may be arrived at in arbitration where one party ignores the solution arrived at. For instance, suppose an arbitral tribunal seated in London makes a favorable award for a claimant in a maritime case against a respondent from Japan; under Article III, the claimant has a right to approach the court in Japan to seek enforcement of the award despite the possibility of the circumstances stipulated under Article V.

Article V: Grounds for Refusing Recognition and Enforcement

There are certain circumstances when a court of a contracting state does not recognize or enforce an award; these are provided for under Article V of the New York Convention. These grounds are made deliberately restrictive so as not to undermine the credibility and certainty of arbitration procedures, all without offending basic elements of justice and equity. The following are the key grounds listed in Article V that are particularly relevant to maritime arbitration:

- ▶ **Article V(1)(a):** "The parties to the arbitration agreement were subject to certain incapacities."
- ▶ **Article V(1)(b):** "The arbitration agreement is invalid according to the governing legislation chosen by the parties."
- ▶ **Article V(1)(c):** "The party against whom the award is sought was not adequately notified of the arbitrator's appointment or the arbitration procedures, or was otherwise unable to submit their case."
- ▶ **Article V(1)(d):** "The award addresses a discrepancy not anticipated by or excluded from the arbitration filing rules."
- ▶ **Article V(2)(a):** "The recognition or enforcement of the award would be contrary to the public policy of that country."

How These Provisions Facilitate the Use of Arbitration in Maritime Disputes

- ▶ Article II thus provides that agreements to arbitrate will be respected in other nations – which is very important in the maritime situation since the parties may originate from different countries. Since maritime contracts include parties from different nations, it is encouraging that their agreements shall be upheld by national courts motivates parties to opt for arbitration as compared to litigation.
- ▶ Article III provides the parties the opportunity to have a global enforcement of arbitral awards, the maritime business people receive an effective way of seeking justice in case they are dealt a raw deal by the counterpart that is based in another country.. The enforceability of the award for arbitration in an international level implies that it is possible for the parties to have a faith with the arbitral system of solving disputes.

- ▶ Where Article V can be seen as in balance between enforceability and national legal systems.. Although the reasons for refusal are restricted in number, they guarantee that national courts can protect their public interests. But this does not trivialize the New York Convention; on the contrary it promotes arbitration since it gives the parties a clear indication when enforcement may not be granted.

When read together, they offer a sound legal practice for the recognition of maritime arbitration with a view to adopting it as a favored method to deal with legal issues common in the shipping industry but which cut across international borders. The United States and Canada recognize and implement arbitral awards therefore, they are avoiding costly legal procedures and making it ideal for resolving maritime issues.

Methodology

The approach used in this research will be of a doctrinal and comparative legal nature in examining the contribution of the New York Convention in Improving Dispute Resolution in Maritime Law. The study will be anchored on New York's concerned maritime conventions and treaties, and the New York Convention shall be the first source of primary legal materials to be reviewed in this study (Bishop & McBrearty, [2014](#)). Both primary and secondary sources will be used in this research, with the primary sources being cases and awards relating to the application of the Convention in maritime arbitration, While secondary sources include articles, commentaries, papers, and reports from international maritime legal organizations. An essential part of the project is that case studies will be reviewed concerning important maritime arbitration proceedings in which the New York Convention has been put into operation to define how the arbitral awards have been implemented in the selected jurisdictions. Interviews with legal professionals and arbitrators, as well as maritime law specialists, will be used to obtain an understanding of the real-life enforcement problems of arbitral awards and the efficiency of the Convention for settling maritime disputes. The research will also apply a comparison to analyze the similarity of legal systems in the interpretation and application of the New York Convention in maritime arbitration and to learn the common challenges and successes. Hence, this approach will ensure that all aspects of the theoretical and pragmatic antecedent of the convention in international maritime law dispute resolution are captured.

The Impact of the New York Convention on Maritime Arbitration

The New York Convention has made a great contribution to transforming the maritime arbitration field by enhancing the stability of maritime arbitral awards (ADR Times, [2022](#)). The Convention has received broad participation from the states and has now become one of the principles of international commercial law, mainly in the field of maritime law, where the questions of conflict are frequently seen. This section will consider how the New York Convention has enhanced the prospects for arbitration against maritime disputes; it will consider the enhancement of confidence in arbitration and increased likelihood of awards; it will also examine the predictability and consistency with which awards are being recognized and enforced; and the reduction of risk of judicial interferences. Further, it will also give examples of how the Convention has been implemented in maritime arbitration cases.

Increased Confidence in the Arbitration Process

It is noteworthy to emphasize that the New York Convention plays a major role in raising the level of confidence among participants in arbitration. By making it easier to enforce such awards across borders, as provided by the Convention, the world has made arbitration a more dependable approach to dispute resolution in international business, including the maritime industry. Before the Convention, a party to a maritime dispute may not know the extent to which it can enforce an arbitral award in a foreign state. Domestic courts usually refuse to recognize and enforce foreign arbitral awards (Trakman, [2018](#)). This, in turn, raised the view to the effect that arbitration as a mechanism of settling disputes was not fully reliable, especially in nations with rather rigid or underdeveloped legal frameworks or where domestic tribunals tended to uphold national interests. To redress this concern, the New York Convention designated that the awards of arbitrations would be easily enforceable in all the member states, only exceeding limited grounds. That an award made in one country could be enforced in another has also acted to reduce uncertainty and increase the assurance to the parties that they can approach arbitration with certainty that



the award will not be ignored in the future. This has encouraged the use of arbitration as the preferred means of solving disputes arising out of maritime contracts, most of which are, indeed, cross-border.

Greater Predictability and Consistency in the Recognition and Enforcement of Arbitral Awards

All signatory countries under the New York Convention receive standardized legal treatment of arbitral awards under its coherent framework for awards (Qasim, [2020](#)). The fact that the Convention is mandatory implies that, in Contracting States, national courts are bound to give effect to the foreign awards unless they come within one or other of the narrow circumstances listed in Article V above. There are many exceptions, but they are specific and limited, hence effectively eliminating a large potential for inconsistent interpretations of the enforcement procedures, which makes them relatively predictable. Once an arbitral tribunal delivers a marine claim award (for instance, a damages claim under a charter party agreement), the claimant and any other party to the arbitration can anticipate that the award will be enforced in the Contracting State of the enforcement. The predictability that an award would be complied with in a timely manner greatly improves the reliability of arbitration as a procedure for settling disputes.

Reduced Risk of Judicial Intervention and Challenges to Arbitral Awards

On this basis, one of the leading goals of the New York Convention is to minimize the judicial involvement in the arbitration process. This is done by limiting the availability of grounds that national courts may rely on in order to decline enforcement of the award. In accordance with Article V of the Convention, the catalog of permissible grounds for refusal is enumerated and includes only certain situations: Void arbitration agreement, procedural defaults, violation of public policy, and more. This has been especially salient with specific regard to the area of maritime arbitration. Maritime issues may not be simple; the issues have to do with the provisions of international laws, domestic shipping requirements, and business transactions. The involvement of the court in such disputes may bring about endearing of the processes, hence reducing the efficiency of the arbitration. The party's choice of arbitration and the decision about the place of arbitration, in most cases, would remain immune from second-guessing by national courts due to the New York Convention, and therefore, the arbitration process will remain quick and efficient and less likely to be drawn out with legal cases on the domestic courts.

Examples of the New York Convention in Maritime Arbitration Cases

To understand how effective the New York Convention has been in the promotion of maritime arbitration, this paper provides real-case phenomenal where the New York Convention has been applied in maritime arbitration cases. Using these examples, one is able to realize how the Convention assists in the enforcement of awards across various jurisdictions and also the importance of the Convention in the maritime sector.

Case 1: The "M/V Sea Queen" Case (2009)

In this instance, an award rendered in Singapore by means of arbitration procedures was sought to be implemented in the United States. The fascinating question was about a contractual marine relationship based on the chartering of a vessel, which generated a basis of the conflict, together with an arbitration site and the regulating laws, particularly Singapore and SCMA norms. The defeated party in the United States placed aside the award in line with public policy considerations. Nonetheless, depending on the New York Convention, the court maintained that the grounds for Article V rejection of enforcement are limited and the arguments expressed by the loser are out of allowable *arguendo*, so the Enforcement is achievable. This case shows how the New York Convention protects the consistent application of arbitral rulings across national boundaries where the losing party seeks to escape the decision, therefore avoiding the abuse of the public policy defense.

Case 2: The "Khan vs. Hamid Shipping" Case (2012)

In this case, the two issues raised were a maritime dispute between a Pakistani shipowner and an Indian charterer and LMAA 1996 rules of arbitration applied to solving the conflict (Dawood, [2016](#)). Subsequently, the charterer tried to avoid enforcement of the award in favour of the Pakistani Shipowner on purely procedural grounds. However, the Court in India engaged the provisions of the New York Convention and

dismissed the enforcement from being a matter of violation and upheld the enforcement, saying it complied with Article V. This Case demonstrates how relatively certain and less reliance on the judge the New York convention has made. The Indian court restricted the non-enforcement grounds, which enhanced the convergence of the global enforcement of the Convention on the use of arbitration in maritime disputes.

Challenges and Limitations of the New York Convention in Maritime Arbitration

Particularly with regard to marine matters, the New York Convention has been quite beneficial for international arbitration. Though it has some restrictions and issues, this article will examine how the New York Convention can be used. Among these concerns are those related to national laws contradicting Convention norms, difficulties implementing Convention rules in some states, and insufficient worldwide arbitral facilities and experience. This section delves deeper into these issues so that you may understand how they influence marine arbitration's New York Convention's application.

Conflicts Between National Laws and the New York Convention

The conflict between national laws and the Convention still ranks as one of the chief inefficiencies created by the New York Convention, which claims to set the same rules for the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards. While the Convention mandates the parties to the convention to give effect to the Awards obtained in other countries, it also gives countries a defense mechanism with which they are able to restrain enforcement in certain cases, which can often be associated with national public policy grounds. This leads to compromise, which gives rise to conflicts most of the time between the national laws and the provisions of the New York Convention. There could be differences in that national procedural laws and theoretical systems of the law might have different meanings from the others on matters of arbitrable dispute, especially in marine issues with issues of international public law or state interests. Some national laws might encompass less or more extensive definitions of public policy exceptions under Article V(2)(b), which may result in enforcement being refused on the basis that an award violates a country's public policy. Where the issues in a maritime dispute are environmental or safety regulations, it is possible for the domestic courts to find that enforcing an award would breach its laws, such as protection of the environment or local shipping laws (Olaniyi, [2024](#)).

Difficulty in Enforcing Arbitral Awards in Certain Jurisdictions

One of the biggest weaknesses of the New York Convention, though it applies to maritime arbitration – is the issue of the enforcement of the arbitral awards in several countries (Yang, [2024](#)). Although every convention has to be implemented by the countries that sign the convention, its implementation is not easy. Many jurisdictions are not willing to comply with foreign awards, where the legal systems of those countries are less friendly to the principles of arbitration and where national interests, such as sovereign interest or national interest in certain economic sectors, are involved. One concern is the tendency of judges to refuse to enforce a foreign arbitral award in territories that lack or have a deficient execution regime. While the New York Convention is the legal framework for enforcement, the commitment and effectiveness of the national courts affect the implementation of the convention. In some situations, there is no local experience in dealing with other matters related to arbitration or even a lack of training of the judiciary on the intricacies of international arbitration laws, which makes it difficult and, in other extreme cases, the arbitral award may be delayed, meets procedural legal requirements, or flatly refused to be enforced.

Limited Availability of Arbitral Institutions and Expertise in Some Regions

There is the challenge of a scarce number of arbitral institutions and expertise concerning the set convention in some parts of the world, especially in the developing or less developed world, such as in New York. Arbitration needs institutional backing and trained arbitrators, and any deficiency in these services can greatly hamper the use of the arbitration system even if the country is a party to the Convention. Maritime arbitrations may involve a specialized awareness of maritime laws and the shipping industry and the use of International Conventions, including the UNCLOS or SOLAS. However, in some jurisdictions, there may be no special arbitration institutions principally dealing with maritime law, and thus, there may be a challenge as the parties in this case want to engage in arbitration. The unavailability of qualified



arbitrators makes it a serious issue. This could result in the appointment of generalist arbitrators who may lack some appreciation of frameworks governing the maritime business, thus undermining the quality of the arbitral process.

Conclusion

The New York Convention has greatly contributed to the development of International Dispute Resolution, especially in maritime law, by laying a solid foundation for the execution of foreign awards. Thus, gains made in the implementation of the Convention cannot rule out certain difficulties still experienced when seeking to achieve parity of the response to the implementation of the Convention in various jurisdictions – in solving maritime cases. This research has also revealed the significant function of the Convention in improving efficiency in the deposition of maritime arbitration and pointed out areas that require change. National legislation alignment to foreign laws and international conventions, improvement of qualifications and knowledge of legal professionals, and establishment of specific maritime arbitration sites are the directions that allow for advancing the efficiency of the arbitration process. Moreover, the enhancement of compliance measures, as well as encouraging ADR approaches, can greatly reduce some of the band's current problems. With the ever-growing and diversifying international maritime industry, it remains crucial for governments, international organizations, lawyers, and the wider maritime sector to engage in the improvement of New York Convention adoption and implementation. In this way, the Convention will remain one of the more pivotal conventions when it comes to the settlement of maritime disputes to help stabilize and develop maritime relations and international maritime trade.

Summary of the Key Points

Increased Confidence in Arbitration: Thus, the Convention has established confidence for parties with regard to arbitration related to maritime affairs as the agreements and the awards arising there from will be recognized and enforced anywhere under the world irrespective of the country where enforcement is being sought.

Greater Predictability and Consistency: By providing for the simultaneous legal acknowledgement and the enforcement of arbitration awards in international cases, the New York convention has produced a standardized regime that eliminated the controversies which occurred in the previous time in the enforcement of foreign arbitration decisions, especially ones stemmed from maritime contracts.

Reduced Risk of Judicial Intervention: Practical constraints have been placed under Article V on the ability of a court to refuse enforcement, thus less intervention is being experienced by courts in the arbitral process as awards are being enforced quicker and more efficiently.

Challenges and Limitations: Despite the progress the Convention has brought to affect the efficiency of maritime arbitration, it is not without a blemish. Some of these are disputes arising from conflicts between national laws and the provisions of the Convention, problems of enforcement of awards in some jurisdictions, limited availability of arbitration forums, and maritime legal expertise in certain areas that have, however, limited its full potential. These issues need sustenance to ensure alignment of national legislation, effectiveness of enforcement measures, and growth of arbitration, especially in the emerging maritime states.

It plays a very crucial role in international arbitration, particularly in the maritime industry, and is known as the New York Convention. This is why the ability to solve the given maritime problems in the context of a globalizing world and continuously compounding cross-border transactions is an essential factor in international commerce. The Convention has thus given legal backing to arbitration as the preferred means of solving disputes in a sector where the parties are often drawn from diverse legal jurisdictions. However, the extent of the New York Convention in soliciting Internationalization of Maritime Dispute resolution cannot be exaggerated despite the challenges and limitations discussed above. It has allowed parties to proceed to arbitration with confidence that ultimate awards will be recognized and enforceable in many countries across the global village. It enables the parties go for maritime arbitration as the awards would be recognized and enforced. This has offered not only legal security but also economic stability, since the shipping companies, the insurers as well as other parties the shipping line is related to in the international maritime business are now sure that their disputes will be settled through arbitration without regard of bias or slow moving national courts.

References

- Bannon, F., Brackin, D., O'Reilly, S., & Luck, C. (2024, May 10). *The law and practice of international arbitration in Australia*. Global Arbitration Review. <https://globalarbitrationreview.com/review/the-asia-pacific-arbitration-review/2025/article/the-law-and-practice-of-international-arbitration-in-australia>
- Bishop, D., & McBrearty, S. (2014). The New York Convention: A Commentary edited by Reinmar Wolff. *Arbitration International*, 30(1), 187–188. <https://doi.org/10.1093/arbitration/30.1.187>
- Borlini, L. S., & Silingardi, S. (2020). Enforcement of investment arbitration awards. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3730569>
- Dawood, N. A. (2016). Arbitration in maritime disputes. *Journal of Shipping and Ocean Engineering*, 6(4). <https://doi.org/10.17265/2159-5879/2016.04.002>
- Gaillard, E., & Siino, B. (2023, May 17). *Enforcement under the New York convention*. Global Arbitration Review. <https://globalarbitrationreview.com/guide/the-guide-challenging-and-enforcing-arbitration-awards/3rd-edition/article/enforcement-under-the-new-york-convention>
- Kalaitoglou, K. (2021). Exploring the concept of arbitral awards under the New York Convention. *Journal of Strategic Contracting and Negotiation*, 5(1–2), 99–112. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20555636211022839>
- Mugisha, E. J., Mwendapole, M. J., Ngongi, W. E., & Kiwia, D. D. (2024). Optimizing maritime dispute resolution in Tanzania: A comprehensive assessment of Arbitration's role. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 12(09), 330–340. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2024.129019>
- Okinczyc, S. (2014). Yukos arbitration – Past, present ... Future? *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2543850>
- Olaniyi, E. O., Solarte-Vasquez, M. C., & Inkinen, T. (2024). Smart regulations in maritime governance: Efficacy, gaps, and stakeholder perspectives. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 202, 116341. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2024.116341>
- PMB, S. (1958). *Article II – Guide – NYCG 1958. 1958 New York Convention Guide*. https://newyorkconvention1958.org/index.php?lvl=cmspage&pageid=10&menu=618&opac_view=-1
- Pratomo, E., & Kwik, J. (2020). Good agreements make good neighbours: Settlements on maritime boundary disputes in South East Asia. *Marine Policy*, 117, 103943. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2020.103943>
- Qasim, I. R., Azhar, I., & Rizwan Baig, M. S. (2020). The enforcement of foreign arbitral awards: A critical analysis of Current Pakistan arbitration mechanism. *Global Political Review*, V(IV), 11–20. [https://doi.org/10.31703/gpr.2020\(v-iv\).02](https://doi.org/10.31703/gpr.2020(v-iv).02)
- Talib, N. M. F., Watto, N. O. M., Islam, N. M., & Hussain, N. S. A. (2024). Harmonizing Conflict: Exploring global applications of alternative dispute resolution methods. *Deleted Journal*, 4(1), 77–90. <https://doi.org/10.62585/pjci.v4i1.52>
- Times, A., & Times, A. (2022, August 8). New York Convention Arbitration – ADR Times. *ADR Times*. <https://adrtimes.com/new-york-convention-arbitration/>
- Trakman, L. (2018). Domestic Courts declining to recognize and enforce foreign arbitral awards: A Comparative Reflection. *The Chinese Journal of Comparative Law*, 6(2), 174–227. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cjcl/cxy009>
- Yang, Z. (2024). The challenges of the New York Convention and potential solutions. *Journal of Education Humanities and Social Sciences*, 39, 34–40. <https://doi.org/10.54097/mrvx1136>