### Mediation

Session 1 – Concept; Types; Advantages and Disadvantages



### Contents

- 1. Concept of mediation
- 2. Types of mediation
- 3. Advantages and disadvantages of mediation



- A. <u>Definition</u>
  - What is mediation?



#### A. <u>Definition</u>

• An example of a definition can be found in the 2008 EU Mediation Directive which defines mediation as "a structured process... whereby two or more parties to a dispute attempt by themselves, on a voluntary basis, to reach an agreement on the settlement of their dispute with the assistance of a mediator" (Mediation Directive Art. 3(a))



- B. <u>Principal features</u>
  - The two principal features of mediation are:
    - It is a process of *negotiation*
    - It is a process that involves the participation of a *mediator*



- B. <u>Principal features</u>
  - A process of negotiation: mediation can be distinguished from other dispute settlement (DS) mechanisms such as litigation and arbitration which are of judicial or quasi-judicial nature (a decision will be rendered based on the facts and the law)



- B. <u>Principal features</u>
  - A process involving the participation of a mediator: The involvement of a mediator raises the question of what his or her role is



- B. <u>Principal features</u>
  - The EU Mediation Directive's definition refers to "assistance" provided by the mediator. What does this mean?



- B. <u>Principal features</u>
  - Generally speaking, one can distinguish two alternative approaches that mediators may take:
    - A facilitative approach
    - An evaluative approach



- B. <u>Principal features</u>
  - *Facilitative* mediation focuses on the *process*, not on the *substance* of the dispute (the mediator facilitates communication between the parties)



- B. <u>Principal features</u>
  - *Evaluative* mediation focuses on the *substance* of the dispute (the mediator will evaluate the parties' respective positions and claims; he or she may, for example, make a settlement proposal)



A. <u>Overview</u>

- One distinguishes between:
  - Judicial, court-annexed and private mediation
  - Optional and mandatory mediation



- B. Judicial, court-annexed and private mediation
  - Judicial mediation is mediation performed by a judge



- B. Judicial, court-annexed and private mediation
  - Example: A dispute arises between A and B. A initiates court proceedings. The court asks the parties whether they would like to mediate. The parties agree and the court appoints a *judge* to serve (exclusively) as a mediator (judicial mediation is notably conducted by Employment Tribunals in the UK)



- B. Judicial, court-annexed and private mediation
  - Court-annexed mediation is mediation conducted in connection with court proceedings and under the supervision of the court hearing the case



- B. Judicial, court-annexed and private mediation
  - Example: A dispute arises between A and B. A initiates court proceedings. The court asks the parties whether they would like to mediate. The parties agree and the court appoints a *private individual* to serve as a mediator (often this person will be on a list kept by the court)



- B. Judicial, court-annexed and private mediation
  - In court-annexed mediation, courts typically have substantial supervisory powers, *e.g.*:
    - They appoint the mediator
    - They set a time frame for the mediation
    - They may terminate the mediation



- B. Judicial, court-annexed and private mediation
  - Private mediation is mediation that is not connected to court proceedings and conducted by a private individual



- B. Judicial, court-annexed and private mediation
  - Example: A dispute arises between A and B. The parties agree to mediate and ask a private mediation service provider to appoint a mediator (or ask Mr. or Ms. X to serve as mediator)



- C. Optional and mandatory mediation
  - In most countries, the use of mediation is generally *optional*, i.e. there is no obligation to resort to mediation



#### C. Optional and mandatory mediation

- However, mediation may sometimes be *mandatory* 
  - One example of mandatory mediation is the system established in Italy under *Decree No. 69 of 21 June 2013* which makes mediation mandatory for a broad range of civil and commercial disputes (notably insurance, banking, inheritance, leases, and medical liability)



- C. Optional and mandatory mediation
  - What may be some of the reasons why legislators make mediation mandatory (for certain categories of disputes)?



A. <u>General observations</u>

- When speaking about the advantages and disadvantages of mediation:
  - We compare mediation to arbitration and litigation
  - We focus on the perspective of the parties



- The main (potential) advantages of mediation are:
  - Cost and time savings
  - Flexibility of outcome
  - Win/win outcomes
  - Control
  - Voluntary compliance
  - Preservation of business relationship



- B. <u>Advantages</u>
  - 1. Cost and time savings
    - Cost and time savings are essentially due to the fact that mediation is not a judicial (or quasi-judicial) process, i.e. it does not involve the submission of legal briefs, documentary evidence, witness testimony, etc.



- 2. Flexibility of outcome
  - Flexibility of outcome refers to the idea that the parties' settlement options are not restricted to the legal remedies courts or arbitral tribunals may grant (in arbitration/litigation, the most frequently granted remedy is damages, while in mediation the parties may agree on amendments to their contract, future deals, etc.)



- 2. Flexibility of outcome
  - Flexibility of outcome also means that "compromise" solutions can be found. Assume, for example, that the parties are in dispute over who has to bear the burden of a levy imposed by the national bank of the seller's country in connection with anti-money-laundering investigations. A court or tribunal will generally have to allocate this burden to one of the parties. In mediation, the parties may decide to split this additional cost.



- B. <u>Advantages</u>
  - 3. Win/win outcomes
    - In mediation, it may be possible to achieve *win/win* outcomes while arbitration/litigation inevitably leads to *win/lose* outcomes



- 3. Win/win outcomes
  - Take the example of the "orange dispute" (both parties claim ownership of an orange)
    - In arbitration/litigation, either one party obtains the orange and the other nothing or the parties split the orange (*win/lose* outcome)
    - In mediation, the parties may realize that they want different parts of the orange and each party may get the part it wants (*win/win* outcome)



- B. <u>Advantages</u>
  - 3. Win/win outcomes
    - Negotiation theory explains the difference between win/win and win/lose outcomes through the concepts of *distributive* and *integrative* bargaining



- 3. Win/win outcomes
  - *Distributive* bargaining assumes that negotiation is a *zero-sum* game (the parties are dividing a pie). Example: Buyer and seller are negotiating the price of a particular object (a house, a watch, etc.)



- B. <u>Advantages</u>
  - 3. Win/win outcomes
    - Integrative bargaining assumes that negotiation can be a positive-sum game (the parties are enlarging the pie or "creating value"). Example: the orange dispute



- B. <u>Advantages</u>
  - 3. Win/win outcomes
    - How to enlarge the pie? How to create value?



- 3. Win/win outcomes
  - Negotiation theory tells us that there are two main ways to create value:
    - By pursuing joint interests
    - By exploiting differences of *preference* or *valuation*



- B. <u>Advantages</u>
  - 3. Win/win outcomes
    - Joint interests may notably include:
      - A joint interest in building or preserving a business relationship
      - A joint interest in avoiding an escalation of conflict (which may cause the parties to incur significant litigation/arbitration costs



- 3. Win/win outcomes
  - The exploitation of differences in valuation or preference is based on the idea that assets or resources are valued differently by different people or entities. Example: When A purchases a 5,000 Euro watch in a jewelry store, this means that the jeweler prefers the money and the client prefers the watch



- 3. Win/win outcomes
  - Example: A and B enter into a joint venture agreement to jointly run a business requiring substantial investments. A and B share losses and profits in equal parts (50/50). It turns out that A is very risk-averse, while B is very risk-friendly. What different financial arrangement may be in the mutual interest of the parties (a win/win change)?



- B. <u>Advantages</u>
  - 4. Control
    - Unlike in arbitration/litigation, the parties have *control* over the outcome (any mediated settlement will necessarily be agreed by the parties). Therefore, the parties' *satisfaction* with the outcome is generally higher than in arbitration/litigation



- 5. Voluntary compliance
  - As a result of control and increased satisfaction with the outcome, parties are very likely voluntarily to comply with the mediated settlement agreement (this is not the case in arbitration/litigation)



- B. <u>Advantages</u>
  - 6. Preservation of business relationship
    - Arbitration/litigation generally puts an end to the business relationship between the parties. A successful mediation typically allows the parties to *pursue their business dealings*



#### C. <u>Disadvantages</u>

• Does mediation present any disadvantages? Which ones?



C. <u>Disadvantages</u>

 One disadvantage of mediation is the *uncertainty* of a successful outcome and, therefore, the possible *waste of resources* (time, money)



C. <u>Disadvantages</u>

- However, it should be noted that:
  - A waste of resources only occurs where mediation is not successful
  - The wasted resources are generally rather minor
  - Time and money invested in the mediation may be partly "transferred" to arbitration/litigation



#### C. <u>Disadvantages</u>

 It is questionable whether mediation presents other disadvantages. One argument that could be raised is that mediation may sometimes lead to *unfair outcomes* (notably as a result of unequal bargaining powers)

