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What does it take to bring justice Online?

- Access to justice is a human right issue
- Show that justice provided online works and is not science fiction
- Understand why and where many initiatives failed
- Give access to justice online now and not in 2100
Access to Justice

✓ Impeding access to justice equates to denial of justice
✓ Giving access to justice through ODR contributes effectively to cure denials to many people who have no other means to seek remedy
✓ Providing remedy is not just a human rights issue, it impacts business, generates trust in online systems, helps establishing a long term consumer/merchant relationship
✓ Resolving a high volume of low value disputes out-of-court, through simple, swift and inexpensive channels impacts the entire society and the economy as a whole
Digitalising Courts

✓ “Arbitral Institutions must invest in technology or they will be forced to play catch up with the courts”

✓ Some countries wisely invested in giving access to state courts online and are inspiring models (Estonia, Lithuania, UK, Singapore, British Columbia (Canada) and some States in the US)

✓ Digitalising courts is undeniably a progress and their success will increase users’ confidence in public & private justice provided online
Why Online Justice is lagging behind?

✓ Courts’ investment do not address all needs
✓ Platforms were built but many were interrupted
✓ Hope was given but users lost confidence after the interruption of services
✓ ODR is considered science fiction
## Potential Multi-Tier Settlement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 3: arbitration</th>
<th>Failing settlement, arbitration or court procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: mediation</td>
<td>Facilitated online settlement with a neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: negotiation</td>
<td>Automated settlement or technology enabled negotiation where parties negotiate directly with one another online</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Good and the Bad...

✓ ODR has a huge potential but is considerably under-explored
✓ Where do the problems lie?
✓ Why online justice is lagging behind?
✓ What does it take to bring it online?

✓ To answer these questions we need to consider:
  ➔ first the undeniable advantages of ODR, the “good”
  ➔ second the lessons to learn from the “bad” to avoid future mistakes
Undeniable Advantages of ODR

- Access to justice to people who have no remedy: low income, in remote locations, with disabilities, cross-border disputes
- Avoids discomfort of court rooms and being intimidated by opponents, lawyers, judges
- Offers a more neutral space for discussions between the parties
- Removes complications of forum selection (no choice of jurisdiction)
- Alleviates the huge courts backlogs in all jurisdictions
- Contributes to saving the environment (paperless procedures, no travelling)
Undeniable Advantages of ODR

- Resolving easily & quickly disputes arising out of online & offline transactions
- Flexibility and use of hybrid mechanisms: automated systems, blind-bidding, online negotiation and mediation
- Equal access to information: essential when parties are not represented
- Parties can file claims or negotiate anytime, any day and from anywhere
- Saves time and money, no lawyers’ costs, no travelling costs
- ODR, like Ombuds, are under-explored as dispute prevention in addition to dispute resolution
Lessons to learn & Lessons for the future

1) Mistake: stop thinking whether access to justice online is possible
Recommendation: do not be a bystander, dare taking initiatives, be an innovator

2) Mistake: building platforms and then interrupting services
Recommendation: continuity is essential and a good business plan

3) Mistake: limiting the project to building a platform only
Recommendation: long term business plan and proper budgeting

4) Mistake: neglecting time and effort for drafting detailed and clear specifications
Recommendation: draft clear specifications and realistic projects

5) Mistake: lack of common think tank and improper or insufficient market survey
Recommendation: share experience and conduct proper market survey
Lessons to learn & Lessons for the future

6) **Mistake:** ignoring users and neglecting tests
   ➡️ **Recommendation:** involve end users and conduct intensive tests

7) **Mistake:** lack of regular promotion of ODR and users’ education
   ➡️ **Recommendation:** proper communication, marketing and training

8) **Mistake:** lack of predictability, striking or chocking differences among services offered
   ➡️ **Recommendation:** standardisation of some processes and centralisation of information

9) **Mistake:** lack of hard data reporting about numbers and proven results
   ➡️ **Recommendation:** publish hard data to assess progress and provide analysis

10) **Mistake:** improper technology suppliers is the beginning of a long and painful journey
    ➡️ **Recommendation:** invest in making a proper choice after thorough analysis of offers
Conclusion

✓ Make online justice a priority, access to justice is a human rights issue
✓ Progress is in our hands, it is everybody’s business
✓ Convince stakeholders to use other methods for settling disputes
✓ Successful online services will help speed up transition to digitalised justice
✓ Investment made now will benefit all players for the short, medium and long term
✓ ODR is not science fiction or rocket science, it requires pragmatism and perseverance
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