

YEREVAN ARBITRATION COLLOQUIUM 2026

April 27-28

DAY ONE - 27 April, 2026

International Commercial Arbitration: Practice, Procedure, and Emerging Challenges

<p>09:30 – 10:00</p>	<p>Registration</p>
<p>10:00 – 10:10</p>	<p>Opening Remarks</p> <p>Hagop Yacoubian, Dean, College of Humanities and Social Sciences</p>
<p>10:10 – 11:50</p>	<p>Opening Conversation (Open to the Public)</p> <p>How We Got Here: Paths into International Arbitration</p> <p>Before anything else begins, the Colloquium opens its doors. International practitioners sit down for an honest conversation about how they arrived in the field, what it looked like when they entered it, and what they would tell a room full of students standing at the beginning of that same path. No slides. No citations. Just the story.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The moment it became a career, and whether that moment was a decision or an accident • What the field looked like from the outside versus what it felt like from the inside • The role of geography, language, and institutional access, and whether those barriers have moved • What they know now that they wish they had known at the start <p><i>Speakers:</i> Kaj Hobér Grant Hanessian Loukas Mistelis Nata Ghibradze Aida Avanesian Norair Babadjanian</p> <p><i>Moderator:</i> Adelaida Baghdasaryan</p>
<p>11:50 - 12:10</p>	<p>Coffee break</p>
<p>12:10 – 14:25</p>	<p>Commercial Arbitration Working Session (Open)</p> <p>The Hard Questions in Commercial Arbitration</p> <p>Not a panel. Grant Hanessian leads an open roundtable discussion. The session works through four questions that cut to the core of contemporary commercial arbitration practice, the kind that practitioners rarely address publicly with full candour. The group tackles the agenda together; no one owns a topic. The room is expected to engage throughout.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency and cost: why has commercial arbitration priced itself out of mid-size disputes, and what has actually worked? • The arbitrator pool: repeat appointments, the inner club problem, and whether the IBA Guidelines on Conflicts have kept pace with market concentration • The speed argument: civil law jurisdictions where courts now resolve disputes faster and cheaper, has arbitration lost its core competitive advantage? • Dispute avoidance before arbitration: do DAABs and multi-tiered mechanisms actually work in practice, or do they just add cost and delay before the inevitable? <p><i>Discussion Leader:</i> Grant Hanessian</p> <p><i>Participants:</i> Kaj Hobér Loukas Mistelis Nata Ghibradze Norair Babadjanian Aida Avanesian</p>
<p>14:25 – 14:45</p>	<p>Standalone Presentation</p> <p>AI in Arbitration: What Is Actually Happening</p> <p>Aram Aghababyan</p>
<p>14:45 – 16:00</p>	<p>Lunch break</p>
<p>16:00 – 17:30</p>	<p>The Tribunal (Closed · Chatham House Rule · Invitation Only)</p> <p>Why Is Arbitration Not Developing in Armenia, and Whose Job Is It to Change That?</p> <p>No panel. No presentations. A small invited group of international practitioners and local professionals convenes without a record and without attribution. The convener opens with a short framing report, then puts questions directly to the group before opening the floor. The session is designed to be comparative and candid in a way that a public session cannot be.</p> <p>Opening report - Davit Khachatryan</p> <p>Questions to the group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the state's role, and is there a risk of it being too interventionist rather than too passive? • Questions raised by the participants <p><i>Attendance by invitation. Composition of the group will not be disclosed. No record is kept.</i></p>

DAY TWO - 28 April, 2026

Investment Arbitration: Regulation, Sovereignty, and Investor Protection

10:00 – 10:20

Opening Keynote

Investment Arbitration: Origins, Architecture, and the Road Ahead

Speaker:

Loukas Mistelis

10:20 – 11:15

Young Practitioners Panel (Open to the Public)

Sovereignty vs. Protection: The Central Tension from the Next Generation's Perspective

Early-career researchers and AUA LLM students present their current work on the fault line that defines contemporary investment arbitration: the tension between a state's right to regulate in the public interest and the obligations of protection that investment treaties impose. Each presenter has six minutes, followed by feedback and questions from the invited guests in the room.

- How the regulatory chill argument has evolved, and whether the evidence now supports it
- The green transition as a stress test: when climate policy meets investor protection
- Developing states and the asymmetry of the system, what reform looks like from the respondent side
- What the next generation of investment lawyers thinks the system should look like in ten years

Panelists:

Early-career researchers and AUA LLM students

Moderator:

Kristine Khanazadyan

11:15 – 11:30

Coffee break

11:30 – 15:30

Investment Arbitration Working Session Contemporary Investment Arbitration: Four Live Questions

11:30 – 13:00

First Half

One session, two halves, four questions. The discussion runs continuously across the morning and afternoon with a lunch break at its midpoint.

- Climate change, state responsibilities, and investment law: the green transition, stranded assets, and energy disputes, *Rockhopper v. Italy*, *RWE v. Netherlands*, and what comes next
- Emergency arbitration in investment disputes: jurisdictional basis, practical problems on the ground, and the gap between the rule and the remedy

13:00 – 14:00

Lunch break

14:00 – 15:30

Second Half

Sanctions compliance as a condition of treaty protection: legality clauses, clean hands doctrine, and admissibility consequences

- Investment screening under CFIUS, the EU FDI Regulation, and analogous national regimes: interaction with treaty protection obligations

Discussion Leader:

Kaj Hobér

15:45 – 17:00

Masterclass, Students and Teachers Teaching Investment Law, Writing in Practice

A focused session for LLM students and early-career practitioners, anchored in two questions: how do you teach investment law so that it forces real doctrinal reasoning, and how does writing, early, often, publicly, build the professional identity that sustains a career across both practice and scholarship.

- What problem-based learning actually demands: designing scenarios that force doctrinal reasoning rather than recitation
- Writing as a practitioner-scholar: how early-career writing builds the professional identity that bridges both tracks
- Teaching oral advocacy and legal writing: lessons from a career spanning practice, academia, and translation

Participants:

Kaj Hobér
Loukas Mistelis