Legal 500
Country Comparative Guides 2026

Switzerland
International Arbitration

Contributor

MLL Legal

Jean Marguerat

Partner | jean.marguerat@mll-legal.com

Urs Boller

Partner | urs.boller@mll-legal.com

Tomás Navarro Blakemore

Counsel | tomas.navarro@mll-legal.com

Matthias Leemann

Senior Associate | matthias.leemann@mll-legal.com

This country-specific Q&A provides an overview of international arbitration laws and regulations applicable in Switzerland.

For a full list of jurisdictional Q&As visit **legal500.com/guides**

Switzerland: International Arbitration

1. What legislation applies to arbitration in your country? Are there any mandatory laws?

Swiss law differentiates between domestic and international arbitration, providing distinct sets of rules for each.

Part 3 of the Swiss Civil Procedure Code (CPC) governs domestic arbitration and applies where all parties to the arbitration agreement had their domicile or permanent residence in Switzerland at the time it was concluded.

Chapter 12 of the Swiss Private International Law Act (PILA) applies to international arbitration, i.e., where at least one of the parties did not have its domicile or permanent residence in Switzerland at the time the arbitration agreement was concluded.

The parties to a domestic arbitration can decide to opt out of the provisions of the CPC and apply the PILA instead. The reverse is also possible (see Article 353(2) CPC; Article 176(2) PILA).

Both domestic and international arbitrations are subject to mandatory rules, e.g. with respect to matters relating to (i) arbitrability (Article 177 PILA/Article 353 CPC), (ii) challenge of arbitrators on the grounds of impartiality and/or independence (Article 180(1)(c) PILA/Article 367(1)(c) CPC), (iii) lis pendens (Article 181 PILA/Article 372 CPC), (iv) equal treatment of the parties and the right to be heard (Article 182(3) PILA/Article 373(4) CPC), (v) judicial assistance by state courts (Article 185 PILA/Article 375(2) CPC), (vi) the setting-aside authority of the Swiss Federal Tribunal (Article 389 CPC/not mandatory under the PILA if all parties are based abroad according to Article 192(1) PILA)

2. Is your country a signatory to the New York Convention? Are there any reservations to the general obligations of the Convention?

Switzerland is a signatory of the New York Convention of 1958 (the New York Convention) which entered into force for Switzerland on 30 August 1965. Upon ratification, Switzerland had made a reciprocity reservation, which was later withdrawn on 23 April 1993.

3. What other arbitration-related treaties and conventions is your country a party to?

Switzerland ratified the Geneva Protocol on Arbitration Clauses of 1923 and the Geneva Convention on the Execution of Foreign Arbitral Awards of 1927 (yet both ceased to have effect between contracting States of the New York Convention the moment contracting States became bound by the New York Convention). Switzerland is also a party to the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States of 1965 (the ICSID Convention) and to the Energy Charter Treaty which entered into force in 1998. It has however not ratified the European Convention on International Commercial Arbitration of 1961.

4. Is the law governing international arbitration in your country based on the UNCITRAL Model Law? Are there significant differences between the two? Are there any impending plans to reform the arbitration laws in your country? Has your jurisdiction adopted, or is it considering adopting, the amendments of 6 July 2026 regarding electronic awards and communications?

Despite the proximity in time between the PILA, which came into effect in 1989, and the UNCITRAL Model Law of 1985, the PILA is not based on the latter. However, the wording of some provisions in the PILA suggests that it was influenced also by the UNCITRAL Model Law. Both adopt a pro-arbitration approach, but Swiss law achieves this with much less dense wording while maintaining its effectiveness. The PILA has stood the test of time and was revised only after more than 30 years, undergoing only minor adjustments.

While the UNCITRAL Model Law and the PILA share many similarities and are based on the same core principles, there are some differences. For instance, the UNCITRAL Model Law does not define which disputes are arbitrable, whereas Article 177(1) PILA provides that any claim involving an economic interest may be submitted to arbitration.

Another difference is that the PILA embodies in its Article 178(2) PILA the *in favorem validatis* principle which

 © 2026 Legalease Ltd

provides that the arbitration agreement will be valid if it conforms with one of three different laws (see Question 7).

There are no impeding plans to reform the arbitration law in Switzerland considering a reform was recently undertaken and entered into force in 2021.

On 1 January 2021, a revision of Chapter 12 of the PILA entered into force. Overall, the amendments did not constitute a major upheaval of the PILA but were made with the overall intention to maintain and strengthen Switzerland's attractiveness as a leading centre for international arbitration.

The goals of this reform were to (i) codify established Swiss arbitration case law from the Swiss Federal Tribunal, (ii) modernise Chapter 12 of the PILA with new features and reinforce Switzerland's arbitration-friendly judicial regime and (iii) further enhance the principle of party autonomy. For example, under the revised set of rules, the parties can now file submissions before the Swiss Federal Tribunal in English and Swiss courts can provide assistance (e.g. provisional and protective measures or the taking of evidence) to foreign arbitral tribunals and parties in foreign arbitral proceedings. Another relevant modification was the codification of how an arbitral tribunal's jurisdiction can derive from an arbitration clause found in a unilateral act (will, foundation charter, trust deed or articles of association) as well as the Swiss Federal Tribunal's practice of allowing parties to request the revision of an arbitral award.

On 1 January 2025, a reform of the CPC came into effect, introducing amendments that also affect arbitration. Indeed, as per the revised text of Article 251a CPC, the cantons may provide that upon joint request of the parties certain state court proceedings related to arbitration (e.g. appointment of the member(s) of the arbitral tribunal, recognition and enforcement of foreign arbitral awards) shall be conducted in English, provided that English was used in the arbitration agreement or in the arbitration proceedings.

As regards the amendments to the UNCITRAL Model Law adopted on 6 July 2026, which introduce provisions on electronic arbitral awards (new Articles 2(g), 3(1), 31(5), 35(3)) and an interpretative recommendation that the New York Convention should not bar enforcement of awards solely because they are in electronic form, Switzerland has not yet adopted these amendments. This interpretative recommendation is particularly relevant for Switzerland because, under Article 194 PILA, the recognition and enforcement of foreign arbitral awards is governed by the New York Convention. Accordingly, any interpretative development concerning the New York Convention's treatment of electronic awards is directly relevant to Swiss enforcement practice. As to whether electronic awards are permissible under Swiss law, Article 189(1) PILA provides that the award shall be rendered in conformity with the procedure and form agreed by the parties. Only in the absence of such agreement does Article 189(2) PILA require the award to be in writing, reasoned, dated and signed. Importantly, Article 189 PILA does not expressly require paper form or a handwritten (wet-ink) signature, meaning that electronic arbitral awards are not prohibited under the Swiss *lex arbitri* as a matter of principle. However, in institutional practice, the Swiss Rules of the Swiss Arbitration Centre (Article 34) still require that an award to be signed and that originals of the award be notified to the parties, suggesting a more conservative approach.

5. What arbitral institutions (if any) exist in your country? When were their rules last amended? Are any amendments being considered?

The leading arbitral institution in Switzerland is the Swiss Arbitration Centre (the Centre).

Created in 2021, the Centre replaced the former Swiss Chambers' Arbitration Institution (SCAI), under a new brand and in collaboration with the Swiss Arbitration Association (ASA).

The Centre administers proceedings under the Swiss Rules of International Arbitration (the Swiss Rules), which were first enacted on 1 January 2004. The current version of the Swiss Rules entered into force on 1 June 2021. The Centre also provides mediation services under the Swiss Rules of Mediation. These rules were recently amended and took effect on 1 June 2021.

The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), based in Geneva, established the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center in 1994, to promote the resolution of intellectual property and technology disputes through arbitration, mediation and expert determination. The latest version of its Arbitration Rules entered into force on 1 July 2021. The WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Centre has dealt mainly with IP disputes in relation to, for example, patent and software licenses, trademarks and patent infringement. It also provides services in relation to domain name disputes.

Finally, the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS), located in Lausanne, is considered the world's arbitration institution for sports-related disputes and has its own arbitration

 © 2026 Legalease Ltd

and mediation rules. Procedures at CAS typically involve in appeal proceedings challenges against sports-related legal measures imposed by federations, such as disciplinary sanctions, financial claims, fines for rule violations, training compensation, or solidarity payments, and in ordinary proceedings sports-related disputes subject to CAS' jurisdiction.

6. Is there a specialist arbitration court in your country?

Switzerland does not have a court specifically dedicated to arbitration. However, setting aside proceedings for awards issued in international arbitrations are handled directly by the Swiss Federal Tribunal, which is recognized for the high quality of its decisions, its pro-arbitration stance and its time efficiency.

7. What are the validity requirements for an arbitration agreement under the laws of your country?

On a formal basis, Article 178(1) PILA requires that an arbitration agreement be made in writing or communicated by any means that allows it to be evidenced by text, e.g. e-mail. Signature is not a requirement for its validity.

On a substantial basis, Swiss law adopts an *in favorem validatis* approach, according to which an arbitration agreement is valid if it complies with any of the following laws: (i) the law chosen by the parties to specifically govern the arbitration agreement (which is very rarely chosen), (ii) the law governing the subject matter of the dispute (in particular the law applicable to the contract); (iii) or Swiss law.

The conditions mentioned above are also applicable to arbitration agreements included in articles of association or other unilateral documents (such as wills, foundation charters or trust deeds), as per Article 178(4) PILA.

8. Are arbitration clauses considered separable from the main contract?

Yes. Swiss law recognizes the principle of separability, according to which the validity of the arbitration agreement can be and is to be assessed separately from the validity of the main contract. This is embodied in Article 178(3) PILA.

9. Do the courts of your country apply a validation principle under which an arbitration agreement should be considered valid and enforceable if it would be so considered under at least one of the national laws potentially applicable to it?

Yes. According to Article 178(2) PILA, an arbitration agreement is valid if it conforms either (i) to the law chosen by the parties to govern the arbitration agreement, (ii) to the law governing the subject-matter of the dispute, in particular the law governing the main contract, or (iii) to Swiss law.

10. Are asymmetric arbitration clauses – for instance, where one party has the right to choose between arbitration or litigation while the other party does not have this option – valid in your jurisdiction?

The Swiss Federal Tribunal has yet to rule on the validity of asymmetrical clauses, and Swiss legal doctrine remains mostly silent on the matter. Nonetheless, some highly respected authors submit that, in light of the importance of party autonomy in the Swiss arbitration framework, asymmetrical clauses should be considered valid unless one of the parties has abused its bargaining power to force the weaker one into accepting an unfair arbitration clause.

11. In what instances can third parties or non-signatories be bound by an arbitration agreement? Are there any recent court decisions on these issues?

The principle of privity of contract by which the arbitration clause binds only the parties that have agreed to it is well established under Swiss law. However, non-signatories can, in specific circumstances, be compelled to arbitrate or may rely on the arbitration agreement to initiate arbitration. This may occur through the application of contract or corporate law principles such as e.g. agency, assignment, subrogation, third-party beneficiary or succession. If no principle is applicable, it is necessary to examine whether the non-signatory party implicitly consented to the arbitration agreement, for instance, through involvement in the negotiation, conclusion, performance or termination of the contract. Additionally, a non-signatory may be estopped from arguing that it is not a party to the arbitration clause, based on the principle of good faith (*venire contra factum*

 © 2026 Legalease Ltd

proprium).

Accordingly, the non-signatories will be part of the arbitration proceedings because they have become true parties to the arbitration agreement, either by agreeing to it or by replacing the original signatories. In Switzerland, the mere fact that two companies share a corporate link or belong to the same group is not, in itself, sufficient grounds for extending the arbitration agreement (what is known as the group of companies doctrine). The Swiss Federal Tribunal's understanding regarding non-signatories has been consistent for a long time and this position has recently been reaffirmed (Decisions 4A_144/2023, 4A_146/2023 and 4A_148/2023, all dated 4 September 2023).

The form requirement of Article 178(1) PILA does not prevent the extension of the arbitration agreement to third parties, provided that the original parties complied with it, according to established case law of the Swiss Federal Tribunal (DFT 129 III 727).

12. Are there any recent court decisions and/or legislative reform in your country concerning the choice of law applicable to an arbitration agreement where no such law has been specified by the Parties?

When the parties have not expressly agreed upon a determined law to specifically govern the arbitration agreement, courts and arbitral tribunals worldwide tend to apply either the law agreed to govern the underlying agreement or the law of the seat. In Switzerland, however, to choose one option over the other is rarely an issue given the *in favorem validatis* principle set forth in Article 178(2) PILA.

According to this rule, the arbitration agreement is valid if it is in accordance with any of the following laws: (i) the law chosen by the parties to govern the arbitration agreement itself, (ii) the law governing the subject matter of the dispute (in particular the law applicable to the contract), or (iii) Swiss law, which is the law of the seat of the arbitration. Notably, there is no hierarchy between these three laws as already decided by the Swiss Federal Tribunal.

Thus, the search for an implicit intent of the parties regarding the law applicable to the arbitration clause becomes practically irrelevant, as it does not matter whether the parties intended to apply the law of the seat (Switzerland) or the law governing the contract to the arbitration clause. Only in a very exceptional case would the parties argue an implicit intent to apply a law to the arbitration clause other than these.

13. How is the law applicable to the substance determined? Is there a specific set of choice of law rules in your country?

Under Swiss law, the parties have great flexibility in selecting the law applicable to the merits of the dispute. The parties may also agree on the application of non-national rules of law (such as the Unidroit Principles of International Commercial Contracts or the *lex mercatoria*). In the absence of such a choice, the arbitral tribunal will apply the law which has the closest connection with the case (Article 187(1) PILA).

The parties may authorise the arbitral tribunal to decide *ex aequo et bono* (Article 187(2) PILA).

While the PILA contains a detailed set of conflicts of law rules, these rules are applicable in state court proceedings only, but not in arbitration proceedings.

14. In your country, are there any particular requirements for and/or restrictions in the appointment of arbitrators?

The PILA does not provide any restriction on the appointment of arbitrators but provides that parties to an arbitration can challenge the arbitrator if circumstances exist that give rise to legitimate doubts as to his or her independence or impartiality (Article 180 PILA).

The IBA Guidelines on Conflict of Interest in International Arbitration are widely accepted in Switzerland and are used (as a yardstick and not as binding rules) by both the Swiss Arbitration Centre and the Swiss Federal Tribunal (e.g. in the recent decision 4A_288/2023 of 11 June 2024).

Unlike the rule set out in Article 13(5) of the ICC Rules, the Swiss Rules do not impose any restrictions on the nationality of arbitrators, providing the institution with greater flexibility to appoint sole arbitrators or presidents of the same nationality as the parties.

15. Can the local courts intervene in the selection of arbitrators? If so, how?

The local court might intervene where the parties cannot reach an agreement or if the members of the arbitral tribunal cannot be appointed or replaced for other reasons. In this case, one of the parties can request the

 © 2026 Legalease Ltd

court's assistance (Article 179(2) and (4) PILA). The court shall grant such request, unless a summary examination reveals that there is no existing arbitration agreement (Article 179(3) PILA).

16. Can the appointment of an arbitrator be challenged? What are the grounds for such a challenge? What is the procedure for such a challenge?

The grounds on which a challenge of an arbitrator is admissible are set out in Article 180 PILA, which is applicable in case the parties have not agreed on a specific challenge procedure (typically by referring to arbitration rules providing for such challenge procedure).

According to Article 180 PILA, arbitrators may be challenged in the following cases: (i) if they lack the qualifications agreed by the parties, (ii) in the event of a ground for challenge as provided under the arbitration rules chosen by the parties, or (iii) if circumstances exist that give rise to legitimate doubt as to their independence or impartiality.

Article 180a PILA sets out the challenge procedure as follows:

- a written notice of challenge shall be given to the challenged member of the arbitral tribunal and the other members within 30 days from the moment the challenging party becomes aware of the grounds for the challenge or could have become aware thereof had it exercised due diligence.
- the challenging party may request the state court to render a decision on the challenged member within 30 days of the filing of the written notice to the challenged arbitrator. The state court's decision is final.
- when the challenge procedure is ongoing, the arbitral tribunal can still continue the proceedings without excluding the challenged member, until a decision is rendered, unless the parties have agreed otherwise.

Article 180b PILA provides that any member of the arbitral tribunal can be removed by agreement of the parties and that a party may request the state court to remove an arbitrator if he or she is unable to carry out his or her duties within a reasonable time or due care.

17. Have there been any recent developments concerning the duty of independence and impartiality of the arbitrators, including the duty of disclosure?

As already stated in Question 14, the IBA Guidelines on Conflicts of Interest in International Arbitration are a useful tool for the determination of the independence and impartiality of arbitrators, with the Swiss Federal Tribunal having expressly referred to these guidelines.

Notably, the parties cannot rely only on the duty of disclosure contained in the IBA Guidelines on Conflicts of Interest in International Arbitration. Indeed, as stated in a recent decision by the Swiss Federal Tribunal (Decision 4A_13/2023 of 11 September 2023 and confirmed in Decision 4A_510/2024 / 4A_512/2024 of 31 January 2026 (the Jordan Chiles case)), the parties have the duty to undertake additional research, including on the Internet, in order to ascertain whether an arbitrator has provided sufficient guarantee of independence and impartiality (the so-called duty of inquisitiveness (*devoir de curiosité*)). The Swiss Federal Tribunal clarified that it is difficult to define the scope of the parties' duty in identifying elements which may give rise to doubt and held that a case-by case analysis shall be made, based on the factual circumstances. In any case, the Swiss Federal Tribunal affirmed that its examination shall be limited to the grounds for challenge that have already been raised during the arbitration proceedings.

The Swiss Federal Tribunal has also recently determined that any grounds for lack of independence and impartiality of an arbitrator must have existed during the arbitration proceedings and in any event prior to the rendering of an award for a setting-aside request of such arbitral award to succeed before the Swiss Federal Tribunal (Decisions 4A_288/2023 and 4A_572/2023, both of 11 June 2024).

18. Are arbitrators immune from liability?

Neither the PILA nor the CPC contain a provision on the arbitrator's liability. It is the prevailing view that, in the interest of the integrity of the arbitration, arbitrators should be immune from liability to the extent permitted by law. Under Swiss law, liability can be excluded by agreement, except for liability based on gross negligence or unlawful intent (Article 100(1) CO). This is reflected in Article 45(1) of the Swiss Rules, which provides that arbitrators are immune for any act or omission in connection with an arbitration proceeding conducted under the Swiss Rules, unless such act or omission is shown to constitute gross negligence or unlawful intent.

 © 2026 Legalease Ltd

In line with these principles, it is generally accepted that an arbitrator may indeed be liable for damages for breach of his or her duties. In 2018, the Swiss Federal Tribunal upheld a decision which held an arbitrator liable for damages because he had failed to render the award within the agreed time, which had resulted in the setting aside of the award (DFT 140 III 75).

19. Is the principle of competence-competence recognized in your country?

Article 186(1) PILA sets forth the principle of competence-competence, under which an arbitral tribunal shall decide on its own jurisdiction, while Article 186(3) PILA provides that the arbitral tribunal can do so by means of an interim award. And Article 186(1)bis PILA provides that the arbitral tribunal shall decide on its jurisdiction without regard to any action on the same subject matter pending before a state court or another arbitral tribunal, unless there are substantial grounds for a stay of the proceedings (Article 186(1)bis PILA).

An arbitral tribunal's award on its jurisdiction can be set-aside before the Swiss Federal Tribunal on the grounds that the arbitral tribunal has wrongly accepted or declined its jurisdiction (Article 190(2)(b) PILA). It is therefore not necessary to wait until the final award (Article 190(3) PILA).

20. What is the approach of local courts towards a party commencing litigation in apparent breach of an arbitration agreement?

If action is brought before a state court in apparent breach of an arbitration agreement, as per Article 7 PILA, such court shall decline its jurisdiction, unless (i) the opposing party has not raised any plea of lack of jurisdiction of the state court, (ii) the court finds that the arbitration agreement is invalid, inoperable or incapable of being performed, or (iii) the arbitral tribunal cannot be constituted due to reasons clearly attributable to the opposing party.

21. What happens when a respondent fails to participate in the arbitration? Can the local courts compel participation?

The PILA does not contain any provision dealing with defaulting parties. Such a situation is governed by the procedure determined by the parties or the arbitral tribunal as applicable to their dispute (Article 182 PILA). Any procedural provision is required to respect the parties' right to be heard and to be treated equally (Article 182(3) PILA).

With respect to institutional rules, Article 30(1) of the Swiss Rules provides that a respondent's failure to participate in the arbitration without showing sufficient cause for that does not constitute an obstacle to the continuation of the arbitration. Accordingly, the arbitration will proceed with or without the respondent's participation.

Local courts will not compel a party to arbitrate. Once a party is duly notified of the existence of the arbitration proceedings, it is up to that party to bear the consequences of its non-participation.

Even though a party may decide not to participate in the proceedings, it shall still be duly informed of every step and given the opportunity to comment.

Under Swiss arbitration law, the fact that respondent did not submit its defence does not lead automatically to the conclusion that the facts alleged by claimant are true.

22. Can third parties voluntarily join arbitration proceedings? If all parties agree to the intervention, is the tribunal bound by this agreement? If all parties do not agree to the intervention, can the tribunal allow for it?

There is no provision in the PILA that addresses the issue of joinder and/or intervention. Yet commentators consider that intervention and joinder should be admissible as long as there is an arbitration agreement binding on all parties (the original parties and the third party). In this case, the arbitral tribunal may allow the joinder or intervention despite jurisdictional objections because the additional party is considered a genuine party to the arbitration agreement, just like the original parties.

This understanding is in accordance with the Swiss domestic arbitration law. Article 376(3) CPC provides that joinder and intervention are admissible only where an arbitration agreement exists between the original parties and the party to be added to the proceedings, i.e. where the consent requirement is fulfilled. Such intervention and joinder are also further subject to the arbitral tribunal's consent.

If all the parties agree to the joinder or intervention, then all parties will be consenting to the arbitration agreement. In this case, arbitrators are likely to agree to the joinder or intervention. However, the arbitral tribunal is not bound

 © 2026 Legalease Ltd

by such an agreement as it may still decide not to allow joinder and consolidation depending on the factual circumstances.

With respect to the Swiss Rules, their Article 6 addresses joinder and interventions. Before the constitution of the arbitral tribunal, claims against additional parties shall be made through a notice of claim submitted to the Secretariat of the Court of the Centre. The arbitration shall proceed even if there is a jurisdictional objection, except where the Centre finds that there is manifestly no arbitration agreement referring to the Swiss Rules or where the agreements are incompatible in case of a multi-contract arbitration. The Centre's decision to proceed with claims against or brought by the additional party is without prejudice to the arbitral tribunal's decision. In case of a request for joinder or intervention filed after the constitution of the arbitral tribunal, it is then for the arbitrators to decide on it.

The Swiss Rules also allow that a party participates in the arbitration in a capacity other than an additional party (e.g. amicus curiae). In this case, the arbitral tribunal shall decide on whether to permit such participation and on its modalities after consulting with all parties and the third person.

23. What interim measures are available? Will local courts issue interim measures pending the constitution of the tribunal? Are anti-suit and/or anti-arbitration injunctions available and enforceable in your country? What is the approach of local courts in your jurisdiction to anti-arbitration injunctions issued in breach of arbitration agreements? Have there been any recent decisions on this point?

Article 183 PILA deals with requests for interim measures. The arbitral tribunal is authorised to grant provisional or conservative measures upon request of a party, unless the parties have agreed otherwise (Article 183(1) PILA). In Switzerland, there are no specific limitations on the types of interim or conservatory measures that may be issued in arbitration, allowing for a wide range of possibilities. These measures may, for instance, aim to prevent a party from breaching a contract by calling a bank guarantee or dissipating assets by selling specific shares. Interim measures can also ensure continued contract performance by ordering a party to continue delivering certain products. If deemed necessary, a party can request the state court's assistance to enforce such measures (Article 183(2) PILA). State court's assistance will also be provided even in case the seat of arbitration is outside the territory of Switzerland (Article 185a PILA, a provision newly introduced in 2021).

If the arbitral tribunal has not been constituted yet, a party may apply to state courts for interim measures. Once the arbitral tribunal has been constituted, the state courts remain competent to order interim measures (so that there is parallel jurisdiction of the arbitral tribunal and the state courts), unless the parties have agreed otherwise.

The Swiss Rules provide that, before the constitution of the arbitral tribunal, the request for interim measures can be submitted to an emergency arbitrator appointed by the institution (Article 43 of the Swiss Rules).

Anti-suit and anti-arbitration injunctions are not expressly excluded under Swiss law. Nevertheless, such measures remain relatively uncommon, as arbitral tribunals seated in Switzerland tend to be reluctant to grant anti-suit injunctions.

To date, there has been no decision by a Swiss court issuing an anti-arbitration injunction, and it seems highly unlikely that a Swiss court would issue such a measure or enforce one.

As to anti-arbitration injunctions issued in breach of arbitration agreements, Swiss courts have consistently upheld the principle of competence-competence and the autonomy of arbitral proceedings. To date, there has been no decision by a Swiss court enforcing an anti-arbitration injunction issued by a foreign court in breach of an arbitration agreement, and it appears highly unlikely that Swiss courts would do so, given Switzerland's strong pro-arbitration stance. There are no recent decisions on this specific point.

24. Are there particular rules governing evidentiary matters in arbitration? Will the local courts in your jurisdiction play any role in the obtaining of evidence? Can local courts compel witnesses to participate in arbitration proceedings?

There are no particular rules governing evidentiary matters under Swiss law and therefore the parties enjoy considerable freedom to set specific rules concerning the taking of evidence. In the absence of an agreement by the parties in this regard, it is for the arbitral tribunal to determine evidentiary matters (Article 182 PILA).

The arbitral tribunal (or a party with its consent) may

 © 2026 Legalease Ltd

request assistance of local courts if required, e.g. to hear a witness who is refusing to testify in arbitration proceedings (Article 184 PILA).

The state court shall apply its own law and on request, it may apply or take into account other procedural rules (Article 184(3) PILA).

In case the seat of arbitration is outside the territory of Switzerland, assistance of Swiss state courts may also be requested (Article 185a PILA).

25. What ethical codes and other professional standards, if any, apply to counsel and arbitrators conducting proceedings in your country? Do these codes and professional standards apply only to counsel and arbitrators having the nationality of your jurisdiction?

The Swiss Federal Act on the Freedom of Movement for Lawyers provides the relevant professional rules which licensed Swiss lawyers must follow. Moreover, the Swiss Bar Association has codified a set of rules which shall be observed by its members. Key duties include the duty to carry out the profession with care and diligence, as well as the duty to remain independent and to avoid any conflicts of interest. These rules and professional standards therefore apply to both counsel and arbitrators, if the latter are also licensed Swiss lawyers.

Swiss law imposes certain restrictions on success fees. Under the applicable rules, Swiss lawyers may not validly agree on a pure contingency fee, as this is said to create a potential conflict of interests between lawyer and client that might undermine the lawyer's independence and duty to act solely in the client's best interests.

26. In your country, are there any rules with respect to the confidentiality of arbitration proceedings?

There is no statutory provision under Swiss law imposing an express duty of confidentiality. Such an obligation is often found in the institutional rules agreed upon by the parties, e.g. Article 44 of the Swiss Rules. According to this provision, parties undertake to keep confidential all awards and orders as well as all materials submitted by another party during the arbitration proceedings, unless expressly agreed otherwise in writing.

Whether a general duty of confidentiality exists in the absence of an institutional rule remains unsettled in Swiss case law and literature. While there appears to be consensus that arbitrators assume a duty of confidentiality by accepting their mandate, the matter is more disputed as to whether the parties are under such an obligation. Some authors hold the view that the parties do indeed have a duty of confidentiality, basing their position on the legitimate expectations of the parties and the principle of good faith. However, other authors disagree and consider that there is no obligation where there is no specific provision or agreement to that effect.

27. How are the IBA guidelines on conflicts of interest and other similar soft law sources viewed by courts and tribunals in your jurisdiction? Are they frequently applied? Have any developments under the 2024 IBA Guidelines, including the expanded Orange List, the treatment of social media conduct, or due diligence obligations on parties, and the UNCITRAL Code of Conduct for Arbitrators been addressed by courts and tribunals in your jurisdiction?

Arbitral tribunals seated in Switzerland usually apply or use as guidelines the IBA Guidelines on Conflicts of Interest and the IBA Rules on the Taking of Evidence, as well as other similar soft law sources. The specific procedural rules set out by arbitral tribunals are usually largely based on the IBA Rules on the Taking of Evidence. Even when the specific procedural rules do not mention them, the parties usually proceed on the assumption that they will be used as guidelines (e.g. in the document production phase).

The Swiss Federal Tribunal has also expressly referred to the IBA Guidelines on Conflicts of Interest, stating that they constitute a “useful work instrument" when analysing the independence of an arbitrator or members of an arbitral tribunal (DFT 142 III 521). The Swiss Arbitration Centre also uses them as guidelines.

Regarding the 2024 IBA Guidelines on Conflicts of Interest, which include an expanded Orange List, guidance on the treatment of social media conduct, and enhanced due diligence obligations on parties, these developments have not yet been specifically addressed by Swiss courts or tribunals in published decisions. However, given the Swiss Federal Tribunal's established practice of referring to the IBA Guidelines as a “useful work instrument," it is expected that the 2024 revisions will be taken into account by arbitral tribunals seated in Switzerland as well as by the Swiss Arbitration Centre. Furthermore, in a recent decision (4A_478/2025 of 10

 © 2026 Legalease Ltd

February 2026), the Swiss Federal Tribunal highlighted, when referring to the Orange List of the IBA Guidelines, the particularities of arbitrator appointment before the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) which must be put into perspective due to the closed list and high number of cases where FIFA is involved.

As for the UNCITRAL Code of Conduct for Arbitrators in International Investment Disputes, adopted in 2023, it has not been specifically addressed by Swiss courts or tribunals to date, as its primary scope is investment arbitration.

28. How are the costs of arbitration proceedings estimated and allocated? Can pre- and post-award interest be included in the principal claim and costs incurred?

The PILA does not contain any specific provision regarding the determination and allocation of costs. In the absence of an agreement between the parties, the tribunal has considerable discretion to decide on costs, while observing any provisions set out in the applicable institutional rules, if any. In Switzerland, arbitrators often follow the "costs follow the event" rule, under which the costs are allocated to the parties in proportion to the success and failure of each party's respective claims and defences. These costs typically include arbitrators' fees, administrative fees of the arbitral institution, and the parties' expenses, such as legal fees, expert fees, and costs related to hearings.

From a Swiss law perspective, default interest on the principal amount is a matter of the law governing the merits of the dispute. In case Swiss law is the applicable substantive law, then pre- and post-award interest can be included on the principal claim.

With respect to costs, unless the parties have agreed otherwise, a party's claim for cost and compensation is governed by Swiss law (being the *lex arbitri*). While Swiss-seated tribunals would rarely grant pre-award interest on costs, post-award interest is common and can be claimed at the enforcement stage even if they have not been expressly awarded.

29. How are applications for security for costs viewed in your jurisdiction?

In Switzerland, it is well accepted that arbitral tribunals have authority to order security for costs which derives from their general power to order interim and conservatory measures pursuant to Article 183(1) PILA. The Swiss Rules also provide this authority in their Article 29(1). The threshold, however, is usually high.

Furthermore, security for costs are even applied by the Swiss Federal Tribunal when one party requests security for its legal fees in the event of setting-aside proceedings before the Swiss Federal Tribunal.

30. What legal requirements are there in your country for the recognition and enforcement of an award? Is there a requirement that the award be reasoned, i.e. substantiated and motivated?

Article 189 PILA states that the award shall be rendered in conformity with the procedure and the form agreed by the parties. Unless the parties agree otherwise, the award shall be in writing, reasoned, dated and signed. In a recent case, the Swiss Federal Tribunal held that when an award is not reasoned in accordance with the parties' agreement, it cannot de facto analyse in challenge proceedings the grounds for challenge due to the complete lack of information in the award itself and must reject the challenge (DFT 149 III 338).

Article 190 PILA provides that the award is final and – therefore – enforceable from the moment of the notification of the award to the parties. The enforceability of the award is generally not suspended by a challenge aimed at annulling the award.

Domestic awards, i.e., awards rendered by a Swiss-seated arbitral tribunal will be recognized and enforced just as any Swiss state court judgment. With respect to awards rendered by an arbitral tribunal whose seat is outside of Switzerland, Article 194 PILA sets forth that such awards will be recognized and enforced in Switzerland in accordance with Article IV of the New York Convention.

Unless there are exceptional circumstances, there is generally no need to initiate separate proceedings for the recognition of the award and obtain a declaration of enforceability (*exequatur*), but the possibility exists. Rather, the recognition and enforceability of the award will normally be examined by the court as a preliminary question within the debt enforcement proceedings.

31. What is the estimated timeframe for the recognition and enforcement of an award (domestic and international)? Can a party bring a motion for the recognition and enforcement of an

 © 2026 Legalease Ltd

award on an ex parte basis? Would the standard of review be different for domestic and international awards?

Both international and national arbitral awards are recognized and enforced in adversarial proceedings. Following the filing for the recognition or enforcement by the applicant, the defendant is invited to submit an answer to the application. The first instance court's decision is subject to an appeal, as is the decision of the appellate court.

Despite the fact that both recognition and enforcement proceedings are dealt with in summary proceedings with limited grounds for objection and means of evidence, the time it takes to actually enforce an award is generally difficult to predict. It is not uncommon for this to take more than a year, and in the case of a recalcitrant debtor it may take considerably longer.

The award creditor may apply to the court for an attachment of the debtor's assets located in Switzerland on an *ex parte* basis, if it can provide *prima facie* evidence of the existence of specific assets and their location.

Domestic awards are enforceable under the same rules as those applicable to state court decisions, in accordance with Articles 336 et seq. CPC. Unless the award must be considered null and void (because, e.g., the document presented lacks the constituent elements of an arbitral award), the debtor cannot raise any objections against the award as such at the enforcement stage.

Foreign arbitral awards are recognised under the New York Convention, in accordance with Article 194 PILA. As per Article IV(1) of the New York Convention, a party requesting the enforcement or the recognition of a foreign arbitral award shall submit (i) a duly authenticated original award or a duly certified copy thereof and (ii) the original of the arbitration agreement or a duly certified copy thereof.

Moreover, in accordance with Article IV(2) of the New York Convention, the filing of a certified translation of the aforementioned documents is required in case the award or the arbitration agreement is not in an official language of the country where the recognition or enforcement is sought.

32. Can arbitration awards be appealed or challenged in local courts? What are the grounds and procedure in this regard? Is it possible for parties to waive any rights of appeal or challenge to an award by agreement?

A challenge against an international arbitral award rendered in Switzerland must be submitted to the Swiss Federal Tribunal within 30 days of the notification of the award. Article 190(2) PILA sets forth the grounds based on which an award can be challenged: (i) irregular composition of the arbitral tribunal; (ii) incorrect decision on jurisdiction of the arbitral tribunal; (iii) the decision goes beyond the claims raised by the parties (*ultra petita*) or does not address one or more claims (*infra petita*); (iv) violation of equal treatment of the parties or their right to be heard; (v) violation of public policy.

Domestic arbitral awards can be challenged before the Swiss Federal Tribunal on two additional grounds, as per Article 393 CPC (which also includes the grounds set forth in Article 190 PILA), which are the following: (i) the award is arbitrary in its result, meaning that it is based on findings which are obviously contrary to the facts of the dispute, or because it constitutes an obvious violation of law or equity, and (ii) the costs and compensation fixed by the arbitral tribunal are manifestly excessive.

A request to the arbitral tribunal for correction (of typographical or accounting mistakes) or explanation of the award (in case it is unclear) or for a supplementary award (in case it failed to address claims) does not affect the 30-day deadline to challenge the award (Article 189a PILA / Article 388 CPC).

The Swiss Federal Tribunal is bound by the findings established during the arbitration proceedings. Before rendering the decision, the Swiss Federal Tribunal normally invites the defendant and the arbitral tribunal to comment on the request for challenge.

In addition to the annulment proceedings, Article 190a PILA provides for the revision of an award. The grounds for a revision are limited and comprise: (i) the discovery of new, significant facts, or uncovered evidence which could not be produced in the earlier arbitration proceedings; (ii) the arbitral award has been influenced by a criminal offence and (iii) circumstances have been found after the issuance of the arbitral award, which give rise to legitimate doubt as to the arbitrator's independence or impartiality.

The request for revision shall be filed within 90 days of the discovery of the ground for revision. A revision cannot be requested after 10 years since the award has been rendered, except in case of a criminal offence.

 © 2026 Legalease Ltd

If none of the parties has their domicile, habitual residence or seat in Switzerland, they may wholly or partly waive all appeals against arbitral awards (Article 192(1) PILA). The waiver may be contained in the arbitration agreement or in a subsequent written declaration of the parties. It must be made expressly. A simple reference to institutional arbitral rules providing for the finality of the award is not sufficient.

In any case, the parties cannot waive the right to a revision of the arbitral award on the ground that the award was influenced by a criminal offence.

33. In what instances can third parties or non-signatories be bound by an award? To what extent might a third party challenge the recognition of an award?

As a general rule, an arbitral award only binds the parties to the arbitration proceedings. In case of partial or universal succession in rights (e.g., in the case of an assignment, corporate restructuring such as a merger), the award may bind a person who was not a party to the arbitration. In addition, if the award modifies or annuls a legal relationship or an obligation arising therefrom, the award will be binding not only upon the parties themselves, but also on any third party (e.g., if the arbitral tribunal, upon a claim by a shareholder, annuls the resolution of a shareholders' meeting, the award will be binding on all shareholders who did not participate in the proceedings).

Under very exceptional circumstances, a third-party may have the standing to challenge an award. For example, a third party may have an interest in setting aside an award if it was somehow impacted by the arbitrator's decision in a case where it should have been provided with an opportunity to participate in the proceedings but was not. This could be the case in an intra-corporate dispute where a shareholder was unaware of the proceedings despite having a right to be informed.

34. Are there any rules / court decisions that regulate or prohibit third party funding of arbitration proceedings – for instance, where funding by an entity not involved in the dispute in return for a share of the eventual award may be barred – in your jurisdiction?

Third party funding is a matter which has not been regulated in Swiss law yet. Nevertheless, the Swiss Federal Tribunal has already confirmed its legality in decisions of 2004 and 2015 (respectively, DFT 131 I 223 and Decision 2C_814/2014 of 22 May 2015).

Swiss law does not provide for an obligation to disclose the existence and identity of a third-party funder, even though the legal doctrine in Switzerland partly supports such a mandatory disclosure.

While the Swiss Rules do not establish a duty to disclose either, the Centre published the Swiss Rules of International Arbitration: International Arbitration Practice Note in March 2023, whose para. 100 provides that parties are expected to disclose the existence and identity of the third-party funder, so as to enable arbitrators to conduct a conflict check and ensure that the involvement of a third-party funder does not affect their independence and impartiality.

35. Is emergency arbitrator relief available and recognized in your country? Are decisions made by emergency arbitrators readily enforceable?

Under Swiss law, there is no statutory provision on emergency arbitration. Nonetheless, emergency arbitration is widely accepted in Switzerland. Article 43 of the Swiss Rules contains specific provisions regarding the procedure for emergency arbitrator relief, including the effects of such decision (Article 43(8), of the Swiss Rules). According to this provision, a decision of the emergency arbitrator shall have the same effects as an interim measure issued by a regular arbitral tribunal. Accordingly, interim relief is binding on the parties and can be enforced in a state court.

That being said, unless the parties agree otherwise, the Swiss state courts remain competent to order interim measures, even if the applicable arbitration rules provide for emergency arbitration. In case a party anticipates that it will be necessary to enforce the interim relief sought, it may be more efficient to directly apply to the state courts and request the granting of interim relief, rather than first applying to the emergency arbitrator and then in a second step having the interim relief enforced by the state courts.

36. Are there arbitral laws or arbitration institutional rules in your country providing simplified or expedited procedures for claims under a certain value? Are they often used?

No mandatory provision under Swiss statutory law provides for expedited or simplified procedures, but institutional arbitration rules provide such procedures.

 © 2026 Legalease Ltd

Notably, the Swiss Arbitration Centre (then known as the Swiss Chambers' Arbitration Institution) was the first institution to introduce provisions for expedited procedures, doing so in 2004.

Article 42 of the Swiss Rules provides for an expedited procedure applicable to cases in which (i) the parties so agree or (ii) where the amount in dispute does not exceed one million Swiss francs (unless the institution decides otherwise, taking into account all relevant circumstances). The award must be rendered within six months from the date when the arbitral tribunal receives the file from the institution.

The expedited procedure under the Swiss Rules has proven to be a success, reaching 48% of all cases decided by the Swiss Arbitration Centre in 2024.

37. Have there been any recent court decisions in your country considering the setting aside of an award that has been enforced in another jurisdiction or vice versa?

With respect to enforcement proceedings in Switzerland governed by the New York Convention, Article V(1)(e) provides that a party can oppose the enforcement of an award in cases where (i) the award has not become binding yet, (ii) the award has been set aside or suspended by a competent authority in the country of its origin. The burden of proof of these two circumstances lies on the applicant in the enforcement proceedings.

The Swiss Federal Tribunal found in a decision of 2008 that the possibility of bringing such an action is not sufficient to render the award non-binding within the meaning of the New York Convention (DFT 135 III 136). Cases where the Federal Tribunal had to deal with objections against enforcement on the basis of a non-binding foreign arbitral award dates back to more than forty years ago. The Federal Tribunal denied the requests, on the grounds that the plaintiff did not submit the necessary proof (DFT 108 IB 85, 1982 and 110 IB 191, 1984).

38. Have there been any recent court decisions in your country considering the issue of corruption? What standard do local courts apply for proving corruption? Which party bears the burden of proving corruption?

Switzerland has a strong and effective legal set of rules to tackle corruption. The Swiss Criminal Code contains essential provisions on this issue. Articles 322ter to 322novies prohibit active and passive bribery of public officials, including arbitrators, as well as active and passive bribery of private individuals. These offenses are prosecuted *ex officio*, except for certain peculiar situations. In Switzerland, the standard of proof for proving corruption applied by local courts is “beyond reasonable doubt".

Corruption is viewed as corrosive to contractual integrity and as a distortion of fair competition—values that are central to Swiss law. Consequently, corruption constitutes an affront to fundamental Swiss principles, rendering it irreconcilable with Swiss public policy. For this reason, an award could be challenged (and enforcement of the award could be refused) on the basis that the award orders a party to pay bribes or otherwise approves corrupt practices.

With regard to the burden of proof, it is for the party bringing the challenge (or objecting to enforcement) to prove that corruption is involved but that the arbitral tribunal failed to consider it in the award. However, if corruption had already been alleged in the arbitral proceedings and the arbitral tribunal rejected the argument for lack of substantiation or lack of proof, the party will be precluded from invoking corruption again.

39. Has your country withdrawn from, or announced its intention to withdraw from, the Energy Charter Treaty? What is the status of the sunset clause in your jurisdiction?

Switzerland has not withdrawn from the Energy Charter Treaty (ECT) and has not announced any intention to do so. Unlike several EU Member States (including Germany, France, Spain, the Netherlands, and others) which decided to withdraw from the ECT following the failure of the modernisation process, Switzerland – as a non-EU state – has maintained its position as a party to the treaty. Switzerland's continued participation in the ECT is consistent with its longstanding support for investment protection and international arbitration. As regards the sunset clause contained in Article 47(3) ECT, it provides that the provisions of the ECT continue to apply for a period of 20 years from the effective date of withdrawal with respect to investments made prior to that date. Since Switzerland has not initiated any withdrawal, the sunset clause is not currently operative in relation to Swiss investors or investments.

40. Have there been any recent court decisions or

 © 2026 Legalease Ltd

legislative developments in your country with respect to intra-European investor-State arbitration, the Energy Charter Treaty, or the enforcement of intra-EU? Are there any pending decisions?

In a landmark decision dated 3 April 2024 (DTF 150 III 280), the Swiss Federal Tribunal ruled on the question of the jurisdiction of arbitral tribunals over intra-EU investment disputes. In relation to an arbitration award in favour of French investor EDF under the Energy Charter Treaty (ECT) against Spain, the Federal Court held that it was not bound by the ECJ judgment Moldova v Komstroy, which had held that the ECT did not apply to intra-EU disputes, and therefore affirmed the jurisdiction of the arbitral tribunal and confirming the award against Spain.

There are no pending decisions as of this date.

As regards the enforcement of intra-EU awards outside the EU, Switzerland's position remains that it is not bound by EU law or by the ECJ's jurisprudence, including the Achmea and Moldova v Komstroy decisions. Accordingly, awards rendered under the ECT or bilateral investment treaties in intra-EU disputes may be recognised and enforced in Switzerland under the New York Convention and the PILA, subject to the usual grounds for refusal. There are no pending decisions on this issue as of this date.

41. Have arbitral institutions in your country implemented reforms towards greater use of technology and a more cost-effective conduct of arbitrations? Have there been any recent developments regarding virtual hearings?

The Swiss Rules were updated in 2021, and two changes linked to the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic have encouraged greater use of technology: (i) an express provision regarding remote hearings and (ii) the possibility of filing a request for arbitration solely in electronic form.

The Swiss Arbitration Centre also supports paperless arbitration by not requiring hard copies of requests for arbitration or further documents, and by allowing notifications and communications with parties via email. Nonetheless, the Swiss Rules do not contain a default provision for electronic filings of the parties' submissions; rather, it is in the discretion of the arbitral tribunal to determine whether the parties' submissions should be provided in hard copies or electronically.

42. Have there been any recent judicial and/or legislative developments in your jurisdiction with regard to disputes involving ESG issues such as climate change, sustainability, social responsibility and/or human rights?

Regarding climate change, in 2020, an association for climate change filed an appeal before the Swiss Federal Tribunal accusing the Swiss Federal Council (the Swiss government) of not taking measures in field of climate change to meet the targets set out in the Paris Agreement. The applicant sought protection from an excessive global rise in temperature on the basis of Articles 2 (right to life) and 8 (right to respect for private life) of the European Convention on Human Rights (the ECHR). The Swiss Federal Tribunal dismissed the appeal on the ground that the association was not sufficiently affected by the alleged omissions (DFT 146 I 145, 2020).

The association filed a request before the European Court of Human Rights (the ECtHR). In April 2024, the Court issued its decision, ruling in favour of the association (Application no. 53600/20). In particular, the ECtHR affirmed that Switzerland had failed to protect its citizens from the global climate change in an adequate and consistent manner and ordered the state to reassess its global climate change strategy, which will be monitored by the Council of Europe.

Regarding human rights, in an earlier judgment (Application no. 10934/21), the ECtHR found Switzerland liable for violating Articles 8 and 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the ECHR. The case concerned an African athlete, Caster Semenya, who had complained that she had been unable to take part in international competitions because she had refused to lower her testosterone levels in order to comply with certain rules of the World Athletics. The athlete first challenged the rules before the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) and the Swiss Federal Tribunal, both of which rejected her claims. The ECtHR held that Switzerland had failed to provide "sufficient institutional and procedural safeguards" to allow her complaints to be examined effectively.

43. Have any international economic sanctions regimes been implemented (either independently, or based on EU law) in your jurisdiction recently? Have there been any recent decisions in your country considering the impact of sanctions on international arbitration proceedings?

 © 2026 Legalease Ltd

Since 2003, Switzerland has a sanctions regime in place based on the Federal Act on the Implementation of International Sanctions of 2002. Sanctions under such regime are predominantly of an economic nature.

Although not a member of the EU, Switzerland aligns itself with the sanctions and designations made by the EU. For example, the Swiss Federal Council (the government of Switzerland) took the decision in 2022 to adopt sanctions against Russia mirroring the packages of sanctions imposed by the EU in 2022 and the most recent changes made in relation to such sanctions were adopted in August 2025. Switzerland has also adopted sanctions concerning Belarus and Moldova.

An arbitral tribunal is obliged to comply with the mandatory rules of the applicable *lex causae* (DFT 120 II 155), regardless of whether this is the law chosen by the parties or the law determined by the arbitral tribunal. Therefore, if the economic sanctions derive from the applicable *lex causae*, they shall be observed. If the economic sanctions belong to a set of rules other than the *lex causae*, they shall be considered only in case they are directly applicable as foreign mandatory rules. There is some uncertainty in the Swiss legal doctrine as to the application of such rules. While some authors tend to consider that the foreign mandatory rules are applicable only if they are closely connected to the case, other authors advocate that the question should be resolved by determining whether the state that enacted the mandatory rules has an overriding and legitimate interest in applying such mandatory rules regardless of the law applicable to the contract.

In any case, it is more likely that economic sanctions resulting from mandatory rules will be considered applicable if they are recognized by a large community of states as part of the international public policy, rather than just by a single state or a small group of states.

A landmark decision of the Swiss Federal Tribunal directly addressing the impact of sanctions on international arbitration is Decision 4A_359/2025 of 15 January 2026, which concerned a Russia-Ukraine gas transit dispute arbitrated under ICC Rules with its seat in Zurich (with an award of approximately USD 1.1 billion). The Russian party argued, *inter alia*, that the Western sanctions regime had rendered the arbitration agreement inoperable under the doctrine of *clausula rebus sic stantibus*. The Swiss Federal Tribunal rejected this argument, holding that the sanctions regimes applicable to Russia contain express carve-outs for legal services related to arbitration, and that the sanctions therefore neither affected the validity or operability of the arbitration agreement, nor deprived the arbitral tribunal of jurisdiction.

The Federal Tribunal further dismissed a challenge based on the alleged lack of independence and impartiality of an arbitrator, but it did so on the ground of forfeiture, i.e. that the challenging party had failed to raise the objection in a timely manner during the arbitration proceedings. An *ordre public* challenge was also rejected.

This decision confirms Switzerland's position that international sanctions do not, as such, preclude arbitration proceedings and that the existing carve-outs for arbitration-related legal services ensure the continued functioning of international arbitration even in the context of comprehensive sanctions regimes.

44. Has your country enacted any regulation and/or implemented any rules, guidlines or regulations regarding the use of artificial intelligence (AI), generative AI or large language models in the context of dispute resolution?

Switzerland has not enacted any specific regulation or implemented any rules, guidelines or regulations regarding the use of artificial intelligence (AI), generative AI or large language models in the context of dispute resolution, including international arbitration.

There is currently no binding framework at the federal level governing the use of AI tools by counsel, arbitrators or institutions in arbitration proceedings.

However, it should be noted that Switzerland is in the process of developing a broader AI regulatory framework. The Swiss Federal Council has been monitoring developments at the EU level, including the EU AI Act, and is expected to present proposals for AI governance in due course.

In the meantime, the general professional and ethical obligations applicable to Swiss lawyers and arbitrators (see Question 25) apply equally when AI tools are used in the course of arbitration proceedings.

45. Are there any specific legal, institutional, or procedural frameworks in your jurisdiction governing the arbitration of digital asset or blockchain-related disputes? Have there been any court decisions in your jurisdiction concerning the validity or enforceability of arbitration agreements incorporated into smart

 © 2026 Legalease Ltd

contracts or digital asset terms?

Switzerland does not have specific legal, institutional or procedural frameworks dedicated exclusively to the arbitration of digital asset or blockchain-related disputes.

However, Switzerland's existing arbitration framework is well-suited to accommodate such disputes. Under Article 177(1) PILA, any claim involving an economic interest may be submitted to arbitration, which encompasses disputes arising from digital asset transactions, blockchain protocols and smart contracts. Switzerland has been at the forefront of blockchain regulation through the DLT Act (Federal Act on the Adaptation of Federal Law to Developments in Distributed Ledger Technology), which entered into force in stages between 1 August 2021 and 1 August 2023 and introduced, *inter alia*, ledger-based securities ("*Registerwertrechte*") and a framework for DLT trading facilities.

These developments provide a solid substantive legal basis for resolving digital asset disputes in arbitration. As regards the enforceability of arbitration agreements incorporated into smart contracts or digital asset terms, there are no published court decisions in Switzerland specifically addressing this issue.

However, given the broad form requirements under Article 178(1) PILA – which requires only that the arbitration agreement be made in writing or communicated by any means that allows it to be evidenced by text – it is generally accepted in Swiss legal doctrine that an arbitration clause embedded in a smart contract or in digital terms of service that can be evidenced in text form should satisfy the formal requirements. The Swiss Arbitration Centre has also positioned itself as an institution open to technology-related disputes.

Contributors

Jean Marguerat
Partner
jean.marguerat@mll-legal.com



Urs Boller
Partner
urs.boller@mll-legal.com



Tomás Navarro Blakemore
Counsel
tomas.navarro@mll-legal.com



Matthias Leemann
Senior Associate
matthias.leemann@mll-legal.com



 © 2026 Legalease Ltd