

INDIA ADR WEEK 2026 – 08 SEP 2026**SESSION 4****THE LAST APPRENTICE: WHO TRAINS THE LAWYERS AND EXPERTS OF
2035?****SPEAKERS:**

**MODERATOR: NEETI SACHDEVA, REGISTRAR & SECRETARY GENERAL,
MCIA**

ANDREW CANNON, PARTNER, HERBERT SMITH FREEHILLS KRAMER

BINDI DAVE, CO-MANAGING PARTNER, WADIA GHANDY & CO

KARTHIK BALISAGAR, SENIOR MANAGING DIRECTOR, FTI CONSULTING

**NICHOLAS PEACOCK, INDEPENDENT ADVOCATE AND ARBITRATOR,
PEACOCK ARBITRATION**

ALISHA SHARMA: Welcome back, ladies and gentlemen. I hope everyone enjoyed their lunch. As we move into afternoon, we turn our attention away from current practice and towards the future of the profession itself. The legal landscape is evolving at unprecedented speed. Technology is redefining the way we work, expectations are shifting and the nature of disputes are becoming ever more specialized. This brings us to a fundamental question - Who will train the lawyers and experts? Who will be the leading these disputes a decade from now? And next session is hosted by the IBA Arbitration Committee, Professional Ethics Committee and FTI Consulting, titled "The Last Apprentice: Who Trains the Lawyers and Experts of 2035". The session will be moderated by Neeti Sachdeva. Joining her are Andrew Cannon, Bindi Dave, Karthik, Balisagar and Nicholas Peacock. This is a conversation that touches the core of our community's future, and one that will resonate deeply across generations of practitioners. I would now request everyone to welcome our moderator and panellists on this stage.

Before we begin the session, I would also like to invite Mr. Alipak Banerjee, Secretary IBA Arbitration Committee, Professional Ethics Committee, on this stage.

ALIPAK BANERJEE: Good Afternoon. Thank you for joining us. This year for the first time, IBA Arbitration Committee and Professional Ethics Committee have jointly collaborated to put together two panels one in Mumbai and the second one will be in Delhi on Friday at 2:30. Thank you Neeti, Madhukeshwar and MCIA for allowing us this opportunity. The panels have been kindly sponsored by FTI Consulting and Jurisphere. On behalf of IBA, I extend a very warm welcome in my capacity as a Secretary of the Professional Ethics Committee. And this is also a unique opportunity for me to introduce Neeti in her own event for the first time perhaps, and thank you for agreeing to moderate the panel. And both the topics as you see, I mean for Mumbai we have the topic "The Last Apprentice: Who Trains the Lawyers and Experts of 2035". It's a thought provoking future perspective, futuristic topic. For Delhi, we have, "Advocate, Client and Arbitrator: Redrawing the Ethical Lines in Arbitration." So we're talking about ethics because this is a collaboration between the Ethics and Arbitration Committee. For the Mumbai leg of the panel, Neeti, over to you to introduce the panel and have the discussion. Thank you so much.

NEETI SACHDEVA: Thank you, Alipak. You were expecting Varuna to be here. Trust me, so was I. I did not know that I will be roped in at the last minute to be moderating this session, but Varuna was very kind enough to at least send me the questions, which has been shared with the panellists; so, I can breathe. I've always wondered, I do end up speaking a fair bit across the globe for different MCIA roadshows; I never get invited to speak at the India ADR

TERES

1

2 Week. So, when this opportunity came I said gladly let me take this on, but now I realise why
3 nobody calls me. It's... I'm so running from one post to another post and trying to get this
4 they're like, Neeti will not know what to talk about. So, I'll try and do my best today.

5 We have a very interesting topic which is, "The Last Apprentice: Who trains the Lawyers and
6 Experts of 2035." I think we should have got some 12-year old or a 14-year old to be on the
7 panel and give this maybe we'll ask them to comment on it later, but right now I have people
8 who've had some good 20- 25 years of experience on my panel and to give this. But why is this
9 topic important? When I sat down to think about it, this topic is important because how we
10 have grown in the international arbitration. When we joined the profession and we were the
11 apprentice, there was a predictable route that we all had to take. As an interns, we had to
12 photocopy the documents, run around with a senior in the court with the files, then we got
13 upgraded, we became associates and then we were asked that before filing, go through every
14 document is there no page is missing. Then we got upgraded a bit more and then we became
15 senior associates, and then we were asked to do memos, which probably most of our seniors
16 just threw in the bin, didn't read it. To cut the long story short, I think the idea was that we did
17 the grunt work. Why? Because the grunt work was the curriculum, and that is where we
18 learned by the judgment of what we are doing under the supervision of our seniors.

19 Today, what we intend to do is that, talk about what's going to happen in 2035. AI is here, I'm
20 not going to make it a very boring conversation just about AI, but is this grunt work being
21 taken over? How would we teach? Is the curriculum changing? And those are some of the
22 questions which I have a very distinguished panel who's going to be answering: Andrew, Bindi,
23 Karthik and Nick.

24 So, let me begin by asking an easy question to Bindi, you first. Before we discuss the future,
25 let's go to the past, right that's where we learn from, and see that the tectonic changes have
26 taken place in the past in this context, what's the one change you would say, which over the
27 last 10-15 years that has most altered how younger practitioners are trained today? And let me
28 also say did you see this coming or did it just come upon on you?

29 **BINDI DAVE:** Okay. So, that's many questions rolled into one, Neeti. I hope I am able to
30 answer all of them properly. But before I answer the question, I liked the topic and the title as
31 to who will train the juniors of tomorrow, I mean 2035. And I thought, you know, as they say,
32 if you ask a wrong question you get a wrong answer. I think the question should have been,
33 "Who do we want that the juniors be trained by?" So, thus far, of course, the way the profession
34 has grown, the way the industry is, it's always the seniors who, you know, groom and train the

2 juniors. Do we want this to change? Do we want AI to train the juniors? I think that's the
3 question that we have to ask first. And if you ask me, I think the answer is surely, no. We don't
4 want AI to be training our juniors. AI, the way I see it, is a tool, is a means to an end, and it's
5 not the end itself. And therefore, we have to use AI for the right reasons. Yes, of course it makes
6 our life easy, of course it makes it very efficient, of course, from the client's perspective it helps
7 reducing the billable work hours. But if you ask me whether AI is going to train the juniors,
8 no, I don't agree with that at all, and we should not let that happen. I think as seniors that is a
9 choice available to us and we must exercise that choice that we use AI wisely. So, I'd like to
10 start with that. And then coming to your question, what change I see?

11 So, I think the first thing that I see a considerable amount of change is in the way we do
12 research. I remember so... well, I try very hard to look young, but I'm not. I've spent 30 years
13 now in the profession. And I was just, you know, talking to my colleagues that when we started,
14 we would do research. Firstly, the first thing that you would look at is the bare Act, to
15 understand how the provisions are crafted. Then you would pull out the commentary. Looking
16 at the commentary, you would pull out the references to the case law. And then as juniors, we
17 would be sent because all this would happen in court whilst you are arguing the matter. The
18 Counsel will scribble something, and as a junior what you had to do was to run to the High
19 Court library, pull out the judgment, hope that the book has not been taken by somebody else,
20 hope that the book is there, and then of course, pull out the correct judgment, quickly read it
21 and then explain to the Counsel whether it helps or doesn't help.

22 And the most, I would say, the item that we would cherish the most or would protect the most
23 with our guarded lives was the High Court library card, because when you would borrow a
24 book from the library, they would take your card and a slip on which of course, you would have
25 written what book you need. Because we would have lost our cards so many times, actually as
26 at my firm, what we would do is behind the slip we would write the name of the Counsel, so
27 that if the book is ever not returned, then I know who I have to go back and get the book from.
28 So, this is the research that... you know, this is how we would do the research and when I
29 started. Of course now I don't even need forget commentary, forget the journals, forget the
30 bare Act, all I need to do is use Harvey, use Claude and you know I'm there. So I think that is
31 a big change. I won't, however, call it tectonic because while the whole journals and research
32 your Manupatra, SCC, all of that have, I would say come through gradually. It's AI I think,
33 which is the only one thing which is I would say taken us by a little surprise. We weren't
34 expecting it to take over in the manner that it is taking over. And coming back to what I said

TERES

1

2 in the opening, I think it is a choice available with us to ensure that we control AI and not that
3 AI controls us. So that's what I...

4 **NEETI SACHDEVA:** Nick, would you want to weigh on this question as well? Did you see
5 this change? What is the change that you think and did you really see this coming?

6 **NICHOLAS PEACOCK:** Yeah thank you. Thank you and thank you to the IBA and to FTI
7 for this invitation. Like Bindi I'm going to go back a bit further than 10 to 15 years because that
8 was only yesterday and I was getting trained some time with the, '90 at the start of it. I
9 absolutely agree with Bindi I think the way we do research has changed a lot. I was thinking
10 about this and I think it's actually come a bit full circle, because like Bindi when I was a junior
11 and I was sent off to research, you were sent off to research. You went to the library and you
12 probably spoke to librarian first and said "help". But like Bindi, Bindi talks about going bare
13 Act and then commentary. Very same in the UK. You would go to a textbook as soon as you
14 could or Halsbury's Laws of England which contains everything you ever need in the guidance
15 to go to go next. And then it seemed to me there was an interregnum when a lot of the juniors
16 that I was supervising in the law firm you'd say to them, go and do some research and they
17 wouldn't move and they'd just start typing. And in that period it seemed there was a lot of data
18 out there. We'd go straight to Westlaw, Lexis or one of the databases and then juniors would
19 pull out a whole lot of case law on a few keywords, but without much structure to it, because
20 they hadn't gone first to the commentary. The textbooks that helped them with somebody
21 senior, an authoritative distilling down and focusing them on where to go in the statute or the
22 cases. And it seems to me actually AI might have brought us back to that point now. Because
23 with AI you ask the question and AI goes off and aggregates and synthesises all that data. And
24 so, presents the juniors of today with an answer rather than just a whole lot of... "I found these
25 100 cases for you." So, in that way it's good. Of course, whether that answer is authoritative
26 and right, we'll probably come on to on the panel. That's right.

27 One quickly one last bit of training I thought, scratching my head and thinking back to those
28 days in the late 90s, what did I do that nobody does now and what was useful? I'm going to
29 put in a plea for the humble attendance note. That bit of work the junior came into the room,
30 the most junior person in the meeting with their pen in their hand, scribbling away, taking the
31 note of the meeting, writing down the action points, justifying their place in the room when
32 otherwise they might not be in that meeting, why is that junior person here or there taking the
33 notes. They come up with the action, they produce the actions after the meeting. And that
34 person therefore was the most attentive listener in the room. You paid attention, you got to
35 hear the senior discussions going on, the strategy being formed, you wrote up the note

TERES

1

2 afterwards, so you understood what was going on and you were responsible for taking forward
3 the actions. I think the absence of that, which I probably didn't see coming, is a shame because
4 frankly, an AI generated script or just a vaguely verbatim record of what was said or the closest
5 word that the AI can get to what was said, is not the same and loses a bit of training for those
6 juniors.

7 **NEETI SACHDEVA:** I agree with Nick on this. I remember very recently, about a year and
8 a half or two years back, right, and we would have this business development meetings or
9 you're meeting people and there is a conversation going on I'd say, "Okay, hold on, I'll put up
10 my little red diary, note it down. After the meeting, I should send this out, I should do this."
11 Two years back I went with my case manager to one of the meetings and I thought, I'll do this
12 she's like, "Hold on, I've already got everything recorded, I'll tell you what needs to be done."
13 I said, "Wow, things do have come a long way which we didn't see coming." I totally agree with
14 you. I do have a few questions or follow ups on AI, but let me just get Karthik in first here.
15 Karthik on the point of Witness examination, right? Things have been changing from the
16 perspective of lawyers and Expert Witnesses. How is training of younger practitioners
17 changing to keep pace with these changes in your area of practice, you would say? A bird's eye
18 view probably on that.

19 **KARTHIK BALISAGAR:** I mean, I want to be honest here, the practice hasn't caught up yet
20 because we're still trying to figure it out. And if there's anybody in the room who's already
21 figured out, please, you know, give me some time and I'd like to talk to you. Having said that,
22 I think it's extremely important to understand our business model and the consulting business
23 model or the professional services business model. You have the expert who comes with a lot
24 at stake - reputation, credibility, technical excellence, experience, so on and so forth. So, he
25 charges for that. And then you have a huge pyramid, the machinery that does the grunt work,
26 right? Reading a lot of documents, assisting the expert with the thought process, thinking,
27 process and arrive at a conclusion. So, that was the old model or probably the current model,
28 and that is how the businesses work, right? You have a lot of billable hours in the bottom of
29 the pyramid, and then you have fewer hours but more quality-oriented hours at the top, and
30 that's the commercials. Now what AI does, as all of you know, is it takes away some of the
31 grunt work, and therefore, the entire billable hour, as a concept, becomes a challenge. With
32 that, is an associated element how do you form... how is the profession formed if you don't
33 allow them to get trained? And there are interesting questions there because our profession is
34 a very peculiar profession; you get paid to think about what never happened.

35 **NEETI SACHDEVA:** Exactly.

TERES

1

KARTHIK BALISAGAR: Okay? It's not it's not like going back in time and looking at, you know, some standards or some case laws; I'm not I'm not simplifying your job as lawyers, but it's slightly more complicated. And to rely on AI in those circumstances is not straightforward. So, what does the client pay for? The client pays for technical expertise and experience, just not the knowledge, but firsthand real-world knowledge about that issue.

Second is the ability to communicate, and this is extremely critical, both written and verbal communication for an expert. How do you communicate very, very difficult ideas, complex ideas into simpler ideas such that a Tribunal is, you know, is convinced about it, right? Because you're talking about plausibility here, not possibilities.

NEETI SACHDEVA: Absolutely.

KARTHIK BALISAGAR: And third one is willing to stake your reputation on that opinion. Currently the model doesn't do that. Now, how do you then train somebody to get there if you are automating all of the grunt work? And that becomes very interesting. So, the current... And I'm being very honest and candid here we haven't figured out... I mean, we are a large organization, we are still figuring it out. I know, a lot of organizations are figuring this out. On the expert work, what we are currently asking people to do is, firstly, check your Confidentiality Agreement with the client; are you allowed to use AI or not? And of course, we can get into what arbitrators procedurally want to do and that's another dicey topic.

Second is, not feeding biased prompts, right? And that's a very heavy topic which I'll come back to, because not many people talk about bias; they talk about hallucination, they talk about, you know, wrong sources and all of that and all of that is a problem, but that's less of a problem than bias.

And thirdly is, informing the expert that AI has been used. Sometimes, juniors tend to get overexcited... and how about this prompt you feed somebody else Mr. X report, can you find all the flaws in this report? That's such a wrong way to approach from an independent expert standpoint, because the other expert might have reasonable points, reasonable grounds, factual grounds as to why that person has taken that position. So, if you feed this to an AI tool, AI tool will somehow generate 10 ideas, and there is a lot of anchoring bias there. So, you need to be careful. So, you need to train your people on how to use the tool and how not to rely on AI at the current stage.

And the most important point is the art of thinking. The logical deduction, the reasoning, all of that is extremely important in our business, more important than just you know, whether

TERES

1

2 your Excel sheet matches or the numbers. That work will be outsourced ultimately can be
3 outsourced. But the thinking process is not. And so that is... what was most important is the
4 art of thinking and communication for us and that still remains so today. So that continues to
5 be the training ground for us.

6 **NEETI SACHDEVA:** I agree. I mean, I'm reminded of a short anecdotal story about Edison
7 who invented the bulb, right? Somebody came to him and said, "What's the point? Now you've
8 invented the bulb? Everybody knows how to make it." And he said, "Everybody knows one way
9 of how to make it they do not know the 99 different ways of how not to make it." And I think
10 that's where for us is as well, right? AI giving the prompts can give you, but where does it get
11 the thinking and what is missing? Nick... before I come to you, Andrew just give me one
12 minute. Nick do you think from an Arbitrator standpoint, how are things changing, the
13 training of the younger practitioners to be Arbitrators?

14 **NICHOLAS PEACOCK:** It's probably I think you start from the question of what do people
15 want from an Arbitrator, and I think that then tells you the training that you need. I think,
16 Clients and Counsel, you know, you want someone experienced and with good judgment and
17 rather importantly, the ability to run the process. What you probably don't necessarily want is
18 somebody who can just read through thousands of documents in 24 seconds and find the
19 needle in the haystack, because that's what AI does and that's what the Counsel hopefully have
20 used AI to do already. Is it changing the training? I think that arbitrators tend to, you know,
21 be a generation behind really I think the cutting edge of the use of AI will and should be within
22 the law firms, within the Counsel who are deploying it. I don't think you want the Arbitrators
23 themselves to be cutting edge, I think you want the Arbitrators to be able to understand and
24 deploy the new technology as it approaches. And you know, those of you who've been doing
25 this job for, let's go 10, 15 years back now and think the technology that was coming in then
26 was electronic submissions and filing, and not turning up necessarily for in-person hearings.
27 And we required the Arbitrators, at that time, and I was a junior one at that at that stage, to be
28 able to receive documents by email, and perhaps not just to use a Hotmail email address with
29 no security attached to it, and to be able to get on virtual calls and to be able to find their way
30 around a soft copy bundle without demanding hard copies be sent in triplicate to their
31 chambers.

32 So, is the training changing? I there's not that much training to be an Arbitrator, other than
33 the job you've done beforehand. You know, you train to be an Arbitrator by doing all those
34 cases that then enables people to say, "Oh, he's probably done a bit of that. He's seen this
35 before and we vaguely trust him/her; let's give them a job of being the Arbitrator." But yeah, I

TERES

1

2 don't think you'll see Arbitrators sitting down and going to the frontiers of AI use. Those that
3 have tried, I think so far have been rather caught out. And you know, there's some unfortunate
4 very rare instances where Arbitrators have tried to get AI to write part of their judgment for
5 them, which haven't gone so well. So I think let's hold back on the on the frontiers of AI use
6 for Arbitrators, for now.

7 **NEETI SACHDEVA:** I mean, we will deep dive into the second part of it on the AI and the
8 use of it. But Andrew, let me get down here on one of the most... my favourite topics, speed,
9 right? As an institution, you're always talking about that we are speeding up the processes.
10 Now the procedural things have been pruned up. We've always known that one of the best
11 ways for the younger people to learn was to see through the process, the difficulties in that
12 process at every stage how it went by and there was a learning curve to it as well. Do you think
13 this overzealous, if my if I may put it... I'm not talking from an MCIA perspective, but yes, if I
14 put on that hat and say that this overzealous of trying to prune, be faster, summary awards, all
15 that process is somehow, are we then missing out an opportunity to train our younger lawyers
16 by this?

17 **ANDREW CANNON:** Very good question, Neeti, thank you. Before I answer it, I want to
18 just to go back to the notetaking. One of my pearls of wisdom that I received as a very young
19 lawyer was, never go into a Partner's office without a notepad because you never know what
20 you're going to be asked, and then you don't want to find out as you walk away from the
21 meeting, you've forgotten everything that you were instructed to do. Well, nowadays, of course,
22 you go on to a Teams call and then you find that the trainee has invited an AI bot to sit on that
23 Team's call with you and transcribe every word that you say. So, we really are only well... But
24 can it make it faster and speed. And before we really get into how AI helps us do that more
25 generally, is it a good thing? Yes, arbitration was supposed to be faster and cheaper. You still
26 ask, I think a majority of people who don't practice in international arbitration, what's the
27 difference? And faster and cheaper is the answer that you will get. It's what we were promised
28 but we all know it doesn't always deliver. But of course, speed and efficiency is the right thing
29 for us all to be looking to achieve and the institutions and the MCIA, among them, have taken
30 great steps to try to achieve that and support users of arbitration in the pursuit of that goal.

31 I have some statistics. The ICC Dispute Resolution Statistics for 2025 show, between its
32 introduction in 2017 and in 2025, over 1,000 cases were administered under the expedited
33 procedure, with a record of 189 cases in 2023 alone. And of course, the expedited procedure
34 itself did away with certain things like the terms of reference which were perceived to be time
35 consuming. Of course, now the new ICC Rules have done away with the Terms of Reference

2 for the standard procedure as well. Now people are lamenting the demise of the terms of
3 reference. In any event, there's constantly innovation. The ICC, also in their 2026 Rules, have
4 now introduced a highly expedited procedure which aims to reach an award within three
5 months of the CMC. SIAC itself has a large number of expedited requests and of course the
6 Mumbai 2025 Rules introduced an early dismissal and summary procedure as well. It's not
7 just the institutions the legislation, the amended English Arbitration Act that was finally
8 passed last year, now allows summary awards, where there's no real prospect of success on
9 particular claims or issues. So, it's a... it's a big part of what we do; it's a big part of what we
10 should be doing. But does it as you say, Neeti, does it necessarily mean shortcuts or that the
11 process is any less rigorous? I think we've all worked on expedited arbitrations and probably
12 the answer is, no, it doesn't and it shouldn't. But there are of course risks.

13 How expedited procedures can actually help? Of course, you see more cases, you see more
14 complete cycles, your judgment calls are tested more frequently, you see if they work or not. If
15 you're stuck as an associate on a massive case, that's all you do, you're doing some enormous
16 document review exercise for months and months on end. Your skills as a lawyer they're
17 developing to some extent but not as much as if you were doing three months, six month
18 expedited arbitration, seeing cases from start to finish in a regular basis. Your feedback loops
19 are better and enhanced, and it brings you more strategic responsibility at an early stage of the
20 case. But of course, there are risks as well from the learning and development perspective. The
21 risk of compression driving the work upwards, and we'll come back to this again in the context
22 of AI. If you're doing things more quickly, the temptation is to give it to the more senior lawyer
23 because you don't have time to go... to work it through, you don't have time for the junior to
24 learn to set it out and then maybe I'm going to need to correct it all at the end. Of course, 9
25 times out of 10 that's not the case, but there is always that fear or that prejudice perhaps in the
26 more senior lawyers.

27 Also you give that responsibility if you own that first memo of advice, you prepare for the CMC.
28 As I said, you're making real strategic choices and if you miss out on that then that can be a
29 concern. And of course, your procedural muscles will get less exercise as it were. 46% of
30 expedited cases, again, ICC statistics in that same period 2017 to 2025 were decided without a
31 hearing; so, you lose that experience as well. So, pros and cons, what really matters fast or
32 otherwise is you're managing the process as well as you can, you're involving the team, you're
33 still doing what you were doing before on a on a micro scale, but you're taking account of all
34 of these different things in the interests of efficiency.

TERES

1

2 **NEETI SACHDEVA:** Great. Bindi, would you want to weigh on this and what's your view
3 about it? Are we sort of losing to train because we are speeding up the process?

4 **BINDI DAVE:** No, I don't think so at all Neeti. I don't agree with that at all because I think
5 the process has not changed, like when you do final hearings, and at least, I'm comparing it
6 with how I would have done matters before the Bombay High Court or you know, any other
7 court in India. I think we are actually seeing a disposal. Otherwise, I think before we had
8 arbitrations, and I'm not even getting to fast track, I'm saying just pure arbitrations, I think it
9 would be a second generation who would actually see the matter. And people who have been
10 here will, you know, know that, because as juniors, like say when I joined, we would be sent to
11 the godown to pull out files which would be all covered with dust and whatever, and then you
12 would know that this is a suit which was filed 20 years ago and it's now getting listed for final
13 hearing. So, you have to get ready, you get in touch with a client, we've lost contact, stakes have
14 lost their meaning, clients are sometimes not even alive, you know. So, we've seen that. So,
15 when you compare that with a disposal, I think that is... I mean it's one can't even compare I
16 would say.

17 And in terms of speed I think. So as I said, it's only that things happen faster. But it's exactly
18 as Andrew said, it's not as if you're cutting corners or anything. And I think it's a very welcome
19 change that we see; people actually get to see a trial. I think where otherwise it would be, as I
20 said, the next generation. So, I think it's a... And also from the clients perspective, I would say,
21 forget just the lawyers, I think the process is same. We still go through the way a trial would
22 have been done, even otherwise.

23 **NEETI SACHDEVA:** Right. And Karthik, let me get you in here on the point that... let's get
24 deep dive into the AI itself, right? The different uses, what are we using it for, what could we
25 use it for? And I have a specific question to say that that AI is now we know is doing some of
26 the grunt work, right? We discussed about it you alluded to it earlier. Something like document
27 review, a first draft research and now we also hear about the quantum modelling support. If
28 that was the training ground, then what's replacing it?

29 **KARTHIK BALISAGAR:** Thanks. I don't know what "quantum modelling support" actually
30 means, but I'll take it to mean I think... probably not and now I'll say...

31 **NEETI SACHDEVA:** But now I'll say we picked it up from AI to tell us that they're doing it
32 so yeah, I take it we're doing it okay.

KARTHIK BALISAGAR: I'm thinking of a new title for myself. Anyway, there's a paper called "Jagged Frontiers" and I invite everybody to look at it and read it out; it's very interesting. It was... it's still a live experiment being done by some of the top notch professors at multiple universities in the US and in England. It's a collaboration between universities on AI. And they have put together a group of 750 consultants at BCG and they're testing them for efficacy of AI. And the results are stunning. For people who are at a certain level of performance, the AI... certain high level of performance, the improvement in their output was about 11%. For people below a certain threshold, whatever the threshold is, the improvement was a staggering 31%, okay? So, there is efficacy, there is improvement.

But what is then hidden behind that is, in cases where the model was not well trained, very esoteric topics, there was an increase in 19% of errors, in the output, across some 50 consultants. Now imagine 19% of errors, whatever that means, being adopted by an expert in an arbitration where millions or billions of dollars are at stake. So, it can get very messy very quickly if you don't understand where the frontier ends. So, the... we really need to understand what is the difference between real intelligence and Artificial Intelligence. And I think Artificial Intelligence packages it very confidently. As you said, real intelligence you know, your associate or consultant, junior consultant will come with a draft which, you know, shows up errors, and you teach them. But you pick up a draft that's been written by AI, it's very hard. I mean, it's hard for me to pick up errors very quickly because it's so confident in the way the output is laid out. So, you need to be careful. You know, it's great to have a first draft, great to have this quantum modelling, but if it is not showing up and surfacing those errors in the way we all are used to reviewing, then your whole review process needs to change. And this is a very important aspect of what we are thinking about at our firm, as to how you need to tackle this entire review process. Because the normal way of picking up errors which used to surface, is no longer there if AI is adopted. So, that becomes an important point as to, you know, what you should be doing internally.

Then I think the consequence of this AI adoption would be that the judgment that you learn over a period of time, over a number of years, I think that will shrink.

NEETI SACHDEVA: Yes.

KARTHIK BALISAGAR: You need to be able to.... because much of your work now as a junior associate or a consultant, whether it's Excel modelling or whatever or drafting, is now being outsourced, with some caveats, of course it's dangerous, but you need to. So that is in itself fine, but how do you know whether what judgment, what reason, what practical

TERES

1

experiences comes in for those judgments, how do you measure that? That becomes a problem. And one of the things that comes to my mind is an example, you know, and for an expert, I think it's a very real example is a pilot, you know, carrying thousands of passengers. Most of the planes are equipped to land on automatic mode; you don't need... But all pilots are trained to land at manually. So, how do you develop judgment or those skills if you're not building up the model yourself? You don't know where the errors can come up, you don't know how the models... modelling quirks work. If you don't know that, what are you going to test then once the model is presented to you. So that thinking... again, you come back to art of thinking it's not easy. So this is I think a bit of a circular reference. In the short term it's all exciting, but actually when it forms the profession, over years, I don't know how this is going to be handled, whether it's lawyers or experts.

So, that's one. And then finally somebody said is art of reading a room. Who's going to teach you? I mean, I'm sitting there testifying in front of Mr. Peacock and he's not happy with something, I'm not saying my view or opinion I should know where to concede. I need to see what my... That's where I bring in credibility to myself and my opinion from an expert standpoint, who's going to teach you that? Those things matter and I think that's where the first draft and quantum modelling will not help you enough.

NEETI SACHDEVA: I couldn't agree more with this on Karthik. And I remember when we started off in the profession, we were told that one of the great jurists. It's said that the practice of law is 20% law, 80% theatrics. You need to know when to say what and when to hold back, right? When to read the room and see the judge is not with you or the Arbitrator is not with you, and to pause, go on to your second topic and then slyly come back to the first point again when you see that the Arbitrator is now more with you. I do not know how we're going to do that. But before I have more comments on this because I have some views on the AI as well, Andrew, what is your view on this topic itself? What we heard from the expert, let's hope lawyer as well.

ANDREW CANNON: It's very interesting. I agree with everything that Karthik was saying. Going back to my earlier trainee description, another pearl of wisdom handed down is, if you're not sure about something, make sure you say it, make sure you tell me. You've reached a conclusion, how have you reached it, what have you not done, what are you worried about, what are the questions you've got? The worst kind of training is someone who comes to you very confidently with an answer, exudes confidence and tells you it's absolutely this, and you think wow, this guy's really confident, must be right, and of course, then you find out later on it's not the case. So, of course AI can do that; just takes more prompts, but as things stand, it's

TERES

1

2 a very inexact science. So, I agree with all of this the grunt work as you said earlier, Neeti, how
3 do we... how do we replace that with the learning curve, the training that comes with it?

4 Everyone now is going to be a partner, they're going to receive a draft and they're going to be
5 commenting on that draft. Who's going to be constructing the draft, structuring it, working
6 out the process behind it? How do we replace that training ground? And it's a very, very
7 important challenge for all of us, not just on the purely legal skills, as I said, understanding,
8 argument, facts, analysing all of that data. The strategic judgment that we were talking about
9 earlier, the oral advocacy, the soft skills. And there's I wanted to mention a case to which sort
10 of illustrates how urgent this is, and it may be a case that I'm going to look at that nods in the
11 room to see how many of you are aware of that here, but the case it's called **Cork against**
12 **Smith**. It was a case in the English court. It's also sometimes called the **Pinsent Masons**
13 case because of the law firm involved. Are there nods? There's certainly nods. And I mean I
14 mentioned the firm simply I mean it's a salutary lesson to us all. But it's an example of in that
15 case and I'll summarize it very briefly, but a junior associate used an AI program that was
16 being piloted by the firm to research a query about a power, a statutory power for to order a
17 liquidated release on a block transfer order. The AI hallucinated a non-existent provision. That
18 went back up through the senior associate and the partner, with no one checking the primary
19 source, and it went to the judge. The judge then looked at this and scratched his head and said,
20 "Well, I'm not sure that's right", and I... and wrote back to the law firm and said can you please
21 check this because I'm not sure this is correct. That went to the senior associate. The partner
22 at this stage was on holiday and was never reverted back to the partner. The senior associate
23 then passed it back down to the junior associate and said "Please check this". The junior
24 associate at that point, and as a senior lawyer, you receive a letter from the judge this is about
25 the most important thing you do as a lawyer. But junior associate, I'm not casting aspersions,
26 this is a new generation that I'm not as familiar with, went back to the AI and said, I've received
27 this query from the judge, were you correct to tell me what you told me before? And the AI
28 said, "Yes, I think so, though you should check the primary source, but I think I am correct."
29 And I mentioned this case because I would commend reading this judgment to all of you who
30 are interested in where we are with AI and the law as things stand, because the judge... What
31 happened is, this went back to the judge no, we're absolutely correct and we confirm it and
32 they use the AI's reasoning process to confirm that this power existed. Again, the senior
33 associate didn't check the primary source either and the partner wasn't involved. And at this
34 point, the judge then ordered the law firm to surrender all of the information around how
35 they'd arrived at this decision, and there was... and considered bringing contempt of court
36 proceedings against the firm. The firm itself, to its credit, then agreed to cooperate entirely

with the Law Society, submitted itself to the Regulation Authority in the UK for a full investigation of what had happened. And the judgment records every prompt and every discussion that took place. And it's, as I said, it's a very interesting lesson into how the mindset is AI can answer all these things for me. In the old days we'd go to three statutes, we'd look at the primary legislation and that there wasn't even this dialogue about how AI was being used. Of course, every law firm has had so many emails from their managing partners about this case because of the lessons that it's taught everybody yeah, and the consequences you can imagine. But I mention it because it's a very good illustration of this issue.

NEETI SACHDEVA: I mean, hallucination by AI is of course, we've been hearing about it. I mean this of course has been one of the cases rather, unfortunate, but a very learning ground for us again, right? But this is not unheard of. We know of American courts where the judgments are just made up before the courts and then decisions are being relied and made upon it. Yes, as of today, hallucination exists. But what our topic is about of 2035, right? AI is getting better, it will get better and we are learning from our experience that we should go and check, and we're telling our juniors as well, don't just rely; go and check again. So, Bindi, tell me this that what are you going to do in 2035, right? So how do we ensure that the younger colleagues keep checking for hallucination, even after AI stops giving them an obvious reason to?

BINDI DAVE: Okay. Firstly, I'm not sure whether I'm going to be around in 2035. But before I come to hallucination and I think that's not the only problem. In fact, you know, as Andrew mentioned, I also want to share one case which we encountered and my partner Ishan is here. Fortunately, he's trained pre-AI, so he did everything that was required to be done. A client came to us who had been served with a notice, a legal notice for a breach of a contract which he'd entered into, and there was a response which also was sent out. I was fairly impressed. And as Karthik mentioned, it was a very confident response and you know, I was like, yeah, okay, you know, I mean... And he had not gone to a lawyer. So, I was firstly of course, crediting him with, you know, that expertise and then he of course, confided that he'd used AI to send out the response. It was not a bad response. Anyway, I told him to send all the papers, and my partner Ishan, I put him on the matter and you know. Fortunately, as I said, because he's trained pre-AI, went through everything, called for all the papers. So, the notice alleged breach in respect of Contract A. The response of course was denying the breach in respect of Contract A. And when Ishan went through all the papers, some papers were missing so he called for the other papers. We realized that in fact Parties had entered into a Contract B pursuant to A. So it was... there was a no issue. Parties were governed then by a different contract. And the

TERES

1

2 response which went out denied the... well, if the paper... everything would have come to us
 3 on Day-1 and I would have been drafting the first response, obviously we would have said that
 4 we are no longer governed by this contract, you know, that was just as simple as that. But
 5 either the client didn't think it important to share that paper with the AI or AI, whichever AI
 6 was using didn't pick it up I don't know what went wrong there. But so, it's not just
 7 hallucination, it's also how you I mean what information you feed in if there's a some mistake
 8 here or there you will end up.... Fortunately, he came to us at the right time and then we ended
 9 up sending a further response and then we tried to, you know, train tracks and cover
 10 everything. But I think... So I would say that since your question was how would you ensure
 11 that this doesn't happen? Well, we are only going to learn with our mistakes. So, I mean it's
 12 not as if... And as I said we can't do without AI because it is helping. As I said, it is definitely
 13 making our jobs easier. It's definitely making things efficient, but you cannot let AI control us.
 14 You will still have to check your work. And I think it's ultimately if a partner is signing on that
 15 work, it's his work, he has to ensure that he has seen everything, he has examined everything.
 16 If he is relying on a junior, then the junior must be taught to take responsibility for the junior's
 17 work because that is how I think delegation works. So, I guess everybody will have to be
 18 responsible at their level to ensure that... And you don't start by saying "what is wrong?" No.
 19 You have to proceed on the basis that this is my work and therefore I must ensure that there's
 20 nothing wrong in it I have covered all tracks, I have checked everything, I have ticked all the
 21 boxes.

22 **NEETI SACHDEVA:** So I think Andrew was right we all are going to start as partners, right?
 23 We will have a draft and then we will say, okay, can I rely, can I send it to my senior partner
 24 and have it? Karthik what do you think about it, how would you make sure that all these
 25 hallucinations are taken care of, your juniors do look into it, recheck it and when they come
 26 with the confident draft, you are confident about it?

27 **KARTHIK BALISAGAR:** Answer is I don't know. But I'll try and answer and an interesting
 28 side note as an... I don't know if all of you have seen this less quoted example on AI, is in the
 29 US courts, this guy was arguing for himself, the Plaintiff, and it had some odd blank spaces,
 30 white spaces. He had inserted white text in the white spaces in the hope that the judge is going
 31 to use AI in sort of formulating his judgment, and it was all prompting AI to sort of take the
 32 position that he was taking. And the judge, you know, clever judge said the white spaces are
 33 odd, looking at it, and then realize and he passed it on to somebody internally and said, figure
 34 this out what's going on. They figured out there's white text prompts written all over,

TERES

1

2 prompting AI machine... the hope that AI machines would be used. So more advanced ways
3 of... you know, naughty ways of using AI.

4 But coming back to the point, I think hallucination is less of a problem; it's... I think again,
5 going back to your point, 2035, I'm hoping that would go away. My problem and I've written
6 a paper on this, is the bias. It is not seen and there are different types of bias and a lot of
7 research is being done as we speak. The first is, you know, when you put a prompt... you know
8 you're an independent expert, right? If you're doing if you're in this business. You can't put
9 prompts like, you know, this is the other side's expert, expert report or these are the facts we
10 need to take this position, could you please help me with this? Whatever the prompt is, there's
11 already bias. And now there is enough science behind prompt engineering that it's very hard
12 to move AI away from the first prompt. So whatever prompt you put in the first time and then
13 say you know, whatever Claude, or whoever it is, no, no, please don't take that into
14 consideration, take this into consideration, it will not move completely. And the science and
15 engineering and they're trying to do away with this problem. But imagine this in our world and
16 you sort of feed that into an expert report, it gets complex and so, and this is called "anchoring
17 bias".

18 The second one is training data bias. And I don't know how many of you know how training
19 data works, but all of these models are trained on what is publicly available, whether it's books,
20 whether it's other sort of news or whatever, it is research papers, and they're still trying to
21 build that training data. Firstly, that is a microcosm, right? There's only a certain amount of
22 data there; not everything that's available. So, if your topic again as I said before is esoteric, is
23 niche or it's dependent on experiences, AI training data might not help as much or it might
24 give you wrong results. So, training data bias based on what the AI has learned, based on
25 what's publicly available or has been fed to it, matters.

26 Okay, there's another private data, I don't know how many expert firms I'm sure the law firms
27 are already doing this, is to use data to the extent they have confidentiality arrangements with
28 their clients to train AI on the private data that they have, right? To the extent that is different
29 for different expert firms and that is incremental knowledge there; that becomes very
30 important. So that training data is again important how your tool is learning.

31 The third one is the most dangerous one and not many people are talking about it. It is called
32 the correlation bias. There's a research being done where 25 LLMs, Large Language Models
33 were asked a simple question and the output was seen amongst these 25 models. It was all
34 correlated, it was all clustered, it was all within a narrow band of answers. The same question

TERES

1

was then put to 15,000 individuals and you got much, much, much better colour, much varied answers, and therefore, there was diversity in thought. So the problem is if two very competent experts experienced experts are relying, in 2035 I'm talking about, on these tools, then the obvious question we're all worried about today is, is the expert independent of the client? The question in 2035 will be, is the expert independent of the machine? And I think that's a very important question. Not much is being discussed, but I would urge people to think about it.

NEETI SACHDEVA: Very interesting. I should be enforcing time, given that I make the other panellists do it. So, I do see that I have about 11 minutes or 10.5 minutes. I do have just one rapid fire question, and then we'll take the questions from the audience. So, get ready to ask difficult questions. This is not AI answered, this is all going to be in-person, intelligent answers that you're going to get right? So get prepared with it I'm warning you off. So, one rapid fire question starting with you Nick, on this. One skill from your own training days that you think will be obsolete by 2035, and one that will become more valuable?

NICHOLAS PEACOCK: Okay, thank you. Obsolete skill. Many people may have heard of Professor Julian Liu, who's one of the founders of international arbitration, founded the Queen Mary School of International Arbitration, was also Andrew and I happily can say was one of our mentors in the law firm Herbert Smith and taught all of us how to do international arbitration. He in his own turn had his problems with technology. And one of the things that Julian would sometimes do of an evening, usually about 06:30, 07:30 or later, is wander the floor waving a piece of paper, and walk into the room of the youngest person he could find on the floor who was still there and say, "Do you know how to use the fax machine (because I don't)? Could you go and send this for me?" So sending a fax I think is a skill I haven't needed to break out for a few years; that's probably gone. In terms, do you want me to deal with what a skill you will need?

NEETI SACHDEVA: Okay, we'll first take it what's going to become obsolete and I'll come back to.

NICHOLAS PEACOCK: One first, then, fax machine.

NEETI SACHDEVA: Let's see what will become obsolete by 2035?

KARTHIK BALISAGAR: What I would say that we are too married to the idea that if you are very good at Excel, you know you've cracked it, I think excel skills will become obsolete very soon if it isn't already now.

NEETI SACHDEVA: Oh my God, don't tell me I was just about trying to learn them now.

2 **ANDREW CANNON:** What a relief yes. Bindi?

3 **BINDI DAVE:** Obsolete is a strong word I'm not sure whether I'll say it will become obsolete,
4 but I think at least in the light at least in disputes practice if I may say so, strategy is 9/10. So
5 I think if you get completely dependent on AI, then strategy is something that probably may
6 go out of the window. And sorry, it's a rapid fire question, but I'll if we have the time, I'll tell
7 you how strategy works.

8 **NEETI SACHDEVA:** Go ahead, yes.

9 **BINDI DAVE:** So, I remember in my junior days we were representing three Indian banks
10 who had all defaulted on letters of credit by this one Swiss bank, and so, the other side, the
11 Swiss bank filed three separate suits against our three clients. One was the weakest because
12 that bank had done nothing in terms of securing itself; other two were slightly better. The
13 Plaintiff on the other side must have wisely filed the weakest suit first and then the other two.
14 The way it works in Bombay, summary suit, summons for judgment, it's a half an hour hearing;
15 either you're on this side or that side. And the advocates and the Plaintiffs would have thought
16 that they would have gotten away if they would have got, you know, decree in the first suit,
17 then it would have followed the same, though the others were stronger. And we sat and
18 thought, how do I change the sequence because the suits were filed in such that the first one
19 would have been heard first. And we strategized, we took out an application for further and
20 better particulars in the weakest one, so ensured that that one got derailed. We completed
21 pleadings in the other two and therefore that one the other two suits got heard first and the
22 strategy actually worked. Because we got unconditional leave in the first suit it went without
23 saying that we got unconditional leave in the other two as well. So, the point I'm making is I
24 think that kind of strategy comes which comes with experience, is something that is... possibly
25 we are going to lose it if we become completely dependent on AI and... So, sorry we are coming
26 back to AI because I mean, that's where we are seeing what is the future. So I think that is one
27 thing that I feel is really one must ensure that we don't lose it is what I would say.

28 **NEETI SACHDEVA:** Yes, Andrew.

29 **ANDREW CANNON:** I'll miss the musty old libraries that we used to be sent to when it
30 wasn't in the law firm library, you had to go to the university library or the court library or
31 whatever I'll miss that though. There may still be a niche area for the really obscure things that
32 aren't yet uploaded. I think probably just the ability to produce a competent generic first draft
33 of things, as we've been saying, I think that will be automated for the vast majority of things
34 that we do day-to-day and that will, I think become obsolete.

TERES

1

NEETI SACHDEVA: Nick, I come back to you the next part of the question, right? What one skill will become more valuable in 2035.

NICHOLAS PEACOCK: Yeah, I think the ability to determine what is private and confidential and what isn't. I think is just becoming more and more important. And I think in many of our private lives and especially the next generation, you're living a lot more without much privacy or confidentiality, maybe you're giving it up willingly or unthinkingly. And I think we've already spotted in this discussion that the use of AI brings with it an awful lot of questions around where the boundaries of confidentiality are. And I think in this practice where I'm pretty sure that users of arbitration will continue to value the confidentiality of the process, the ability to know when you are compromising that will be all important.

NEETI SACHDEVA: Karthik, very quickly one

KARTHIK BALISAGAR: I think it's the art of persuasion whilst remaining independent. There's a lot packed behind those words, but I think that becomes really important, if the profession survives.

NEETI SACHDEVA: Oh my, my! Well...

KARTHIK BALISAGAR: If I am gone, you're gone too.

NEETI SACHDEVA: You're going to be the next one. Yes, Bindi.

BINDI DAVE: So, I think thinking on your feet is something that will become very valuable because people will resort to AI for anything and everything. I think whether it's advocacy or, you know, structuring a transaction or negotiating a deal, I think it'll be very... I think the one thing that will be really valued is you are able to survive without any computer, without any AI, without any phone, and that is, I would say thinking on your feet probably.

NEETI SACHDEVA: Lovely. Yes, Andrew.

ANDREW CANNON: I think the skills that make us fundamentally human, that's what will be the most valuable. Sitting in a hearing room, reading the room, the things that are unsaid, the facial expressions of the Arbitrators when you're giving that... when you're giving your arguments, cross-examining Witnesses, building trust with your clients so that they come to you rather than put something in a computer. AI can't sit across a table and know what's unsaid. That will remain an essential skill.

TERES

1

NEETI SACHDEVA: I just have one wish that conferences, like this do not just get away. We still interact. And when Varuna can't make it, you don't have an AI asking questions, you still get a Neeti to do that for you. Thank you very much it was very interesting. We do still have a couple of minutes, if anybody would like to ask a question, we do have some mics which we can get around. Yes please can we... if you could just introduce yourself.

MAJID: Hi. I'm Majid and I'm a corporate attorney. So you know a slightly different profile. But you know, just two observations and then I'll come to the question. You know, AI seems to have thrown information asymmetry out of the window, something that lawyers really utilized for a very long time and monetized it also at some level. The other thing is that lawyers have also been slow to change at some level. Now when we think about who's going to be joining the profession in 2035, it's going to be very AI-native... it's going to be a very AI-native generation. They will have seen, you know, 10 years of possibly, you know, high-end AI and it would be far better than what it is right now. How does our role as senior practitioners change to ensure that there is... you know, the output that goes out is just right? Maybe we have to reimagine entirely what our role is at some level, and that's a question I keep asking myself, because I feel like, you know, there is a sense of romance to how we were trained and it was beautiful, it was great, but the generation that's coming in is going to be hooked on to entirely different things. Just something that I keep thinking about.

NEETI SACHDEVA: That's right. I think Karthik did allude to it and said that that we will also have to change as to how we now function and what we have learned, unlearn and to deal with this. Do you have a question after that comment as well or is... that. Very quickly if you could in 30s, let us know your question.

MAJID: I wanted to ask how do we change? What is our role? We can't be doing the same things that we've been doing or we have been taught to do, right? So, we need to do something different now.

NEETI SACHDEVA: Does anyone on the panel have a magic wand to say that how will we change to that? Andrew, do you want to take a shot at it?

ANDREW CANNON: Quickly, I mean, I think we... We inevitably will change, but we need to identify precisely these skills that are still going to be valuable and make sure we train for those skills, and train to use the AI in the best, most effective way to ensure it's accurate. Have more exposure to those moments that build legal judgment, to the strategic decision making. We still have to ask the right questions. So, we will still need... we will still need that training. And we use AI... we sound a bit pessimistic maybe on the panel there are so many

TERES

1

opportunities. The junior lawyers have AI as an incredible adversary in mooted competitions or mock cross-examination. Test your case theory, what have I got wrong, what have I not spotted. There are huge opportunities here but you've still got to have that fundamental judgment yourself.

NEETI SACHDEVA: We probably want to start. Yes.

KARTHIK BALISAGAR: Just two examples. I don't have an answer. Look at what's happened to the automobile industry today. You're you know, whatever horsepower cars from Germany, is now competing with BYD, right? So, you will probably have to not call yourself legal services, you'll have to call yourself legal tech services or something like that. So there will be a change, as Andrew you have suggested.

NEETI SACHDEVA: We'll ask AI what we need to change. Any other question? I have just about yes 10s. We'll take just one more minute and we'll finish it right here. If you could introduce yourself and keep your question short, please.

VISHALAKSHI: Good afternoon, everybody. Many thanks to MCIA and for the wonderful insights that were shared on AI. My name is Vishalakshi. I'll be very quick. So my question is addressed to all the panel members and its relation to one specific point that Nicholas mentioned. You said, Nicholas, that Arbitrators in general should not be as tech savvy or should not use... in comparison to Counsel and Parties and other stakeholders, Arbitrators should not be very tech-oriented because they need to review the details and everything. But do you not envisage a competition... do you not envisage a market where there is going to be a competition between AI rendered awards and human rendered awards? And at some point of time this like AAA, what AAA is doing and what other institutions are doing? Companies and markets will want our awards to be, you know... like they would be comfortable at the end of the day for Arbitrators and for other Parties to use AI comfortably. And maybe somewhere down the line, that is what is envisioned. I mean, that is what is there, like AI rendered awards will be the future at some point. So, how do... because I think our younger generation, we still have 20 to 25 years down the line to become Arbitrators. So, for the next 20 to 25 years, how do you see Arbitrators handling AI and technology? To what extent they should be using it? I mean, I get it that this is not related to the topic, but how should they be using it and to what extent?

NEETI SACHDEVA: Nick, do you want to take that?

TERES

1

NICHOLAS PEACOCK: Yeah, well I don't think... it's not that Arbitrators shouldn't be tech savvy. I think, I was saying I don't think Arbitrators will be at the cutting edge of this. I don't think it's for Arbitrators to get ahead of the market and get ahead of the Counsel who are in front of them, and I think the... I think the answer to your point is, the process has to retain the confidence of the users and the users will decide what they want. Now if the users want a judgment of an individual, that individual must be able to operate the process and use the technology as part of that process and deal with Counsel who are using the technology to operate the process that the client wants at that time. Can an in-person Arbitrator compete with AI? If that's what the client wants? I really don't think so. I mean, it's there already. If clients want to use AI just to feed all their documents in and ask the computer what the answer is, they can do that now. And I can certainly envisage a world, and it will probably creep upon us, where it'll start with low value consumer disputes, the kind you have now, with Amazon, you know this turned up and it was broken. Well, there's no person making the decision to give you a refund there; that's all AI already. And then that'll creep forward and there'll be traders who say, well, we have a whole basket of oil and gas disputes. They're not worth very much, so let's try feeding those into AI and see if we can live with the knocks, you know, the good awards, the bad judgments, it is worth it overall for our for our convenience? And then the threshold at which you stop using AI and turn to an actual person, may move. But I don't think an Arbitrator can compete with that, if that's what the client wants to use. So, I think it all comes back to what it is that the users have confidence in and what they want to... what they want the Arbitrator or AI to do.

NEETI SACHDEVA: We'll also see a lot more protocols coming up and seeing that how Arbitrators need to do. I mean, there are a lot more questions I'm sure, but like I said, I need to enforce the rule that I create. And Anushka is right standing here and nodding and not approving that I've taken a minute more than what I was promised. So, thank you very much. I would request all of you to please join me in thanking my panellists for what was a very interesting session, I would say. And I'm glad that Varuna could not make it so I could ask all those questions. And hopefully we'll have the next session of saying that 2045 what we're going to do in the next IAW session we should discuss that. Thank you very much for being a wonderful audience as well. Thank you.

ANUSHKA MANSHARAMANI: Thank you to our moderator and panellists for this interesting and forward looking discussion. I request the panellists and the moderator kindly step forward for a group picture. The next session will start at 04:30. Thank you.