



NSAI
Standards

Standard Recommendation
S.R. CWA 16026:2009

Standardisation of Online Dispute Resolution Tools

S.R. CWA 16026:2009

Incorporating amendments/corrigenda issued since publication:

<i>This document replaces:</i>	<i>This document is based on:</i> CWA 16026:2009	<i>Published:</i>
This document was published under the authority of the NSAI and comes into effect on: 27 November, 2009		ICS number: 03.120.10
NSAI 1 Swift Square, Northwood, Santry Dublin 9	T +353 1 807 3800 F +353 1 807 3838 E standards@nsai.ie W NSAI.ie	Sales: T +353 1 857 6730 F +353 1 857 6729 W standards.ie
Údarás um Chaighdeáin Náisiúnta na hÉireann		

CEN

CWA 16026

WORKSHOP

November 2009

AGREEMENT

ICS 03.120.10

English version

Standardisation of Online Dispute Resolution Tools

This CEN Workshop Agreement has been drafted and approved by a Workshop of representatives of interested parties, the constitution of which is indicated in the foreword of this Workshop Agreement.

The formal process followed by the Workshop in the development of this Workshop Agreement has been endorsed by the National Members of CEN but neither the National Members of CEN nor the CEN Management Centre can be held accountable for the technical content of this CEN Workshop Agreement or possible conflicts with standards or legislation.

This CEN Workshop Agreement can in no way be held as being an official standard developed by CEN and its Members.

This CEN Workshop Agreement is publicly available as a reference document from the CEN Members National Standard Bodies.

CEN members are the national standards bodies of Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and United Kingdom.



EUROPEAN COMMITTEE FOR STANDARDIZATION
COMITÉ EUROPÉEN DE NORMALISATION
EUROPÄISCHES KOMITEE FÜR NORMUNG

Management Centre: Avenue Marnix 17, B-1000 Brussels

Contents

Foreword	5
1. Scope	7
2. Normative References	8
2.1 Normative References	8
2.2 Informative References	8
3. Survey of ODR Models and Providers	10
3.2.1 The ODR providers surveyed	10
3.3 Transversal analysis	13
3.3.1 Scope of application	13
3.3.2 Type of service.....	13
3.3.3 Costs and Charges	14
3.3.4 Type of claim.....	14
4. Analysis of ODR Processes	16
4.1 Categorisation of ODR Models	16
4.1.1 Facilitative, Advisory and Determinative Processes.....	16
4.1.2 Internal Progression.....	16
4.1.3 Table of Comparisons.....	17
4.1.4 Active and Passive Roles	17
4.2 Consensual Nature of ODR	18
4.3 Analysis of Actors and Roles	18
4.3.1 Parties.....	18
4.3.2 ODR Providers.....	19
4.3.3 ODR Platform.....	19
4.3.4 Neutrals.....	19
4.3.5 Representatives	20
4.3.6 Witnesses	20
4.3.7 Enforcement Authorities	20
4.3.8 Regulators.....	20
5. Background on Technical Aspects of ODR	22
5.1 Introduction	22
5.2 Basic Information Categories	22
Table 1 –The basic information categories in ODR and their associated requirements.	23
5.3 Electronic Communication Considerations	23
5.3.1 Communication in Automated Negotiation	23
5.3.2 Communication in Assisted Negotiation	23
5.3.3 Communication in Online Mediation	24
5.3.4 Communication in Online Arbitration	24
Table 2 - Communication Needs of the different ODR models	24
5.3.5 Limitations of online communications.	24
5.4 Fourth Party Effect in ODR	25
5.4.1 Technological Factors.....	25
5.4.2 Subjective Factors	25
5.4.3 Dispute Resolution Factors.....	26
Figure 1- The Technology Trust Equation in ODR	26
5.5 Confidentiality in ODR	27
5.5.1 Confidentiality in Online Arbitration.....	27
5.5.2 Confidentiality in Online Mediation	27
5.5.3 Confidentiality in Assisted Negotiation	27

5.5.4	Confidentiality in Automated Negotiation.....	27
5.6	Security concerns in ODR	27
5.7	Interoperability Considerations.....	28
5.7.1	OdrXML.....	28
5.7.2	Web Service Technologies	28
5.8	Preliminary Conclusions.....	28
6.	Background on Regulatory and Legal Aspects	29
6.1	Introduction	29
6.2	Legal Regulation	29
6.2.1	Legal Regulation of Arbitration.....	29
6.2.1.1	National Laws	29
	Table 3 - Legal Requirements Common in National Arbitration Laws.....	30
6.2.1.2	International Laws.....	30
6.2.1.3	Model Law.....	31
6.2.2	Legal Regulation of ADR	31
6.2.2.1	The Mediation Directive	31
	Table 4 - Principal Features of the Mediation Directive.....	32
6.2.2.2	EC Recommendations 98/257 and 2001/310.....	32
	Table 5 - Requirements of EC Recommendation 98/257 (applicable to "active" neutrals)	33
	Table 6 - Requirements of EC Recommendation 2001/310 (applicable to "passive" neutrals)	35
6.3	Self Regulatory Principles, Recommendations and Standards.....	37
	Table 7 - Summary of Common Self Regulatory Recommendations.....	39
6.4	ISO Standard ISO 10003 – Guidelines for Dispute Resolution External to Organisations	40
6.5	General Legal Requirements Relating to Online Services	40
6.5.1	Directive 2000/31/EC on electronic commerce	40
6.5.2	Directive 97/7/EC on distance selling	41
7.	Interoperability Aspects	42
7.1	Referring Scenario.....	42
7.2	Interoperability definition.....	42
7.3	Interoperability Goals.....	42
7.4	Process interoperability.....	43
7.6	Availability and Labelling.....	43
8.	ODR Taxonomy and Ontology	44
8.1	Introduction	44
8.2	ODR Taxonomy	45
8.2.1	Type of process	45
8.2.2	Disputing parties	45
8.2.3	Third party.....	45
8.2.4	Actors involved.....	45
8.2.5	Identification details	46
8.2.6	Type of dispute	47
8.2.7	Pre-dispute information.....	47
8.2.8	Course of the process.....	47
8.2.9	History of the process	47
8.2.10	Authorization	48
8.2.11	Events	48
8.2.12	Communication	48
8.2.13	Substance of the process	48
8.2.14	Outcome	49
8.3	Ontology	50
8.4	ODR Ontology Classes	53
8.5	ODR Ontology Design using Protégé-OWL	55

9. Conclusions and Recommendations	63
9.1 Supporting Pan-European ODR	63
9.2 Reducing the Barriers to ODR.....	63
9.3 Increasing Trust and Confidence in ODR	63
9.4 Promoting ODR.....	63
9.5 Improving the Accessibility of ODR.....	63
9.6 Gathering and Sharing Information about ODR	64
9.7 Future Standards Related Work	64
9.7.1 Standards and best practices applicable to ODR providers.....	64
9.7.2 Standards applicable to ODR communications	64
9.7.3 Standards concerning ODR statistics	64

Foreword

Many different On-line Dispute Resolution (ODR) services were developed all over Europe to allow consumers and other potential users (B2B and B2C) to exploit ADR (Alternative Dispute Resolution) resources.

This CEN Workshop Agreement (CWA) contains guidelines for users to access ADR resources using electronic tools, focussing on Online Dispute Resolution (ODR). The production of this CWA was formally accepted at the CEN Workshop Stand ODR kick-off meeting on 17 December 2007.

In Europe, several organisations are involved on the management of ADR. ODRs are becoming more and more important at international level for the out-of-court settlement of disputes on e-commerce, e-business and e-tourism.

In the CWA, whilst recognising that the technical requirements of ODR may necessitate the introduction of specific processes that vary from those applicable in ADR, ODR and ADR processes are examined in as close a synergy as may be practicable. This CWA recommends that their future evolution goes on in parallel to the maximum practicable extent and promotes clear, simple and homogeneous rules for the use of ODR services on a pan-European basis.

In different European countries, and even sometimes within the same country, available ODR services are currently implementing heterogeneous procedures that create confusion among potential users. Moreover, ODR systems offer different user interfaces, and are seldom multi-lingual. They are unable to exchange information with each other, preventing potential users from using their features within a multi-language and cross-country business environment. This represents a barrier to the development of European e-business for both consumers and industries.

A conference was held in Brussels on 31 March 2009 to present the CWA to interested stakeholders and discuss the way forward. The CWA was approved in an electronic endorsement round which run from July to end August 2009. The organisations supporting this CWA were:

ADR Chambers, Canada

CMAF (Centre of mediation and arbitration) of the Paris Chamber of Commerce, France

Consumer Council of DIN, Germany

Eurochambres, Belgium

European Multimedia Forum, Belgium

FEDMA (Federation of European Direct and Interactive Marketing), Belgium

Forum des droits sur l'Internet, France

Free University Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Mediation Service of the Turin Chamber of Commerce, Italy

The Mediation Room, United Kingdom

Ebay/Paypal, USA

Tinnova, Italy

Tiga Technologies, France

Unioncamere Toscana (Union of the Tuscan Chambers of Commerce), Italy

University of Leicester, School of Law, United Kingdom

S.R. CWA 16026:2009

CWA 16026:2009 (E)

University College Dublin, Ireland

University of Barcelona, Institute of Law and Technology, Spain

Mr Zondag, New Zealand

This CEN Workshop Agreement is publicly available as a reference document from the National Members of CEN : AENOR, AFNOR, ASRO, BDS, BSI, CSNI, CYS, DIN, DS, ELOT, EVS, IBN, IPQ, IST, LVS, LST, MSA, MSZT, NEN, NSAI, ON, PKN, SEE, SIS, SIST, SFS, SN, SNV, SUTN and UNI.

Comments or suggestions from the users of the CEN Workshop Agreement are welcome and should be addressed to the CEN Management Centre.

1. Scope

This CEN Workshop Agreement (CWA) specifies guidelines to facilitate a clearer and easier use and exploitation of ADR resources to the potential users. The focus is Online Dispute Resolution (ODR).

This CEN Workshop Agreement contains:

1. **Analysis of the different kind of ODR models and tools in Europe and at the international level** (the most relevant). This includes: business process models and workflow, bodies in charge of them, regulations and legal frameworks, roles, technological solutions, impacts on users and on markets, existing and on-going standardisation processes (EU & US). Cross reference to ISO 10003 will be made for the items which are already covered by ISO 10003 (ex. Dispute resolution methods).
2. **Identification of interoperability issues** among existing ODR systems and services;
3. **Identification of the framework for generating methodological improvements and standardization supports** enabling cross-country access to ODR resources and interoperability among them;
4. **Definition of the taxonomy** of business concepts, roles and processes;
5. **Mapping of this taxonomy to a XML-based dialect**. To this end, past and on-going experiences such the ODR Xml and the jurisdiction-based model of XBRL are considered.

This is a free preview. Purchase the entire publication at the link below:

[Product Page](#)

-
- [Looking for additional Standards? Visit Intertek Inform Infostore](#)
 - [Learn about LexConnect, All Jurisdictions, Standards referenced in Australian legislation](#)
-