



AAAI Standards for AI in ADR

Introduction

The American Arbitration Association-International Centre for Dispute Resolution® (AAA-ICDR®) sets the standards for fair, efficient, and cost-effective alternative dispute resolution (ADR). We pioneer and refine procedural rules informed by our extensive experience administering millions of cases. Our processes work and have kept up with the times for a century. Parties, advocates, and neutrals place their trust in us and rely on our expert staff every day.

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is fundamental to the next century of ADR, and ADR processes must evolve. We embraced this new technology early. We are fluent in AI. We will continue to build it into our processes.

The AAA-ICDR is also a mission-driven nonprofit. We want all users of ADR services to benefit from AI, and we want to lead the field in responsible and ethical use of AI. To those ends, we encourage advocates, neutrals, and other ADR administrators to apply these AAAI Standards.

AI in ADR

The AAA-ICDR is an ADR administrator. Administrators maintain technology platforms and case management processes, and AI has an important and growing role in that. Staff use AI in their own work and uphold the integrity of AI tools deployed for use by parties, advocates, and neutrals.

Neutrals use AI tools to streamline tasks and do quality work. In the spirit of ADR, they should work toward fair, cost-effective, and efficient resolution of disputes while upholding ethical standards. They also have a duty to remain impartial and exercise independent judgment.

Advocates also use AI tools to streamline tasks and do quality work. An ADR administrator does not have a formal role to play in advising lawyers about efficient client service but we encourage advocates to be leaders in incorporating AI for better, faster, and cheaper outcomes.

The AAAI Standards provide a comprehensive framework for responsible AI use in ADR. They address Ethical and Human-Centric Values, Privacy and Security, Accuracy and Reliability, Explainability and Transparency, Accountability, and Adaptability.

Standard 1: Ethical and Human-Centric Values

ADR Administrators: Design AI systems that align with ethical standards, support fair and unbiased outcomes that respect the rights of all participants, and safeguard equity in dispute resolution. Design AI systems with human oversight that are imbued with appropriate values, mitigate bias, and preserve control over critical decisions.



Neutrals: Any existing ethical obligations still apply when using AI. Preserve human perspective and judgment when using AI. Critically evaluate how parties and advocates use AI. Avoid overreliance on technology or outputs provided by one party or one vendor. Rely instead on direct review of evidence and reasoned deliberation in reaching conclusions.

Advocates: Any existing ethical obligations still apply when using AI. Validate alignment between AI outputs and recognized legal principles, ensuring independent human judgment controls. Cooperate with neutrals on how best to leverage AI in presenting a case.

Standard 2: Privacy and Security

ADR Administrators: Manage data responsibly with strict attention to privacy while adhering to data governance standards. Foster trust in the dispute resolution process by protecting data confidentiality, integrity, and system reliability while defending against external threats and ensuring operational resilience.

Neutrals: Confirm that any external AI tools used—whether for document translation, analytics, scheduling, or other purposes—meet relevant security standards, preventing leakage of confidential data.

Advocates: If external AI tools are used, confirm that they meet relevant security standards. Anonymize or otherwise protect case data to preserve party confidentiality and ensure compliance with privacy obligations.

Standard 3: Accuracy and Reliability

ADR Administrators: AI applications should provide reliable outputs, maintain consistency under varied conditions, and communicate any limitations or the need for human oversight at key points in the process. AI applications should adhere to industry standards for uptime and response time to human inputs.

Neutrals and Advocates: Outputs from AI tools should be reviewed to verify accuracy against trusted source materials, including evidence, party filings, and legal authorities.

Standard 4: Explainability and Transparency

ADR Administrators: AI systems should allow staff and participants in the process to understand and trust their outputs. Clearly communicate the choices made in developing AI applications to enhance delivery of services.

Neutrals: Weigh the probative value of AI outputs in submissions by parties and examine them for misstatements, bias, or dubious references. When in doubt, seek clarification. Communicate to case participants the ways in which AI informs the neutral's process.

Advocates: Examine AI outputs for misstatements, biased outputs, or dubious references. Explain how AI was used, and correct any errors promptly.



Standard 5: Accountability

ADR Administrators: Establish human ownership over AI across processes. Carefully select and continuously assess third-party vendors to ensure reliable performance and alignment with values.

Neutrals: Maintain a working knowledge of AI capabilities. Avoid shortcuts that could compromise quality. Understand risks, benefits, and ethical considerations for AI tools. And ensure automated document summaries or data analysis never overshadow firsthand examination of evidence and arguments.

Advocates: Exercise professional judgment when leveraging AI tools for analysis, research, scheduling, or other purposes. Confirm outputs through human scrutiny informed by professional expertise.

Standard 6: Adaptability

ADR Administrators: Establish and apply standards for monitoring and evaluation of AI systems. Commit to staff training, research, and feedback loops that maintain a culture of innovation and AI literacy.

Neutrals: Continually update knowledge about AI technologies. Incorporate AI-assisted scheduling, translation, evidence organization, and other tools if they enhance clarity and minimize delays, but evaluate every dispute according to its unique context.

Advocates: Continually update knowledge about AI technologies, and seek to apply AI in a manner that supports the goals of ADR. Examples include: streamlining discovery, expediting legal research, and delegating certain administrative tasks.