Cryptographically Secured Arbitration in Self-executing Agreements. With the help of blockchain

Author 1st Tarushi Acharya, Author 2nd Dr. Braham Pal Singh Author 3rd Ravindra Kumar

Department of Law, TIIPS, GGIPU Dwarka Delhi, India

Abstract This article explores the twofold effect that blockchain advancements and smart agreements have on debate goals. From one viewpoint, these advancements empower private gatherings to devise arbitral frameworks that are self-upholding and, consequently, generally sidestep the acknowledgment and authorization methodology through which State courts customarily apply a specific command over arbitration. This marvel may in the future permit arbitration to turn out to be independent, hence prompting the minimization of State courts. Then again, nonetheless, such a minimization has not occurred at this point; unexpectedly, the new blockchain-related wonder of introductory coin contributions has led to some conspicuous legal disputes. These cases bring up especially fascinating jurisdictional issues, particularly considering the trouble of accommodating the decentralized idea of the blockchain with the regional methodology whereby a ward is commonly designated among public courts.
Keywords: smart, arbitration, blockchain

1. Introduction

Blockchain is an information base of all exchanges across a shared organization. This is viewed as the super specialized advancement of Bitcoin and other digital forms of money, with the possibility to upset various business measures. Bitcoin is by a wide margin the most renowned use of blockchain technology. The cryptographic money stores exchanges in supposed Bitcoins, inside a decentralized record of its blockchain [1]. Notwithstanding, blockchain technology has a lot more applications, both existing and potential, just as being utilized for digital money. Among these applications are smart agreements[2]. Passages into the record might comprise PC code that executes the agreements of an agreement between parties. Such gatherings will as a rule be gatherings to contracts, private people, corporate substances, public establishments, or different elements. The more refined the code, the more computerized, self-executing, and "smarter" the agreement[3]. Eventually, we might see independent gatherings as modernized specialists, like Web of Things (IoT) gadgets, associated web-based, going into smart agreements without human impedance. This article investigates the utilization of blockchain technology for applications other than cryptographic money (blockchain 2.0), specifically the connection between blockchain technology and smart agreements, and thinks about a portion of their potential business applications. What are the properties of a smart agreement and how might it profit from the utilization of blockchain technology? All the more strangely according to an administrative perspective, what are the lawful difficulties that engineers of smart agreements face when carrying their applications to the market? The article will just present probably the most major and comprehensively material legitimate issues, for example, contract law, security and consumer assurance. In like manner, industry explicit administrative structures for the monetary and other industry areas won't be thought of.

2. Objectives

i. Investigation ofecosystem of blockchain arbitral frameworks: backwoods of transnational arbitration

ii. Investigation of Blockchain advances, smart agreements, and different creatures: mechanizing debate goal?

3. Blockchain technology

The blockchain is information-based technology that chips away at an organization like the Internet. Clients introduce the application locally and the "hubs" all hold a duplicate of the data set. No focal server holds authority over the data set. The data set is organized as a record or a library of sections into the blockchain. These sections are totaled into information structure blocks. The blockchain comprises of squares that hold "time-stepped" clusters of legitimate passages. Each square incorporates the "hash" of the earlier square, connecting the squares together. The connected squares structure a chain, with each extra square re-in forcing those before it. From this interaction comes the name blockchain. Passages - or exchanges - are passed from one client to another, or hub to hub, on a best-exertion premise. The particular blockchain application characterizes a substantial exchange. In cryptographic money applications like Bitcoin, a substantial exchange should be carefully marked, burn through at least one unspent yields of past exchanges, and the amount of exchange yields should not surpass the amount of sources of info. Different applications might utilize an alternate technique for approval, like outsider certificate, or none by any means.

Squares record and affirm when, and in what succession, exchanges enter and are signed in the blockchain. Squares are made by clients in Bitcoin known as "excavators", who utilize particular programming or hardware planned explicitly to make blocks. Square creation - or mining - is exorbitant as far as hardware and handling (power). To make Bitcoin blocks, diggers are boosted to make blocks by two kinds of remunerations: a pre-characterized per-block grant and charges presented inside the actual exchanges, payable to any excavator who effectively affirms the exchange. Different applications may suddenly boost block makers. In the event that the blockchain application is run for inner use inside a bank or a gathering of banks these may just compensate outsiders or representatives to play out this assignment.

4. Blockchain 2.0

The assumed designer of the blockchain, Satoshi Nakamoto, never saw the utilization of blockchain technology restricted to Bitcoin or other cryptographic forms of money. In a correspondence from 20103 he imagined that "the [blockchain] configuration upholds an enormous assortment of conceivable exchange types that I planned years prior. Escrow exchanges, reinforced agreements, outsider arbitration, multiparty marks, and so forth In the event that Bitcoin gets on incredibly, these are things that we'll need to investigate in the future..." This development of the utilization of blockchain technology in new applications is actually the thing we are seeing at this point.

The term blockchain 2.0 serves to recognize Bitcoin as a resource and the "blockchain as a programmable circulated trust infrastructure"[4] all the more by and large, with increases of new adaptable components of on-chain utility and extensibility. Rather than review the blockchain as a component of the decentralization of cash and installments, blockchain 2.0 extends the extent of the technology to empower the decentralization of business sectors all the more for the most part, and the exchange will include different sorts of resources by giving registers to authentications and privileges and commitments in land, IPR, vehicles, works of art, etc. As blockchain 2.0 is code the new application is supposed to be running on another arrangement of conventions ("blockchain 2.0 convention"). A correlation with the conventions of the Web and its layer of stacks outlines the connection between blockchain 1.0 and blockchain 2.0. The previous can be seen as the TCP/IP transport layer though the last can saw as HTTP, SMTP and FTP. In this setting blockchain 2.0 applications would be similar to programs, informal communities and document sharing services[5].

5. Smart contracts

Smart agreements are PC conventions that implant the agreements of an agreement. The intelligible terms (the source code) of an agreement are ordered into executable PC code that can run on an organization. Numerous sorts of authoritative statements may hence be made to some degree or completely self-executing, self-implementing, or both. Smart agreements are not another idea. The expression "smart agreements" was instituted by PC researcher Scratch Szabo, most likely around 1993, to underline the objective of bringing what he calls the "profoundly developed" practices of agreement law and related strategic approaches to the plan of electronic business conventions between outsiders on the Internet[6]. An early variation of smart agreements is advanced privileges the executives plans. These are smart agreements for copyright licenses, as are monetary cryptography plans for monetary agreements.

The blockchain technology empowers smart agreements by expanding on its circulated record engineering. The code that makes up the smart agreement can be added as a feature of a passage to the blockchain 2.0 application. Smart agreements among outsiders obscure to one another would now be able to be gone into because of the trust that is incorporated into the blockchain as a data set that can't be manufactured or altered. Specifically, contracts with many outsiders would now be able to be marked (multisig contracts) for minimal price. Subsequently the meaning of a blockchainbased smart agreement: "a piece of code (the smart agreement), sent to the common, recreated record, which can keep up with its own state, control its own resources and which reacts to the appearance of outside data or the receipt of assets"[7] .

6. Transparency and privacy

The first Bitcoin code has been delivered under an open source permit and all blockchain 2.0 applications have likewise been open source. To an untouchable this might be progressive be that as it may, with the predominance of the open source models in every aspect of registering advancement, it would really be a change in perspective on the off chance that somebody had selected delivering another stage, for example, the blockchain or a blockchain 2.0 application like Ethereum on a shut source permit. By the by, the availability of the source code furnishes the blockchain with significant transparency, which adds to the confidence in the framework and its record that accompanies the consensusdriven appropriated information base design. All clients of the blockchain can check if the basic code has any security imperfections or contains any indirect accesses to permit altering. As a take-off point, data pretty much all exchanges on the blockchain is open to all clients. This transparency permits all clients to check their duplicate of the record for consistency with other clients' duplicates. Moreover, any very much associated hub can decide, with sensible assurance, regardless of whether an exchange does or doesn't exist in the informational collection. Any hub that makes an exchange can, after an affirmation period, decide with a healthy degree of confidence whether the exchange is legitimate, ready to happen and become last (for example that no clashing exchanges were affirmed into the blockchain somewhere else that would nullify the exchange, like similar cryptographic money units "twofold spent" elsewhere).

This transparency might be difficult for the protection of its client. The Bitcoin network endeavors to protect the security of its clients by permitting hubs to get to the record under a nom de plume. As referenced previously, to move a Bitcoin the hub doesn't need to uncover the actual personality of the individual or association working the hub. Everything necessary is that the hub makes the exchange with a computerized signature with a substantial private cryptographic key. On the off chance that the utilization of a blockchain 2.0 application requests a connection to a client's character, this individual data will be open for all who utilize the application. This makes difficulties in regard of consistence with EU information insurance regulation. A portion of these difficulties are like those looked by worldwide internet business sites. Others might be new. In the event that a blockchain data set holds individual information in clear text, this data will be replicated on completely conveyed duplicates of the record to all hubs. Who are these hubs? In an EU information assurance setting, who are information regulators and information processors?

7. Code is law

Lawrence Lessig broadly said that "code is law"[8]. He called attention to that coders and programming modelers, by settling on a decision about the working and construction of IT organizations and the applications that sudden spike in demand for them, settled on significant and frequently basic choices about the principles under which the frameworks would be administered. In this limit coders had supplanted conventional lawmakers. This was and still is valid concerning the construction of many layers in the product stack. The coders chipping away at the blockchain layer settle on such choices.

The equivalent applies to the block chain 2.0 applications, for example, the Ethereum prearranging language. Coders - or perhaps more appropriately their paymasters - plan the substance and extent of the smart agreements that coders will change over into PC executable code. This gives coders the serving directly in choosing the structure and cutoff points for the agreements can be utilizedin their rendition of a blockchain 2.0 application. In any case, actually this will turn into a client driven market. Gatherings to smart agreements will pay coders to tailor smart agreements to suit their requirements.

Coders will become likened to legal counselors drafting "conventional" agreements, and coders will be helped by legal advisors represented considerable authority in the language and mechanics of smart

agreements. Similarly, as it was immediately understood that the internet was not liberated from government obstruction, it should be perceived that smart agreements are exposed to "code as law" yet are represented by the tradition that must be adhered to. Indeed, even smart agreements with independent programming specialists as gatherings can follow their beginnings to human activities and will likewise affect individuals or different entertainers in the "genuine" world eventually. Similarly, as there are many cutoff points to opportunity of agreement by and large, there will be many cutoff points in agreement law and regulation on the independence and self- requirement of smart agreements. Smart agreements don't exist in a legitimate vacuum similarly as the internet isn't cut off from this present reality.

8. Adjudication and flexibility

Smart agreements can be - from a certain point of view - completely mechanized and self- upholding. When the agreements are set in PC code the agreement will run its course and the terms will be executed fairly by the PC based on the code and the exogenous occasions. In numerous business connections, specifically inside monetary administrations, these properties make smart agreements exceptionally alluring. Mechanization, joined with the absence of conventional trust- building costs related with the block chain's conveyed nature, essentially diminishes exchange costs, making such trades considerably more beneficial. Yet, business (and private) trades are frequently extremely intricate. As any agreement legal advisor would concur, drafting an agreement that considers every conceivable possibility and expresses every one of their reactions is beyond the realm of imagination.

A vital capacity of courts is to mediate in issues where conditions have changed in a way not predicted by the gatherings at the hour of going into the agreement. A smart agreement might have dispensed the danger in normal double style of any deviation from business as usual and may have embedded some reference to an outside mediator of whether such deviation has happened. In this manner, the smart agreement can be executed by the PC with no obstruction. Be that as it may, the gatherings might be in a circumstance where they don't need the agreement to be executed stringently. The two players may ex bet concur that the agreement's requirement ought to be made dependent upon its decency or conscionability. The party with specific interests in the smart agreement being completely implemented may, on misgivings, need to apply a proportion of reasonableness to guarantee the proceeded with business relationship with the other party. Smart agreements can end up being entirely firm, unfit to adjust to changing conditions and the gatherings' updated inclinations.

Progressively, man-made reasoning (computer-based intelligence) can be applied to the drafting, overseeing and implementation of smart agreements however artificial intelligence can't give the important update of code dependent on inserted standards of decency and monetary proficiency. Most likely, not long from now, computer-based intelligence will want to accept these standards in both the underlying drafting and the ensuing authorization of smart agreements. In any case, for the time being, many smart agreements used to oversee complex private and business connections should stay open-finished and depend on the contribution from wetware legal advisors and silk-robed appointed authorities.

9. The link to the physical world

As we advance toward blockchain 2.0 applications, the requirement for connections to the physical becomes obvious. Setting up a blockchain-put together land register with respect to a server or coding a smart agreement to be recorded as an exchange on a blockchain application might end up being the simple aspect. Checking that an individual asserting that he has title to a real estate parcel, not to mention confirming that the holder of a public key is who he professes to be, will frequently be a beyond difficult undertaking. But for the blockchain to be of worth this legitimate connection to the actual world should be set up. By and large, all privileges and commitments (aside from those in cryptographic money) enrolled on blockchain 2.0 applications should depend on the legitimacy under pertinent law, and frequently on the certificate by some administration or outsider position, that conditions under relevant regulation have been made. Setting up the actual connections is regularly the most awkward and costly part to be survived, if trades must be worked with. While setting up a decentralized data set design dependent on blockchain will bring down exchange cost essentially, that is frequently insufficient.

10. The law of contracts

Completely computerized and self-authorizing smart agreements might manage business situations so intricate and capricious that the code will neglect to implant all potential responses to every conceivable inquiry. As referenced above, soon smart agreements will regularly need to depend on courts and arbitration in issues of uncertainty. A part of authoritative law controls issues where the gatherings, as an issue of law, can't go astray in their agreements from the obligatory arrangement set somewhere near agreement law. Certain legitimate standards are so central to the regulation of monetary action that courts won't implement in any case substantial agreements if these standards are not conformed to. There are likewise cutoff points to the opportunity of smart agreements.

A court will give solutions for the abused gatherings to a smart agreement that has been executed, if the agreement would be considered invalid by the court because of neighborhood forms of ideas like extortion, pressure, imitation, absence of lawful limit and inappropriateness. These standards are so central to regulation of trades that it would be counterproductive if these could be dodged alone by exposing to the done deal of a completely computerized and self-authorizing smart agreement. Negation of agreements regarding standards of law stays a special case for the standard concerning conventional agreements.

There is not a good excuse to accept that exposing smart agreements to a similar authoritative law system will keep them from turning out to be generally embraced, specifically where the gatherings are organizations that are thought to be more skilled to ensure themselves in agreements. Unexpectedly, gatherings to smart agreements should be expected additionally to favor such legally binding law checks. Almost certainly, an imaginative blockchain 2.0 beginning up will concoct a semiautomated administration that will bring down the danger of authoritative danger of misrepresentation, and absence of legitimate limit.

11. Consumer regulation

Smart agreements will coordinate trade of monetary worth in an assortment of areas. Because of public interest contemplations large numbers of these areas will be vigorously controlled. Moving agreements onto a blockchain may prompt inquiries concerning the decision of law and purview at the same time, similar to most of customary worldwide agreements, public courts and officials will ultimately foster a superior degree of comprehension. Likewise with global web based business, smart agreements will not (for long) work outside of peace and lawfulness. The test isn't whether any public court will mediate a smart agreement, rather it is that the line of courts competing to turn into the lawful gathering and utilize its public assemblage of law will most likely be long. No place will this be more obvious than concerning consumer regulation. Many smart agreements will have a consumer and a business as the gatherings. The business is probably going to bear the expense of setting fully operational the blockchain 2.0 application and to singularly draft the agreements of the smart agreements. It ought to be clear that smart agreement terms with gatherings of clients that are secured by enactment need to conform to least freedoms and denials. The lawful situation of a consumer, a breadwinner, a minor or an inhabitant can't be more regrettable under a smart agreement than under customary agreements. If so, courts will refute a smart agreement that neglects to consent, paying little mind to computerization and selfenforcement.

Nonetheless, consistence with compulsory regulation is a test to smart agreements not a deterrent. It is just an issue of refinement. The really difficult a legitimate structure, the more significant it becomes to foster the code that inserts the guidelines of the system into, for instance, a smart consumer contract. Some required arrangements leave space for optional appraisal by an outsider for reasonableness, yet consumer regulation is additionally profoundly able for computerization by coding terms with respect to beauty periods, formalistic notification and such into a smart agreement. Today online business destinations have consolidated practically all lawful consistences into their online business applications. These organizations as of now utilize smart agreements. Moving the internet business information base to a blockchain will presumably be the lesser assignment.

12. The ecosystem of blockchain arbitral systems: a terra incognita of transnational arbitration

To investigate the backcountry of transnational arbitration dependent on blockchain innovations, it is as a matter of first importance important to take a gander at the current truth of the wonder inside the bitcoin framework (subsection 1). Therefore, it will be feasible to extend the viewpoint and take a gander at equal advancements in other blockchain-based applications (subsection 2).

Self-enforcing bitcoin arbitration based on multi-signature addresses and its consequences on recognition and enforcement

Inside the bitcoin framework, clients have conceived a private adjudication framework that is somewhat more refined than the escrow instrument at first imagined by Nakamoto: the multi- signature address.15 this gadget basically works like a lock with two keyholes; it must be opened if two keys are utilized. Two gatherings going into an exchange can utilize this gadget to store coins (for instance, the cost for the offer of specific products), until the commitments emerging out of that exchange have been performed. The two players are given an advanced key to the location; if no question emerges, they can utilize the two keys to open the coins, together deciding their last objective (ordinarily, the location of the dealer). If there should be an occurrence of a debate, nonetheless, neither one of the gatherings can get to the coins independently, yet both of them can request a private adjudicator to audit current realities from the case and out which of the two disputants is qualified for the contested assets.

What the adjudicator is approached to direct, in aggregate, is a simple type of arbitration, evaluating current realities of the case and figuring out which party ought to win. The private adjudicator is given a third key; not at all like an escrow specialist co-op, subsequently, the individual in question has no one-sided admittance to the contested mint pieces (which must be gathered if two keys are together utilized). The adjudicator, in any case, can give their key to the overarching party, hence guaranteeing that the disputant qualified for the assets (who will currently have two of the three keys) will really get them. A multi-signature address, then, at that point, permits private gatherings to set up a debate goal technique that (in spite of its clearly crude person in many regards) is successfully ready to uphold its own results.

While the utilization of bitcoin multi-signature addresses is in no way, shape or form a standard pattern in transnational business, the size of the marvel seems to be astonishing. At the hour of composing, more than 30% of the current coins are put away on addresses of this type, and specific sites considerably offer arbitrator rating administrations that the gatherings can use to track down a private adjudicator for their debate, if need be[9]. It is baffling that the current wonder has been to a great extent disregarded by arbitration trained professionals and transnational legal counselors up until now; adjudication dependent on multi-signature addresses is by all accounts a remarkable type of transnational arbitration, working outside of the shadow of State law with a serious level of conclusiveness and independence. It very well may be contended that, from an absolutely specialized outlook, this type of blockchain-based adjudication is the most exceptional pragmatic launch of the hypothesis of 'delocalized arbitration' set forth by conspicuous scholars[10]. Yet, until now, very little is thought about the commonsense truth of this strategy; the personality of the mediators (who are regularly non-lawyers), the modes wherein the gatherings and the referees cooperate, the proof taking instruments, and the considerable standards or standards applied to the debates actually stay a kind of backwoods of private adjudication, where most arbitration researchers have not wandered at this point[11].

To completely get a handle on the effect of this arrangement of advancements on private adjudication, it is especially valuable to check out their consequences for the thoughts of acknowledgment and authorization. Customarily, an arbitral honor can just create legitimate outcomes in a given public overall set of laws whenever it has been perceived, and the law administering acknowledgment (most quite, with regards to global arbitration, Article V of the 1958 New York Convention)22 permits the courts of the mentioned State to decrease acknowledgment within the sight of a restricted, however significant, situation, for example, an infringement of the option to be heard or hostility with that specific ward's public approach. At the end of the day, States keep a certain 'gatekeeping' work vis-a'- vis choices delivered by arbitral courts; acknowledgment comprises an insignificant, however significant, channel for arbitral honors, forestalling a decision gave by mediators from creating any sort of useful outcome in cases that are generally viewed as 'neurotic'. On the other hand, on account of an arbitration dependent on a multi-signature address, this channel is altogether skirted; albeit the decision gave by the private adjudicator likely could be denied acknowledgment by State courts, and the methodology may not be viewed as a type of arbitration at all,23 the private choice produces down to earth outcomes (to be specific, the coins are coordinated to the common party) without the

requirement for any sort of intermediation with respect to the State and its courts. It is, viably, a type of self- authorizing arbitration, where the issuance of an arbitral choice and its functional execution not exclusively are firmly associated yet in addition genuinely cross-over completely.

13. Blockchain technologies, smart contracts, and other animals: automating dispute resolution?

While bitcoin never formed into the standard installment framework that its inventor(s) had visualized, it had a significant impact: the presentation of the blockchain, the technology through which a record can be reliably kept up with by clients associating on a distributed premise without the requirement for incorporated management. The blockchain has been as of late advanced as an answer pertinent to a wide scope of issues. While an evaluation of the genuine helpfulness of circulated records (instead of different kinds of advances) falls unmistakably outside of the extent of this article, it is irrefutable that the most recent couple of years have been portrayed by a critical enthusiasm30 for distributed record-keeping arrangements past the particular utilization of 'computerized cash'.

Perhaps the most unmistakable venture dependent on blockchain advancements is without a doubt Ethereum. Ethereum was dispatched in 2015 with the primary motivation behind defeating a portion of the limits of bitcoin and, specifically, empowering clients to go into exchanges more intricate than a basic exchange of assets. At the point when two Ethereum clients go into an understanding, they can interpret (essentially huge pieces of) that arrangement into programming script, accordingly depending on the technology (instead of on one another's acceptable confidence and individual drive) to guarantee the presentation of the commitments emerging out of it. This kind of system is broadly marked as 'smart agreement'. Such a definition is somewhat deceptive as the legitimate capability of this sort of exchange as an agreement isn't outright (however clearly relies upon the formal and considerable subtleties of the exchanges just as the appropriate law),32 and the content essentially gives a deterministic framework as opposed to any type of computerized reasoning. In spite of the expressed entanglements, be that as it may, evaluate how much this utilization of blockchain innovations might affect debate goal.

The possibility of a self-executing understanding may obviously propose that any requirement for outsider agreement enforcement33—for instance, through arbitration or court case—is delivered obsolete.34 This, in any case, plainly can't be the situation as long as programming script just takes into account the robotization of those pieces of an arrangement that are deterministic in nature. For any non-insignificant transaction,35 a huge piece of the gatherings' arrangement can't be encoded in on the off chance that assertions in any case, rather, is incorporated by non-deterministic ideas and general conditions like great confidence, sensibility, and the numerous different ideas framing the foundation of agreement law. Except if man-made consciousness creates to the stage where a machine can emulate human thinking in this regard, the requirement for an outsider human adjudicator can't be rejected, at whatever point an authoritative question requires the use of this kind of legitimate idea.

14. Conclusions

The former sections uncover the potential for the utilization and execution of Smart Agreements and Blockchain. The greatest obstacle seems, by all accounts, to be drafting such complex agreements and the consumer getting what she is pursuing. In this present reality where consumers as of now battle with legitimate language and extensive agreements, the utilization of Smart Agreements and Blockchain may really be the panacea. On the off chance that Ricardian Agreements are shaped with least agreements, driven by Blockchain technology, consumers might have the option to enter in such prerequisites in a structure. Such structure would then be able to be utilized to characterize the agreements in the smart agreement, while it keeps on existing in a lucid structure. Subsequently, it satisfies customary necessities of agreement law. Such structures can be enhanced with comprehensive legal insurances which can be 'considered' to be remembered for the Smart Agreement. For privileges emerging out of such 'considering arrangements', the consumer can keep seeking after customary case cures. Be that as it may, to the degree, the exchange can be 'assuming' conditions, the authorization might be robotized. However this arrangement might give off an impression of being 'piece-feast,' it is in any case, a stage forward in evening out the cut sided battleground of consumer agreements and freedoms.

REFEARANCE

[1] David Williams, 'That Internet Thing? It's Just a Fad' (NBR. Co. Nz, 31 January 2013) accessed 5 April 2020.

[2] Liz Coll and Robin Simpson, 'Connection and Protection in the Digital Age: The Internet of Things and Challenges for Consumer Protection' (2016) Consumers International accessed 2 April 2020.

[3] The language of this Article is sufficiently broad to cover also cases of so-called automated contracting, i.e. where the parties agree to use a system capable of setting in motion self- executing electronic actions leading to the conclusion of a contract without the intervention of a natural person, See, UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts 2016, art 2.1.1 (3).

[4] Fred Lambert, 'Tesla Vehicles can now Diagnose Themselves and Even Pre-Order Parts for Service' (Electrek, 6 May 2019) accessed on 5 April 2020.

[5] Amitranjan Gantain, Joy Patra and Ayan Mukherjee, 'Integrate Device Data with Smart Contracts in IBM Blockchain' (IBM Developer, 1 June 2017) accessed on 5 April 2020.

[6] Miklos Boronkay and Philip Exenberger, 'Blockchain, Smart Contracts and Arbitration Overrated Hype or Chance for the Arbitration Community?' in Christian Klausseger and others (eds), Chapter IV: Science and Arbitration in Austrian Yearbook on International Arbitration 2020 (MANZ Verlag Wien, Stampfli, C.H. Beck 2020) 413.

[7] Nick Szabo, 'Formalizing and Securing Relationships on Public Networks' (1997) 2 First Monday accessed 7 April 2020.

[8] Mateja Durovic and Andre Janssen, 'The Formation of Smart Contracts and Beyond: Shaking the Fundamentals of Contract Law?' (2018) Research Gate accessed 2 April 2020. 9 Ibid.

[9] It should be noted that Bitcoins led to the establishment of Ethereum which is a more sophisticated blockchain platform allowing more complicated transactions beyond just transfers

[10]　　Vijay Raghunathan, 'Smart Contracts - Putting the Customer Back into "Customer Service"' (Medium, 19 October 2018) accessed 7 April 2020.

[11]　　Clifford Chance, 'Smart Contracts: Legal Agreements for the Digital Age' (2018) Briefings Clifford Chance accessed 4 April 2020.