

Legal Harmonisation in BRICS: Analysing Cross-Border Trade Rules and Dispute Settlement Mechanisms

Haryono¹, Woro Utari², Diah Ayu Rahmawati³, Budi Endarto⁴, Joice Soraya⁵

^{1,3} Universitas Bhayangkara Surabaya

^{2,4} Universitas Bhayangkara Surabaya

⁵ Universitas Wisnu Wardhana Malang

Article Info	ABSTRACT
<p>Article history:</p> <p>Received Dec, 2024 Revised Dec, 2024 Accepted Dec, 2024</p>	<p>This study explores the legal harmonization of cross-border trade regulations and dispute settlement mechanisms within the BRICS bloc, comprising Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa. With diverse legal traditions and economic priorities, BRICS nations face significant challenges in aligning their legal frameworks to foster seamless trade and effective dispute resolution. Using a normative juridical approach, this research examines regulatory disparities, existing dispute resolution mechanisms, and the potential for harmonization. The findings highlight key barriers, such as fragmented legal systems, inconsistent enforcement, and limited institutional capacity, while proposing actionable strategies, including standardized tariff systems, mutual recognition agreements, and the establishment of a centralized arbitration body. By addressing these issues, the study underscores the importance of legal alignment for enhancing economic integration and strengthening BRICS' position in global trade.</p>
<p>Keywords:</p> <p>BRICS Legal Harmonization Cross-Border Trade Dispute Resolution</p>	
<p>Corresponding Author:</p> <p>Name: Haryono Institution: Universitas Bhayangkara Surabaya Email: haryono@ubhara.ac.id</p>	<p><i>This is an open access article under the CC BY-SA license.</i></p> 

1. INTRODUCTION

The BRICS nations—Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa—represent a significant bloc of emerging economies that aim to reshape global trade and economic partnerships. Despite their collective potential, the diversity in their legal systems poses challenges to achieving cohesive economic integration. BRICS countries have demonstrated resilience during global financial crises, outperforming developed nations in economic growth [1]. With vast populations and abundant resources, they

have achieved notable economic expansion and export growth [1]. Furthermore, BRICS serves as a platform for multilateral diplomacy, promoting a more equitable global governance structure [2] and challenging traditional Western dominance by advocating for the interests of emerging economies [3]. However, disparities in legal frameworks among BRICS nations complicate trade agreements and economic policies, thereby hindering seamless integration [4]. These differences necessitate ongoing dialogue and negotiation to align interests and legal standards for effective collaboration [5].

Legal harmonization is essential for facilitating cross-border trade within the BRICS nations, as it addresses the diverse legal traditions and regulatory frameworks that can hinder economic cooperation. By aligning legal principles, countries can minimize inconsistencies in trade policies, customs procedures, and dispute resolution mechanisms, fostering a more predictable business environment. A harmonized regulatory framework can streamline processes, such as the approval of medical devices, which currently face delays due to differing regulations across BRICS countries [6]. Additionally, harmonization can enhance legal clarity and encourage innovation in digital trade by addressing the lack of uniform regulations for digital assets and smart contracts [7]. However, the diversity in legal traditions, including common law, civil law, and hybrid systems, complicates the harmonization process [8]. Effective harmonization also requires the engagement of various stakeholders to ensure that legal frameworks reflect the needs of all parties involved [9].

Cross-border trade regulations are essential for facilitating the exchange of goods and services among nations, yet inconsistencies in national policies can impede trade efficiency. Variations in tariffs, non-tariff barriers, and compliance standards significantly increase trade costs and complexities. Tariffs often affect pricing and competitiveness, while non-tariff barriers, such as quotas and import licensing, complicate compliance and raise business costs [10]. Additionally, regulatory heterogeneity can lead to expensive conformity assessments, further hindering trade efficiency [10], [11]. Mechanisms for dispute resolution are equally crucial in maintaining stable trade relationships. Effective systems, such as those employed by countries like Australia, prioritize transparency, while others, such as Indonesia, reflect unique socio-political contexts that influence their approaches [12]. Alternative methods, including arbitration and

mediation, can enhance the efficiency of resolving trade conflicts [12].

The BRICS nations, comprising Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa, hold significant economic potential, contributing over 25% of global GDP and nearly 40% of the population. However, the lack of legal harmonization among these countries presents substantial barriers to trade efficiency and collaboration, making it crucial to address these discrepancies to enhance intra-BRICS trade and ensure competitiveness in the global market. Economic integration among BRICS countries has deepened, strengthening bilateral trade and investment relations while leveraging the unique competitive advantages of each member [13]. Despite their collective economic strength, inconsistent legal frameworks hinder effective trade and dispute resolution, limiting economic collaboration within the bloc [7], [14]. Existing agreements among BRICS nations are often programmatic and lack enforceable norms, complicating trade transactions [7]. Legal harmonization is therefore essential for improving trade efficiency and establishing robust dispute settlement mechanisms, as emphasized in strategic planning documents advocating cohesive legal frameworks to support sustainable economic growth [15], [16].

The BRICS nations encounter significant legal and regulatory disparities that hinder cross-border trade and effective dispute resolution, stemming from varying legal traditions that complicate the harmonization of trade regulations and create obstacles for businesses. These nations operate under diverse legal systems, including common law, civil law, and hybrid frameworks, leading to inconsistent regulations and complicating the establishment of a unified investment protection regime [17]. Inconsistent tariffs and conflicting customs procedures further create trade barriers, as businesses face varying compliance requirements across countries [7]. Additionally, the lack of standardized regulations, particularly in sectors like

medical devices, complicates trade and investment efforts [6]. The absence of a cohesive dispute settlement mechanism undermines trust among BRICS nations, resulting in prolonged conflicts and reduced economic efficiency [17]. While efforts to create a common legal framework are ongoing, significant challenges remain due to cultural and legal differences [18].

This paper focuses on the normative juridical aspects of legal harmonization within the BRICS bloc, with a particular emphasis on cross-border trade regulations and dispute settlement mechanisms. It aims to examine existing regulatory frameworks and dispute resolution strategies, identify challenges in achieving harmonization, and propose practical recommendations for enhancing legal cohesion. By employing a normative juridical approach, the study analyzes principles, doctrines, and legal norms to provide a comprehensive understanding of the issue.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 *Overview of Legal Harmonization*

Legal harmonization is essential for facilitating trade and economic integration among diverse jurisdictions, particularly in regions like BRICS, where legal systems vary significantly. By aligning legal principles and regulations, harmonization aims to reduce trade barriers and foster a collaborative economic environment. However, the distinct legal traditions—common law, civil law, and hybrid systems—pose substantial challenges to achieving effective harmonization [19]. Implementation issues also arise, as seen in the African Continental Free Trade Area, where harmonization efforts

often lack robust compliance mechanisms [20]. Moreover, the success of such initiatives heavily depends on the political commitment of member states to prioritize legal alignment over national interests [20]. International frameworks can play a pivotal role in addressing these challenges; for example, global standards in copyright laws demonstrate how diverse legal solutions can be unified [21]. Collaborative efforts by organizations like the FATF further emphasize the importance of cooperative frameworks in promoting legal harmonization to address transnational issues [19].

2.2 *Cross-Border Trade Regulations*

Cross-border trade regulations are crucial for facilitating international commerce, particularly within blocs like BRICS, where inconsistent policies can create significant barriers. The World Trade Organization (WTO) emphasizes the importance of harmonized frameworks to reduce transaction costs and enhance trade flows. Divergent tariff structures among BRICS nations increase costs for businesses and discourage intra-bloc trade, while non-tariff barriers, such as varying standards and regulations, complicate compliance and elevate operational expenses for exporters and importers [22]. Inconsistent customs procedures further result in delays and inefficiencies, undermining the global competitiveness of BRICS countries [23]. Efforts like Brazil's Compliant Shipment Program demonstrate how improved customs efficiency

and data quality can serve as a model for other BRICS nations (Morini et al., 2024). Aligning trade standards with international norms is essential for fostering global integration and compliance, as emphasized by Bagwell and Staiger [24]. However, the lack of unified regulations in areas like data protection and taxation continues to pose challenges for cross-border transactions, highlighting the need for international cooperation [25], [26].

2.3 *Dispute Settlement Mechanisms*

Dispute settlement mechanisms are essential for resolving trade conflicts and ensuring economic stability. The WTO's Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU) is often regarded as a model framework due to its structured approach, impartiality, and transparency. However, its effectiveness can be limited in regional contexts like BRICS, where domestic legal systems and enforcement capabilities vary significantly. The WTO's Dispute Settlement Mechanism (DSM) plays a central role in global trade governance by ensuring compliance with trade rules [27]. Despite its significance, the DSM faces challenges such as lengthy procedures and the recent closure of the Appellate Body, raising concerns about its efficiency [28]. Moreover, its credibility is tested in high-stakes disputes, such as the US-China trade war, where it struggles to uphold multilateralism [29]. Research indicates that tailored dispute resolution frameworks, which consider the specific legal and

economic contexts of member states, may be more effective in enhancing compliance and enforcement, addressing the limitations of the WTO's one-size-fits-all approach [30].

2.4 *Best Practices and Theoretical Approaches*

Theoretical frameworks such as legal pluralism and comparative law offer valuable insights into achieving legal harmonization. Legal pluralism, as described by [31], acknowledges the coexistence of multiple legal systems within a single framework and advocates for flexible approaches to integration. Comparative law, on the other hand, emphasizes the analysis of similarities and differences between legal systems to identify common principles that can serve as the basis for harmonization [32].

Best practices from other regional blocs, such as the European Union (EU), provide practical examples of successful harmonization efforts. The EU's approach to aligning trade regulations and dispute settlement mechanisms demonstrates the importance of establishing clear legal standards, fostering mutual trust, and creating institutions that facilitate cooperation. While the BRICS context differs significantly from the EU, these lessons can inform strategies for addressing the unique challenges faced by the bloc.

2.5 *Gaps in Existing Literature*

Despite extensive research on trade regulations and dispute resolution, limited attention has been given to the specific challenges of legal harmonization within BRICS.

Existing studies primarily focus on individual member states or broader international frameworks, overlooking the complexities of aligning legal systems within a diverse bloc. Furthermore, there is a lack of empirical research on the effectiveness of current harmonization efforts and their impact on trade and economic growth in BRICS.

3. METHODS

3.1 Approach

This study employs a normative juridical research approach, focusing on analyzing legal principles, regulations, and frameworks related to cross-border trade and dispute settlement mechanisms within the BRICS nations. The normative juridical method is appropriate for examining the legal norms and doctrines underpinning trade regulations and harmonization efforts. It involves analyzing primary and secondary legal sources to understand the regulatory disparities and propose solutions for legal alignment.

3.2 Data Sources

The research utilizes both primary and secondary data sources. Primary data include legal instruments, international treaties, trade agreements, and dispute settlement frameworks adopted by the BRICS nations, such as documents from the World Trade Organization (WTO), regional agreements within BRICS, and domestic trade laws. Secondary data comprise academic journal articles, books, legal commentaries, and reports from international organizations like the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and the BRICS Business Council, offering valuable insights into the theoretical and practical aspects of legal harmonization.

3.3 Data Collection Techniques

The data collection process involves document analysis, which includes reviewing

legal texts, treaties, and trade agreements to identify the regulatory frameworks governing cross-border trade and dispute settlement in BRICS. It also encompasses a comprehensive literature review of academic studies and reports to understand the challenges and best practices associated with legal harmonization. Additionally, a comparative analysis is conducted to examine the legal systems of BRICS nations, identifying areas of divergence and potential alignment by analyzing trade regulations, customs procedures, and dispute resolution mechanisms.

3.4 Data Analysis

The data analysis process involves several steps: legal analysis, which examines the principles, doctrines, and norms underlying trade regulations and dispute resolution frameworks by interpreting legal texts to understand their implications for harmonization; comparative analysis, which identifies similarities and differences in the legal systems of BRICS nations and assesses their impact on trade and dispute settlement, including the compatibility of domestic laws with international trade norms; gap analysis, which highlights gaps in existing regulations and identifies barriers to legal harmonization, particularly in assessing the adequacy of current dispute settlement mechanisms; and normative analysis, which proposes strategies for legal alignment based on the findings, grounded in legal theory and best practices from other regional blocs.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Current State of Cross-Border Trade Regulations in BRICS

BRICS countries show significant differences in their trade policies, which complicates the potential for effective trade harmonization. Brazil's high tariffs aimed at protecting its local industry influence trade dynamics within BRICS [33], while China promotes international competitiveness through export-oriented tariff policies [34]. Russia's dependence on natural resource exports creates additional complexity due to

different regulatory priorities than other BRICS countries [35]. On the other hand, customs processes and infrastructure also show gaps. Brazil and India still use outdated manual customs procedures, causing inefficiencies [35], whereas South Africa and China have modernized their customs systems, improving compliance and reducing delays [36].

4.2 Dispute Resolution Mechanisms in BRICS

Each BRICS country uses its domestic legal system to resolve trade disputes, which creates challenges for businesses engaged in cross-border trade. Brazil and Russia rely on domestic judicial processes that are often protracted and expensive, posing a major obstacle to foreign investment. In contrast, China uses specialized arbitration centers for trade disputes, which offer efficiency but lack transparency and international recognition. Meanwhile, India and South Africa adopt hybrid models that combine arbitration and court intervention, although their efficiency levels vary [37], [38].

The main obstacles to effective dispute resolution in BRICS include fragmented approaches, lack of a uniform dispute resolution framework, and weak institutional mechanisms that limit enforcement. Different cultures and legal traditions further complicate the establishment of unified mechanisms. A centralized dispute resolution system, such as that of the European Union through the European Court of Justice, could be a potential model for the BRICS. Although full adoption of this model is difficult due to political and structural differences, the development of a regional arbitration framework could help address some of the gaps [39], [40].

4.3 Challenges and Opportunities for Legal Harmonization

Challenges to legal harmonization in BRICS stem from diverse legal systems, as the bloc includes common law (India, South Africa), civil law (Brazil, Russia), and socialist

law (China), leading to structural and procedural differences. In addition, economic and political disparities among member states, with varying levels of development and different priorities, hamper consensus-building in harmonization efforts. Institutional weaknesses further compound these challenges, as limited capacity in regulatory institutions in some countries affects the implementation and enforcement of harmonized regulations.

Despite the challenges, there are significant opportunities for harmonization within BRICS. Aligning with international standards, such as those set by the WTO and UN, can bridge regulatory gaps and simplify compliance for businesses. Establishing Mutual Recognition Agreements (MRAs) for standards and certification can reduce technical barriers to trade. Moreover, enhancing institutional capacity through technical assistance and knowledge sharing among BRICS members can facilitate smoother implementation of harmonized laws, promoting greater economic integration and cooperation.

4.4 Proposed Strategy for Legal Harmonization

Developing a unified tariff classification system is essential to reduce trade costs and increase predictability. This can be achieved through an agreement that harmonizes tariff schedules across BRICS countries while still accommodating each country's unique economic needs. Such tariff harmonization will not only improve trade efficiency, but also promote closer economic integration among BRICS members.

The establishment of a BRICS-specific arbitration body can offer a consistent and impartial platform for resolving trade disputes. To achieve this, it requires uniform arbitration rules agreed by all member states, a mechanism to ensure the enforceability of arbitral awards across jurisdictions, and equal representation of all BRICS countries to foster trust and credibility. Harmonization efforts can begin by focusing on priority sectors such as technology, agriculture, and energy, which

are of common interest to all BRICS members. This approach is expected to yield faster results and prove the benefits of legal harmonization for this economic bloc.

4.5 Implications for Economic Integration

Harmonized trade rules and dispute resolution mechanisms can significantly reduce transaction costs, improve supply chain efficiency, and promote increased trade volumes in BRICS. A predictable legal environment will foster investor confidence, attracting foreign direct investment (FDI), especially in sectors that require long-term commitments such as infrastructure and energy. By presenting a unified legal framework, BRICS can not only strengthen its internal economic integration but also enhance its negotiating power in global trade forums, making it a more influential economic bloc in the international arena.

4.6 Limitations of Harmonization Efforts

Despite the potential benefits, harmonization efforts within BRICS face several limitations. Political differences often lead member states to prioritize national interests over collective goals, resulting in resistance to harmonized regulations. Resource limitations further hamper progress, as the development of the necessary legal and institutional infrastructure requires substantial financial and human resources, which may be limited in some countries. In addition, cultural resistance, stemming from different approaches to trade and law enforcement, may hinder consensus on effective harmonization strategies.

4.7 Comparative Insights from Other Regional Blocks

Lessons from the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the European Union (EU) provide valuable insights for BRICS in its efforts towards legal harmonization. ASEAN's success in harmonizing trade regulations through phased agreements and capacity-building initiatives demonstrates the effectiveness of

gradual harmonization over direct integration. Similarly, the EU's emphasis on strong institutions and clear legal standards provides a model for enhancing legal cohesion. Adapting these practices to the BRICS context, particularly by establishing regional arbitration centers, could address the bloc's unique challenges while promoting greater legal harmony.

4.8 Recommendations for Future Harmonization Efforts

1. BRICS countries should invest in regulatory institutions and encourage technical collaboration to address capacity gaps.
2. Focusing on specific sectors and building small-scale agreements can demonstrate the benefits of harmonization and encourage wider adoption.
3. Establishing regular high-level dialogue among BRICS leaders can facilitate consensus building and align national priorities with common goals.

5. CONCLUSION

This study concludes that Hadith and Legal harmonization within BRICS presents both challenges and opportunities to improve cross-border trade and dispute resolution. The diverse legal systems in Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa create regulatory gaps that hinder economic integration. However, this study highlights that harmonization can be achieved through strategic measures such as adopting international standards, establishing a centralized dispute resolution body, and focusing on sectoral harmonization. These efforts require strong political commitment, institutional capacity building, and a phased implementation approach. Possible benefits include reduced transaction costs, increased trade efficiency, and increased investor confidence, while a unified legal framework will strengthen the BRICS' influence in global trade negotiations, and solidify its role as a

major economic bloc. Despite persistent challenges such as political differences and resource constraints, the recommendations of this study provide a roadmap to achieve legal

alignment and promote sustainable growth. By addressing these issues collaboratively, BRICS can unlock its economic potential and set an example for other regional alliances.

REFERENCES

- [1] Biju and R.Ramki, "a Study on Multilateral Trade and Investments Among Brics Countries," *Int. J. Eng. Technol. Manag. Sci.*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 280–285, 2023, doi: 10.46647/ijetms.2023.v07i01.041.
- [2] A. Dutta, "Multilateral diplomacy: Role of BRICS in altering the discourse of global governance," *Int. J. Sci. Technol. Res.*, vol. 8, no. 10, pp. 1026–1031, 2019.
- [3] R. Kappel, "Global power shifts and challenges for the global order," *IMVF Policy Pap.*, vol. 2, pp. 1–13, 2015.
- [4] C. Aleksia and A. R. Bakhtiar, "BRICS as New Alternatives in Reforming International Financial Institutions and Economic Partnerships," *Insign. J. Int. Relations*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 128–143, 2023.
- [5] E. Y. Arapova, "The 'BRICS Plus' as the first international platform connecting regional trade agreements," *Asia-Pacific Soc. Sci. Rev.*, vol. 19, no. 2, p. 4, 2019.
- [6] H. Pawar and M. Patel, "Harmonization of Regulatory Frameworks for Medical Devices in BRICS Countries: A Path to Enhanced Trade and Investment," in *Annales Pharmaceutiques Françaises*, Elsevier, 2024.
- [7] A. O. Inshakova, E. I. Inshakova, and A. V Lavrentyeva, "Determinants and prospects for the legal harmonization of the intra-BRICS trade turnover in the digital form," in *Digital Economy: Complexity and Variety vs. Rationality 9*, Springer, 2020, pp. 209–219.
- [8] E. E. Orlova, "The role of harmonization of legal regulation in the process of global and regional integration," *J. Foreign Legis. Comp. Law*, vol. 17, no. 6, pp. 147–158, 2021.
- [9] M. F. Marikar, "Harmonizing the National Legal System Through the Formation of Ideal Legislation," *J. Leg.*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 167–178, 2023.
- [10] M. Von Lampe, K. Deconinck, and V. Bastien, "Trade-Related International Regulatory Co-operation: A Theoretical Framework," 2016.
- [11] T. M. Evans, "Role of International Rules in Blockchain-Based Cross-Border Commercial Disputes," *Wayne L. Rev.*, vol. 65, p. 1, 2019.
- [12] R. B. Riyanto, E. Laryea, N. Fibrianti, and D. Latifiani, "Cross-Border Trade Disputes: A Comparative Analysis of Indonesia and Australia," *J. Indones. Leg. Stud.*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2024.
- [13] T. Parfinenko, "International Economic Integration of BRICS Countries–Driver of Regional and Global Economic Growth," in "New Silk Road: Business Cooperation and Prospective of Economic Development"(NSRBCPED 2019), Atlantis Press, 2020, pp. 426–431.
- [14] T. V Luzina, E. A. Dudareva, E. M. Akhmetshin, N. A. Prodanova, Y. S. Berdova, and G. E. Emaletdinova, "International legal format for trans regionalisation of trade and economic partnership within BRICS in global development," *Sp. Cult. India*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 76–85, 2019.
- [15] V. Shaidullina and I. Semenovskiy, "BRICS CounTRIES'EconoMIC AnD LEGAL CooPERATIOn THROuGH THE PRISM oF STRATEGIC PLAnnInG DoCuMEnTS," *BRICS Law J.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 4–34, 2022.
- [16] A. N. Ali, S. A. R. A. A. Al-Ibraheemi, and A. A. Obaid, "BRICS bloc in light of international economic challenges: A study of reality and dimensions," *Int. J. Prof. Bus. Rev.*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. e0661–e0661, 2022.
- [17] N. Fatima, "Future of Dispute Resolution and Investment in BRICS," *Rev. Bras. Altern. Disput. Resolut. J. Altern. Disput. Resolut.*, vol. 4, no. 8, pp. 187–209, 2022.
- [18] Z. Maria and P. Vladimir, "Experiences of legal integration and reception by the BRICS countries: five passengers in a boat (Without a Dog)," *BRICS Law J.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 4–23, 2018.
- [19] W. M. F. de Moraes, "HARMONIZAÇÃO DAS LEGISLAÇÕES INTERNAS: A COORDENAÇÃO INTERNACIONAL COMO INSTRUMENTO EFICAZ PARA O ENFRENTAMENTO À LAVAGEM DE CAPITAIS," *RECIMA21-Revista Científica Multidiscip.* 2675–6218, vol. 5, no. 9, pp. e595641–e595641, 2024.
- [20] A. E. Etagha, "Legal harmonisation of non-tariff barriers of regional economic communities as a catalyst to the realisation of the African continental free trade area." 2023.
- [21] B. Marušić, "Legislative harmonisation on an international level through multilateral international agreements," in *The Autonomous Legal Concept of Communication to the Public*, Edward Elgar Publishing, 2023, pp. 53–89.
- [22] S. E. Owusu and B. Peyravi, "The Impact of Trade Policies on International Marketing Strategies," *Appl. Bus. Issues Solut.*, pp. 17–21, 2024.
- [23] C. Morini, F. P. Leonardo, V. Chaudhary, and J. Hintsu, "A Paradigm Shift in Cross-Border E-Commerce Regulatory Compliance: Evidence From Brazil," *World Cust. J.*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 3–19, 2024.
- [24] J. O. Atadoga *et al.*, "Cross-border tax challenges and solutions in global finance," *Financ. Account. Res. J.*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 252–261, 2024.
- [25] L. Sun, "Overview of Regulations on Cross Border Data Flow," *Acad. J. Sci. Technol.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 171–176, 2023.
- [26] X. Ziyi, "International Law Protection of Cross-Border Transmission of Personal Information Based on Cloud Computing and Big Data," *Mob. Inf. Syst.*, vol. 2022, no. 1, p. 9672693, 2022.

- [27] K. Odilovna, "RESOLVING TRADE DISPUTES IN A GLOBALIZED WORLD: THE EFFICACY AND CHALLENGES OF THE WTO DISPUTE SETTLEMENT MECHANISM," *Int. J. Law Criminol.*, vol. 4, pp. 47–52, Nov. 2024, doi: 10.37547/ijlc/Volume04Issue11-06.
- [28] H. Guan, "On the Reform of WTO Dispute Settlement Mechanism and Suggestions," *Adv. Econ. Manag. Polit. Sci.*, vol. 71, pp. 185–191, Jan. 2024, doi: 10.54254/2754-1169/71/20241487.
- [29] J. Yang, "Suggestions Regarding the WTO Dispute Settlement Mechanism in Strengthening Multilateralism," *Lect. Notes Educ. Psychol. Public Media*, vol. 4, pp. 1125–1133, May 2023, doi: 10.54254/2753-7048/4/2022830.
- [30] A. Sykes, "Enforcement and dispute resolution," *Law Econ. Int. Trade Agreements*, pp. 80–126, 2023, doi: 10.4337/9781802209747.00011.
- [31] M. Berman, *The politics of authenticity: Radical individualism and the emergence of modern society*. Verso Books, 2009.
- [32] K. Zweigert and H. Kötz, "Введение в сравнительное правоведение в сфере частного права," (No Title), 1998.
- [33] E. F. de Sousa, E. C. Roos, F. J. K. Neto, and G. B. B. Vieira, "Tariff policies and economic management: A position of the Brazilian ports," *Case Stud. Transp. Policy*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 374–382, 2021.
- [34] C. Schonerwald, L. Michelon, and M. Corrêa, "Geography, international trade and institutions: an econometric analysis of the BRICS," *Conjunt. Austral*, vol. 11, pp. 28–47, Mar. 2020, doi: 10.22456/2178-8839.96612.
- [35] L. S. Viana, E. L. de Matos, N. S. Soares, L. J. S. Rego, and C. E. I. Drumond, "The Importance of BRICS for the trade flow of the segment Brazilian wood pulp with Russia," *Res. Soc. Dev.*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. e37511322861–e37511322861, 2022.
- [36] S. F. N. Wildain, "ANALYSIS OF THE INFLUENCE OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE POLICY ON THE INDONESIAN ECONOMY:(Case Study when Oil Palm is discriminated in the EU)," *CASHFLOW Curr. Adv. Res. SHARIA Financ. Econ. Worldw.*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 71–76, 2022.
- [37] M. Nurudeen, A. Latilo, H. Imosemi, and Q. Imosemi, "Conceptual model for strengthening international commercial arbitration in promoting cross-border trade and investment in developing economies," *Glob. J. Res. Multidiscip. Stud.*, vol. 2, pp. 17–33, Sep. 2024, doi: 10.58175/gjrms.2024.2.1.0037.
- [38] F. Dias Simões, "A Dispute Resolution Centre for the BRICS?," 2017. doi: 10.1017/9781108236102.014.
- [39] E.-U. Petersmann, "Justice as conflict resolution: Proliferation, fragmentation, and decentralization of dispute settlement in international trade," *U. Pa. J. Int'l Econ. L.*, vol. 27, p. 273, 2006.
- [40] W. Gu, "Hybrid dispute resolution beyond the Belt and Road: Toward a new design of Chinese Arb-Med (-Arb) and its global implications," *Wash. Int'l LJ*, vol. 29, p. 117, 2019.