In the matter of an arbitration under the Rules of Arbitration of the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes

Case No. ARB/10/23

International Dispute Resolution Centre (IDRC) 1 Paternoster Lane London EC4M 7BQ

Day 3

Friday, 29th July 2022

Hearing on Annulment

Before: MS DEVA VILLANÚA PROFESSOR DOUG JONES AO PROFESSOR LAWRENCE BOO

TECO GUATEMALA HOLDINGS LLC Claimant/Respondent on Annulment -v-

REPUBLIC OF GUATEMALA

Respondent/Applicant

Secretary to the Committee: MERCEDES CORDIDO-FREYTES DE KUROWSKI Assistant to the Committee: FELIPE ARAGÓN BARRERO

> Transcript produced by Trevor McGowan Lisa Gulland and Georgina Vaughn

APPEARANCES

FOR CLAIMANT/RESPONDENT ON ANNULMENT

ANDREA J MENAKER, White & Case LLP PETR POLÁŠEK, White & Case LLP KRISTEN M YOUNG, White & Case LLP POORVI SATIJA, White & Case LLP KIT CHONG NG, White & Case LLP BROOKE WILSON, White & Case LLP SEBASTIAN MODOS, White & Case LLP DAVID NICHOLSON, TECO Energy Inc JAVIER CUEBAS, TECO Energy Inc

FOR RESPONDENT/APPLICANT

IGNACIO TORTEROLA, GST LLP DIEGO GOSIS, GST LLP QUINN SMITH, GST LLP PABLO MORI, GST LLP CARMINE PASCUZZO, GST LLP FARHOD SHARIPOV, GST LLP FABIOLA MADRIGAL, GST LLP NICOLAS GONZÁLEZ, GST LLP KATHERINE SANOJA, GST LLP JOSÉ ANGELO DAVID, GST LLP BETHEL KASSA, GST LLP WUELMER GÓMEZ GONZÁLEZ, Attorney General of the Republic of Guatemala RITA CASTEJÓN, Advisor to the Superior Office of the Attorney General's Office CRISTÍAN RODRÍGUEZ, Advisor to the Superior Office of the Attorney General's Office LILIAN NÁJERA, Head of the International Affairs Unit of the Attorney General's Office JULIO SANTIZ, Attorney General's Office MARIO MÉRIDA, Attorney General's Office ANDRES PUENTE, Attorney General's Office DIEGO DE LEÓN, Attorney General's Office JANIO ROSALES, Minister of Economy MARIA LUISA FLORES VILLAGRÁN, Vice Minister of Integration and Foreign Trade VICTORIA MEZA, Director of Foreign Trade, Ministry of Economy KARLA LIQUEZ, Ministry of Economy IVANNIA PONCE, Ministry of Economy TANIA GUZMÁN, Ministry of Economy

INTERPRETERS

DANIEL GIGLIO, Spanish-English interpreter SILVIA COLLA, Spanish-English interpreter ANNA SOPHIA CHAPMAN, Spanish-English interpreter

SPANISH COURT REPORTERS

Elizabeth Cicoria, DR Esteno

SUPPORT STAFF

IVANIA FERNÁNDEZ, ICSID paralegal DIMITRIOS GEORGIOS KONTOGIANNIS, ICSID intern

Submissions re draft Code of Conduct on behalf4
of Respondent
By Dr Torterola4
Submissions re draft Code of Conduct on behalf7
of Claimant
By Ms Menaker7
Questions from THE TRIBUNAL9
Answers to Tribunal questions
By Mr Gosis21
By Ms Menaker41
By Mr Gosis50
By Ms Menaker54
By Mr Polášek60
By Mr Gosis61
By Mr Polášek65
By Ms Menaker78
By Dr Torterola82
By Ms Menaker89
Discussion re procedural matters

09:43	1 Friday, 29th July 2022	10:05 1	authorities, we went and just looked at the authorities
	2 (10.02 am)	2	in the record and in the presentations of the parties,
	3 THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, everybody, to the third day of	3	and put them in slides after each individual question.
	4 this hearing. (Interpreted) I would like to thank those	4	The Committee asked us to also identify the
	5 in Guatemala who are connecting very early in the	5	different sources for the valuations used in the
	6 morning. (Pause)	6	different phases of the arbitration. We have taken
	7 (In English) So welcome, everybody. Before we	7	snippets from the reports and the findings regarding
	8 begin, are there any housekeeping issues? Before I give	8	those presentations and we just put them together in the
	you the floor to comment on the code of conduct, of	9	presentation you have before you.
	0 course.	10	But there's nothing here which is not an answer to
	1 Mr Torterola, good morning. Did you get more sleep	10	one of the specific questions by the Committee
	2 than yesterday?	11	yesterday.
	3 DR TORTEROLA: Yes, I got two more hours than yesterday.	12	THE PRESIDENT: Have you prepared anything similar?
	4 THE PRESIDENT: Well, that is a 100% increase!	13	MS MENAKER: We have not. We prepared some answers; we
			haven't prepared any PowerPoint or anything like that.
	5 DR TORTEROLA: That's a very appropriate comment, yes.	15	
	6 No, we don't have any administrative matters to	16	Like I said, I don't object: as long as we're going
	7 discuss this morning.	17	to be answering questions one by one and each of us have
	8 THE PRESIDENT: Good.	18	an opportunity, to the extent they put something on
	9 Ms Menaker?	19	a slide, that is fine. But I only wanted to remark that
	MS MENAKER: We don't have any either, thank you.	20	it was certainly not our expectation that one party
	1 THE PRESIDENT: Good.	21	would be giving a presentation in full, with 73 slides.
	2 So, Mr Torterola, you would like to comment on the	22	THE PRESIDENT: Okay. Well, if at any point during the
	3 recently filed document, the fourth version of the draft	23	answers you feel that this is exceeding the scope of
	4 Code of Conduct.	24	what it is intended to be, please feel free to make the
2	5 DR TORTEROLA: Yes. We have prepared a PowerPoint	25	objection and we will deal with it.
	Page 1		Page 3
	č		C
10:03		10:06 1	MS MENAKER: Okay.
	today. We are going to distribute them.	10:06 1 2	THE PRESIDENT: Yes? Excellent.
	today. We are going to distribute them.THE PRESIDENT: Okay.	2 3	THE PRESIDENT: Yes? Excellent. Mr Torterola, whenever you feel like it.
	 today. We are going to distribute them. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MS MENAKER: Madam President, members of the Committee, we 	2 3 4	THE PRESIDENT: Yes? Excellent. Mr Torterola, whenever you feel like it. DR TORTEROLA: I will bother the members of the Committee
	 today. We are going to distribute them. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MS MENAKER: Madam President, members of the Committee, we don't object if they want to use a slide to demonstrate 	2 3	THE PRESIDENT: Yes? Excellent.Mr Torterola, whenever you feel like it.DR TORTEROLA: I will bother the members of the Committee with the translation. So I will be speaking in Spanish
	 today. We are going to distribute them. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MS MENAKER: Madam President, members of the Committee, we don't object if they want to use a slide to demonstrate a point in response to a question, but this was not 	2 3 4 5 6	THE PRESIDENT: Yes? Excellent.Mr Torterola, whenever you feel like it.DR TORTEROLA: I will bother the members of the Committee with the translation. So I will be speaking in Spanish about the new Code of Conduct. (Pause)
	 today. We are going to distribute them. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MS MENAKER: Madam President, members of the Committee, we don't object if they want to use a slide to demonstrate a point in response to a question, but this was not scheduled as a presentation. There are 73 slides here. 	2 3 4 5 6 7	THE PRESIDENT: Yes? Excellent.Mr Torterola, whenever you feel like it.DR TORTEROLA: I will bother the members of the Committee with the translation. So I will be speaking in Spanish about the new Code of Conduct. (Pause)(10.06 am)
	 today. We are going to distribute them. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MS MENAKER: Madam President, members of the Committee, we don't object if they want to use a slide to demonstrate a point in response to a question, but this was not scheduled as a presentation. There are 73 slides here. So I don't think that that's appropriate, for one of the 	2 3 4 5 6	 THE PRESIDENT: Yes? Excellent. Mr Torterola, whenever you feel like it. DR TORTEROLA: I will bother the members of the Committee with the translation. So I will be speaking in Spanish about the new Code of Conduct. (Pause) (10.06 am) Submissions re draft Code of Conduct on behalf of Respondent
	 today. We are going to distribute them. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MS MENAKER: Madam President, members of the Committee, we don't object if they want to use a slide to demonstrate a point in response to a question, but this was not scheduled as a presentation. There are 73 slides here. So I don't think that that's appropriate, for one of the parties to have anticipated making a presentation or to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 THE PRESIDENT: Yes? Excellent. Mr Torterola, whenever you feel like it. DR TORTEROLA: I will bother the members of the Committee with the translation. So I will be speaking in Spanish about the new Code of Conduct. (Pause) (10.06 am) Submissions re draft Code of Conduct on behalf of Respondent DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) I first wanted to say that
	 today. We are going to distribute them. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MS MENAKER: Madam President, members of the Committee, we don't object if they want to use a slide to demonstrate a point in response to a question, but this was not scheduled as a presentation. There are 73 slides here. So I don't think that that's appropriate, for one of the parties to have anticipated making a presentation or to submit to the Committee in writing all of this. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 THE PRESIDENT: Yes? Excellent. Mr Torterola, whenever you feel like it. DR TORTEROLA: I will bother the members of the Committee with the translation. So I will be speaking in Spanish about the new Code of Conduct. (Pause) (10.06 am) Submissions re draft Code of Conduct on behalf of Respondent DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) I first wanted to say that I have compared the drafts, drafts no. 3 and no. 4, and
	 today. We are going to distribute them. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MS MENAKER: Madam President, members of the Committee, we don't object if they want to use a slide to demonstrate a point in response to a question, but this was not scheduled as a presentation. There are 73 slides here. So I don't think that that's appropriate, for one of the parties to have anticipated making a presentation or to submit to the Committee in writing all of this. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 THE PRESIDENT: Yes? Excellent. Mr Torterola, whenever you feel like it. DR TORTEROLA: I will bother the members of the Committee with the translation. So I will be speaking in Spanish about the new Code of Conduct. (Pause) (10.06 am) Submissions re draft Code of Conduct on behalf of Respondent DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) I first wanted to say that I have compared the drafts, drafts no. 3 and no. 4, and there are substantial changes. The language is being
1	 today. We are going to distribute them. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MS MENAKER: Madam President, members of the Committee, we don't object if they want to use a slide to demonstrate a point in response to a question, but this was not scheduled as a presentation. There are 73 slides here. So I don't think that that's appropriate, for one of the parties to have anticipated making a presentation or to submit to the Committee in writing all of this. THE PRESIDENT: Is it just on the draft Code of Conduct or is it also 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 THE PRESIDENT: Yes? Excellent. Mr Torterola, whenever you feel like it. DR TORTEROLA: I will bother the members of the Committee with the translation. So I will be speaking in Spanish about the new Code of Conduct. (Pause) (10.06 am) Submissions re draft Code of Conduct on behalf of Respondent DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) I first wanted to say that I have compared the drafts, drafts no. 3 and no. 4, and there are substantial changes. The language is being consolidated, and everything that was bracketed and
11111	 today. We are going to distribute them. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MS MENAKER: Madam President, members of the Committee, we don't object if they want to use a slide to demonstrate a point in response to a question, but this was not scheduled as a presentation. There are 73 slides here. So I don't think that that's appropriate, for one of the parties to have anticipated making a presentation or to submit to the Committee in writing all of this. THE PRESIDENT: Is it just on the draft Code of Conduct or is it also 3 DR TORTEROLA: No, this is about some of the questions that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 THE PRESIDENT: Yes? Excellent. Mr Torterola, whenever you feel like it. DR TORTEROLA: I will bother the members of the Committee with the translation. So I will be speaking in Spanish about the new Code of Conduct. (Pause) (10.06 am) Submissions re draft Code of Conduct on behalf of Respondent DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) I first wanted to say that I have compared the drafts, drafts no. 3 and no. 4, and there are substantial changes. The language is being consolidated, and everything that was bracketed and everything that was crossed out and commented on, well,
	 today. We are going to distribute them. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MS MENAKER: Madam President, members of the Committee, we don't object if they want to use a slide to demonstrate a point in response to a question, but this was not scheduled as a presentation. There are 73 slides here. So I don't think that that's appropriate, for one of the parties to have anticipated making a presentation or to submit to the Committee in writing all of this. THE PRESIDENT: Is it just on the draft Code of Conduct or is it also DR TORTEROLA: No, this is about some of the questions that I will let my colleague Mr Gosis explain. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 THE PRESIDENT: Yes? Excellent. Mr Torterola, whenever you feel like it. DR TORTEROLA: I will bother the members of the Committee with the translation. So I will be speaking in Spanish about the new Code of Conduct. (Pause) (10.06 am) Submissions re draft Code of Conduct on behalf of Respondent DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) I first wanted to say that I have compared the drafts, drafts no. 3 and no. 4, and there are substantial changes. The language is being consolidated, and everything that was bracketed and everything that was crossed out and commented on, well, all these things are being broken down.
11111	 today. We are going to distribute them. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MS MENAKER: Madam President, members of the Committee, we don't object if they want to use a slide to demonstrate a point in response to a question, but this was not scheduled as a presentation. There are 73 slides here. So I don't think that that's appropriate, for one of the parties to have anticipated making a presentation or to submit to the Committee in writing all of this. THE PRESIDENT: Is it just on the draft Code of Conduct or is it also DR TORTEROLA: No, this is about some of the questions that I will let my colleague Mr Gosis explain. Otherwise, as Ms Menaker has suggested, you don't 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 THE PRESIDENT: Yes? Excellent. Mr Torterola, whenever you feel like it. DR TORTEROLA: I will bother the members of the Committee with the translation. So I will be speaking in Spanish about the new Code of Conduct. (Pause) (10.06 am) Submissions re draft Code of Conduct on behalf of Respondent DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) I first wanted to say that I have compared the drafts, drafts no. 3 and no. 4, and there are substantial changes. The language is being consolidated, and everything that was bracketed and everything that was crossed out and commented on, well, all these things are being broken down. Second, there are substantial issues that are being
	 today. We are going to distribute them. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MS MENAKER: Madam President, members of the Committee, we don't object if they want to use a slide to demonstrate a point in response to a question, but this was not scheduled as a presentation. There are 73 slides here. So I don't think that that's appropriate, for one of the parties to have anticipated making a presentation or to submit to the Committee in writing all of this. THE PRESIDENT: Is it just on the draft Code of Conduct or is it also DR TORTEROLA: No, this is about some of the questions that I will let my colleague Mr Gosis explain. Otherwise, as Ms Menaker has suggested, you don't need to take a printed copy. It is just to be 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 THE PRESIDENT: Yes? Excellent. Mr Torterola, whenever you feel like it. DR TORTEROLA: I will bother the members of the Committee with the translation. So I will be speaking in Spanish about the new Code of Conduct. (Pause) (10.06 am) Submissions re draft Code of Conduct on behalf of Respondent DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) I first wanted to say that I have compared the drafts, drafts no. 3 and no. 4, and there are substantial changes. The language is being consolidated, and everything that was bracketed and everything that was crossed out and commented on, well, all these things are being broken down. Second, there are substantial issues that are being dealt with in this Code of Conduct. The Claimants
	 today. We are going to distribute them. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MS MENAKER: Madam President, members of the Committee, we don't object if they want to use a slide to demonstrate a point in response to a question, but this was not scheduled as a presentation. There are 73 slides here. So I don't think that that's appropriate, for one of the parties to have anticipated making a presentation or to submit to the Committee in writing all of this. THE PRESIDENT: Is it just on the draft Code of Conduct or is it also DR TORTEROLA: No, this is about some of the questions that I will let my colleague Mr Gosis explain. Otherwise, as Ms Menaker has suggested, you don't need to take a printed copy. It is just to be 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 THE PRESIDENT: Yes? Excellent. Mr Torterola, whenever you feel like it. DR TORTEROLA: I will bother the members of the Committee with the translation. So I will be speaking in Spanish about the new Code of Conduct. (Pause) (10.06 am) Submissions re draft Code of Conduct on behalf of Respondent DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) I first wanted to say that I have compared the drafts, drafts no. 3 and no. 4, and there are substantial changes. The language is being consolidated, and everything that was bracketed and everything that was crossed out and commented on, well, all these things are being broken down. Second, there are substantial issues that are being
	 today. We are going to distribute them. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MS MENAKER: Madam President, members of the Committee, we don't object if they want to use a slide to demonstrate a point in response to a question, but this was not scheduled as a presentation. There are 73 slides here. So I don't think that that's appropriate, for one of the parties to have anticipated making a presentation or to submit to the Committee in writing all of this. THE PRESIDENT: Is it just on the draft Code of Conduct or is it also DR TORTEROLA: No, this is about some of the questions that I will let my colleague Mr Gosis explain. Otherwise, as Ms Menaker has suggested, you don't need to take a printed copy. It is just to be completely transparent and to give a copy to anyone, and counsel on the other side of the room. We don't intend 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 THE PRESIDENT: Yes? Excellent. Mr Torterola, whenever you feel like it. DR TORTEROLA: I will bother the members of the Committee with the translation. So I will be speaking in Spanish about the new Code of Conduct. (Pause) (10.06 am) Submissions re draft Code of Conduct on behalf of Respondent DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) I first wanted to say that I have compared the drafts, drafts no. 3 and no. 4, and there are substantial changes. The language is being consolidated, and everything that was bracketed and everything that was crossed out and commented on, well, all these things are being broken down. Second, there are substantial issues that are being dealt with in this Code of Conduct. The Claimants
	 today. We are going to distribute them. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MS MENAKER: Madam President, members of the Committee, we don't object if they want to use a slide to demonstrate a point in response to a question, but this was not scheduled as a presentation. There are 73 slides here. So I don't think that that's appropriate, for one of the parties to have anticipated making a presentation or to submit to the Committee in writing all of this. THE PRESIDENT: Is it just on the draft Code of Conduct or is it also DR TORTEROLA: No, this is about some of the questions that I will let my colleague Mr Gosis explain. Otherwise, as Ms Menaker has suggested, you don't need to take a printed copy. It is just to be completely transparent and to give a copy to anyone, and counsel on the other side of the room. We don't intend 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 THE PRESIDENT: Yes? Excellent. Mr Torterola, whenever you feel like it. DR TORTEROLA: I will bother the members of the Committee with the translation. So I will be speaking in Spanish about the new Code of Conduct. (Pause) (10.06 am) Submissions re draft Code of Conduct on behalf of Respondent DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) I first wanted to say that I have compared the drafts, drafts no. 3 and no. 4, and there are substantial changes. The language is being consolidated, and everything that was bracketed and everything that was crossed out and commented on, well, all these things are being broken down. Second, there are substantial issues that are being dealt with in this Code of Conduct. The Claimants showed us yesterday a situation where no double-hatting can occur. The matter at hand, it's not only a 100% double-hatting issue; this has to do with the
	 today. We are going to distribute them. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MS MENAKER: Madam President, members of the Committee, we don't object if they want to use a slide to demonstrate a point in response to a question, but this was not scheduled as a presentation. There are 73 slides here. So I don't think that that's appropriate, for one of the parties to have anticipated making a presentation or to submit to the Committee in writing all of this. THE PRESIDENT: Is it just on the draft Code of Conduct or is it also DR TORTEROLA: No, this is about some of the questions that I will let my colleague Mr Gosis explain. Otherwise, as Ms Menaker has suggested, you don't need to take a printed copy. It is just to be completely transparent and to give a copy to anyone, and counsel on the other side of the room. We don't intend to do anything besides being transparent, and everything 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 THE PRESIDENT: Yes? Excellent. Mr Torterola, whenever you feel like it. DR TORTEROLA: I will bother the members of the Committee with the translation. So I will be speaking in Spanish about the new Code of Conduct. (Pause) (10.06 am) Submissions re draft Code of Conduct on behalf of Respondent DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) I first wanted to say that I have compared the drafts, drafts no. 3 and no. 4, and there are substantial changes. The language is being consolidated, and everything that was bracketed and everything that was crossed out and commented on, well, all these things are being broken down. Second, there are substantial issues that are being dealt with in this Code of Conduct. The Claimants showed us yesterday a situation where no double-hatting can occur. The matter at hand, it's not only a 100%
	 today. We are going to distribute them. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MS MENAKER: Madam President, members of the Committee, we don't object if they want to use a slide to demonstrate a point in response to a question, but this was not scheduled as a presentation. There are 73 slides here. So I don't think that that's appropriate, for one of the parties to have anticipated making a presentation or to submit to the Committee in writing all of this. THE PRESIDENT: Is it just on the draft Code of Conduct or is it also DR TORTEROLA: No, this is about some of the questions that I will let my colleague Mr Gosis explain. Otherwise, as Ms Menaker has suggested, you don't need to take a printed copy. It is just to be completely transparent and to give a copy to anyone, and counsel on the other side of the room. We don't intend to do anything besides being transparent, and everything is responsive to the questions that you have put to us. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 THE PRESIDENT: Yes? Excellent. Mr Torterola, whenever you feel like it. DR TORTEROLA: I will bother the members of the Committee with the translation. So I will be speaking in Spanish about the new Code of Conduct. (Pause) (10.06 am) Submissions re draft Code of Conduct on behalf of Respondent DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) I first wanted to say that I have compared the drafts, drafts no. 3 and no. 4, and there are substantial changes. The language is being consolidated, and everything that was bracketed and everything that was crossed out and commented on, well, all these things are being broken down. Second, there are substantial issues that are being dealt with in this Code of Conduct. The Claimants showed us yesterday a situation where no double-hatting can occur. The matter at hand, it's not only a 100% double-hatting issue; this has to do with the
	 today. We are going to distribute them. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MS MENAKER: Madam President, members of the Committee, we don't object if they want to use a slide to demonstrate a point in response to a question, but this was not scheduled as a presentation. There are 73 slides here. So I don't think that that's appropriate, for one of the parties to have anticipated making a presentation or to submit to the Committee in writing all of this. THE PRESIDENT: Is it just on the draft Code of Conduct or is it also DR TORTEROLA: No, this is about some of the questions that I will let my colleague Mr Gosis explain. Otherwise, as Ms Menaker has suggested, you don't need to take a printed copy. It is just to be completely transparent and to give a copy to anyone, and counsel on the other side of the room. We don't intend to do anything besides being transparent, and everything is responsive to the questions that you have put to us. My colleague would like to explain: the majority of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 THE PRESIDENT: Yes? Excellent. Mr Torterola, whenever you feel like it. DR TORTEROLA: I will bother the members of the Committee with the translation. So I will be speaking in Spanish about the new Code of Conduct. (Pause) (10.06 am) Submissions re draft Code of Conduct on behalf of Respondent DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) I first wanted to say that I have compared the drafts, drafts no. 3 and no. 4, and there are substantial changes. The language is being consolidated, and everything that was bracketed and everything that was crossed out and commented on, well, all these things are being broken down. Second, there are substantial issues that are being dealt with in this Code of Conduct. The Claimants showed us yesterday a situation where no double-hatting can occur. The matter at hand, it's not only a 100% double-hatting issue; this has to do with the relationship between the number of people that are
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2	 today. We are going to distribute them. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MS MENAKER: Madam President, members of the Committee, we don't object if they want to use a slide to demonstrate a point in response to a question, but this was not scheduled as a presentation. There are 73 slides here. So I don't think that that's appropriate, for one of the parties to have anticipated making a presentation or to submit to the Committee in writing all of this. THE PRESIDENT: Is it just on the draft Code of Conduct or is it also DR TORTEROLA: No, this is about some of the questions that I will let my colleague Mr Gosis explain. Otherwise, as Ms Menaker has suggested, you don't need to take a printed copy. It is just to be completely transparent and to give a copy to anyone, and counsel on the other side of the room. We don't intend to do anything besides being transparent, and everything is responsive to the questions that you have put to us. My colleague would like to explain: the majority of the slides are connected to the issue of valuation. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 THE PRESIDENT: Yes? Excellent. Mr Torterola, whenever you feel like it. DR TORTEROLA: I will bother the members of the Committee with the translation. So I will be speaking in Spanish about the new Code of Conduct. (Pause) (10.06 am) Submissions re draft Code of Conduct on behalf of Respondent DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) I first wanted to say that I have compared the drafts, drafts no. 3 and no. 4, and there are substantial changes. The language is being consolidated, and everything that was bracketed and everything that was crossed out and commented on, well, all these things are being broken down. Second, there are substantial issues that are being dealt with in this Code of Conduct. The Claimants showed us yesterday a situation where no double-hatting can occur. The matter at hand, it's not only a 100% double-hatting issue; this has to do with the relationship between the number of people that are involved in arbitration frequently and that have
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2	 today. We are going to distribute them. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MS MENAKER: Madam President, members of the Committee, we don't object if they want to use a slide to demonstrate a point in response to a question, but this was not scheduled as a presentation. There are 73 slides here. So I don't think that that's appropriate, for one of the parties to have anticipated making a presentation or to submit to the Committee in writing all of this. THE PRESIDENT: Is it just on the draft Code of Conduct or is it also DR TORTEROLA: No, this is about some of the questions that I will let my colleague Mr Gosis explain. Otherwise, as Ms Menaker has suggested, you don't need to take a printed copy. It is just to be completely transparent and to give a copy to anyone, and counsel on the other side of the room. We don't intend to do anything besides being transparent, and everything is responsive to the questions that you have put to us. My colleague would like to explain: the majority of the slides are connected to the issue of valuation. MR GOSIS: Yes, what we did basically was for every 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 THE PRESIDENT: Yes? Excellent. Mr Torterola, whenever you feel like it. DR TORTEROLA: I will bother the members of the Committee with the translation. So I will be speaking in Spanish about the new Code of Conduct. (Pause) (10.06 am) Submissions re draft Code of Conduct on behalf of Respondent DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) I first wanted to say that I have compared the drafts, drafts no. 3 and no. 4, and there are substantial changes. The language is being consolidated, and everything that was bracketed and everything that was crossed out and commented on, well, all these things are being broken down. Second, there are substantial issues that are being dealt with in this Code of Conduct. The Claimants showed us yesterday a situation where no double-hatting can occur. The matter at hand, it's not only a 100% double-hatting issue; this has to do with the relationship between the number of people that are involved in arbitration frequently and that have a professional relationship that at some point in time
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 today. We are going to distribute them. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MS MENAKER: Madam President, members of the Committee, we don't object if they want to use a slide to demonstrate a point in response to a question, but this was not scheduled as a presentation. There are 73 slides here. So I don't think that that's appropriate, for one of the parties to have anticipated making a presentation or to submit to the Committee in writing all of this. THE PRESIDENT: Is it just on the draft Code of Conduct or is it also DR TORTEROLA: No, this is about some of the questions that I will let my colleague Mr Gosis explain. Otherwise, as Ms Menaker has suggested, you don't need to take a printed copy. It is just to be completely transparent and to give a copy to anyone, and counsel on the other side of the room. We don't intend to do anything besides being transparent, and everything is responsive to the questions that you have put to us. My colleague would like to explain: the majority of the slides are connected to the issue of valuation. MR GOSIS: Yes, what we did basically was for every question, particularly starting with questions 19 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 THE PRESIDENT: Yes? Excellent. Mr Torterola, whenever you feel like it. DR TORTEROLA: I will bother the members of the Committee with the translation. So I will be speaking in Spanish about the new Code of Conduct. (Pause) (10.06 am) Submissions re draft Code of Conduct on behalf of Respondent DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) I first wanted to say that I have compared the drafts, drafts no. 3 and no. 4, and there are substantial changes. The language is being consolidated, and everything that was bracketed and everything that was crossed out and commented on, well, all these things are being broken down. Second, there are substantial issues that are being dealt with in this Code of Conduct. The Claimants showed us yesterday a situation where no double-hatting can occur. The matter at hand, it's not only a 100% double-hatting issue; this has to do with the relationship between the number of people that are involved in arbitration frequently and that have a professional relationship that at some point in time may call into question their impartiality or
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 today. We are going to distribute them. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MS MENAKER: Madam President, members of the Committee, we don't object if they want to use a slide to demonstrate a point in response to a question, but this was not scheduled as a presentation. There are 73 slides here. So I don't think that that's appropriate, for one of the parties to have anticipated making a presentation or to submit to the Committee in writing all of this. THE PRESIDENT: Is it just on the draft Code of Conduct or is it also DR TORTEROLA: No, this is about some of the questions that I will let my colleague Mr Gosis explain. Otherwise, as Ms Menaker has suggested, you don't need to take a printed copy. It is just to be completely transparent and to give a copy to anyone, and counsel on the other side of the room. We don't intend to do anything besides being transparent, and everything is responsive to the questions that you have put to us. My colleague would like to explain: the majority of the slides are connected to the issue of valuation. MR GOSIS: Yes, what we did basically was for every question, particularly starting with questions 19 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 THE PRESIDENT: Yes? Excellent. Mr Torterola, whenever you feel like it. DR TORTEROLA: I will bother the members of the Committee with the translation. So I will be speaking in Spanish about the new Code of Conduct. (Pause) (10.06 am) Submissions re draft Code of Conduct on behalf of Respondent DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) I first wanted to say that I have compared the drafts, drafts no. 3 and no. 4, and there are substantial changes. The language is being consolidated, and everything that was bracketed and everything that was crossed out and commented on, well, all these things are being broken down. Second, there are substantial issues that are being dealt with in this Code of Conduct. The Claimants showed us yesterday a situation where no double-hatting can occur. The matter at hand, it's not only a 100% double-hatting issue; this has to do with the relationship between the number of people that are involved in arbitration frequently and that have a professional relationship that at some point in time may call into question their impartiality or independence.

10:08 1	and impartiality, they indicate these things. The Code	10:12 1	Submissions re draft Code of Conduct on behalf of Claimant
10.08 1		2	MS MENAKER: May I just make a few brief comments?
3		3	The first is, as is clear, these are drafts that
4		4	have not been adopted yet; they are still under
5		5	consideration. There is no consensus. So, as the
6		6	chairman of the ICSID Administrative [Council] remarked,
7	-	0 7	of course they can't be relied upon at this stage. And
8		8	certainly even after if they are adopted, they can't
9		8 9	be applied retrospectively. So that's the first thing.
10	•	9 10	The second is: even on the slide that we were just
11		10	looking at, where Mr Torterola noted the disclosure
12	•	11	obligation and it said "in the eyes of the parties",
13		12	you will note that was bracketed. And there's bracketed
13	•	13	text throughout, which means that it's still under
14		14	discussion. And at times you will see there are notes
1.		15	describing why some text is bracketed, and what some of
17	•	10	delegates believe and others, and that's still under
18	1	17	discussion.
19	· · ·	18	Third, there are different provisions you just
20		19 20	saw the ones on disclosure, but there's also notably
20		20	a provision once you get beyond disclosure, again,
21	*	21 22	we're looking at the underlying circumstances, and
23		22	there's a specific provision that I pointed to yesterday
24		23 24	dealing with multiple roles.
25		24 25	And particularly on that, you can see a lack of
	finde is also an obligation, not on the party out on	20	And particularly on that, you can see a lack of
	Page 5		Page 7
10:11 1	the arbitrator, to make all reasonable efforts to gain	10:14 1	consensus, because in the earlier draft which we
10:11 1	the arbitrator, to make all reasonable efforts to gain knowledge of the circumstances, interests and	10:14 1	consensus, because in the earlier draft which we discussed in our brief, draft 3, there are three
10:11 1 2 3	knowledge of the circumstances, interests and	2	discussed in our brief, draft 3, there are three
2	-		discussed in our brief, draft 3, there are three different options. So Article 4, "Limit on multiple
2 3	knowledge of the circumstances, interests and relationships that may exist.	2 3	discussed in our brief, draft 3, there are three different options. So Article 4, "Limit on multiple roles", they have an option 1, which is a full
2 3 4	knowledge of the circumstances, interests and relationships that may exist. (Slide 4) This draft, draft no. 4, has an annex.	2 3 4	discussed in our brief, draft 3, there are three different options. So Article 4, "Limit on multiple
2 3 4 5	knowledge of the circumstances, interests and relationships that may exist.(Slide 4) This draft, draft no. 4, has an annex.And I took one issue simply to share with the Committee.	2 3 4 5	discussed in our brief, draft 3, there are three different options. So Article 4, "Limit on multiple roles", they have an option 1, which is a full prohibition; they have an option 2, which is a modified
2 3 4 5 6	knowledge of the circumstances, interests and relationships that may exist.(Slide 4) This draft, draft no. 4, has an annex.And I took one issue simply to share with the Committee.It says that:	2 3 4 5 6	discussed in our brief, draft 3, there are three different options. So Article 4, "Limit on multiple roles", they have an option 1, which is a full prohibition; they have an option 2, which is a modified prohibition; and an option 3, which is full disclosure
2 3 4 5 6 7	knowledge of the circumstances, interests and relationships that may exist. (Slide 4) This draft, draft no. 4, has an annex. And I took one issue simply to share with the Committee. It says that: "A Candidate and an Arbitrator shall disclose any	2 3 4 5 6 7	discussed in our brief, draft 3, there are three different options. So Article 4, "Limit on multiple roles", they have an option 1, which is a full prohibition; they have an option 2, which is a modified prohibition; and an option 3, which is full disclosure with an option to challenge.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	knowledge of the circumstances, interests and relationships that may exist. (Slide 4) This draft, draft no. 4, has an annex. And I took one issue simply to share with the Committee. It says that: "A Candidate and an Arbitrator shall disclose any circumstances likely to give rise to doubts"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	discussed in our brief, draft 3, there are three different options. So Article 4, "Limit on multiple roles", they have an option 1, which is a full prohibition; they have an option 2, which is a modified prohibition; and an option 3, which is full disclosure with an option to challenge. Then that changed in the latest draft, draft 4, to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	knowledge of the circumstances, interests and relationships that may exist. (Slide 4) This draft, draft no. 4, has an annex. And I took one issue simply to share with the Committee. It says that: "A Candidate and an Arbitrator shall disclose any circumstances likely to give rise to doubts" It's not that the person is not impartial or that it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	discussed in our brief, draft 3, there are three different options. So Article 4, "Limit on multiple roles", they have an option 1, which is a full prohibition; they have an option 2, which is a modified prohibition; and an option 3, which is full disclosure with an option to challenge. Then that changed in the latest draft, draft 4, to what I read yesterday, which in essence is proposing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	knowledge of the circumstances, interests and relationships that may exist. (Slide 4) This draft, draft no. 4, has an annex. And I took one issue simply to share with the Committee. It says that: "A Candidate and an Arbitrator shall disclose any circumstances likely to give rise to doubts" It's not that the person is not impartial or that it lacks independence. It talks about "justifiable	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	discussed in our brief, draft 3, there are three different options. So Article 4, "Limit on multiple roles", they have an option 1, which is a full prohibition; they have an option 2, which is a modified prohibition; and an option 3, which is full disclosure with an option to challenge. Then that changed in the latest draft, draft 4, to what I read yesterday, which in essence is proposing a limit on concurrent roles, or if you have served in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	knowledge of the circumstances, interests and relationships that may exist. (Slide 4) This draft, draft no. 4, has an annex. And I took one issue simply to share with the Committee. It says that: "A Candidate and an Arbitrator shall disclose any circumstances likely to give rise to doubts" It's not that the person is not impartial or that it lacks independence. It talks about "justifiable doubts", reasonable doubts, in connection with their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	discussed in our brief, draft 3, there are three different options. So Article 4, "Limit on multiple roles", they have an option 1, which is a full prohibition; they have an option 2, which is a modified prohibition; and an option 3, which is full disclosure with an option to challenge. Then that changed in the latest draft, draft 4, to what I read yesterday, which in essence is proposing a limit on concurrent roles, or if you have served in both capacities within the last three years, and is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 knowledge of the circumstances, interests and relationships that may exist. (Slide 4) This draft, draft no. 4, has an annex. And I took one issue simply to share with the Committee. It says that: "A Candidate and an Arbitrator shall disclose any circumstances likely to give rise to doubts" It's not that the person is not impartial or that it lacks independence. It talks about "justifiable doubts", reasonable doubts, in connection with their independence or impartiality. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	discussed in our brief, draft 3, there are three different options. So Article 4, "Limit on multiple roles", they have an option 1, which is a full prohibition; they have an option 2, which is a modified prohibition; and an option 3, which is full disclosure with an option to challenge. Then that changed in the latest draft, draft 4, to what I read yesterday, which in essence is proposing a limit on concurrent roles, or if you have served in both capacities within the last three years, and is really focused on issue conflicts and whether you will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 knowledge of the circumstances, interests and relationships that may exist. (Slide 4) This draft, draft no. 4, has an annex. And I took one issue simply to share with the Committee. It says that: "A Candidate and an Arbitrator shall disclose any circumstances likely to give rise to doubts" It's not that the person is not impartial or that it lacks independence. It talks about "justifiable doubts", reasonable doubts, in connection with their independence or impartiality. This also in the eyes of a third party. They also 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	discussed in our brief, draft 3, there are three different options. So Article 4, "Limit on multiple roles", they have an option 1, which is a full prohibition; they have an option 2, which is a modified prohibition; and an option 3, which is full disclosure with an option to challenge. Then that changed in the latest draft, draft 4, to what I read yesterday, which in essence is proposing a limit on concurrent roles, or if you have served in both capacities within the last three years, and is really focused on issue conflicts and whether you will have a lack of independence or impartiality because you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	knowledge of the circumstances, interests and relationships that may exist. (Slide 4) This draft, draft no. 4, has an annex. And I took one issue simply to share with the Committee. It says that: "A Candidate and an Arbitrator shall disclose any circumstances likely to give rise to doubts" It's not that the person is not impartial or that it lacks independence. It talks about "justifiable doubts", reasonable doubts, in connection with their independence or impartiality. This also in the eyes of a third party. They also added something that didn't exist before and it was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	discussed in our brief, draft 3, there are three different options. So Article 4, "Limit on multiple roles", they have an option 1, which is a full prohibition; they have an option 2, which is a modified prohibition; and an option 3, which is full disclosure with an option to challenge. Then that changed in the latest draft, draft 4, to what I read yesterday, which in essence is proposing a limit on concurrent roles, or if you have served in both capacities within the last three years, and is really focused on issue conflicts and whether you will have a lack of independence or impartiality because you are arguing a specific issue before another tribunal
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 knowledge of the circumstances, interests and relationships that may exist. (Slide 4) This draft, draft no. 4, has an annex. And I took one issue simply to share with the Committee. It says that: "A Candidate and an Arbitrator shall disclose any circumstances likely to give rise to doubts" It's not that the person is not impartial or that it lacks independence. It talks about "justifiable doubts", reasonable doubts, in connection with their independence or impartiality. This also in the eyes of a third party. They also added something that didn't exist before and it was included now: 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	discussed in our brief, draft 3, there are three different options. So Article 4, "Limit on multiple roles", they have an option 1, which is a full prohibition; they have an option 2, which is a modified prohibition; and an option 3, which is full disclosure with an option to challenge. Then that changed in the latest draft, draft 4, to what I read yesterday, which in essence is proposing a limit on concurrent roles, or if you have served in both capacities within the last three years, and is really focused on issue conflicts and whether you will have a lack of independence or impartiality because you are arguing a specific issue before another tribunal while deciding on that same issue as an arbitrator. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 knowledge of the circumstances, interests and relationships that may exist. (Slide 4) This draft, draft no. 4, has an annex. And I took one issue simply to share with the Committee. It says that: "A Candidate and an Arbitrator shall disclose any circumstances likely to give rise to doubts" It's not that the person is not impartial or that it lacks independence. It talks about "justifiable doubts", reasonable doubts, in connection with their independence or impartiality. This also in the eyes of a third party. They also added something that didn't exist before and it was included now: including in the eyes of the disputing parties" 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	discussed in our brief, draft 3, there are three different options. So Article 4, "Limit on multiple roles", they have an option 1, which is a full prohibition; they have an option 2, which is a modified prohibition; and an option 3, which is full disclosure with an option to challenge. Then that changed in the latest draft, draft 4, to what I read yesterday, which in essence is proposing a limit on concurrent roles, or if you have served in both capacities within the last three years, and is really focused on issue conflicts and whether you will have a lack of independence or impartiality because you are arguing a specific issue before another tribunal while deciding on that same issue as an arbitrator. And in one of the notes, it in fact says:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 knowledge of the circumstances, interests and relationships that may exist. (Slide 4) This draft, draft no. 4, has an annex. And I took one issue simply to share with the Committee. It says that: "A Candidate and an Arbitrator shall disclose any circumstances likely to give rise to doubts" It's not that the person is not impartial or that it lacks independence. It talks about "justifiable doubts", reasonable doubts, in connection with their independence or impartiality. This also in the eyes of a third party. They also added something that didn't exist before and it was included now: " including in the eyes of the disputing parties" 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	discussed in our brief, draft 3, there are three different options. So Article 4, "Limit on multiple roles", they have an option 1, which is a full prohibition; they have an option 2, which is a modified prohibition; and an option 3, which is full disclosure with an option to challenge. Then that changed in the latest draft, draft 4, to what I read yesterday, which in essence is proposing a limit on concurrent roles, or if you have served in both capacities within the last three years, and is really focused on issue conflicts and whether you will have a lack of independence or impartiality because you are arguing a specific issue before another tribunal while deciding on that same issue as an arbitrator. And in one of the notes, it in fact says: "One thing that the Working Group may wish to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 knowledge of the circumstances, interests and relationships that may exist. (Slide 4) This draft, draft no. 4, has an annex. And I took one issue simply to share with the Committee. It says that: "A Candidate and an Arbitrator shall disclose any circumstances likely to give rise to doubts" It's not that the person is not impartial or that it lacks independence. It talks about "justifiable doubts", reasonable doubts, in connection with their independence or impartiality. This also in the eyes of a third party. They also added something that didn't exist before and it was included now: including in the eyes of the disputing parties" These are some of the matters that are being included in this draft Code of Conduct, and I think that for this Annulment Committee it is important to look at 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	discussed in our brief, draft 3, there are three different options. So Article 4, "Limit on multiple roles", they have an option 1, which is a full prohibition; they have an option 2, which is a modified prohibition; and an option 3, which is full disclosure with an option to challenge. Then that changed in the latest draft, draft 4, to what I read yesterday, which in essence is proposing a limit on concurrent roles, or if you have served in both capacities within the last three years, and is really focused on issue conflicts and whether you will have a lack of independence or impartiality because you are arguing a specific issue before another tribunal while deciding on that same issue as an arbitrator. And in one of the notes, it in fact says: "One thing that the Working Group may wish to confirm is that it would be the Arbitrator that would need to determine whether the legal issues are substantially so similar."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 knowledge of the circumstances, interests and relationships that may exist. (Slide 4) This draft, draft no. 4, has an annex. And I took one issue simply to share with the Committee. It says that: "A Candidate and an Arbitrator shall disclose any circumstances likely to give rise to doubts" It's not that the person is not impartial or that it lacks independence. It talks about "justifiable doubts", reasonable doubts, in connection with their independence or impartiality. This also in the eyes of a third party. They also added something that didn't exist before and it was included now: " including in the eyes of the disputing parties" These are some of the matters that are being included in this draft Code of Conduct, and I think that for this Annulment Committee it is important to look at these things in context. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	discussed in our brief, draft 3, there are three different options. So Article 4, "Limit on multiple roles", they have an option 1, which is a full prohibition; they have an option 2, which is a modified prohibition; and an option 3, which is full disclosure with an option to challenge. Then that changed in the latest draft, draft 4, to what I read yesterday, which in essence is proposing a limit on concurrent roles, or if you have served in both capacities within the last three years, and is really focused on issue conflicts and whether you will have a lack of independence or impartiality because you are arguing a specific issue before another tribunal while deciding on that same issue as an arbitrator. And in one of the notes, it in fact says: "One thing that the Working Group may wish to confirm is that it would be the Arbitrator that would need to determine whether the legal issues are substantially so similar." So again, these things are under discussion. But
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 knowledge of the circumstances, interests and relationships that may exist. (Slide 4) This draft, draft no. 4, has an annex. And I took one issue simply to share with the Committee. It says that: "A Candidate and an Arbitrator shall disclose any circumstances likely to give rise to doubts" It's not that the person is not impartial or that it lacks independence. It talks about "justifiable doubts", reasonable doubts, in connection with their independence or impartiality. This also in the eyes of a third party. They also added something that didn't exist before and it was included now: " including in the eyes of the disputing parties" These are some of the matters that are being included in this draft Code of Conduct, and I think that for this Annulment Committee it is important to look at these things in context. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	discussed in our brief, draft 3, there are three different options. So Article 4, "Limit on multiple roles", they have an option 1, which is a full prohibition; they have an option 2, which is a modified prohibition; and an option 3, which is full disclosure with an option to challenge. Then that changed in the latest draft, draft 4, to what I read yesterday, which in essence is proposing a limit on concurrent roles, or if you have served in both capacities within the last three years, and is really focused on issue conflicts and whether you will have a lack of independence or impartiality because you are arguing a specific issue before another tribunal while deciding on that same issue as an arbitrator. And in one of the notes, it in fact says: "One thing that the Working Group may wish to confirm is that it would be the Arbitrator that would need to determine whether the legal issues are substantially so similar." So again, these things are under discussion. But I also thought that was of interest.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 knowledge of the circumstances, interests and relationships that may exist. (Slide 4) This draft, draft no. 4, has an annex. And I took one issue simply to share with the Committee. It says that: "A Candidate and an Arbitrator shall disclose any circumstances likely to give rise to doubts" It's not that the person is not impartial or that it lacks independence. It talks about "justifiable doubts", reasonable doubts, in connection with their independence or impartiality. This also in the eyes of a third party. They also added something that didn't exist before and it was included now: " including in the eyes of the disputing parties" These are some of the matters that are being included in this draft Code of Conduct, and I think that for this Annulment Committee it is important to look at these things in context. That's it, thank you. THE PRESIDENT: (Interpreted) Perfect. Thank you very much. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	discussed in our brief, draft 3, there are three different options. So Article 4, "Limit on multiple roles", they have an option 1, which is a full prohibition; they have an option 2, which is a modified prohibition; and an option 3, which is full disclosure with an option to challenge. Then that changed in the latest draft, draft 4, to what I read yesterday, which in essence is proposing a limit on concurrent roles, or if you have served in both capacities within the last three years, and is really focused on issue conflicts and whether you will have a lack of independence or impartiality because you are arguing a specific issue before another tribunal while deciding on that same issue as an arbitrator. And in one of the notes, it in fact says: "One thing that the Working Group may wish to confirm is that it would be the Arbitrator that would need to determine whether the legal issues are substantially so similar." So again, these things are under discussion. But I also thought that was of interest. Finally, my last comment is on Article 11, which is
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 knowledge of the circumstances, interests and relationships that may exist. (Slide 4) This draft, draft no. 4, has an annex. And I took one issue simply to share with the Committee. It says that: "A Candidate and an Arbitrator shall disclose any circumstances likely to give rise to doubts" It's not that the person is not impartial or that it lacks independence. It talks about "justifiable doubts", reasonable doubts, in connection with their independence or impartiality. This also in the eyes of a third party. They also added something that didn't exist before and it was included now: including in the eyes of the disputing parties" These are some of the matters that are being included in this draft Code of Conduct, and I think that for this Annulment Committee it is important to look at these things in context. That's it, thank you. THE PRESIDENT: (Interpreted) Perfect. Thank you very much. (In English) Yes, Ms Menaker. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	discussed in our brief, draft 3, there are three different options. So Article 4, "Limit on multiple roles", they have an option 1, which is a full prohibition; they have an option 2, which is a modified prohibition; and an option 3, which is full disclosure with an option to challenge. Then that changed in the latest draft, draft 4, to what I read yesterday, which in essence is proposing a limit on concurrent roles, or if you have served in both capacities within the last three years, and is really focused on issue conflicts and whether you will have a lack of independence or impartiality because you are arguing a specific issue before another tribunal while deciding on that same issue as an arbitrator. And in one of the notes, it in fact says: "One thing that the Working Group may wish to confirm is that it would be the Arbitrator that would need to determine whether the legal issues are substantially so similar." So again, these things are under discussion. But I also thought that was of interest. Finally, my last comment is on Article 11, which is "Compliance with the Code". And that provision, as it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 knowledge of the circumstances, interests and relationships that may exist. (Slide 4) This draft, draft no. 4, has an annex. And I took one issue simply to share with the Committee. It says that: "A Candidate and an Arbitrator shall disclose any circumstances likely to give rise to doubts" It's not that the person is not impartial or that it lacks independence. It talks about "justifiable doubts", reasonable doubts, in connection with their independence or impartiality. This also in the eyes of a third party. They also added something that didn't exist before and it was included now: " including in the eyes of the disputing parties" These are some of the matters that are being included in this draft Code of Conduct, and I think that for this Annulment Committee it is important to look at these things in context. That's it, thank you. THE PRESIDENT: (Interpreted) Perfect. Thank you very much. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	discussed in our brief, draft 3, there are three different options. So Article 4, "Limit on multiple roles", they have an option 1, which is a full prohibition; they have an option 2, which is a modified prohibition; and an option 3, which is full disclosure with an option to challenge. Then that changed in the latest draft, draft 4, to what I read yesterday, which in essence is proposing a limit on concurrent roles, or if you have served in both capacities within the last three years, and is really focused on issue conflicts and whether you will have a lack of independence or impartiality because you are arguing a specific issue before another tribunal while deciding on that same issue as an arbitrator. And in one of the notes, it in fact says: "One thing that the Working Group may wish to confirm is that it would be the Arbitrator that would need to determine whether the legal issues are substantially so similar." So again, these things are under discussion. But I also thought that was of interest. Finally, my last comment is on Article 11, which is
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 knowledge of the circumstances, interests and relationships that may exist. (Slide 4) This draft, draft no. 4, has an annex. And I took one issue simply to share with the Committee. It says that: "A Candidate and an Arbitrator shall disclose any circumstances likely to give rise to doubts" It's not that the person is not impartial or that it lacks independence. It talks about "justifiable doubts", reasonable doubts, in connection with their independence or impartiality. This also in the eyes of a third party. They also added something that didn't exist before and it was included now: including in the eyes of the disputing parties" These are some of the matters that are being included in this draft Code of Conduct, and I think that for this Annulment Committee it is important to look at these things in context. That's it, thank you. THE PRESIDENT: (Interpreted) Perfect. Thank you very much. (In English) Yes, Ms Menaker. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	discussed in our brief, draft 3, there are three different options. So Article 4, "Limit on multiple roles", they have an option 1, which is a full prohibition; they have an option 2, which is a modified prohibition; and an option 3, which is full disclosure with an option to challenge. Then that changed in the latest draft, draft 4, to what I read yesterday, which in essence is proposing a limit on concurrent roles, or if you have served in both capacities within the last three years, and is really focused on issue conflicts and whether you will have a lack of independence or impartiality because you are arguing a specific issue before another tribunal while deciding on that same issue as an arbitrator. And in one of the notes, it in fact says: "One thing that the Working Group may wish to confirm is that it would be the Arbitrator that would need to determine whether the legal issues are substantially so similar." So again, these things are under discussion. But I also thought that was of interest. Finally, my last comment is on Article 11, which is "Compliance with the Code". And that provision, as it

10:15 1	states that:	10:19 1	this is governed by state law, not federal law, in the
2	"Any disqualification and removal procedure or any	2	United States.
3	sanction and remedy provided for in the applicable rules	3	DR TORTEROLA: (In English) Okay. What is true or not in
4	or treaty shall apply"	4	the United States, I would like to give the floor to my
5	Either "to the Code" or "shall continue to apply	5	colleague Quinn Smith to speak about that, because he is
6	irrespective of the Code", and those options are both	6	the one that deals more often and focused on the
7	still bracketed.	7	practice in the United States. (Interpreted) I am going
8	So those were just the comments I wished to add.	8	to put forth other considerations in connection with the
9	(10.16 am)	9	question posed by Professor Jones.
10	Questions from THE TRIBUNAL	10	First, I wanted to say that it is true that this is
11	PROFESSOR JONES: May I ask both counsel a question. And	11	a draft code. It is a draft. But as we've been
12	for that purpose, it would be useful to have slide 3 of	12	discussing in dealing with this matter, well, this draft
13	the Guatemala slides, if that's possible.	13	project is receiving comments in connection with things
14	To some extent, as both counsel have identified,	14	that it is understood are the things to be done or
15	there is an advancement of existing positions	15	things that are related to the concern of those who are
16	potentially contained within this and preceding drafts.	16	facing procedures of this nature, and they believe that
17	And to a certain extent, the chairman of the	17	this is what should be stated.
18	Administrative Committee has said that where things are	18	This reminds me of the matter of whether the
19	moved forward by this draft, in his view, there is no	19	non-Member States of the Vienna Convention have to apply
20	binding effect of those proposals that move things	20	the Vienna Convention. These are not rules of a penal
21	forward.	21	nature; these are rules that reflect practice. Many of
22	I would be interested in counsels' submission in	22	the principles of the Vienna Convention on the Law of
23	respect of paragraph 7 of Article 10, if we could just	23	Treaties, these are customary international law, these
24	scroll down to that. What do counsel say as to whether	24	are practice. So the obligation goes further from
25	paragraph 7 is a movement forward or merely a statement	25	whether the Convention has been adopted or not.
	D 0		D 11
	Page 9		Page 11
10:17 1	of an existing position? And just for the record, it	10:21 1	So independently of whether these things have been
10:17 1 2	reads:	10:21 1 2	adopted or not, well, this shows concerns, concerns from
	reads: "The fact of non-disclosure does not in itself		adopted or not, well, this shows concerns, concerns from the international community and concern from the
2	reads: "The fact of non-disclosure does not in itself establish [a lack of impartiality or independence]	2 3 4	adopted or not, well, this shows concerns, concerns from the international community and concern from the community of states that are involved in these things.
2 3	reads: "The fact of non-disclosure does not in itself establish [a lack of impartiality or independence] [a breach of article 3 to 6 of the Code]."	2 3	adopted or not, well, this shows concerns, concerns from the international community and concern from the community of states that are involved in these things. Some of the principles are principles that have been
2 3 4 5 6	reads: "The fact of non-disclosure does not in itself establish [a lack of impartiality or independence] [a breach of article 3 to 6 of the Code]." MS MENAKER: If I may, we believe that that is a statement	2 3 4 5 6	adopted or not, well, this shows concerns, concerns from the international community and concern from the community of states that are involved in these things. Some of the principles are principles that have been present for a long time in practice for example,
2 3 4 5 6 7	reads:"The fact of non-disclosure does not in itselfestablish [a lack of impartiality or independence][a breach of article 3 to 6 of the Code]."MS MENAKER: If I may, we believe that that is a statementof existing law, so to speak; it is not an advancement.	2 3 4 5 6 7	adopted or not, well, this shows concerns, concerns from the international community and concern from the community of states that are involved in these things. Some of the principles are principles that have been present for a long time in practice for example, those that have to do with independence or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 reads: "The fact of non-disclosure does not in itself establish [a lack of impartiality or independence] [a breach of article 3 to 6 of the Code]." MS MENAKER: If I may, we believe that that is a statement of existing law, so to speak; it is not an advancement. Not only did the chairman of the ICSID Administrative 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	adopted or not, well, this shows concerns, concerns from the international community and concern from the community of states that are involved in these things. Some of the principles are principles that have been present for a long time in practice for example, those that have to do with independence or impartiality and they don't have to be a standard
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 reads: "The fact of non-disclosure does not in itself establish [a lack of impartiality or independence] [a breach of article 3 to 6 of the Code]." MS MENAKER: If I may, we believe that that is a statement of existing law, so to speak; it is not an advancement. Not only did the chairman of the ICSID Administrative Council reiterate that in the Misen v Ukraine case, he 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	adopted or not, well, this shows concerns, concerns from the international community and concern from the community of states that are involved in these things. Some of the principles are principles that have been present for a long time in practice for example, those that have to do with independence or impartiality and they don't have to be a standard themselves. But the standard is reasonable doubt in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 reads: "The fact of non-disclosure does not in itself establish [a lack of impartiality or independence] [a breach of article 3 to 6 of the Code]." MS MENAKER: If I may, we believe that that is a statement of existing law, so to speak; it is not an advancement. Not only did the chairman of the ICSID Administrative Council reiterate that in the Misen v Ukraine case, he did not and he is juxtaposing that with saying: we 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	adopted or not, well, this shows concerns, concerns from the international community and concern from the community of states that are involved in these things. Some of the principles are principles that have been present for a long time in practice for example, those that have to do with independence or impartiality and they don't have to be a standard themselves. But the standard is reasonable doubt in connection with the standard of independence or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 reads: "The fact of non-disclosure does not in itself establish [a lack of impartiality or independence] [a breach of article 3 to 6 of the Code]." MS MENAKER: If I may, we believe that that is a statement of existing law, so to speak; it is not an advancement. Not only did the chairman of the ICSID Administrative Council reiterate that in the Misen v Ukraine case, he did not and he is juxtaposing that with saying: we can't look at the code, we can't look at anything in 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	adopted or not, well, this shows concerns, concerns from the international community and concern from the community of states that are involved in these things. Some of the principles are principles that have been present for a long time in practice for example, those that have to do with independence or impartiality and they don't have to be a standard themselves. But the standard is reasonable doubt in connection with the standard of independence or impartiality in the eyes of a third party. And now
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 reads: "The fact of non-disclosure does not in itself establish [a lack of impartiality or independence] [a breach of article 3 to 6 of the Code]." MS MENAKER: If I may, we believe that that is a statement of existing law, so to speak; it is not an advancement. Not only did the chairman of the ICSID Administrative Council reiterate that in the Misen v Ukraine case, he did not and he is juxtaposing that with saying: we can't look at the code, we can't look at anything in draft that hasn't yet been adopted, but he states this 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	adopted or not, well, this shows concerns, concerns from the international community and concern from the community of states that are involved in these things. Some of the principles are principles that have been present for a long time in practice for example, those that have to do with independence or impartiality and they don't have to be a standard themselves. But the standard is reasonable doubt in connection with the standard of independence or impartiality in the eyes of a third party. And now these things are being discussed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 reads: "The fact of non-disclosure does not in itself establish [a lack of impartiality or independence] [a breach of article 3 to 6 of the Code]." MS MENAKER: If I may, we believe that that is a statement of existing law, so to speak; it is not an advancement. Not only did the chairman of the ICSID Administrative Council reiterate that in the Misen v Ukraine case, he did not and he is juxtaposing that with saying: we can't look at the code, we can't look at anything in draft that hasn't yet been adopted, but he states this categorically, that the fact of non-disclosure cannot in 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	adopted or not, well, this shows concerns, concerns from the international community and concern from the community of states that are involved in these things. Some of the principles are principles that have been present for a long time in practice for example, those that have to do with independence or impartiality and they don't have to be a standard themselves. But the standard is reasonable doubt in connection with the standard of independence or impartiality in the eyes of a third party. And now these things are being discussed. When they talk about "in the eyes of a third party",
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 reads: "The fact of non-disclosure does not in itself establish [a lack of impartiality or independence] [a breach of article 3 to 6 of the Code]." MS MENAKER: If I may, we believe that that is a statement of existing law, so to speak; it is not an advancement. Not only did the chairman of the ICSID Administrative Council reiterate that in the Misen v Ukraine case, he did not and he is juxtaposing that with saying: we can't look at the code, we can't look at anything in draft that hasn't yet been adopted, but he states this categorically, that the fact of non-disclosure cannot in and of itself be grounds for disqualification. So he's 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	adopted or not, well, this shows concerns, concerns from the international community and concern from the community of states that are involved in these things. Some of the principles are principles that have been present for a long time in practice for example, those that have to do with independence or impartiality and they don't have to be a standard themselves. But the standard is reasonable doubt in connection with the standard of independence or impartiality in the eyes of a third party. And now these things are being discussed. When they talk about "in the eyes of a third party", for someone who comes from somewhere else, like you,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	reads: "The fact of non-disclosure does not in itself establish [a lack of impartiality or independence] [a breach of article 3 to 6 of the Code]." MS MENAKER: If I may, we believe that that is a statement of existing law, so to speak; it is not an advancement. Not only did the chairman of the ICSID Administrative Council reiterate that in the Misen v Ukraine case, he did not and he is juxtaposing that with saying: we can't look at the code, we can't look at anything in draft that hasn't yet been adopted, but he states this categorically, that the fact of non-disclosure cannot in and of itself be grounds for disqualification. So he's stating that as the existing law or code or obligation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 adopted or not, well, this shows concerns, concerns from the international community and concern from the community of states that are involved in these things. Some of the principles are principles that have been present for a long time in practice for example, those that have to do with independence or impartiality and they don't have to be a standard themselves. But the standard of independence or impartiality in the eyes of a third party. And now these things are being discussed. When they talk about "in the eyes of a third party", for someone who comes from somewhere else, like you, Professor Jones, or like the former chief justice of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	reads: "The fact of non-disclosure does not in itself establish [a lack of impartiality or independence] [a breach of article 3 to 6 of the Code]." MS MENAKER: If I may, we believe that that is a statement of existing law, so to speak; it is not an advancement. Not only did the chairman of the ICSID Administrative Council reiterate that in the Misen v Ukraine case, he did not and he is juxtaposing that with saying: we can't look at the code, we can't look at anything in draft that hasn't yet been adopted, but he states this categorically, that the fact of non-disclosure cannot in and of itself be grounds for disqualification. So he's stating that as the existing law or code or obligation. That's also reiterated in the IBA Guidelines, for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 adopted or not, well, this shows concerns, concerns from the international community and concern from the community of states that are involved in these things. Some of the principles are principles that have been present for a long time in practice for example, those that have to do with independence or impartiality and they don't have to be a standard themselves. But the standard is reasonable doubt in connection with the standard of independence or impartiality in the eyes of a third party. And now these things are being discussed. When they talk about "in the eyes of a third party", for someone who comes from somewhere else, like you, Professor Jones, or like the former chief justice of the International Court of Justice or a judge of the Court
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	reads: "The fact of non-disclosure does not in itself establish [a lack of impartiality or independence] [a breach of article 3 to 6 of the Code]." MS MENAKER: If I may, we believe that that is a statement of existing law, so to speak; it is not an advancement. Not only did the chairman of the ICSID Administrative Council reiterate that in the Misen v Ukraine case, he did not and he is juxtaposing that with saying: we can't look at the code, we can't look at anything in draft that hasn't yet been adopted, but he states this categorically, that the fact of non-disclosure cannot in and of itself be grounds for disqualification. So he's stating that as the existing law or code or obligation. That's also reiterated in the IBA Guidelines, for instance, that have been around for a long time and that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 adopted or not, well, this shows concerns, concerns from the international community and concern from the community of states that are involved in these things. Some of the principles are principles that have been present for a long time in practice for example, those that have to do with independence or impartiality and they don't have to be a standard themselves. But the standard is reasonable doubt in connection with the standard of independence or impartiality in the eyes of a third party. And now these things are being discussed. When they talk about "in the eyes of a third party", for someone who comes from somewhere else, like you, Professor Jones, or like the former chief justice of the International Court of Justice or a judge of the Court of Cassation, they see this and they think this is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	reads: "The fact of non-disclosure does not in itself establish [a lack of impartiality or independence] [a breach of article 3 to 6 of the Code]." MS MENAKER: If I may, we believe that that is a statement of existing law, so to speak; it is not an advancement. Not only did the chairman of the ICSID Administrative Council reiterate that in the Misen v Ukraine case, he did not and he is juxtaposing that with saying: we can't look at the code, we can't look at anything in draft that hasn't yet been adopted, but he states this categorically, that the fact of non-disclosure cannot in and of itself be grounds for disqualification. So he's stating that as the existing law or code or obligation. That's also reiterated in the IBA Guidelines, for instance, that have been around for a long time and that are often relied upon. And you see that in many other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	adopted or not, well, this shows concerns, concerns from the international community and concern from the community of states that are involved in these things. Some of the principles are principles that have been present for a long time in practice for example, those that have to do with independence or impartiality and they don't have to be a standard themselves. But the standard is reasonable doubt in connection with the standard of independence or impartiality in the eyes of a third party. And now these things are being discussed. When they talk about "in the eyes of a third party", for someone who comes from somewhere else, like you, Professor Jones, or like the former chief justice of the International Court of Justice or a judge of the Court of Cassation, they see this and they think this is unacceptable.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	reads: "The fact of non-disclosure does not in itself establish [a lack of impartiality or independence] [a breach of article 3 to 6 of the Code]." MS MENAKER: If I may, we believe that that is a statement of existing law, so to speak; it is not an advancement. Not only did the chairman of the ICSID Administrative Council reiterate that in the Misen v Ukraine case, he did not and he is juxtaposing that with saying: we can't look at the code, we can't look at anything in draft that hasn't yet been adopted, but he states this categorically, that the fact of non-disclosure cannot in and of itself be grounds for disqualification. So he's stating that as the existing law or code or obligation. That's also reiterated in the IBA Guidelines, for instance, that have been around for a long time and that are often relied upon. And you see that in many other disqualification decisions and the like, and we've	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	adopted or not, well, this shows concerns, concerns from the international community and concern from the community of states that are involved in these things. Some of the principles are principles that have been present for a long time in practice for example, those that have to do with independence or impartiality and they don't have to be a standard themselves. But the standard is reasonable doubt in connection with the standard of independence or impartiality in the eyes of a third party. And now these things are being discussed. When they talk about "in the eyes of a third party", for someone who comes from somewhere else, like you, Professor Jones, or like the former chief justice of the International Court of Justice or a judge of the Court of Cassation, they see this and they think this is unacceptable. So I don't know how much these provisions reflect
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	reads: "The fact of non-disclosure does not in itself establish [a lack of impartiality or independence] [a breach of article 3 to 6 of the Code]." MS MENAKER: If I may, we believe that that is a statement of existing law, so to speak; it is not an advancement. Not only did the chairman of the ICSID Administrative Council reiterate that in the Misen v Ukraine case, he did not and he is juxtaposing that with saying: we can't look at the code, we can't look at anything in draft that hasn't yet been adopted, but he states this categorically, that the fact of non-disclosure cannot in and of itself be grounds for disqualification. So he's stating that as the existing law or code or obligation. That's also reiterated in the IBA Guidelines, for instance, that have been around for a long time and that are often relied upon. And you see that in many other disqualification decisions and the like, and we've quoted some of those in our written submissions as well.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	 adopted or not, well, this shows concerns, concerns from the international community and concern from the community of states that are involved in these things. Some of the principles are principles that have been present for a long time in practice for example, those that have to do with independence or impartiality and they don't have to be a standard themselves. But the standard of independence or impartiality in the eyes of a third party. And now these things are being discussed. When they talk about "in the eyes of a third party", for someone who comes from somewhere else, like you, Professor Jones, or like the former chief justice of the International Court of Justice or a judge of the Court of Cassation, they see this and they think this is unacceptable. So I don't know how much these provisions reflect practice or not, but I do think that they reflect
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	reads: "The fact of non-disclosure does not in itself establish [a lack of impartiality or independence] [a breach of article 3 to 6 of the Code]." MS MENAKER: If I may, we believe that that is a statement of existing law, so to speak; it is not an advancement. Not only did the chairman of the ICSID Administrative Council reiterate that in the Misen v Ukraine case, he did not and he is juxtaposing that with saying: we can't look at the code, we can't look at anything in draft that hasn't yet been adopted, but he states this categorically, that the fact of non-disclosure cannot in and of itself be grounds for disqualification. So he's stating that as the existing law or code or obligation. That's also reiterated in the IBA Guidelines, for instance, that have been around for a long time and that are often relied upon. And you see that in many other disqualification decisions and the like, and we've quoted some of those in our written submissions as well. PROFESSOR JONES: And it sits in contradistinction, as	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 adopted or not, well, this shows concerns, concerns from the international community and concern from the community of states that are involved in these things. Some of the principles are principles that have been present for a long time in practice for example, those that have to do with independence or impartiality and they don't have to be a standard themselves. But the standard of independence or impartiality in the standard of independence or impartiality in the eyes of a third party. And now these things are being discussed. When they talk about "in the eyes of a third party", for someone who comes from somewhere else, like you, Professor Jones, or like the former chief justice of the International Court of Justice or a judge of the Court of Cassation, they see this and they think this is unacceptable. So I don't know how much these provisions reflect practice or not, but I do think that they reflect practice and concerns.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 reads: "The fact of non-disclosure does not in itself establish [a lack of impartiality or independence] [a breach of article 3 to 6 of the Code]." MS MENAKER: If I may, we believe that that is a statement of existing law, so to speak; it is not an advancement. Not only did the chairman of the ICSID Administrative Council reiterate that in the Misen v Ukraine case, he did not and he is juxtaposing that with saying: we can't look at the code, we can't look at anything in draft that hasn't yet been adopted, but he states this categorically, that the fact of non-disclosure cannot in and of itself be grounds for disqualification. So he's stating that as the existing law or code or obligation. That's also reiterated in the IBA Guidelines, for instance, that have been around for a long time and that are often relied upon. And you see that in many other disqualification decisions and the like, and we've quoted some of those in our written submissions as well. PROFESSOR JONES: And it sits in contradistinction, as I understand it, to some of the jurisprudence in the 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 adopted or not, well, this shows concerns, concerns from the international community and concern from the community of states that are involved in these things. Some of the principles are principles that have been present for a long time in practice for example, those that have to do with independence or impartiality and they don't have to be a standard themselves. But the standard of independence or impartiality in the standard of independence or impartiality in the eyes of a third party. And now these things are being discussed. When they talk about "in the eyes of a third party", for someone who comes from somewhere else, like you, Professor Jones, or like the former chief justice of the International Court of Justice or a judge of the Court of Cassation, they see this and they think this is unacceptable. So I don't know how much these provisions reflect practice or not, but I do think that they reflect practice and concerns.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 reads: "The fact of non-disclosure does not in itself establish [a lack of impartiality or independence] [a breach of article 3 to 6 of the Code]." MS MENAKER: If I may, we believe that that is a statement of existing law, so to speak; it is not an advancement. Not only did the chairman of the ICSID Administrative Council reiterate that in the Misen v Ukraine case, he did not and he is juxtaposing that with saying: we can't look at the code, we can't look at anything in draft that hasn't yet been adopted, but he states this categorically, that the fact of non-disclosure cannot in and of itself be grounds for disqualification. So he's stating that as the existing law or code or obligation. That's also reiterated in the IBA Guidelines, for instance, that have been around for a long time and that are often relied upon. And you see that in many other disqualification decisions and the like, and we've quoted some of those in our written submissions as well. PROFESSOR JONES: And it sits in contradistinction, as I understand it, to some of the states of the United States. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 adopted or not, well, this shows concerns, concerns from the international community and concern from the community of states that are involved in these things. Some of the principles are principles that have been present for a long time in practice for example, those that have to do with independence or impartiality and they don't have to be a standard themselves. But the standard of independence or impartiality in the standard of independence or impartiality in the eyes of a third party. And now these things are being discussed. When they talk about "in the eyes of a third party", for someone who comes from somewhere else, like you, Professor Jones, or like the former chief justice of the International Court of Justice or a judge of the Court of Cassation, they see this and they think this is unacceptable. So I don't know how much these provisions reflect practice or not, but I do think that they reflect practice and concerns. In connection with your comment, the right principle is that the lack of disclosure in and of itself is not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 reads: "The fact of non-disclosure does not in itself establish [a lack of impartiality or independence] [a breach of article 3 to 6 of the Code]." MS MENAKER: If I may, we believe that that is a statement of existing law, so to speak; it is not an advancement. Not only did the chairman of the ICSID Administrative Council reiterate that in the Misen v Ukraine case, he did not and he is juxtaposing that with saying: we can't look at the code, we can't look at anything in draft that hasn't yet been adopted, but he states this categorically, that the fact of non-disclosure cannot in and of itself be grounds for disqualification. So he's stating that as the existing law or code or obligation. That's also reiterated in the IBA Guidelines, for instance, that have been around for a long time and that are often relied upon. And you see that in many other disqualification decisions and the like, and we've quoted some of those in our written submissions as well. PROFESSOR JONES: And it sits in contradistinction, as I understand it, to some of the jurisprudence in the United States. MS MENAKER: That's correct. And as you noted too, the 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 adopted or not, well, this shows concerns, concerns from the international community and concern from the community of states that are involved in these things. Some of the principles are principles that have been present for a long time in practice for example, those that have to do with independence or impartiality and they don't have to be a standard themselves. But the standard is reasonable doubt in connection with the standard of independence or impartiality in the eyes of a third party. And now these things are being discussed. When they talk about "in the eyes of a third party", for someone who comes from somewhere else, like you, Professor Jones, or like the former chief justice of the International Court of Justice or a judge of the Court of Cassation, they see this and they think this is unacceptable. So I don't know how much these provisions reflect practice or not, but I do think that they reflect practice and concerns. In connection with your comment, the right principle is that the lack of disclosure in and of itself is not a ground for disqualification. That provision has to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 reads: "The fact of non-disclosure does not in itself establish [a lack of impartiality or independence] [a breach of article 3 to 6 of the Code]." MS MENAKER: If I may, we believe that that is a statement of existing law, so to speak; it is not an advancement. Not only did the chairman of the ICSID Administrative Council reiterate that in the Misen v Ukraine case, he did not and he is juxtaposing that with saying: we can't look at the code, we can't look at anything in draft that hasn't yet been adopted, but he states this categorically, that the fact of non-disclosure cannot in and of itself be grounds for disqualification. So he's stating that as the existing law or code or obligation. That's also reiterated in the IBA Guidelines, for instance, that have been around for a long time and that are often relied upon. And you see that in many other disqualification decisions and the like, and we've quoted some of those in our written submissions as well. PROFESSOR JONES: And it sits in contradistinction, as I understand it, to some of the jurisprudence in the United States. MS MENAKER: That's correct. And as you noted too, the 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 adopted or not, well, this shows concerns, concerns from the international community and concern from the community of states that are involved in these things. Some of the principles are principles that have been present for a long time in practice for example, those that have to do with independence or impartiality and they don't have to be a standard themselves. But the standard is reasonable doubt in connection with the standard of independence or impartiality in the eyes of a third party. And now these things are being discussed. When they talk about "in the eyes of a third party", for someone who comes from somewhere else, like you, Professor Jones, or like the former chief justice of the International Court of Justice or a judge of the Court of Cassation, they see this and they think this is unacceptable. So I don't know how much these provisions reflect practice or not, but I do think that they reflect practice and concerns. In connection with your comment, the right principle is that the lack of disclosure in and of itself is not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 reads: "The fact of non-disclosure does not in itself establish [a lack of impartiality or independence] [a breach of article 3 to 6 of the Code]." MS MENAKER: If I may, we believe that that is a statement of existing law, so to speak; it is not an advancement. Not only did the chairman of the ICSID Administrative Council reiterate that in the Misen v Ukraine case, he did not and he is juxtaposing that with saying: we can't look at the code, we can't look at anything in draft that hasn't yet been adopted, but he states this categorically, that the fact of non-disclosure cannot in and of itself be grounds for disqualification. So he's stating that as the existing law or code or obligation. That's also reiterated in the IBA Guidelines, for instance, that have been around for a long time and that are often relied upon. And you see that in many other disqualification decisions and the like, and we've quoted some of those in our written submissions as well. PROFESSOR JONES: And it sits in contradistinction, as I understand it, to some of the jurisprudence in the United States. MS MENAKER: That's correct. And as you noted too, the 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 adopted or not, well, this shows concerns, concerns from the international community and concern from the community of states that are involved in these things. Some of the principles are principles that have been present for a long time in practice for example, those that have to do with independence or impartiality and they don't have to be a standard themselves. But the standard is reasonable doubt in connection with the standard of independence or impartiality in the eyes of a third party. And now these things are being discussed. When they talk about "in the eyes of a third party", for someone who comes from somewhere else, like you, Professor Jones, or like the former chief justice of the International Court of Justice or a judge of the Court of Cassation, they see this and they think this is unacceptable. So I don't know how much these provisions reflect practice or not, but I do think that they reflect practice and concerns. In connection with your comment, the right principle is that the lack of disclosure in and of itself is not a ground for disqualification. That provision has to be

10:23 1	circumstances of the case indicate, for example, that	10:27 1	that's not necessary? (In English) Sorry, I think
2	an arbitrator or arbitrator candidate must disclose.	2	I should have said that in English.
3	And if there are doubts as to the disclosure that is	3	MR SMITH: I don't think it's necessary. We can get into US
4	to say whether the arbitrator doubts whether to disclose	4	law, but I don't think it's relevant to what we're
5	or not to disclose the arbitrator must disclose.	5	discussing. Other than I don't agree with what was
6	This is a principle that has been adopted and we can	6	presented.
7	see that this section is not given between brackets. So	7	PROFESSOR JONES: You don't agree with what?
8	this is something that has moved forward, as we said	8	MR SMITH: Because the Federal Arbitration Act is a federal
9	a moment ago.	9	statute, and so it's not determined by what the states
10	-	10	sature, and so it's not determined by what the states
11	-	10	Supreme Court says. And the Supreme Court has taken
11		11	a different line, and so that's why it is a broader
12	-	12	standard to disclose, and not governed by state law.
13		13	PROFESSOR JONES: The issue that I was referring to was some
14		14	jurisprudence, some state jurisprudence particularly,
16		15	which says non-disclosure of itself will give rise to
17		10	an accusation of bias.
17		17	MR SMITH: Yes. And if we look at the Federal Arbitration
19		18	Act, we have to look at the federal jurisprudence to
20		19 20	understand. So I need to look at those cases to really
	-	20 21	-
21	•	21	get to the bottom of it, but that would be the distinction.
22 23			
25		23 24	PROFESSOR JONES: Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker, any points you'd like to add?
		24 25	MS MENAKER: No. I mean, we can elaborate on it if it's of
25	DR TORTEROLA: I'm going to ask for help. I don't know if	25	MS MENAKER. No. 1 mean, we can elaborate on it in its of
	Page 13		Page 15
10.05 1		10.00 1	
10:25 1	1	10:28 1	interest to the [Committee]. I do think that I mean,
2	I don't see it between brackets. I understand then that	2	obviously, in every case the Federal Arbitration Act
2 3	I don't see it between brackets. I understand then that the language was adopted, but I'm not sure. (Pause)	2 3	obviously, in every case the Federal Arbitration Act does not always apply. So there is jurisprudence under
2 3 4	I don't see it between brackets. I understand then that the language was adopted, but I'm not sure. (Pause) Madam President, let me confirm that this was in	2 3 4	obviously, in every case the Federal Arbitration Act does not always apply. So there is jurisprudence under state law for domestic arbitration, for instance, as
2 3 4 5	I don't see it between brackets. I understand then that the language was adopted, but I'm not sure. (Pause) Madam President, let me confirm that this was in there.	2 3 4 5	obviously, in every case the Federal Arbitration Act does not always apply. So there is jurisprudence under state law for domestic arbitration, for instance, as well. So you do have a lot of jurisprudence. And we'd
2 3 4 5 6	I don't see it between brackets. I understand then that the language was adopted, but I'm not sure. (Pause) Madam President, let me confirm that this was in there. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. So I have another question then.	2 3 4 5 6	obviously, in every case the Federal Arbitration Act does not always apply. So there is jurisprudence under state law for domestic arbitration, for instance, as well. So you do have a lot of jurisprudence. And we'd have to also see in particular if there was something in
2 3 4 5 6 7	I don't see it between brackets. I understand then that the language was adopted, but I'm not sure. (Pause) Madam President, let me confirm that this was in there. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. So I have another question then. When is it that this guideline I don't know what	2 3 4 5 6 7	obviously, in every case the Federal Arbitration Act does not always apply. So there is jurisprudence under state law for domestic arbitration, for instance, as well. So you do have a lot of jurisprudence. And we'd have to also see in particular if there was something in particular one was interested in.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I don't see it between brackets. I understand then that the language was adopted, but I'm not sure. (Pause) Madam President, let me confirm that this was in there. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. So I have another question then. When is it that this guideline I don't know what it is really, I don't know what the value is going to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	obviously, in every case the Federal Arbitration Act does not always apply. So there is jurisprudence under state law for domestic arbitration, for instance, as well. So you do have a lot of jurisprudence. And we'd have to also see in particular if there was something in particular one was interested in. But as far as the rule in international arbitration,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I don't see it between brackets. I understand then that the language was adopted, but I'm not sure. (Pause) Madam President, let me confirm that this was in there. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. So I have another question then. When is it that this guideline I don't know what it is really, I don't know what the value is going to be accorded to this. I don't know when this came up on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	obviously, in every case the Federal Arbitration Act does not always apply. So there is jurisprudence under state law for domestic arbitration, for instance, as well. So you do have a lot of jurisprudence. And we'd have to also see in particular if there was something in particular one was interested in. But as far as the rule in international arbitration, I think it has been well established for a very long
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I don't see it between brackets. I understand then that the language was adopted, but I'm not sure. (Pause) Madam President, let me confirm that this was in there. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. So I have another question then. When is it that this guideline I don't know what it is really, I don't know what the value is going to be accorded to this. I don't know when this came up on these drafts. Perhaps we are going to have to look at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	obviously, in every case the Federal Arbitration Act does not always apply. So there is jurisprudence under state law for domestic arbitration, for instance, as well. So you do have a lot of jurisprudence. And we'd have to also see in particular if there was something in particular one was interested in. But as far as the rule in international arbitration, I think it has been well established for a very long time that non-disclosure in and of itself is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I don't see it between brackets. I understand then that the language was adopted, but I'm not sure. (Pause) Madam President, let me confirm that this was in there. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. So I have another question then. When is it that this guideline I don't know what it is really, I don't know what the value is going to be accorded to this. I don't know when this came up on these drafts. Perhaps we are going to have to look at the earlier versions. You can take a break and then	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	obviously, in every case the Federal Arbitration Act does not always apply. So there is jurisprudence under state law for domestic arbitration, for instance, as well. So you do have a lot of jurisprudence. And we'd have to also see in particular if there was something in particular one was interested in. But as far as the rule in international arbitration, I think it has been well established for a very long time that non-disclosure in and of itself is insufficient, and what you look at is whether the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 11	I don't see it between brackets. I understand then that the language was adopted, but I'm not sure. (Pause) Madam President, let me confirm that this was in there. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. So I have another question then. When is it that this guideline I don't know what it is really, I don't know what the value is going to be accorded to this. I don't know when this came up on these drafts. Perhaps we are going to have to look at the earlier versions. You can take a break and then respond, or respond later.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	obviously, in every case the Federal Arbitration Act does not always apply. So there is jurisprudence under state law for domestic arbitration, for instance, as well. So you do have a lot of jurisprudence. And we'd have to also see in particular if there was something in particular one was interested in. But as far as the rule in international arbitration, I think it has been well established for a very long time that non-disclosure in and of itself is insufficient, and what you look at is whether the underlying circumstances are disqualifying.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 I don't see it between brackets. I understand then that the language was adopted, but I'm not sure. (Pause) Madam President, let me confirm that this was in there. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. So I have another question then. When is it that this guideline I don't know what it is really, I don't know what the value is going to be accorded to this. I don't know when this came up on these drafts. Perhaps we are going to have to look at the earlier versions. You can take a break and then respond, or respond later. So when is it that this became a reality? When was 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	obviously, in every case the Federal Arbitration Act does not always apply. So there is jurisprudence under state law for domestic arbitration, for instance, as well. So you do have a lot of jurisprudence. And we'd have to also see in particular if there was something in particular one was interested in. But as far as the rule in international arbitration, I think it has been well established for a very long time that non-disclosure in and of itself is insufficient, and what you look at is whether the underlying circumstances are disqualifying. PROFESSOR JONES: My only interest is this: that that is my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I don't see it between brackets. I understand then that the language was adopted, but I'm not sure. (Pause) Madam President, let me confirm that this was in there. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. So I have another question then. When is it that this guideline I don't know what it is really, I don't know what the value is going to be accorded to this. I don't know when this came up on these drafts. Perhaps we are going to have to look at the earlier versions. You can take a break and then respond, or respond later. So when is it that this became a reality? When was this codified as a draft?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 obviously, in every case the Federal Arbitration Act does not always apply. So there is jurisprudence under state law for domestic arbitration, for instance, as well. So you do have a lot of jurisprudence. And we'd have to also see in particular if there was something in particular one was interested in. But as far as the rule in international arbitration, I think it has been well established for a very long time that non-disclosure in and of itself is insufficient, and what you look at is whether the underlying circumstances are disqualifying. PROFESSOR JONES: My only interest is this: that that is my understanding of the existing position, subject only
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I don't see it between brackets. I understand then that the language was adopted, but I'm not sure. (Pause) Madam President, let me confirm that this was in there. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. So I have another question then. When is it that this guideline I don't know what it is really, I don't know what the value is going to be accorded to this. I don't know when this came up on these drafts. Perhaps we are going to have to look at the earlier versions. You can take a break and then respond, or respond later. So when is it that this became a reality? When was this codified as a draft? DR TORTEROLA: I am told that this has been there since	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 obviously, in every case the Federal Arbitration Act does not always apply. So there is jurisprudence under state law for domestic arbitration, for instance, as well. So you do have a lot of jurisprudence. And we'd have to also see in particular if there was something in particular one was interested in. But as far as the rule in international arbitration, I think it has been well established for a very long time that non-disclosure in and of itself is insufficient, and what you look at is whether the underlying circumstances are disqualifying. PROFESSOR JONES: My only interest is this: that that is my understanding of the existing position, subject only potentially to some outlying jurisdictions that might be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 I don't see it between brackets. I understand then that the language was adopted, but I'm not sure. (Pause) Madam President, let me confirm that this was in there. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. So I have another question then. When is it that this guideline I don't know what it is really, I don't know what the value is going to be accorded to this. I don't know when this came up on these drafts. Perhaps we are going to have to look at the earlier versions. You can take a break and then respond, or respond later. So when is it that this became a reality? When was this codified as a draft? DR TORTEROLA: I am told that this has been there since draft no. 2. I don't have personal knowledge of that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 obviously, in every case the Federal Arbitration Act does not always apply. So there is jurisprudence under state law for domestic arbitration, for instance, as well. So you do have a lot of jurisprudence. And we'd have to also see in particular if there was something in particular one was interested in. But as far as the rule in international arbitration, I think it has been well established for a very long time that non-disclosure in and of itself is insufficient, and what you look at is whether the underlying circumstances are disqualifying. PROFESSOR JONES: My only interest is this: that that is my understanding of the existing position, subject only potentially to some outlying jurisdictions that might be aberrant, but that in a broad sense the US jurisprudence
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 I don't see it between brackets. I understand then that the language was adopted, but I'm not sure. (Pause) Madam President, let me confirm that this was in there. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. So I have another question then. When is it that this guideline I don't know what it is really, I don't know what the value is going to be accorded to this. I don't know when this came up on these drafts. Perhaps we are going to have to look at the earlier versions. You can take a break and then respond, or respond later. So when is it that this became a reality? When was this codified as a draft? DR TORTEROLA: I am told that this has been there since draft no. 2. I don't have personal knowledge of that but I am going to avail myself of the opportunity to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 obviously, in every case the Federal Arbitration Act does not always apply. So there is jurisprudence under state law for domestic arbitration, for instance, as well. So you do have a lot of jurisprudence. And we'd have to also see in particular if there was something in particular one was interested in. But as far as the rule in international arbitration, I think it has been well established for a very long time that non-disclosure in and of itself is insufficient, and what you look at is whether the underlying circumstances are disqualifying. PROFESSOR JONES: My only interest is this: that that is my understanding of the existing position, subject only potentially to some outlying jurisdictions that might be aberrant, but that in a broad sense the US jurisprudence suggesting where it does that non-disclosure of itself
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 I don't see it between brackets. I understand then that the language was adopted, but I'm not sure. (Pause) Madam President, let me confirm that this was in there. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. So I have another question then. When is it that this guideline I don't know what it is really, I don't know what the value is going to be accorded to this. I don't know when this came up on these drafts. Perhaps we are going to have to look at the earlier versions. You can take a break and then respond, or respond later. So when is it that this became a reality? When was this codified as a draft? DR TORTEROLA: I am told that this has been there since draft no. 2. I don't have personal knowledge of that but I am going to avail myself of the opportunity to look into this. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 obviously, in every case the Federal Arbitration Act does not always apply. So there is jurisprudence under state law for domestic arbitration, for instance, as well. So you do have a lot of jurisprudence. And we'd have to also see in particular if there was something in particular one was interested in. But as far as the rule in international arbitration, I think it has been well established for a very long time that non-disclosure in and of itself is insufficient, and what you look at is whether the underlying circumstances are disqualifying. PROFESSOR JONES: My only interest is this: that that is my understanding of the existing position, subject only potentially to some outlying jurisdictions that might be aberrant, but that in a broad sense the US jurisprudence suggesting where it does that non-disclosure of itself is not bias is not generally accepted.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I don't see it between brackets. I understand then that the language was adopted, but I'm not sure. (Pause) Madam President, let me confirm that this was in there. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. So I have another question then. When is it that this guideline I don't know what it is really, I don't know what the value is going to be accorded to this. I don't know when this came up on these drafts. Perhaps we are going to have to look at the earlier versions. You can take a break and then respond, or respond later. So when is it that this became a reality? When was this codified as a draft? DR TORTEROLA: I am told that this has been there since draft no. 2. I don't have personal knowledge of that but I am going to avail myself of the opportunity to look into this.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 obviously, in every case the Federal Arbitration Act does not always apply. So there is jurisprudence under state law for domestic arbitration, for instance, as well. So you do have a lot of jurisprudence. And we'd have to also see in particular if there was something in particular one was interested in. But as far as the rule in international arbitration, I think it has been well established for a very long time that non-disclosure in and of itself is insufficient, and what you look at is whether the underlying circumstances are disqualifying. PROFESSOR JONES: My only interest is this: that that is my understanding of the existing position, subject only potentially to some outlying jurisdictions that might be aberrant, but that in a broad sense the US jurisprudence suggesting where it does that non-disclosure of itself is not bias is not generally accepted.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I don't see it between brackets. I understand then that the language was adopted, but I'm not sure. (Pause) Madam President, let me confirm that this was in there. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. So I have another question then. When is it that this guideline I don't know what it is really, I don't know what the value is going to be accorded to this. I don't know when this came up on these drafts. Perhaps we are going to have to look at the earlier versions. You can take a break and then respond, or respond later. So when is it that this became a reality? When was this codified as a draft? DR TORTEROLA: I am told that this has been there since draft no. 2. I don't have personal knowledge of that but I am going to avail myself of the opportunity to look into this. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you can tell us the years. I don't know whether draft 2 was passed.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	 obviously, in every case the Federal Arbitration Act does not always apply. So there is jurisprudence under state law for domestic arbitration, for instance, as well. So you do have a lot of jurisprudence. And we'd have to also see in particular if there was something in particular one was interested in. But as far as the rule in international arbitration, I think it has been well established for a very long time that non-disclosure in and of itself is insufficient, and what you look at is whether the underlying circumstances are disqualifying. PROFESSOR JONES: My only interest is this: that that is my understanding of the existing position, subject only potentially to some outlying jurisdictions that might be aberrant, but that in a broad sense the US jurisprudence suggesting where it does that non-disclosure of itself is not bias is not generally accepted. If anyone wants to contest that, I'd be interested. But I'm just exposing my own view of the position.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 20 21	 I don't see it between brackets. I understand then that the language was adopted, but I'm not sure. (Pause) Madam President, let me confirm that this was in there. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. So I have another question then. When is it that this guideline I don't know what it is really, I don't know what the value is going to be accorded to this. I don't know when this came up on these drafts. Perhaps we are going to have to look at the earlier versions. You can take a break and then respond, or respond later. So when is it that this became a reality? When was this codified as a draft? DR TORTEROLA: I am told that this has been there since draft no. 2. I don't have personal knowledge of that but I am going to avail myself of the opportunity to look into this. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you can tell us the years. I don't know whether draft 2 was passed. DR TORTEROLA: April 2021, madam. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 obviously, in every case the Federal Arbitration Act does not always apply. So there is jurisprudence under state law for domestic arbitration, for instance, as well. So you do have a lot of jurisprudence. And we'd have to also see in particular if there was something in particular one was interested in. But as far as the rule in international arbitration, I think it has been well established for a very long time that non-disclosure in and of itself is insufficient, and what you look at is whether the underlying circumstances are disqualifying. PROFESSOR JONES: My only interest is this: that that is my understanding of the existing position, subject only potentially to some outlying jurisdictions that might be aberrant, but that in a broad sense the US jurisprudence suggesting where it does that non-disclosure of itself is not bias is not generally accepted. If anyone wants to contest that, I'd be interested. But I'm just exposing my own view of the position.
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 I don't see it between brackets. I understand then that the language was adopted, but I'm not sure. (Pause) Madam President, let me confirm that this was in there. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. So I have another question then. When is it that this guideline I don't know what it is really, I don't know what the value is going to be accorded to this. I don't know when this came up on these drafts. Perhaps we are going to have to look at the earlier versions. You can take a break and then respond, or respond later. So when is it that this became a reality? When was this codified as a draft? DR TORTEROLA: I am told that this has been there since draft no. 2. I don't have personal knowledge of that but I am going to avail myself of the opportunity to look into this. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you can tell us the years. I don't know whether draft 2 was passed. DR TORTEROLA: April 2021, madam. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 obviously, in every case the Federal Arbitration Act does not always apply. So there is jurisprudence under state law for domestic arbitration, for instance, as well. So you do have a lot of jurisprudence. And we'd have to also see in particular if there was something in particular one was interested in. But as far as the rule in international arbitration, I think it has been well established for a very long time that non-disclosure in and of itself is insufficient, and what you look at is whether the underlying circumstances are disqualifying. PROFESSOR JONES: My only interest is this: that that is my understanding of the existing position, subject only potentially to some outlying jurisdictions that might be aberrant, but that in a broad sense the US jurisprudence suggesting where it does that non-disclosure of itself is not bias is not generally accepted. If anyone wants to contest that, I'd be interested. But I'm just exposing my own view of the position. MR SMITH: Understood. On this, we just want to draw your attention if
2 3 4 5 6 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 I don't see it between brackets. I understand then that the language was adopted, but I'm not sure. (Pause) Madam President, let me confirm that this was in there. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. So I have another question then. When is it that this guideline I don't know what it is really, I don't know what the value is going to be accorded to this. I don't know when this came up on these drafts. Perhaps we are going to have to look at the earlier versions. You can take a break and then respond, or respond later. So when is it that this became a reality? When was this codified as a draft? DR TORTEROLA: I am told that this has been there since draft no. 2. I don't have personal knowledge of that but I am going to avail myself of the opportunity to look into this. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you can tell us the years. I don't know whether draft 2 was passed. DR TORTEROLA: April 2021, madam. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. April 2021? DR TORTEROLA: Yes, that was draft no. 2, madam. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 obviously, in every case the Federal Arbitration Act does not always apply. So there is jurisprudence under state law for domestic arbitration, for instance, as well. So you do have a lot of jurisprudence. And we'd have to also see in particular if there was something in particular one was interested in. But as far as the rule in international arbitration, I think it has been well established for a very long time that non-disclosure in and of itself is insufficient, and what you look at is whether the underlying circumstances are disqualifying. PROFESSOR JONES: My only interest is this: that that is my understanding of the existing position, subject only potentially to some outlying jurisdictions that might be aberrant, but that in a broad sense the US jurisprudence suggesting where it does that non-disclosure of itself is not bias is not generally accepted. If anyone wants to contest that, I'd be interested. But I'm just exposing my own view of the position. MR SMITH: Understood. On this, we just want to draw your attention if you go back down to sub 7 that we were discussing. We
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ 24\\ 24\\ 24\\ 24\\ 24\\ 24\\ 24\\ 24\\ 24$	 I don't see it between brackets. I understand then that the language was adopted, but I'm not sure. (Pause) Madam President, let me confirm that this was in there. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. So I have another question then. When is it that this guideline I don't know what it is really, I don't know what the value is going to be accorded to this. I don't know when this came up on these drafts. Perhaps we are going to have to look at the earlier versions. You can take a break and then respond, or respond later. So when is it that this became a reality? When was this codified as a draft? DR TORTEROLA: I am told that this has been there since draft no. 2. I don't have personal knowledge of that but I am going to avail myself of the opportunity to look into this. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you can tell us the years. I don't know whether draft 2 was passed. DR TORTEROLA: April 2021, madam. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. April 2021? DR TORTEROLA: Yes, that was draft no. 2, madam. THE PRESIDENT: Very well. Thank you very much. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 obviously, in every case the Federal Arbitration Act does not always apply. So there is jurisprudence under state law for domestic arbitration, for instance, as well. So you do have a lot of jurisprudence. And we'd have to also see in particular if there was something in particular one was interested in. But as far as the rule in international arbitration, I think it has been well established for a very long time that non-disclosure in and of itself is insufficient, and what you look at is whether the underlying circumstances are disqualifying. PROFESSOR JONES: My only interest is this: that that is my understanding of the existing position, subject only potentially to some outlying jurisdictions that might be aberrant, but that in a broad sense the US jurisprudence suggesting where it does that non-disclosure of itself is not bias is not generally accepted. If anyone wants to contest that, I'd be interested. But I'm just exposing my own view of the position. MR SMITH: Understood. On this, we just want to draw your attention if you go back down to sub 7 that we were discussing. We were talking about what was in square brackets and what
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 12\\ 22\\ 23\\ 22\\ 23\\ 23\\ 22\\ 23\\ 23\\ 23\\ 2$	 I don't see it between brackets. I understand then that the language was adopted, but I'm not sure. (Pause) Madam President, let me confirm that this was in there. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. So I have another question then. When is it that this guideline I don't know what it is really, I don't know what the value is going to be accorded to this. I don't know when this came up on these drafts. Perhaps we are going to have to look at the earlier versions. You can take a break and then respond, or respond later. So when is it that this became a reality? When was this codified as a draft? DR TORTEROLA: I am told that this has been there since draft no. 2. I don't have personal knowledge of that but I am going to avail myself of the opportunity to look into this. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you can tell us the years. I don't know whether draft 2 was passed. DR TORTEROLA: April 2021, madam. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. April 2021? DR TORTEROLA: Yes, that was draft no. 2, madam. THE PRESIDENT: Very well. Thank you very much. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 obviously, in every case the Federal Arbitration Act does not always apply. So there is jurisprudence under state law for domestic arbitration, for instance, as well. So you do have a lot of jurisprudence. And we'd have to also see in particular if there was something in particular one was interested in. But as far as the rule in international arbitration, I think it has been well established for a very long time that non-disclosure in and of itself is insufficient, and what you look at is whether the underlying circumstances are disqualifying. PROFESSOR JONES: My only interest is this: that that is my understanding of the existing position, subject only potentially to some outlying jurisdictions that might be aberrant, but that in a broad sense the US jurisprudence suggesting where it does that non-disclosure of itself is not bias is not generally accepted. If anyone wants to contest that, I'd be interested. But I'm just exposing my own view of the position. MR SMITH: Understood. On this, we just want to draw your attention if you go back down to sub 7 that we were discussing. We
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ 24\\ 24\\ 24\\ 24\\ 24\\ 24\\ 24\\ 24\\ 24$	 I don't see it between brackets. I understand then that the language was adopted, but I'm not sure. (Pause) Madam President, let me confirm that this was in there. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. So I have another question then. When is it that this guideline I don't know what it is really, I don't know what the value is going to be accorded to this. I don't know when this came up on these drafts. Perhaps we are going to have to look at the earlier versions. You can take a break and then respond, or respond later. So when is it that this became a reality? When was this codified as a draft? DR TORTEROLA: I am told that this has been there since draft no. 2. I don't have personal knowledge of that but I am going to avail myself of the opportunity to look into this. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you can tell us the years. I don't know whether draft 2 was passed. DR TORTEROLA: April 2021, madam. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. April 2021? DR TORTEROLA: Yes, that was draft no. 2, madam. THE PRESIDENT: Very well. Thank you very much. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 obviously, in every case the Federal Arbitration Act does not always apply. So there is jurisprudence under state law for domestic arbitration, for instance, as well. So you do have a lot of jurisprudence. And we'd have to also see in particular if there was something in particular one was interested in. But as far as the rule in international arbitration, I think it has been well established for a very long time that non-disclosure in and of itself is insufficient, and what you look at is whether the underlying circumstances are disqualifying. PROFESSOR JONES: My only interest is this: that that is my understanding of the existing position, subject only potentially to some outlying jurisdictions that might be aberrant, but that in a broad sense the US jurisprudence suggesting where it does that non-disclosure of itself is not bias is not generally accepted. If anyone wants to contest that, I'd be interested. But I'm just exposing my own view of the position. MR SMITH: Understood. On this, we just want to draw your attention if you go back down to sub 7 that we were discussing. We were talking about what was in square brackets and what

1		1	
10:30	1 and 6 of the Code" is in brackets, right, which means	10:33 1	a disclosure. If you fail to make a disclosure, the
10.50	 that a breach of Article 2 therefore would in itself 	10.55 1	standard for disqualification, whether you are
	 a establish a lack of impartiality or independence. 	3	independent or impartial, doesn't change, and there's no
	4 So what is in discussion would potentially limit	4	burden-shifting in that regard.
	5 what you see in 7 to just 3 to 6. So I would say that	5	PROFESSOR BOO: The burden doesn't change, I agree.
	6 maybe it's not quite as broad as has been proposed.	6	MS MENAKER: Right. So you will sometimes see language
	7 MS MENAKER: I'd just remark I may not have fully	7	where parties debate whether the non-disclosure is
	8 understood that. But there are two bracketed texts.	8	a so-called "aggravating factor". And again, I think
	9 When I read two bracketed texts, you're normally	9	it's very closely linked to the circumstances. If you
	choosing which wording you prefer. So "does not in and	10	are engaged by one of the parties and you don't disclose
	of itself" either "establish a lack of impartiality or	11	that and it's clearly a disqualifying circumstance:
	independence" or "a breach of article 3 to 6 of the	12	you are working for one of the parties when you try
	13 Code".	13	to explain that, that may be perceived as being
	Article 1 is just definitions: you can't have	14	
	a breach of definitions. Article 2 is application of	15	problematic and disqualifying.
	the code: you can't have a breach of application of the	16	
	code. Article 3 is the requirement of independence and	17	disqualification decisions the party or the adjudicator
	impartiality, so it can't show a breach of that.	18	looking at whether it was a so-called "honest exercise
	19 Then Article 4 is the limits on multiple roles,	19	of discretion", right? So it's not that it's such
	20 which is what we were discussing. So again,	20	a burden, but they're taking into account: why was or
	a non-disclosure of your multiple roles in and of itself	21	they're trying to surmise: why was this not made, the
	could not be a breach of that obligation; you would have	22	disclosure? And again, if it was public information, if
	to show, in this draft at least, that there was that	23	they did not think it was disqualifying or problematic,
	underlying circumstance of an issue conflict that would	24	and they look at those circumstances.
	25 be disqualifying.	25	But I do not think that there was ever
	D 17		D 10
	Page 17		Page 19
10:31	Then again, Article 5 is the duty of due diligence;	10:34 1	a burden-shifting for that arbitrator him- or herself to
	2 Article 6, integrity and competence.	2	explain why they often offer explanations, but that's
	3 So I see these as again, they're discussing the	3	when you're in a disqualification challenge, not in
	wording, but the concept is the same: the non-disclosure	4	annulment, when they're given no opportunity to do so.
	5 in and of itself is not a breach of or is not	5	But I don't think it affects the underlying
	6 disqualifying, in other words.	6	determination.
	7 PROFESSOR BOO: Chair, if I may just follow up on this	7	THE PRESIDENT: Any more questions?
	discussion on the fact that non-disclosure of itself	8	DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) Just to complete the answer to
	does not establish lack of impartiality; much depends on	9	the question that you asked us before. Draft no. 1 that
1	0 what was not disclosed.	10	is dated May 4th 2020, I have it in front of me, and it
1	1 Then it occurs to my mind: to whom then does the	11	is Article 5, and that article says "Conflict of
1		12	interest: the obligation to disclose". This is
1		13	May 4th 2020, before the additional decision. And it
	4 therefore the burden should shift to that person to show	14	establishes at item (iii) the obligation to disclose
1		15	relations with current and previous relationships with
	6 Is there such a concept?	16	any adjudicators or experts taking part in the
1		17	proceedings. And that text is dated May 4th 2020.
1	-	18	THE PRESIDENT: (Interpreted) Thank you very much.
1		19	With this, Dr Torterola, we have completed your
2		20	comments in connection with the new document; correct?
2		21	DR TORTEROLA: Yes.
2		22	THE PRESIDENT: Very well. Thank you.
2	· · · · · ·	23 24	(In English) Any more questions? Good.
			As you remember from yesterday, I did have questions
,	5 independent and impartial and the obligation to make	- 25	regarding now the 2010-2015 tree cash tiows were
2	5 independent and impartial, and the obligation to make	25	regarding how the 2010-2013 free cash flows were

1		1	
10:37 1	projected in the but for scenario. Could we see this	10:39 1	be the case that determinations of historical losses
	projected in the but-for scenario. Could we see this now, if possible?		made by the Original Tribunal which it explicitly
23		23	decided were inadequate to provide all the data
	And afterwards we may go through the questions, because there's 24 of them, and we'd like to hear how		necessary for the calculation of the 'loss of value'
4		4	-
5	the parties envisage the rest of today's hearing to	5	damages can [bind the Resubmission Tribunal] in relation
6	proceed. Are we going to select some of the questions;	6	to the calculation of those same 'loss of value'
7	would they like to answer them in writing? To be	7	damages."
8	completely honest, I don't think we will be able to go	8	Paragraph 83. Paragraph 81:
9	through the 24 questions by 2 o'clock. But I don't	9	"The difference is evident from the fact that the
10	know; I'm open to suggestions from the parties.	10	calculation of the [sale price] 'but for' the breaches
11	But first I'd like to understand how Kaczmarek did	11	of the DR-CAFTA, is not necessarily a straightforward
12	those projections and what the Tribunal accepted.	12	arithmetical exercise involving only data used to
13	I give the floor to Guatemala.	13	calculate the historical damages. It cannot be assumed
14	MR GOSIS: Thank you, Madam President.	14	that historical losses would inevitably lead to
15	(10.37 am)	15	a reduction of precisely the same amount (adjusted for
16	Answers to Tribunal questions	16	time differences, etc)"
17	MR GOSIS: The request, as we understood it yesterday, was	17	THE PRESIDENT: Slower, please. You are being translated,
18	to go through the presentations on the formulation of	18	and when one reads, it tends to increase the pace.
19	value that was underlying the damages claim by Claimant	19	MR GOSIS: Absolutely. I apologise.
20	and the observations that Respondent had at the	20	" (adjusted for time differences, etc) in [the
21	different phases of the arbitration; and you have also	21	sale price]. For example, the market for electricity
22	asked us to deal with the contradictions we had	22	might have expanded or contracted significantly over the
23	identified regarding these issues in the Award. You	23	historical period, or there might have been more or
24	asked us to be as graphic as possible in identifying these contradictions.	24 25	fewer potential buyers of EEGSA by the end of the
25	these contradictions.	23	period, or material shifts in the costs of distribution.
	Page 21		Page 23
10.38 1	We had a seriatim presentation starting with those	10:41 1	Any such changes in the market conditions would be
10:38 1	We had a seriatim presentation starting with those contradictions and then going to the damages models	10:41 1	Any such changes in the market conditions would be expected to affect the value of EEGSA, but would be
2	contradictions and then going to the damages models.	2	expected to affect the value of EEGSA, but would be
2 3	contradictions and then going to the damages models. I don't know if this is the opportunity to perhaps start	2 3	expected to affect the value of EEGSA, but would be independent of the question of EEGSA's losses."
2 3 4	contradictions and then going to the damages models. I don't know if this is the opportunity to perhaps start with the contradictions?	2	expected to affect the value of EEGSA, but would be independent of the question of EEGSA's losses." Then paragraph 84:
2 3 4 5	contradictions and then going to the damages models. I don't know if this is the opportunity to perhaps start with the contradictions? THE PRESIDENT: Sure. I'm interested in hearing the	2 3 4	expected to affect the value of EEGSA, but would be independent of the question of EEGSA's losses." Then paragraph 84: " there is need for proof of some other factor or
2 3 4 5 6	contradictions and then going to the damages models.I don't know if this is the opportunity to perhaps start with the contradictions?THE PRESIDENT: Sure. I'm interested in hearing the contradictions, so	2 3 4 5	expected to affect the value of EEGSA, but would be independent of the question of EEGSA's losses." Then paragraph 84: " there is need for proof of some other factor or data not available to the Original Tribunal"
2 3 4 5 6 7	contradictions and then going to the damages models.I don't know if this is the opportunity to perhaps start with the contradictions?THE PRESIDENT: Sure. I'm interested in hearing the contradictions, soMR GOSIS: Thank you very much.	2 3 4 5 6	expected to affect the value of EEGSA, but would be independent of the question of EEGSA's losses." Then paragraph 84: " there is need for proof of some other factor or data not available to the Original Tribunal" " it is plainly unsafe to rule that the question
2 3 4 5 6	 contradictions and then going to the damages models. I don't know if this is the opportunity to perhaps start with the contradictions? THE PRESIDENT: Sure. I'm interested in hearing the contradictions, so MR GOSIS: Thank you very much. So maybe we will start at slide 33, which says 	2 3 4 5 6 7	expected to affect the value of EEGSA, but would be independent of the question of EEGSA's losses." Then paragraph 84: " there is need for proof of some other factor or data not available to the Original Tribunal" " it is plainly unsafe to rule that the question of the amount of any 'loss of value' damages has
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 contradictions and then going to the damages models. I don't know if this is the opportunity to perhaps start with the contradictions? THE PRESIDENT: Sure. I'm interested in hearing the contradictions, so MR GOSIS: Thank you very much. So maybe we will start at slide 33, which says "Contradictions in the findings affecting damages". 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	expected to affect the value of EEGSA, but would be independent of the question of EEGSA's losses." Then paragraph 84: " there is need for proof of some other factor or data not available to the Original Tribunal" " it is plainly unsafe to rule that the question of the amount of any 'loss of value' damages has already been so distinctly argued and determined by the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 contradictions and then going to the damages models. I don't know if this is the opportunity to perhaps start with the contradictions? THE PRESIDENT: Sure. I'm interested in hearing the contradictions, so MR GOSIS: Thank you very much. So maybe we will start at slide 33, which says "Contradictions in the findings affecting damages". If you go to slide 35. We took a different approach 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	expected to affect the value of EEGSA, but would be independent of the question of EEGSA's losses." Then paragraph 84: " there is need for proof of some other factor or data not available to the Original Tribunal" " it is plainly unsafe to rule that the question of the amount of any 'loss of value' damages has
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 contradictions and then going to the damages models. I don't know if this is the opportunity to perhaps start with the contradictions? THE PRESIDENT: Sure. I'm interested in hearing the contradictions, so MR GOSIS: Thank you very much. So maybe we will start at slide 33, which says "Contradictions in the findings affecting damages". If you go to slide 35. We took a different approach than we had used in our presentations earlier in the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	expected to affect the value of EEGSA, but would be independent of the question of EEGSA's losses." Then paragraph 84: " there is need for proof of some other factor or data not available to the Original Tribunal" " it is plainly unsafe to rule that the question of the amount of any 'loss of value' damages has already been so distinctly argued and determined by the Original Tribunal that it is not only unnecessary but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 contradictions and then going to the damages models. I don't know if this is the opportunity to perhaps start with the contradictions? THE PRESIDENT: Sure. I'm interested in hearing the contradictions, so MR GOSIS: Thank you very much. So maybe we will start at slide 33, which says "Contradictions in the findings affecting damages". If you go to slide 35. We took a different approach than we had used in our presentations earlier in the hearing and what we have put here is the specific 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	expected to affect the value of EEGSA, but would be independent of the question of EEGSA's losses." Then paragraph 84: " there is need for proof of some other factor or data not available to the Original Tribunal" " it is plainly unsafe to rule that the question of the amount of any 'loss of value' damages has already been so distinctly argued and determined by the Original Tribunal that it is not only unnecessary but also impermissible for this Tribunal to hear and decide
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 contradictions and then going to the damages models. I don't know if this is the opportunity to perhaps start with the contradictions? THE PRESIDENT: Sure. I'm interested in hearing the contradictions, so MR GOSIS: Thank you very much. So maybe we will start at slide 33, which says "Contradictions in the findings affecting damages". If you go to slide 35. We took a different approach than we had used in our presentations earlier in the hearing and what we have put here is the specific portion of the specific paragraphs in the Resubmission 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	expected to affect the value of EEGSA, but would be independent of the question of EEGSA's losses." Then paragraph 84: " there is need for proof of some other factor or data not available to the Original Tribunal" " it is plainly unsafe to rule that the question of the amount of any 'loss of value' damages has already been so distinctly argued and determined by the Original Tribunal that it is not only unnecessary but also impermissible for this Tribunal to hear and decide upon fresh submissions on the point."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 contradictions and then going to the damages models. I don't know if this is the opportunity to perhaps start with the contradictions? THE PRESIDENT: Sure. I'm interested in hearing the contradictions, so MR GOSIS: Thank you very much. So maybe we will start at slide 33, which says "Contradictions in the findings affecting damages". If you go to slide 35. We took a different approach than we had used in our presentations earlier in the hearing and what we have put here is the specific portion of the specific paragraphs in the Resubmission Award that constitute what we call the first set of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	expected to affect the value of EEGSA, but would be independent of the question of EEGSA's losses." Then paragraph 84: " there is need for proof of some other factor or data not available to the Original Tribunal" " it is plainly unsafe to rule that the question of the amount of any 'loss of value' damages has already been so distinctly argued and determined by the Original Tribunal that it is not only unnecessary but also impermissible for this Tribunal to hear and decide upon fresh submissions on the point." We didn't put the reference here, but I think it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 contradictions and then going to the damages models. I don't know if this is the opportunity to perhaps start with the contradictions? THE PRESIDENT: Sure. I'm interested in hearing the contradictions, so MR GOSIS: Thank you very much. So maybe we will start at slide 33, which says "Contradictions in the findings affecting damages". If you go to slide 35. We took a different approach than we had used in our presentations earlier in the hearing and what we have put here is the specific portion of the specific paragraphs in the Resubmission Award that constitute what we call the first set of premises that will be contradicted by the second set, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	expected to affect the value of EEGSA, but would be independent of the question of EEGSA's losses." Then paragraph 84: " there is need for proof of some other factor or data not available to the Original Tribunal" " it is plainly unsafe to rule that the question of the amount of any 'loss of value' damages has already been so distinctly argued and determined by the Original Tribunal that it is not only unnecessary but also impermissible for this Tribunal to hear and decide upon fresh submissions on the point." We didn't put the reference here, but I think it's paragraph 85. We do have the full text of every
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 contradictions and then going to the damages models. I don't know if this is the opportunity to perhaps start with the contradictions? THE PRESIDENT: Sure. I'm interested in hearing the contradictions, so MR GOSIS: Thank you very much. So maybe we will start at slide 33, which says "Contradictions in the findings affecting damages". If you go to slide 35. We took a different approach than we had used in our presentations earlier in the hearing and what we have put here is the specific portion of the specific paragraphs in the Resubmission Award that constitute what we call the first set of premises that will be contradicted by the second set, and we will start the demonstration exercise through 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	expected to affect the value of EEGSA, but would be independent of the question of EEGSA's losses." Then paragraph 84: " there is need for proof of some other factor or data not available to the Original Tribunal" " it is plainly unsafe to rule that the question of the amount of any 'loss of value' damages has already been so distinctly argued and determined by the Original Tribunal that it is not only unnecessary but also impermissible for this Tribunal to hear and decide upon fresh submissions on the point." We didn't put the reference here, but I think it's paragraph 85. We do have the full text of every provision that we are citing here that appears from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 contradictions and then going to the damages models. I don't know if this is the opportunity to perhaps start with the contradictions? THE PRESIDENT: Sure. I'm interested in hearing the contradictions, so MR GOSIS: Thank you very much. So maybe we will start at slide 33, which says "Contradictions in the findings affecting damages". If you go to slide 35. We took a different approach than we had used in our presentations earlier in the hearing and what we have put here is the specific portion of the specific paragraphs in the Resubmission Award that constitute what we call the first set of premises that will be contradicted by the second set, and we will start the demonstration exercise through this. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	expected to affect the value of EEGSA, but would be independent of the question of EEGSA's losses." Then paragraph 84: " there is need for proof of some other factor or data not available to the Original Tribunal" " it is plainly unsafe to rule that the question of the amount of any 'loss of value' damages has already been so distinctly argued and determined by the Original Tribunal that it is not only unnecessary but also impermissible for this Tribunal to hear and decide upon fresh submissions on the point." We didn't put the reference here, but I think it's paragraph 85. We do have the full text of every provision that we are citing here that appears from slides 40 onwards, and which is why it's a very long set
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 contradictions and then going to the damages models. I don't know if this is the opportunity to perhaps start with the contradictions? THE PRESIDENT: Sure. I'm interested in hearing the contradictions, so MR GOSIS: Thank you very much. So maybe we will start at slide 33, which says "Contradictions in the findings affecting damages". If you go to slide 35. We took a different approach than we had used in our presentations earlier in the hearing and what we have put here is the specific portion of the specific paragraphs in the Resubmission Award that constitute what we call the first set of premises that will be contradicted by the second set, and we will start the demonstration exercise through this. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	expected to affect the value of EEGSA, but would be independent of the question of EEGSA's losses." Then paragraph 84: " there is need for proof of some other factor or data not available to the Original Tribunal" " it is plainly unsafe to rule that the question of the amount of any 'loss of value' damages has already been so distinctly argued and determined by the Original Tribunal that it is not only unnecessary but also impermissible for this Tribunal to hear and decide upon fresh submissions on the point." We didn't put the reference here, but I think it's paragraph 85. We do have the full text of every provision that we are citing here that appears from slides 40 onwards, and which is why it's a very long set of slides, because we chose to have everything in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 contradictions and then going to the damages models. I don't know if this is the opportunity to perhaps start with the contradictions? THE PRESIDENT: Sure. I'm interested in hearing the contradictions, so MR GOSIS: Thank you very much. So maybe we will start at slide 33, which says "Contradictions in the findings affecting damages". If you go to slide 35. We took a different approach than we had used in our presentations earlier in the hearing and what we have put here is the specific portion of the specific paragraphs in the Resubmission Award that constitute what we call the first set of premises that will be contradicted by the second set, and we will start the demonstration exercise through this. There's a first set of findings by the Resubmission that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	expected to affect the value of EEGSA, but would be independent of the question of EEGSA's losses." Then paragraph 84: " there is need for proof of some other factor or data not available to the Original Tribunal" " it is plainly unsafe to rule that the question of the amount of any 'loss of value' damages has already been so distinctly argued and determined by the Original Tribunal that it is not only unnecessary but also impermissible for this Tribunal to hear and decide upon fresh submissions on the point." We didn't put the reference here, but I think it's paragraph 85. We do have the full text of every provision that we are citing here that appears from slides 40 onwards, and which is why it's a very long set of slides, because we chose to have everything in a single deck for the Committee to be able to look at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 contradictions and then going to the damages models. I don't know if this is the opportunity to perhaps start with the contradictions? THE PRESIDENT: Sure. I'm interested in hearing the contradictions, so MR GOSIS: Thank you very much. So maybe we will start at slide 33, which says "Contradictions in the findings affecting damages". If you go to slide 35. We took a different approach than we had used in our presentations earlier in the hearing and what we have put here is the specific portion of the specific paragraphs in the Resubmission Award that constitute what we call the first set of premises that will be contradicted by the second set, and we will start the demonstration exercise through this. There's a first set of findings by the Resubmission that new evidence is necessary to determine if loss of value 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	expected to affect the value of EEGSA, but would be independent of the question of EEGSA's losses." Then paragraph 84: " there is need for proof of some other factor or data not available to the Original Tribunal" " it is plainly unsafe to rule that the question of the amount of any 'loss of value' damages has already been so distinctly argued and determined by the Original Tribunal that it is not only unnecessary but also impermissible for this Tribunal to hear and decide upon fresh submissions on the point." We didn't put the reference here, but I think it's paragraph 85. We do have the full text of every provision that we are citing here that appears from slides 40 onwards, and which is why it's a very long set of slides, because we chose to have everything in a single deck for the Committee to be able to look at this.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 contradictions and then going to the damages models. I don't know if this is the opportunity to perhaps start with the contradictions? THE PRESIDENT: Sure. I'm interested in hearing the contradictions, so MR GOSIS: Thank you very much. So maybe we will start at slide 33, which says "Contradictions in the findings affecting damages". If you go to slide 35. We took a different approach than we had used in our presentations earlier in the hearing and what we have put here is the specific portion of the specific paragraphs in the Resubmission Award that constitute what we call the first set of premises that will be contradicted by the second set, and we will start the demonstration exercise through this. There's a first set of findings by the Resubmission Tribunal that basically speak to the proposition that new evidence is necessary to determine if loss of value damages existed; and then, of course, what the value of those loss of damages would be. So paragraph 83, the 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 expected to affect the value of EEGSA, but would be independent of the question of EEGSA's losses." Then paragraph 84: " there is need for proof of some other factor or data not available to the Original Tribunal" " it is plainly unsafe to rule that the question of the amount of any 'loss of value' damages has already been so distinctly argued and determined by the Original Tribunal that it is not only unnecessary but also impermissible for this Tribunal to hear and decide upon fresh submissions on the point." We didn't put the reference here, but I think it's paragraph 85. We do have the full text of every provision that we are citing here that appears from slides 40 onwards, and which is why it's a very long set of slides, because we chose to have everything in a single deck for the Committee to be able to look at this. MS MENAKER: Can I just ask the Committee one question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 contradictions and then going to the damages models. I don't know if this is the opportunity to perhaps start with the contradictions? THE PRESIDENT: Sure. I'm interested in hearing the contradictions, so MR GOSIS: Thank you very much. So maybe we will start at slide 33, which says "Contradictions in the findings affecting damages". If you go to slide 35. We took a different approach than we had used in our presentations earlier in the hearing and what we have put here is the specific portion of the specific paragraphs in the Resubmission Award that constitute what we call the first set of premises that will be contradicted by the second set, and we will start the demonstration exercise through this. There's a first set of findings by the Resubmission Tribunal that basically speak to the proposition that new evidence is necessary to determine if loss of value damages existed; and then, of course, what the value of those loss of damages would be. So paragraph 83, the Second Tribunal says: 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 expected to affect the value of EEGSA, but would be independent of the question of EEGSA's losses." Then paragraph 84: " there is need for proof of some other factor or data not available to the Original Tribunal" " it is plainly unsafe to rule that the question of the amount of any 'loss of value' damages has already been so distinctly argued and determined by the Original Tribunal that it is not only unnecessary but also impermissible for this Tribunal to hear and decide upon fresh submissions on the point." We didn't put the reference here, but I think it's paragraph 85. We do have the full text of every provision that we are citing here that appears from slides 40 onwards, and which is why it's a very long set of slides, because we chose to have everything in a single deck for the Committee to be able to look at this. MS MENAKER: Can I just ask the Committee one question. Because I thought that the President's question was quite specific: that you wanted to understand how Mr Kaczmarek had quantified the but-for cash flows from
$ \begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 23 \\ 24 \\ \end{array} $	 contradictions and then going to the damages models. I don't know if this is the opportunity to perhaps start with the contradictions? THE PRESIDENT: Sure. I'm interested in hearing the contradictions, so MR GOSIS: Thank you very much. So maybe we will start at slide 33, which says "Contradictions in the findings affecting damages". If you go to slide 35. We took a different approach than we had used in our presentations earlier in the hearing and what we have put here is the specific portion of the specific paragraphs in the Resubmission Award that constitute what we call the first set of premises that will be contradicted by the second set, and we will start the demonstration exercise through this. There's a first set of findings by the Resubmission Tribunal that basically speak to the proposition that new evidence is necessary to determine if loss of value damages existed; and then, of course, what the value of those loss of damages would be. So paragraph 83, the Second Tribunal says: "the 'historical' and 'loss of value' claims are 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 expected to affect the value of EEGSA, but would be independent of the question of EEGSA's losses." Then paragraph 84: " there is need for proof of some other factor or data not available to the Original Tribunal" " it is plainly unsafe to rule that the question of the amount of any 'loss of value' damages has already been so distinctly argued and determined by the Original Tribunal that it is not only unnecessary but also impermissible for this Tribunal to hear and decide upon fresh submissions on the point." We didn't put the reference here, but I think it's paragraph 85. We do have the full text of every provision that we are citing here that appears from slides 40 onwards, and which is why it's a very long set of slides, because we chose to have everything in a single deck for the Committee to be able to look at this. MS MENAKER: Can I just ask the Committee one question. Because I thought that the President's question was quite specific: that you wanted to understand how Mr Kaczmarek had quantified the but-for cash flows from 2010 to 2013. And we also prepared an answer.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 contradictions and then going to the damages models. I don't know if this is the opportunity to perhaps start with the contradictions? THE PRESIDENT: Sure. I'm interested in hearing the contradictions, so MR GOSIS: Thank you very much. So maybe we will start at slide 33, which says "Contradictions in the findings affecting damages". If you go to slide 35. We took a different approach than we had used in our presentations earlier in the hearing and what we have put here is the specific portion of the specific paragraphs in the Resubmission Award that constitute what we call the first set of premises that will be contradicted by the second set, and we will start the demonstration exercise through this. There's a first set of findings by the Resubmission Tribunal that basically speak to the proposition that new evidence is necessary to determine if loss of value damages existed; and then, of course, what the value of those loss of damages would be. So paragraph 83, the Second Tribunal says: "the 'historical' and 'loss of value' claims are 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 expected to affect the value of EEGSA, but would be independent of the question of EEGSA's losses." Then paragraph 84: " there is need for proof of some other factor or data not available to the Original Tribunal" " it is plainly unsafe to rule that the question of the amount of any 'loss of value' damages has already been so distinctly argued and determined by the Original Tribunal that it is not only unnecessary but also impermissible for this Tribunal to hear and decide upon fresh submissions on the point." We didn't put the reference here, but I think it's paragraph 85. We do have the full text of every provision that we are citing here that appears from slides 40 onwards, and which is why it's a very long set of slides, because we chose to have everything in a single deck for the Committee to be able to look at this. MS MENAKER: Can I just ask the Committee one question. Because I thought that the President's question was quite specific: that you wanted to understand how Mr Kaczmarek had quantified the but-for cash flows from
$ \begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 23 \\ 24 \\ \end{array} $	 contradictions and then going to the damages models. I don't know if this is the opportunity to perhaps start with the contradictions? THE PRESIDENT: Sure. I'm interested in hearing the contradictions, so MR GOSIS: Thank you very much. So maybe we will start at slide 33, which says "Contradictions in the findings affecting damages". If you go to slide 35. We took a different approach than we had used in our presentations earlier in the hearing and what we have put here is the specific portion of the specific paragraphs in the Resubmission Award that constitute what we call the first set of premises that will be contradicted by the second set, and we will start the demonstration exercise through this. There's a first set of findings by the Resubmission Tribunal that basically speak to the proposition that new evidence is necessary to determine if loss of value damages existed; and then, of course, what the value of those loss of damages would be. So paragraph 83, the Second Tribunal says: "the 'historical' and 'loss of value' claims are 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 expected to affect the value of EEGSA, but would be independent of the question of EEGSA's losses." Then paragraph 84: " there is need for proof of some other factor or data not available to the Original Tribunal" " it is plainly unsafe to rule that the question of the amount of any 'loss of value' damages has already been so distinctly argued and determined by the Original Tribunal that it is not only unnecessary but also impermissible for this Tribunal to hear and decide upon fresh submissions on the point." We didn't put the reference here, but I think it's paragraph 85. We do have the full text of every provision that we are citing here that appears from slides 40 onwards, and which is why it's a very long set of slides, because we chose to have everything in a single deck for the Committee to be able to look at this. MS MENAKER: Can I just ask the Committee one question. Because I thought that the President's question was quite specific: that you wanted to understand how Mr Kaczmarek had quantified the but-for cash flows from 2010 to 2013. And we also prepared an answer.

10:42 1	presentation; I expect this will take quite a while. It	10:45 1	The data used to determine historical losses is
2		2	insufficient to determine if loss of value existed, or
3	make, say, a half-hour presentation on damages.	3	its amount.
4		4	The Original Tribunal already found it had no
5	• •	5	evidence sufficient to make a finding of loss of value.
6		6	Evidence of any changes in market conditions could
7		7	impact any determination of whether loss of value
8		8	existed.
9	-	9	It would be unsafe to make a finding on loss of
10		10	value based on the data before the Original Tribunal.
		10	The Resubmission Tribunal would deal with loss of
11			
12	· ·	12	value as an open question.
13		13	This is a summary of paragraphs 80 to 86 of the
14		14	Resubmission Award, which is from the snippets that we
15	•	15	had in the preceding slide.
16		16	(Slide 37) The second set of premises, which are
17		17	premises that speak to the contrary proposition, they
18		18	now say: no new evidence is necessary to determine loss
19		19	of value damages. And this is taken from
20		20	paragraphs 104, 105, 138, 134 of the same Resubmission
21		21	Award.
22		22	We have summarised the findings in this 104, 105,
23		23	134, [138] in slide 38. In these [paragraphs], the
24		24	Resubmission Tribunal says:
25	interrupting two minutes ago, which I could have, just	25	Findings on historical losses suffice for the
	Page 25		Page 27
	-		-
10:43 1	to have a full record of this.	10:46 1	Resubmission Tribunal to calculate and award loss of
10:43 1 2		10:46 1 2	Resubmission Tribunal to calculate and award loss of value damages.
2	As I just mentioned before the interruption, from	2	value damages.
2 3	As I just mentioned before the interruption, from slide 40 to 50 for instance, all we did is we were	2 3	value damages. The data used to determine historical losses is
2 3 4	As I just mentioned before the interruption, from slide 40 to 50 for instance, all we did is we were taking portions from these paragraphs to show more clearly exactly where the contradiction lies. But	2 3 4	value damages. The data used to determine historical losses is sufficient to determine that loss of value existed, and
2 3 4 5	As I just mentioned before the interruption, from slide 40 to 50 for instance, all we did is we were taking portions from these paragraphs to show more clearly exactly where the contradiction lies. But slides 40 to 50 is only the full text of that paragraph,	2 3 4 5	value damages. The data used to determine historical losses is sufficient to determine that loss of value existed, and its amount.
2 3 4 5 6	As I just mentioned before the interruption, from slide 40 to 50 for instance, all we did is we were taking portions from these paragraphs to show more clearly exactly where the contradiction lies. But slides 40 to 50 is only the full text of that paragraph, in case the Committee wanted to have everything in	2 3 4 5 6	value damages. The data used to determine historical losses is sufficient to determine that loss of value existed, and its amount. The reduction in cash flows used to calculate
2 3 4 5 6 7	As I just mentioned before the interruption, from slide 40 to 50 for instance, all we did is we were taking portions from these paragraphs to show more clearly exactly where the contradiction lies. But slides 40 to 50 is only the full text of that paragraph, in case the Committee wanted to have everything in a single spot.	2 3 4 5 6 7	value damages. The data used to determine historical losses is sufficient to determine that loss of value existed, and its amount. The reduction in cash flows used to calculate historical losses is the sole basis to determine loss of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	As I just mentioned before the interruption, from slide 40 to 50 for instance, all we did is we were taking portions from these paragraphs to show more clearly exactly where the contradiction lies. But slides 40 to 50 is only the full text of that paragraph, in case the Committee wanted to have everything in a single spot. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Gosis, if there's anything in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	value damages. The data used to determine historical losses is sufficient to determine that loss of value existed, and its amount. The reduction in cash flows used to calculate historical losses is the sole basis to determine loss of value damages.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 8 9	As I just mentioned before the interruption, from slide 40 to 50 for instance, all we did is we were taking portions from these paragraphs to show more clearly exactly where the contradiction lies. But slides 40 to 50 is only the full text of that paragraph, in case the Committee wanted to have everything in a single spot. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Gosis, if there's anything in the presentation that I think doesn't really brief the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	value damages. The data used to determine historical losses is sufficient to determine that loss of value existed, and its amount. The reduction in cash flows used to calculate historical losses is the sole basis to determine loss of value damages. The same data and methods applied by the Original
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	As I just mentioned before the interruption, from slide 40 to 50 for instance, all we did is we were taking portions from these paragraphs to show more clearly exactly where the contradiction lies. But slides 40 to 50 is only the full text of that paragraph, in case the Committee wanted to have everything in a single spot. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Gosis, if there's anything in the presentation that I think doesn't really brief the Committee on questions, I will let you know so you can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	value damages. The data used to determine historical losses is sufficient to determine that loss of value existed, and its amount. The reduction in cash flows used to calculate historical losses is the sole basis to determine loss of value damages. The same data and methods applied by the Original Tribunal are to be applied by the Resubmission Tribunal.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	As I just mentioned before the interruption, from slide 40 to 50 for instance, all we did is we were taking portions from these paragraphs to show more clearly exactly where the contradiction lies. But slides 40 to 50 is only the full text of that paragraph, in case the Committee wanted to have everything in a single spot. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Gosis, if there's anything in the presentation that I think doesn't really brief the Committee on questions, I will let you know so you can skip it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 value damages. The data used to determine historical losses is sufficient to determine that loss of value existed, and its amount. The reduction in cash flows used to calculate historical losses is the sole basis to determine loss of value damages. The same data and methods applied by the Original Tribunal are to be applied by the Resubmission Tribunal. If you go to slide 37, you will find the exact
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 11	As I just mentioned before the interruption, from slide 40 to 50 for instance, all we did is we were taking portions from these paragraphs to show more clearly exactly where the contradiction lies. But slides 40 to 50 is only the full text of that paragraph, in case the Committee wanted to have everything in a single spot. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Gosis, if there's anything in the presentation that I think doesn't really brief the Committee on questions, I will let you know so you can skip it. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. All I mean is I was not going to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 value damages. The data used to determine historical losses is sufficient to determine that loss of value existed, and its amount. The reduction in cash flows used to calculate historical losses is the sole basis to determine loss of value damages. The same data and methods applied by the Original Tribunal are to be applied by the Resubmission Tribunal. If you go to slide 37, you will find the exact language in each of those paragraphs from which we have taken these conclusions.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	As I just mentioned before the interruption, from slide 40 to 50 for instance, all we did is we were taking portions from these paragraphs to show more clearly exactly where the contradiction lies. But slides 40 to 50 is only the full text of that paragraph, in case the Committee wanted to have everything in a single spot. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Gosis, if there's anything in the presentation that I think doesn't really brief the Committee on questions, I will let you know so you can skip it. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. All I mean is I was not going to read from [all] of these. But since the Committee	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 value damages. The data used to determine historical losses is sufficient to determine that loss of value existed, and its amount. The reduction in cash flows used to calculate historical losses is the sole basis to determine loss of value damages. The same data and methods applied by the Original Tribunal are to be applied by the Resubmission Tribunal. If you go to slide 37, you will find the exact language in each of those paragraphs from which we have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	As I just mentioned before the interruption, from slide 40 to 50 for instance, all we did is we were taking portions from these paragraphs to show more clearly exactly where the contradiction lies. But slides 40 to 50 is only the full text of that paragraph, in case the Committee wanted to have everything in a single spot. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Gosis, if there's anything in the presentation that I think doesn't really brief the Committee on questions, I will let you know so you can skip it. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. All I mean is I was not going to read from [all] of these. But since the Committee wanted to see the contradictions, we made the simplified	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 value damages. The data used to determine historical losses is sufficient to determine that loss of value existed, and its amount. The reduction in cash flows used to calculate historical losses is the sole basis to determine loss of value damages. The same data and methods applied by the Original Tribunal are to be applied by the Resubmission Tribunal. If you go to slide 37, you will find the exact language in each of those paragraphs from which we have taken these conclusions. Go to slide 39, and this is what we thought was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	As I just mentioned before the interruption, from slide 40 to 50 for instance, all we did is we were taking portions from these paragraphs to show more clearly exactly where the contradiction lies. But slides 40 to 50 is only the full text of that paragraph, in case the Committee wanted to have everything in a single spot. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Gosis, if there's anything in the presentation that I think doesn't really brief the Committee on questions, I will let you know so you can skip it. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. All I mean is I was not going to read from [all] of these. But since the Committee wanted to see the contradictions, we made the simplified analysis and then pasted the full text, so that it was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 value damages. The data used to determine historical losses is sufficient to determine that loss of value existed, and its amount. The reduction in cash flows used to calculate historical losses is the sole basis to determine loss of value damages. The same data and methods applied by the Original Tribunal are to be applied by the Resubmission Tribunal. If you go to slide 37, you will find the exact language in each of those paragraphs from which we have taken these conclusions. Go to slide 39, and this is what we thought was a clear answer to the Committee's question yesterday.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 As I just mentioned before the interruption, from slide 40 to 50 for instance, all we did is we were taking portions from these paragraphs to show more clearly exactly where the contradiction lies. But slides 40 to 50 is only the full text of that paragraph, in case the Committee wanted to have everything in a single spot. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Gosis, if there's anything in the presentation that I think doesn't really brief the Committee on questions, I will let you know so you can skip it. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. All I mean is I was not going to read from [all] of these. But since the Committee wanted to see the contradictions, we made the simplified analysis and then pasted the full text, so that it was in a single deck. But it's going to be shorter than the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 value damages. The data used to determine historical losses is sufficient to determine that loss of value existed, and its amount. The reduction in cash flows used to calculate historical losses is the sole basis to determine loss of value damages. The same data and methods applied by the Original Tribunal are to be applied by the Resubmission Tribunal. If you go to slide 37, you will find the exact language in each of those paragraphs from which we have taken these conclusions. Go to slide 39, and this is what we thought was a clear answer to the Committee's question yesterday. This is the way in which each of the premises on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 As I just mentioned before the interruption, from slide 40 to 50 for instance, all we did is we were taking portions from these paragraphs to show more clearly exactly where the contradiction lies. But slides 40 to 50 is only the full text of that paragraph, in case the Committee wanted to have everything in a single spot. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Gosis, if there's anything in the presentation that I think doesn't really brief the Committee on questions, I will let you know so you can skip it. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. All I mean is I was not going to read from [all] of these. But since the Committee wanted to see the contradictions, we made the simplified analysis and then pasted the full text, so that it was in a single deck. But it's going to be shorter than the 35 slides. And the same with the valuation reports. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 value damages. The data used to determine historical losses is sufficient to determine that loss of value existed, and its amount. The reduction in cash flows used to calculate historical losses is the sole basis to determine loss of value damages. The same data and methods applied by the Original Tribunal are to be applied by the Resubmission Tribunal. If you go to slide 37, you will find the exact language in each of those paragraphs from which we have taken these conclusions. Go to slide 39, and this is what we thought was a clear answer to the Committee's question yesterday. This is the way in which each of the premises on slide 35, summarised in slide 36, contradict each of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 As I just mentioned before the interruption, from slide 40 to 50 for instance, all we did is we were taking portions from these paragraphs to show more clearly exactly where the contradiction lies. But slides 40 to 50 is only the full text of that paragraph, in case the Committee wanted to have everything in a single spot. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Gosis, if there's anything in the presentation that I think doesn't really brief the Committee on questions, I will let you know so you can skip it. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. All I mean is I was not going to read from [all] of these. But since the Committee wanted to see the contradictions, we made the simplified analysis and then pasted the full text, so that it was in a single deck. But it's going to be shorter than the 35 slides. And the same with the valuation reports. So this is the first set of premises the Second 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 value damages. The data used to determine historical losses is sufficient to determine that loss of value existed, and its amount. The reduction in cash flows used to calculate historical losses is the sole basis to determine loss of value damages. The same data and methods applied by the Original Tribunal are to be applied by the Resubmission Tribunal. If you go to slide 37, you will find the exact language in each of those paragraphs from which we have taken these conclusions. Go to slide 39, and this is what we thought was a clear answer to the Committee's question yesterday. This is the way in which each of the premises on slide 35, summarised in slide 36, contradict each of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 As I just mentioned before the interruption, from slide 40 to 50 for instance, all we did is we were taking portions from these paragraphs to show more clearly exactly where the contradiction lies. But slides 40 to 50 is only the full text of that paragraph, in case the Committee wanted to have everything in a single spot. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Gosis, if there's anything in the presentation that I think doesn't really brief the Committee on questions, I will let you know so you can skip it. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. All I mean is I was not going to read from [all] of these. But since the Committee wanted to see the contradictions, we made the simplified analysis and then pasted the full text, so that it was in a single deck. But it's going to be shorter than the 35 slides. And the same with the valuation reports. So this is the first set of premises the Second Tribunal established in the Resubmission Award, and the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 value damages. The data used to determine historical losses is sufficient to determine that loss of value existed, and its amount. The reduction in cash flows used to calculate historical losses is the sole basis to determine loss of value damages. The same data and methods applied by the Original Tribunal are to be applied by the Resubmission Tribunal. If you go to slide 37, you will find the exact language in each of those paragraphs from which we have taken these conclusions. Go to slide 39, and this is what we thought was a clear answer to the Committee's question yesterday. This is the way in which each of the premises on slide 35, summarised in slide 36, contradict each of the premises in slide 37, summarised in slide 38. You cannot maintain that findings on historical
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 As I just mentioned before the interruption, from slide 40 to 50 for instance, all we did is we were taking portions from these paragraphs to show more clearly exactly where the contradiction lies. But slides 40 to 50 is only the full text of that paragraph, in case the Committee wanted to have everything in a single spot. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Gosis, if there's anything in the presentation that I think doesn't really brief the Committee on questions, I will let you know so you can skip it. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. All I mean is I was not going to read from [all] of these. But since the Committee wanted to see the contradictions, we made the simplified analysis and then pasted the full text, so that it was in a single deck. But it's going to be shorter than the 35 slides. And the same with the valuation reports. So this is the first set of premises the Second Tribunal established in the Resubmission Award, and the summary is basically these six lines we have in 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 value damages. The data used to determine historical losses is sufficient to determine that loss of value existed, and its amount. The reduction in cash flows used to calculate historical losses is the sole basis to determine loss of value damages. The same data and methods applied by the Original Tribunal are to be applied by the Resubmission Tribunal. If you go to slide 37, you will find the exact language in each of those paragraphs from which we have taken these conclusions. Go to slide 39, and this is what we thought was a clear answer to the Committee's question yesterday. This is the way in which each of the premises on slide 35, summarised in slide 36, contradict each of the premises in slide 37, summarised in slide 38. You cannot maintain that findings on historical losses are insufficient and irrelevant to determine if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 As I just mentioned before the interruption, from slide 40 to 50 for instance, all we did is we were taking portions from these paragraphs to show more clearly exactly where the contradiction lies. But slides 40 to 50 is only the full text of that paragraph, in case the Committee wanted to have everything in a single spot. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Gosis, if there's anything in the presentation that I think doesn't really brief the Committee on questions, I will let you know so you can skip it. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. All I mean is I was not going to read from [all] of these. But since the Committee wanted to see the contradictions, we made the simplified analysis and then pasted the full text, so that it was in a single deck. But it's going to be shorter than the 35 slides. And the same with the valuation reports. So this is the first set of premises the Second Tribunal established in the Resubmission Award, and the summary is basically these six lines we have in slide 36: 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 value damages. The data used to determine historical losses is sufficient to determine that loss of value existed, and its amount. The reduction in cash flows used to calculate historical losses is the sole basis to determine loss of value damages. The same data and methods applied by the Original Tribunal are to be applied by the Resubmission Tribunal. If you go to slide 37, you will find the exact language in each of those paragraphs from which we have taken these conclusions. Go to slide 39, and this is what we thought was a clear answer to the Committee's question yesterday. This is the way in which each of the premises on slide 35, summarised in slide 36, contradict each of the premises in slide 37, summarised in slide 38. You cannot maintain that findings on historical losses are insufficient and irrelevant to determine if loss of value existed, or its amount, and at the same
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 As I just mentioned before the interruption, from slide 40 to 50 for instance, all we did is we were taking portions from these paragraphs to show more clearly exactly where the contradiction lies. But slides 40 to 50 is only the full text of that paragraph, in case the Committee wanted to have everything in a single spot. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Gosis, if there's anything in the presentation that I think doesn't really brief the Committee on questions, I will let you know so you can skip it. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. All I mean is I was not going to read from [all] of these. But since the Committee wanted to see the contradictions, we made the simplified analysis and then pasted the full text, so that it was in a single deck. But it's going to be shorter than the 35 slides. And the same with the valuation reports. So this is the first set of premises the Second Tribunal established in the Resubmission Award, and the summary is basically these six lines we have in slide 36: 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 value damages. The data used to determine historical losses is sufficient to determine that loss of value existed, and its amount. The reduction in cash flows used to calculate historical losses is the sole basis to determine loss of value damages. The same data and methods applied by the Original Tribunal are to be applied by the Resubmission Tribunal. If you go to slide 37, you will find the exact language in each of those paragraphs from which we have taken these conclusions. Go to slide 39, and this is what we thought was a clear answer to the Committee's question yesterday. This is the way in which each of the premises on slide 35, summarised in slide 36, contradict each of the premises in slide 37, summarised in slide 38. You cannot maintain that findings on historical losses are insufficient and irrelevant to determine if loss of value existed, or its amount, and at the same time find that findings on historical losses suffice for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 As I just mentioned before the interruption, from slide 40 to 50 for instance, all we did is we were taking portions from these paragraphs to show more clearly exactly where the contradiction lies. But slides 40 to 50 is only the full text of that paragraph, in case the Committee wanted to have everything in a single spot. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Gosis, if there's anything in the presentation that I think doesn't really brief the Committee on questions, I will let you know so you can skip it. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. All I mean is I was not going to read from [all] of these. But since the Committee wanted to see the contradictions, we made the simplified analysis and then pasted the full text, so that it was in a single deck. But it's going to be shorter than the 35 slides. And the same with the valuation reports. So this is the first set of premises the Second Tribunal established in the Resubmission Award, and the summary is basically these six lines we have in slide 36: Findings on historical losses are insufficient and irrelevant to determine if the loss of value existed, or 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	 value damages. The data used to determine historical losses is sufficient to determine that loss of value existed, and its amount. The reduction in cash flows used to calculate historical losses is the sole basis to determine loss of value damages. The same data and methods applied by the Original Tribunal are to be applied by the Resubmission Tribunal. If you go to slide 37, you will find the exact language in each of those paragraphs from which we have taken these conclusions. Go to slide 39, and this is what we thought was a clear answer to the Committee's question yesterday. This is the way in which each of the premises on slide 35, summarised in slide 36, contradict each of the premises in slide 37, summarised in slide 38. You cannot maintain that findings on historical losses are insufficient and irrelevant to determine if loss of value existed, or its amount, and at the same time find that findings on historical losses suffice for the Resubmission Tribunal to calculate and award loss of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 As I just mentioned before the interruption, from slide 40 to 50 for instance, all we did is we were taking portions from these paragraphs to show more clearly exactly where the contradiction lies. But slides 40 to 50 is only the full text of that paragraph, in case the Committee wanted to have everything in a single spot. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Gosis, if there's anything in the presentation that I think doesn't really brief the Committee on questions, I will let you know so you can skip it. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. All I mean is I was not going to read from [all] of these. But since the Committee wanted to see the contradictions, we made the simplified analysis and then pasted the full text, so that it was in a single deck. But it's going to be shorter than the 35 slides. And the same with the valuation reports. So this is the first set of premises the Second Tribunal established in the Resubmission Award, and the summary is basically these six lines we have in slide 36: Findings on historical losses are insufficient and irrelevant to determine if the loss of value existed, or 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 value damages. The data used to determine historical losses is sufficient to determine that loss of value existed, and its amount. The reduction in cash flows used to calculate historical losses is the sole basis to determine loss of value damages. The same data and methods applied by the Original Tribunal are to be applied by the Resubmission Tribunal. If you go to slide 37, you will find the exact language in each of those paragraphs from which we have taken these conclusions. Go to slide 39, and this is what we thought was a clear answer to the Committee's question yesterday. This is the way in which each of the premises on slide 35, summarised in slide 36, contradict each of the premises in slide 37, summarised in slide 38. You cannot maintain that findings on historical losses are insufficient and irrelevant to determine if loss of value existed, or its amount, and at the same time find that findings on historical losses suffice for the Resubmission Tribunal to calculate and award loss of value damages, or that the reduction in cash flows used

11 found it had no evidence sufficient to make a finding of 11 flows and leave the interest thing aside. Thank you. 12 loss of value, yet, in the same instrument, find also 13 that the reduction in cash flows used by the Original 13 that the reduction in cash flows used by the Original 13 So if we go to slide 56 onwards, we start with the 14 Tribunal to calculate historical losses is the sole 13 So if we go to slide 58, we have, starting with the 15 basis to determine loss of value damages, and that the 16 Side 58, we have his analysis of the methods 17 are to be applied by the Resubmission Tribunal. 16 Slide 58, we have his analysis of the methods 18 You cannot find that evidence of any changes in 18 well, Navigant uses a cash flow projection for lost cash 19 market conditions could impact any determination of 16 Slide 58, we have his analysis of the methods 21 and methods are to be applied. 20 a combination of DCF and two comparable approaches 22 So we have just put the contradiction in arrows from 24 damages claimed in the arbitration; while, in 25 Second Award on this point. Page 29 Page 31 10:49 1	5			
2Similarly, your cannot find the same time fund the data used to determine if storated losses is is sufficient to determine its storated losses is is sufficient to determine historical losses is is sufficient to determine historical losses is is sufficient to determine historical losses is is amount, or that the reduction in cash flows used by the sole hasis to determine loss of value existed, and its amount, or that the reduction in cash flows used by the sole hasis to determine loss of value duranges. To cannot find that the Original Thibmual trady to cannot find that the Original Thibmual to acclusture historical losses is the sole hasis to determine loss of value duranges. To rearmot find that the Original Thibmual to acclusture historical losses is to determine loss of value duranges. Thibmual to acclusture historical losses is to determine loss of value duranges. Thibmual to acclusture historical losses is to determine loss of value duranges. Thibmual to acclusture historical losses is to determine loss of value duranges in the same instrument, find also to determine loss of value duranges in the same data and methods applied by the Original Thibmual reared to and methods applied by the Original Thibmual reared to and methods applied by the Original Thibmual reared to durange in the construction in arrows from the premises on the first set of sides to show here hist set of a state or side set of and the side is one or and the durange in the construction in arrows from the original the to accuration within the same data a matchas and nethod simpler even the accuration is anto barden apply paragraph 767; that the investment was rak-free as from the original the source or thing here. The metal here accuration is anow here the source and in a source that the source or the accuration is anow and and the source or this source or the source or the s	10.47 1	is the cole basis to determine loss of value democras	10.50 1	mode in the relation to avial. And this is compating
 data used to determine historical losses is insufficient 4 to determine thistorical losses is insufficient 5 and that the data used to determine historical losses is 6 sufficient to determine that loss of value existed, and 7 is amount, of that the reduction in call hows used by 8 the Original Tribunal to calculate historical losses is 9 the sole hasis to determine loss of value damages. 10 You cannot find that the Original Tribunal already 11 found it had no veidence sufficient to make a finding of 12 loss of value, yet, in the same instrument, find alto 13 sum chara and methods applied by the Original 14 Tribunal to calculate historical losses is the sole 15 or cannot find that the Veidence and makes finding of 16 you cannot find that evidence of any expansion 17 sum data and methods applied by the Original Tribunal 17 are to be applied by the Grightal 18 well. Noriginut sea such as and ysis of the methods 19 market conditions could impact any determination of 19 market conditions could impact any determination 19 market conditions could impact any determination 10 where we have a stating with the corradiction in arrows from 21 second Award on this point. 22 second Award on this point. 23 where we have a parties of the exact ournal (char in the stating with the same data 24 set of slides to the second 25 second Award on this point. 26 where we have a parties of futures the same data 26 and methods applied by the corradiction in arrows from 21 comparable publicly make approaches - 12 21 constrained award on this point. 27 Big 29 Page 31 28 10.42 1 projection for the historical losses, DCP for the 2 bue low value and the purchase price in DECA 10 for - 3 THE PRESIDENT. The same data to in 3 cartificants, suggestime to Markagestime that to . 3 retuinant, since that the determination within it 3 retuinants, see it in the evalues of the theoremine 3 retuinants, see it in the evalues of the same data to in 3 retuinant we have the arcaculasion that the same data 3 retuinants, see it in the retuinan		c		
 4 conset to Costa Risa. Mr Rezumark was the expert for example in the term of the determine that loss of value existed, and sist ficture to determine that loss of value existed, and sist ficture to determine that loss of value existed, and the to Criginal Tribunal area due to Criginal Tribunal to Calculate historical losses is to the sofe basis to determine that the Corginal Tribunal area due to Criginal Tribunal area due to Criginal Tribunal area due to the same data and methods applied by the Original Tribunal area due to be applied by the Brain Store of Yalue existed, and that the same data and methods applied by the Original Tribunal area due to be applied by the Original Tribunal area due to be applied by the Original Tribunal area due to be applied by the Original Tribunal area due to be applied by the Original Tribunal area due to be applied by the Original Tribunal area due and methods applied by the Original Tribunal area due to be applied by the Original Tribunal area due to be applied by the Original Tribunal area due to be applied by the Original Tribunal area due and methods applied. The averter minime of the second state to be applied by the Original Tribunal area due and methods applied. The original Tribunal area due and methods applied by the Original Arbitration of Dribunal. 10:49 1 We will just adip now all the way down to side 53. Avard. And here the issue could mapter and exertant watch exect mortal due to a singles of the arbitration while, in a state or Dribunal area due and methods applied by and of Dribunal area due and the toriginal arbitration of due area due to bar applied by and of the arbitration while, in a divertification is arrows from the precises on the first set of sides to the second state area due when the same dua and methods applied by and the due so or value area due when a similar set of much simpler even area area due and the tabel for sides to be applied by and the due area due to the simplem. 10:40 1 We will just adip now all t				
and that the data used to determine historical losses is sufficient to determine that loss of value existed, and is arount, or that the reduction in cash flows used by the Original Tribunal to calculate historical losses is to be havis to determine loss of value damages. So to borrow at commercial rates, as the Tribunal books in the Hesubmission (Laward that is the purpose of 20 around find that the original Tribunal to calculate historical losses is that the reduction in cash flows used by the to cannot find that the original Tribunal to calculate historical losses is that the reduction in cash flows used by the forginal tribunal to calculate historical losses is the sole liss is to determine historical losses is the sole liss is to determine historical losses is the sole liss is to determine historical losses is the sole list are to be applied by the Resubmission Tribunal. To caromfind that veldence of any changes in the therefore any changes in the sole applied.10 THE PRESIDENT: Mr Cosis, cand your concentration on the sole are well the historical losses, and uses a combination of DCF and two companish approaches - a combination of DCF and two companish approaches - a combination of duranges in the Resubmission the area and here area and any and reduction, in a right set of allos to be second a set of sides to show the exact commission the any durant were and and mitch singer even a rand we have a similar set of much singer even to reduction, in a right set of allos to show the second on the singer.10.491We will just skip now all the way down to side 53, paragraph 767, the the investment was risk-free as from 2110.521projection for the historical losses, DCF for the to advalue and the sub-row have a distinct DCC aclosed spanded by the a distinct DCC aclosed spanded by the paragraph 767,				
 sufficient to determine that loss of value existed, and its sum anount, or that the reduction in cash flows used by the Original Tribunal to ecidence stifticine to make a finding of the sole basis to determine loss of value damages. you cannot find that the Original Tribunal areasy and that the reduction in cash flows used by the Original arbitraria con the original arbitraria contradiction in the same data and methods applied by the Original Tribunal area to be applied by the Resubmission Tribunal. You cannot find that evidence of any changes in market confinitions could impact any determination of where here so still arbitraria to the same data and methods are to be applied by the Original Tribunal area to be applied by the Original Tribunal area to a show the exact contradiction in arrows from the restrict and that the same data and methods are to be applied by the Original Tribunal area to show the exact contradiction in arrows from a state size and where the state and the same data and methods are to be applied by the Original Tribunal area to show the exact contradiction in arrows from the second as are to be applied by the Original Arbitrarion, which, in the premises on the first set of slides to the second second as the premises on the first set of slides to the second second a mine point. Yage 29 Yage 31 Yege 32 Yege 31 Yege 33 Yege 34 Yege 34<td></td><td></td><td></td><td>-</td>				-
7its amount, or that the reduction in cash flows used by the sole basis to determine loss of value damages.10Yac cannot find that the Original Tribunal to calculate historical losses is is the sole basis to determine loss of value damages.10Yac cannot find that the Original Tribunal aready to loss of value, yet, in the same instrument, find also the reduction in cash flows used by the Original are to be applied by the Original Tribunal.11Tribunal to calculate historical losses is the sole12loss of value, yet, in the same instrument, find also to cannot find that vel/conce? any class.13shot the reduction in cash flows used by the Original are to be applied by the Resubmission Tribunal.14Tribunal to calculate historical losses is the sole15basis to determine loss of value damages, and that the same data and methods applied by the Original Tribunal.16same data and methods applied by the Original Tribunal.17or cannot find that vel/conce? any charges in and methods are to be applied.18Wo cannot find that vel/conce? any charges in and methods are to be applied.21and methods are to be applied.22So we have just put the contradiction in arrows from the permisses on the first sot of slides to show the exate contradiction in arrows from the permisses on the first sot of slides to show the exate contradiction in the sole.22So we have quality as to funch simpler even 				
 8 the Original Tribunal to calculate historical losses is the sole basis to determine loss of value damages. 10 You cannot find that the Original Tribunal atready to the same fitticent to make a finding of loss of value, exit in the same instrument. If rid also so is value damages, and that the the requirement. If rid also so is the sole basis to determine loss of value damages, and that the same data and methods applied by the Original Tribunal to a cluculate historical losses is the sole to basis to determine loss of value damages, and that the same data and methods applied by the Original Tribunal to a cluculate historical losses is the sole to basis to determine loss of value damages, and that the same data and methods applied. You cannot find that evidence of any changes in market conditions could impact any determination of the sectomission Tribunal. 10.49 1 We will just skip now all the way down to slide 57. Where we have a similar sol of mark is the Resubmission Tribunal is not bound to apply paraphr 767; its where to tail we that interest rate avanded to the practices of a finder sole were to an amiled that is the same finding of the cluck in the Resubmission Tribunal is not bound to apply paraphr 767; its where to tail we that interest rate avanded to pragraphr 767 is where that markings in Tribunal is not bound to apply paraphr 767; its where that and the resubmission Award. 10.49 1 We wall just skip now all the way down to slide 57. Where we have a premise A: that paragraphr 767 is where the analysis of a mark is informed were to an amiled that interest rate avanded to pragraphr 767; its where the analysis of the method is applied by the cluck. In the resubmission Tribunal is not bound to apply paraphr 767; its where the analysis of the subor of the heave that the interest rate avanded to pragraphr 767; its where the analysis of the method is applied paragraphr 767; its where the analysis to the submission Tribunal 16 A ward inthe restremission Tribunal 17 and tha	6			
 9 the sole basis to determine loss of value damages. 10 You cannot find that the Criginal Tribunal already 11 found it had no evidence sufficient make a finding of 12 loss of value, yet, in the same instrument, find also 13 that the reduction in cash flow sued by the Original 14 Tribunal to calculate historical losses is the sole 15 basis to determine loss of value damages, and that the 16 same data and methods applied by the Original Tribunal. 17 you cannot find that evidence of any changes in 18 you cannot find that evidence of any changes in 19 market conditions could impact any determination of 20 whether loss of value existed, and that the same data 21 and methods are to be applied. 22 so we have just put the contradiction in arrows from 23 the premises on the first set of siles to the second 24 set of sildes to show the exact contradiction in the 25 Second Award on this point. 29 Page 31 10:49 1 We will just skip now all the way down to sile 53, 20 where we have a similal set of much simpler even 21 corbor 2101. 21 we have a similal set of much simpler even 22 more and the interset rate awarded 23 under paragraph 767, that interset rate awarded 24 under paragraph 767 is keit way is single for a protoch? 24 to chore 210. 25 are than the inserts rate awarded 26 under paragraph 767, is widenly on trick-free. These 26 are whan were not annulled; that the 27 are with the colucion, also vorbatin from the 28 restensision Award: that the Resubmission Award. 29 the fore yubations from the Resubmission Award. 20 the original arbitration. 21 corbore 210. Corbor 2010. 22	7	•	7	
 You cannot find that the Original Tribunal Jaready found it had no evidence sufficient to make a finding of fous of value, yet, in the same instrument, find also that the reduction in cash flows used by the Original that the reduction in cash flows used by the Original that the reduction in cash flows used by the Original that the reduction in cash flows used by the Original thin the reduction in cash flows used by the Original thin the reduction in cash flows used by the Original at to be applied by the Resubmission Tribunal are to be applied by the Resubmission fribunal Side 58, we have its analysis of the methods applied by each of the parties. Mr Kaszmarek, says: well, Navigant uses a cash flow comparable approaches - contradictions regarding the issue of interest, which is where we have a similar set of much simpler even contradictions regarding the issue of interest, which is where we have a similar set of much simpler even contradictions regarding the issue of interest, which is where we have a similar set of much simpler We ward and here the issue could not be simpler. We have a premise B: that the interest rate awarded and werbatim quotations from the Resubmission Avard. Resubmission Avard: that the Resubmissi	8	the Original Tribunal to calculate historical losses is	8	holds in the [Resubmission] Award that is the purpose of
11 found it had no evidence sufficient to make a finding of 12 11 found it had no evidence sufficient to make a finding of 12 11 four sufficient to make a finding of 13 11 four sufficient to make a finding of 12 12 MR GOSIS: Yes, absolutely. 13 So if We go to side 56 onwards, we start with the 14 review of the reports by M Kaczmarek, starting with the 15 16 Side 58, we have his analysis of the methods 17 applied by each of the partice. 16 Side 58, we have his analysis of the methods 17 applied by each of the partice. 18 You cannot find that evidence of may changes in 19 market conditions. could impact any determination of 20 whether loss of value and the value are and the 21 and methods are to be applied. 20 a combination OFDCF and two comparable partice in 22 Transactions - for both the brice sof value 23 a combination of DCF and two comparable approaches - 20 21 a combination DCF and two comparable approaches - 21 21 a combination DCF and two comparable approaches - 21 21 a combination and the value and the 24 a combination and the value and the 25 a combination and DCF and two comparable applicity traded comparatis, whice, in 25 a combination and DCF and two com	9	the sole basis to determine loss of value damages.	9	awarding interest, to invest in risk-free investments
 loss of value, yet, in the same instrument, find also that the reduction in cash flows used by the Original think the reduction in cash flows used by the Original think the reduction in cash flows used by the Original think the reduction in cash flows used by the Original think the reduction in cash flows used by the Original think the reduction in cash flows used by the Original Tribunal are to be applied by the Resubmission Tribunal. You cannot find that evidence of any changes in market conditions could impact any determination of whether loss of value existed, and that the same data and methods are to be applied. So we have is just put the contradiction in arrows from the premises on the first set of slides to the second second Award on this point. Page 29 Fage 31 10:49 We will just skip now all the way down to slide 53, whave, a apremise A: that paragraphs 766 and 767 of the Original Award were not annalled; that the Resubmission Thomal is not bouth be simpler. Resubmission Award. There was have a annalled; that the Resubmission Award and the flexature varies for any canner from the simpler avera fur this own DCF approach? Me have a premise B: that the interest rate awarded under paragraph 70? is evidently not risk-free as from 21s do cather 2010. There was the conclusion, and so verbatin from the Resubmission Thomal is not bound to opply paragraph 70? is evidently not risk-free as from 21s Abo - and this is something that we had a trait the Next paragraph 70? is evidently not risk-free as from 21s Abo - and this is something that we had a trait the train frin	10	You cannot find that the Original Tribunal already	10	THE PRESIDENT: Mr Gosis, could you concentrate on the cash
 13 that the reduction in cash flows used by the Original Tribunal to calculate historical losses is the sole 14 Tribunal to calculate historical losses is the sole 15 basis to determine loss of value dumages, and that the 16 as ane data and methods applied by the Original Tribunal 17 applied by each of the parties. Mr Kaczmarek, starting with the 10 original Avaruation of DCF and two companible approaches 10 original Avaruation of thirst et of differs to the second in the same data 21 and methods are to be applied. 22 So we have just put the contradiction in arrows from 24 set of slides to show the exact contradiction in the 25 Second Award on this point. 10.49 1 We will just skip now all the way down to slide 53, 21 where we have a a similar set of match simpler even 32 orthor dictions regarding the issue of interest, which is 33 meas and and here the issue could not be simpler. 34 part of the calculation of damages in the Resubmission 35 Award. And here the issue could not be simpler. 36 We have a premise A: that paragraphs 767 at the interest rate awarded 37 und verbaim incons, from the Resubmission Award. 38 Resubmission Arward - as preparagnely 767. 30 We have a premise B: that the interest rate awarded 31 are all verbaim quotations from the Resubmission Award. 31 There is no way, to quote from MINE v Guinea, to go 31 for a read with M to folds estimation from the 32 meant - nisk-free rates as sole obtain (free rate). 31 the seates that from the advard - as per paragraph 767. 32 meant - nisk-free rates as sole obtain (free rate). 32 meant - nisk-free rates as sole obtain (free rate). 33 meant - nisk-free rates, sole obtain a raik. There we have the conclusion. 34 the finder in the Avard - as per paragraph 767. 35 Her PRESIDENT: T	11	found it had no evidence sufficient to make a finding of	11	flows and leave the interest thing aside. Thank you.
14 Tribunal to calculate historical losses is the sole 15 basis to determine loss of value damages, and that the same data and methods are to be applied by the Resubmission Tribunal. 17 are to be applied by the Resubmission Tribunal. 18 You cannot find that evidence of any changes in market conditions could impact any determination of 20 whether loss of value existed, and that the same data and methods are to be applied. 21 and methods are to be applied. 22 So we have just put the contradiction in arrows from 23 the premises on the first st of slides to show the exact contradiction in the 25 23 Second Award on this point. 24 set of slides to show the exact contradiction in the 25 25 Second Award on this point. 26 We will just skip now all the way down to slide 53, evant. And here the issue of interest, which is a part of the calculation of dumges in the Resubmission 47 of the original Award were not annulled; that the Resubmission Tribunal is not hound to apply paragraph 767, is wither to conclusion, advo retuin from the Resubmission Award. 18 We have a premise B: that the interest rate warded and regrading the same data in the first store of the Star and the sone of the original arbitration. 19 There whave thave the conclusion, advo verbatin from the resubmission Award. 14 There whave the conclusion, advo verbatin from the Resubmission Award. 10	12	loss of value, yet, in the same instrument, find also	12	MR GOSIS: Yes, absolutely.
 basis to determine loss of value damages, and that the is same data and methods applied by the Cestibusion Tribunal is nor bea pplied. You cannot find that evidence of any changes in market conditions could impact any determination of the well. Navigant uses a cash flow projection for lost cash in the premises on the first set of sildes to the second and methods are to be applied. So we have its put the contradiction in the second as set of sildes to the second as set of sildes to show the exact contradiction in the premises on the first set of sildes to the second as set of sildes to the second as set of sildes to show the exact contradiction in the 25 Second Award on this point. Page 29 10:49 1 We will just skip now all the way down to silde 53, where we have a similar set of much simpler even 3 contradiction of damages in the Resubmision 7 the for signal Award were not annulpts 76 and 767 of the Original Award were not annulpts 76 and 767 of the Original Award were not annulpts 76 and 767 of the Original Award were not annulpts 76 and 767 of the Original Award were not annulpts 76 and 767 of the Submission Thobanal is not bound to apply paragraph 767; that the interest mate submission Award. There we have a termine B: that the interest rate awarded 12 under paragraph 767; that the interest rate awarded 13 are all verbatim goatations from the Resubmission Award. The we have the conclusion, also verbatim from the 18 Resubmission Thobanal is not bound to apply paragraph 767; that the interest rate awarded 14 choose a DCF approach to 24 more rate and this is an of this to some from the NES of Submission Thobanal is not bound to apply 79 from premise B to the conclusion. There is no way, to quote from MNEY Colume, to go from premise A to premise B to the conclusion. There is no way, to quote from MNEY Colume, to go from premise A to premise B to the conclusion. There is no way, to quote from MNEY Colume, to go from premise	13	that the reduction in cash flows used by the Original	13	So if we go to slide 56 onwards, we start with the
16 same data and methods applied by the Original Tribunal 17 are to be applied by the Resubmission Tribunal. 18 You cannot find that evidence of any changes in 19 market conditions could impact any determination of 20 whether loss of value existed, and that the same data 21 and methods are to be applied. 22 So we have just put the contradiction in arrows from 23 sto we have suist set of slides to how the exact contradictions in the premises on the first set of slides to how the exact contradiction in the 24 set of slides to how the exact contradiction in the 25 Second Award on this point. 26 we will just skip now all the way down to slide 53, 2 where we have a similar set of much simpler even 3 contradictions regarding the sisue olitheres, which is 4 part of the calculation of amages in the Resubmission 5 Award. And here the issue could not be simpler. 6 We have a premise A: that pragraphs 767 is evidently not risk-free. 7 the Coriginal Award were not ammilled; that the 8 resubmission Tribunal sion of bom to apply 9 paragraph 767, is evidently not risk-free. 10	14	Tribunal to calculate historical losses is the sole	14	review of the reports by Mr Kaczmarek, starting with the
 16 same data and methods applied by the Original Tribunal are to be applied by the Resubmission Tribunal. 17 applied by each of the parties. Mr Kazmarek says: 18 Wou cannot find that evidence of any changes in amaket conditions could impact any determination of 20 whether loss of value existed, and that the same data 21 and methods are to be applied. 22 So we have just put the contradiction in arrows from 23 the premises on the first set of slides to the second 24 set of slides to how the exact contradiction in the 25 Second Award on this point. 29 Page 29 Page 31 10.49 1 We will just skip now all the way down to slide 53, 2 where we have a similar set of much simpler even 3 contradictions regarding the issue of interest, which is 4 part of the calculation of damages in the Resubmission 5 Award. And here the issue of interest, which is 4 part of the calculation of damages in the Resubmission 5 Award. And here the issue could not be simpler. 10.49 1 We will just skip now all the way down to slide 53, 2 where we have a similar set of much simpler even 3 contradictions regarding the issue of interest, which is 4 part of the calculation of damages in the Resubmission 5 Award. And here the issue could not be simpler. 10.49 1 We will just skip now all the way down to slide 53, 2 where we have a similar set of much singler. 10.40 First and ward were not amulled; that the 8 Resubmission Tribunal is not bound to apply 9 paragraph 767; that the interest rate awarded 12 under paragraph 767; the the interest rate awarded 13 criticisms regarding Kazmarek's DCF model. So he just mode 13 criticisms regarding Kazmarek's DCF model. So he just made 14 that finding in the Award – as per paragraph 767. 10 There is no way, to quote from MINE v Chainet, og 2 17 mor verbaint bocause the reference is in a fortome in 18 that finding in the Award – as per paragraph 767. 10 There is no way, to quote from MINE v Chaines, to go 2 17 more ver	15	basis to determine loss of value damages, and that the	15	original arbitration.
 are to be applied by the Resubmission Tribunal. You cannot find that evidence of any changes in market conditions could impact any determination of 20 whether loss of value existed, and that the same data and methods are to be applied. So we have just put the contradiction in arrows from 23 the premises on the first set of slides to the second 32 to set of slides to show the exact contradiction in the 25 Second Award on this point. Page 29 10.49 1 We will just skip now all the way down to slide 53, 2 where we have a similar set of nucles impler. Where we have a similar set of suices in there susceed and the environs regarding the issue of interest, which is 2 adstance DCF calculation. To first methaments, a data paragraph 767, that the interest rate awarded 12 more reading be issue from the resulting from the Resubmission Award. We have a premise B: that the interest rate awarded 12 more radiations from the Resubmission Award. Then we have dar and the interest rate awarded 12 worder paragraph 767. We have a premise B: that the interest rate awarded 13 are all verbatim because the reforence is in a footnote in 16 that finding in the Award were and minime to the second to advite a data 2 advite the Crosenders. Then we have due conclusion, also verbatim from the 18 resubmission Avard. Then we have the conclusion, also verbatim from the 18 resubmission from the Resubmission Avard. There is no way, to quote from MINE v Guinea, to go from premise A to paragraph 767. Akso – and this is something that we had a tatit 2 exchange with Mr Poláck y systerd ay about what this is a meant – risk-free assest obtain (if) the paragraph 767. Akso – and this is something that we had a tatit 2 exchange with Mr Poláck y systerd ay about what this is a meant – risk-free assest obtain (if) traparation from the 2 burfor. The concentration. There is no way, to quote from MINE v Guinea, to go from premise	16	-	16	Slide 58, we have his analysis of the methods
 You cannot find that evidence of any changes in market conditions could impact any determination of vertain between the conditions could impact any determination of vertain between the conditions and that the same data and methods are to be applied. So we have just put the contradiction in arrows from the premises on the first set of slides to the second set of slides to the second site in the premises on the first set of slides to the second second and the second set of slides to the second vertain the contradiction in the 23 second Award on this point. Page 29 Page 31 10:49 1 We will just skip now all the way down to slide 53, where we have a similar set of much simpler even contradictions regarding the issue of interest, which is a part of the calculation of the measurement, set free the issue could not be simpler. We have a premise A: that paragraphs 766 and 767 of the Original Award were not annulled; that the Besubmission Thibunal is not bound to apply paragraph 767; that the investment was risk-free as from 12 tat October 2010. We have a premise B: that the interest rate awarded 12 under paragraph 767 is evidently not risk-free. These are all value in the seause the reference is in a fortome in the Award - as per paragraph 767. There have the conclusion, also verbait if from the 15 resubmission Thibunal int 16 way: the conters on any. to quote from MINE V Guinea, to go 20 from premise A to premise B to the conclusion. Abso - and this is something that we had a tacit 2 exchange with M Polákek yesterday about what this are mart - risk-free astes obtain full reparation through 21 Also - and this is something that we had a tacit 2 exchange with M Polákek yesterday about what this 22 to Octover any risk-free rates, 23 to ocover any risk-free rates, 25 to cover any ris			17	
 market conditions could impact any determination of whether loss of value existed, and that the same data and methods are to be applied. and methods are to be applied. So we have just put the contradiction in arrows from a factor of siles to show the exact contradiction in the permises on the first set of slides to the second start are start set of slides to show the exact contradiction in the 23 actual value, which is what we call the loss of value and the arsact software of slides to show the exact contradiction in the 25 method start we comparable publicly raded companis. Comparable publicly rade and rade raded raded				
 whether loss of value existed, and that the same data and methods are to be applied. and methods are to be applied. So we have its part the contradiction in arrows from the premises on the first set of slides to the second at set of slides to show the exact contradiction in the 25 Second Award on this point. Page 29 Page 31 10:49 1 We will just skip now all the way down to slide 53, where we have a similar set of much simpler even 3 contradictions regarding the issue of interest, which is 4 part of the calculation of damages in the Resubmission 7 the Original Award were not annulled; that the 8 Resubmission Tribunal is not bound to apply 9 paragraph 767; that the interest rate awarded 10 whave a premise 8: that paragraph 767 is a vidently not risk-free. These are all verbatim quotations from the Resubmission Tribunal is not bound to apply 9 paragraph 767; that the interest rate awarded 12 under paragraph 767; that the interest rate awarded 13 are all verbatim quotations from the Resubmission Tribunal is not bound to apply 9 paragraph 767; that the interest rate awarded 14 Award interest after 21st October 2010 - and this is morthing that we had a tacit 22 exchange with Mr Polášek yesterday about what this 23 reter assets obtain fill reparation through 21 Abo - and this is something that we had a tacit 22 exchange with Mr Polášek yesterday about what this 3 reter starts that provide returns at risk-free rates, 25 to cover any risk-free investment that could have been a fair summary of what was be actual value, not the 24 damages claimed in the diverd - as per paragraph 767. Abo - and this is something that we had a tacit 22 exchange with Mr Polášek yesterday about what this 3 reter starts that provide returns at risk-free rates, 25 to cover any risk-free investment that could have been a fair summary of what was bacfore the Original Tribunal? Abo - and this is something that we had a tacit 22 exchange with Mr Polášek yester				
 and methods are to be applied. So we have just put the contradiction in arrows from the premises on the first set of slides to the second set of slides to show the exact contradiction in the premises on the first set of slides to the second damages claimed in the arbitration; while, in 23 actual value, which is what we call the loss of value damages claimed in the arbitratior; while, in 23 actual value, which is what we call the loss of value damages claimed in the arbitratior; while, in 23 actual value, which is what we call the loss of value damages claimed in the arbitratior; while, in 25 Mr Kaczmarek's view, Compass Lexecon uses a cash flow Page 31 10:49 1 We will just skip now all the way down to slide 53, where we have a similar set of much simpler even 3 contradictions regarding the issue of interest, which is a part of the calculation of damages in the Resubmission 5 Award. And here the issue could not be simpler. 6 We have a premise A: that paragraphs 766 and 767 of 7 the 0 figinal Award were not annulled; that the Resubmission Tribunal is not bound to apply 9 paragraph 767 is evidently not risk-free. These ar all verbatim quotations from the Resubmission Award. 11 We have premise B: that the interest rate awarded 12 under paragraph 767 is evidently not risk-free. These ar all verbatim quotations from the Resubmission Award. 12 Award interest after 2101 C- and this is an footnote in 18 that finding in the Award – as per paragraph 767. 13 There is no way, to quote from MINE V Guinea, to go from permise A to premise B to the conclusion. 21 Also – and this is sonething that we had a tacit 2 exchange with Mr Polášek yesterday about what this interest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates, 25 to cover any risk-free investment tha could have been 21 to cover any risk-free investment tha could have been 22 the DCF valuations underlying the immess to firmes trates that provide retures at isk-free rates, 25 to cover any ris		· ·		
 So we have just put the contradiction in arrows from the premises on the first set of slides to the second set of slides to show the exact contradiction in the 25 Second Award on this point. Page 29 10:49 1 We will just skip now all the way down to slide 53, where we have a similar set of much simpler even 3 contradictions regarding the issue of interest, which is 4 part of the calculation of damages in the Resubmission 5 Award. And here the issue could not be simpler. We ward a vard were not annulled; that the 8 Resubmission Tribunal is not bound to apply 21st October 2010. Ward interest fare 12ts October 2010. There is no way, to quote form MINE Y oblication, also verbatim from the 8 Resubmission Award. There vand, ward: that the Resubmission Award. There vand ward: that the Resubmission Award. There is no way, to quote from MINE Y oblication, also verbatim from the 15 Resubmission Award. There is no way, to quote from MINE Y oblication, also verbatim from the 15 Resubmission Award. There is no way, to quote from MINE Y oblication, also verbatim from the 21st October 2010. Award interest after 21st October 2010 - and this is 17 not verbatim because the reference is in a footnote in 18 that finding in the Award - as per paragraph 767. MR GOSIS: It is and it is not, because Mr Abdal not only 21 criticism K Mr Aczmarek's DCF model, but had 16 choose a DCF approach to calculate the buf-for, but it 17 didn't make a completely separate DCF model, but had 16 choose a DCF approach to Calculation of its its and it is not, because Mr Abdala not only 21 criticism K Mr Aczmarek's DCF model, but had 22 the DCF valuations underlying the 23 valuation, for instance. So it's not - 24 THE PRESIDENT: But that was the actual value, not the 25 but-for. The concentrating on the but-for. So forget 				
 23 the premises on the first set of slides to the second 24 set of slides to show the exact contradiction in the 25 Second Award on this point. Page 29 10:49 1 We will just skip now all the way down to slide 53, 2 where we have a similar set of much simpler even 3 contradictions regarding the issue of interest, which is 4 part of the calculation of damages in the Resubmission 5 Award. And here the issue of interest, which is 4 part of the calculation of damages in the Resubmission 7 the Original Award were not annulled; that the 8 Resubmission Tribunal is not bound to apply 9 paragraph 767 is widently not risk-free as from 10 21st October 2010. 11 We have premise B: that the interest rate awarded 12 under paragraph 767 is evidently not risk-free as from 13 that finding in the Award - as per paragraph 767. 14 Ther we have the conclusion, also verbatim from the 15 Resubmission Award: that the Resubmission Award. 16 Award interest 2100 Cotober 2010. 17 not verbatim quotations from the Resubmission Tribunal will 16 Award interest fare 21st October 2010. 17 not verbatim because the reference is in a footnote in 18 that finding in the Award - as per paragraph 767. 19 There is no way, to quote from MINE Y colume, to go 10 from premise A to premise B to the conclusion. 21 Also - and this is something that we had a tacit 22 exchange with Mr Polášek yesterday about what this 23 meant - risk-free assets obtain full reparation through 24 interest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates, 25 to cover any risk-free investment that could have been 				
24 set of slides to show the exact contradiction in the 24 damages claimed in the arbitration; while, in 25 Second Award on this point. Page 29 Page 31 10:49 1 We will just skip now all the way down to slide 53, Page 31 10:49 1 We will just skip now all the way down to slide 53, Page 31 10:49 1 We will just skip now all the way down to slide 53, Page 31 10:49 1 We will just skip now all the way down to slide 53, Page 31 10:49 1 We will just skip now all the way down to slide 53, Page 31 10:49 1 We will just skip now all the way down to slide 53, Page 51 2 where we have a similar set of much simpler contradictions regarding the issue of interest, which is a part of the calculation of a simpler. Page 51 6 We have a premise 8: that paragraphs 766 and 767 of the original Award were not annulled; that the resubmission Thounal will and paragraph 767; that the interest rate awarded Inter paragraph 767 is evidently not risk-free. These are all verbatim quotations from the Resubmission Award. ME MENAER: Madam President, may 1 just say that Dr Abda 12 11 We have premise B: that the interest rate awarded Inter meas have the conclusion, also verbatim from the Resubmission Tribunal will				
25 Second Award on this point. Page 29 Page 31 10:49 1 We will just skip now all the way down to slide 53, Page 31 10:49 1 We will just skip now all the way down to slide 53, Page 31 10:49 1 We will just skip now all the way down to slide 53, Page 31 10:49 1 We wave a similar set of much simpler even but-for value and the purchase price in DECA II for 3 contradictions regarding the issue of interest, which is a distinct DCF calculation, or is i just amendments, 5 Award. And here the issue could not be simpler. MR GOSIS: It's simpler to see it in the resubmission than 7 the Original Award were not annulled; that the Resubmission Tribunal is not bound to apply 9 paragraph 767; that the interest rate awarded md work in the resubmission Tribunal will 10 21st October 2010. THE PRESIDENT: Oh, sorry that was the original arbitration. 11 We have a premise B: that the interest rate awarded mesubmission Tribunal will 16 Award interest after 21st October 2010. mad that finding in the Award - as per paragraph 767. 19 There is no way, to quote from MINE v Guinea, to go fort prentise A to premise B to the conclusion.		-		
Page 3Page 310:491We will just skip now all the way down to Islide 53,2where we have a similar set of much simpler even3contradictions regarding the issue of interest, which is4part of the calculation of damages in the Resubmission5Award. And here the issue could not be simpler.6We have a premise A: that paragraphs 766 and 767 of7the Original Award were not annalled; that the8Resubmission Tribunal is not bound to apply9paragraph 767; that the investment was risk-free as from11We have premise B: that the interest rate awarded12under paragraph 767 is evidently not risk-free. These13rate we the conclusion, also verbain from the14Resubmission Award: that the Resubmission Tribunal with15Resubmission Award: that the Resubmission Tribunal with16Award interest after 21st October 201011Ms MENAKER: Madam President, may 1 just say that Dr Abde12Mark the Resubmission Tribunal with13Rob - and this is something that we had a tatif14exchange with Mr Polášek yesterday about what this15meant - risk-free assets obtain full reparation through16a fair summary of what was before the Original Tribunal?17There is no way, to quote from MINE v Guinea, to go18rest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates,19not verbain because the reference is in a footonse19a fair summary of what was before the Original Tribunal?10 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>				
 10:49 1 We will just skip now all the way down to slide 53, 2 where we have a similar set of much simpler even 3 contradictions regarding the issue of interest, which is 4 part of the calculation of damages in the Resubmission 5 Award. And here the issue could not be simpler. 6 We have a premise A: that paragraph 766 and 767 of 7 the Original Award were not annulled; that the 8 Resubmission Tribunal is not bound to apply 9 paragraph 767; that the interest rate awarded 10 under paragraph 767; that the interest rate awarded 11 We have premise B: that the interest rate awarded 12 under paragraph 767 is evidently not risk-free. These are all verbatim quotations from the Resubmission Award. 14 Then we have the conclusion, also verbatim from the 15 Resubmission Award: that the Resubmission Award: 16 Award interest after 21st October 2010. 17 not verbatim because the reference is in a footnote in 18 that finding in the Award as per paragraph 767. 19 There is no way, to quote from MINE v Guinea, to go 20 from premise A to premise B to the conclusion. 21 Also and this is something that we had a tacit 22 exchange with Mr Polášek yesterday about what this 23 meant risk-free assets obtain full reparation through 24 interest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates, 25 to cover any risk-free investment that could have been 	25	Second Award on this point.	25	Mr Kaczmarek s view, Compass Lexecon uses a cash now
 where we have a similar set of much simpler even contradictions regarding the issue of interest, which is part of the calculation of damages in the Resubmission Award. And here the issue could not be simpler. We have a premise A: that paragraphs 766 and 767 of the Original Award were not annulled; that the Resubmission Tribunal is not bound to apply paragraph 767; that the investment was risk-free as from 21st October 2010. We have premise B: that the interest rate awarded under paragraph 767 is evidently not risk-free. These are all verbatim quotations from the Resubmission Award. Then we have the conclusion, also verbatim from the Resubmission Award: that the Resubmission Award. There is no way, to quote from MINE v Guinea, to go from premise A to premise B to the conclusion. Also - and this is something that we had a tacit exchange with Mr Polášek yesterday about what this meant risk-free assets obtain full reparation through interest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates, to cover any risk-free investment that could have been but-for value and the purchase price in DECA II for THE PRESIDENT: Does Compass use in the but-for value a distinct DCF calculation, or is it just amendments, THE PRESIDENT: Oh, sorry that was the original arbitration. I'm to trebatim quotations from the Resubmission Award. Ther is no way, to quote from MINE v Guinea, to go from premise A to premise B to the conclusion. Also - and this is something that we had a tacit exchange with Mr Polášek yesterday about what this meant risk-free assets obtain full reparation through interest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates, to cover any risk-free investment that could have been 		Page 29		Page 31
 where we have a similar set of much simpler even contradictions regarding the issue of interest, which is part of the calculation of damages in the Resubmission Award. And here the issue could not be simpler. We have a premise A: that paragraphs 766 and 767 of the Original Award were not annulled; that the Resubmission Tribunal is not bound to apply paragraph 767; that the investment was risk-free as from 21st October 2010. We have premise B: that the interest rate awarded under paragraph 767 is evidently not risk-free. These are all verbatim quotations from the Resubmission Award. Then we have the conclusion, also verbatim from the Resubmission Award: that the Resubmission Award. There is no way, to quote from MINE v Guinea, to go from premise A to premise B to the conclusion. Also - and this is something that we had a tacit exchange with Mr Polášek yesterday about what this meant risk-free assets obtain full reparation through interest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates, to cover any risk-free investment that could have been but-for value and the purchase price in DECA II for THE PRESIDENT: Does Compass use in the but-for value a distinct DCF calculation, or is it just amendments, THE PRESIDENT: Oh, sorry that was the original arbitration. I'm to trebatim quotations from the Resubmission Award. Ther is no way, to quote from MINE v Guinea, to go from premise A to premise B to the conclusion. Also - and this is something that we had a tacit exchange with Mr Polášek yesterday about what this meant risk-free assets obtain full reparation through interest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates, to cover any risk-free investment that could have been 				
 3 contradictions regarding the issue of interest, which is 4 part of the calculation of damages in the Resubmission 5 Award. And here the issue could not be simpler. 6 We have a premise A: that paragraphs 766 and 767 of 7 the Original Award were not annulled; that the 8 Resubmission Tribunal is not bound to apply 9 paragraph 767; that the investment was risk-free as from 10 21st October 2010. 11 We have premise B: that the interest rate awarded 12 under paragraph 767 is evidently not risk-free. These 13 are all verbatim quotations from the Resubmission Tribunal will 16 Award interest after 21st October 2010 and this is 17 not verbatim because the reference is in a footnote in 18 that finding in the Award as per paragraph 767. 19 There is no way, to quote from MINE v Guinea, to go 10 from premise A to premise B to the conclusion. 11 Also and this is something that we had a tacit 22 exchange with Mr Polášek yesterday about what this 23 meant risk-free assets obtain full reparation through 24 interest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates, 25 to cover any risk-free investment that could have been 3 THE PRESIDENT: But that was the actual value, not the 25 but-for. I'm concentrating on the but-for. So forget 	10:49 1	We will just skip now all the way down to slide 53,	10:52 1	projection for the historical losses, DCF for the
 4 part of the calculation of damages in the Resubmission 5 Award. And here the issue could not be simpler. 6 We have a premise A: that paragraphs 766 and 767 of 7 the Original Award were not annulled; that the 8 Resubmission Tribunal is not bound to apply 9 paragraph 767; that the investment was risk-free as from 10 21st October 2010. 11 We have premise B: that the interest rate awarded 12 under paragraph 767 is evidently not risk-free. These 13 are all verbatim quotations from the Resubmission Award. 14 Then we have the conclusion, also verbatim from the 15 Resubmission Award: that the Resubmission Tribunal will 16 Award interest after 21st October 2010 and this is 17 not verbatim because the reference is in a footnote in 18 that finding in the Award as per paragraph 767. 19 There is no way, to quote from MINE v Guinea, to go 20 from premise A to premise B to the conclusion. 21 Also and this is something that we had a tacit 22 exchange with Mr Polášek yesterday about what this 23 meant risk-free assets obtain full reparation through 24 interest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates, 25 to cover any risk-free investment that could have been 	2	where we have a similar set of much simpler even	2	but-for value and the purchase price in DECA II for
 Award. And here the issue could not be simpler. We have a premise A: that paragraphs 766 and 767 of We have a premise A: that paragraphs 766 and 767 of the Original Award were not annulled; that the Resubmission Tribunal is not bound to apply paragraph 767; that the investment was risk-free as from 21st October 2010. We have premise B: that the interest rate awarded under paragraph 767 is evidently not risk-free. These are all verbatim quotations from the Resubmission Award. Then we have the conclusion, also verbatim from the Resubmission Award: that the Resubmission Tribunal will Award interest after 21st October 2010 and this is that finding in the Award as per paragraph 767. There is no way, to quote from MINE v Guinea, to go from premise A to premise B to the conclusion. Also and this is something that we had a tacit exchange with Mr Polášek yesterday about what this meant risk-free assets obtain full reparation through interest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates, to cover any risk-free investment that could have been to cover any risk-free investment that could have been to cover any risk-free investment that could have been to cover any risk-free investment that could have been to cover any risk-free investment that could have been to cover any risk-free investment that could have been to cover any risk-free investment that could have been to cover any risk-free investment that could have been to cover any risk-free investment that could have been the DCF valuations underlying the Lifer. Yes forget 	3	contradictions regarding the issue of interest, which is	3	THE PRESIDENT: Does Compass use in the but-for value
 6 We have a premise A: that paragraphs 766 and 767 of the Original Award were not annulled; that the Resubmission Tribunal is not bound to apply paragraph 767; that the investment was risk-free as from 21st October 2010. 11 We have premise B: that the interest rate awarded under paragraph 767 is evidently not risk-free. These are all verbatim quotations from the Resubmission Award. 14 Then we have the conclusion, also verbatim from the Resubmission Award: that the Resubmission Tribunal will Award interest after 21st October 2010 and this is not verbatim because the reference is in a footnote in that finding in the Award as per paragraph 767. 19 There is no way, to quote from MINE v Guinea, to go from premise A to premise B to the conclusion. 20 from premise A to premise B to the conclusion. 21 Also and this is something that we had a tacit exchange with Mr Polášek yesterday about what this meant risk-free assets obtain full reparation through interest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates, to cover any risk-free investment that could have been 6 MR GOSIS: It is and it is not, because Mr Abdala not only 7 THE PRESIDENT: But that was the actual value, not the to cover any risk-free investment that could have been 6 MR GOSIS: It is not is not- 7 THE PRESIDENT: But that was the actual value, not the to cover any risk-free investment that could have been 	4	part of the calculation of damages in the Resubmission	4	a distinct DCF calculation, or is it just amendments,
 the Original Award were not annulled; that the Resubmission Tribunal is not bound to apply paragraph 767; that the investment was risk-free as from 21st October 2010. We have premise B: that the interest rate awarded under paragraph 767 is evidently not risk-free. These are all verbatim quotations from the Resubmission Award. Then we have the conclusion, also verbatim from the Resubmission Award: that the Resubmission Tribunal will Award interest after 21st October 2010 - and this is that finding in the Award as per paragraph 767. There is no way, to quote from MINE v Guinea, to go from premise A to premise B to the conclusion. Also and this is something that we had a tacit exchange with Mr Polášek yesterday about what this meant risk-free assets obtain full reparation through interest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates, to cover any risk-free investment that could have been to cover any risk-free investment that could have been to cover any risk-free investment that could have been to cover any risk-free investment that could have been to cover any risk-free investment that could have been 	5	Award. And here the issue could not be simpler.	5	criticisms, suggestions to Navigant's DCF approach?
 Resubmission Tribunal is not bound to apply paragraph 767; that the investment was risk-free as from 21st October 2010. We have premise B: that the interest rate awarded under paragraph 767 is evidently not risk-free. These are all verbatim quotations from the Resubmission Award. Then we have the conclusion, also verbatim from the Resubmission Award: that the Resubmission Tribunal will Award interest after 21st October 2010 and this is not verbatim because the reference is in a footnote in that finding in the Award as per paragraph 767. There is no way, to quote from MINE v Guinea, to go from premise A to premise B to the conclusion. Also and this is something that we had a tacit exchange with Mr Polášek yesterday about what this meant risk-free assets obtain full reparation through interest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates, to cover any risk-free investment that could have been 8 THE PRESIDENT: Oh, sorry that was the original arbitration. 9 The PRESIDENT: Oh, sorry that was the original arbitration. 9 The PRESIDENT: Madam President, may I just say that Dr Abda 10 that. 11 MS MENAKER: Madam President, may I just say that Dr Abda 12 other was the conclusion. 13 drive are all verbatim because the reference is in a footnote in 14 firther is no way, to quote from MINE v Guinea, to go 20 from premise A to premise B to the conclusion. 21 Also and this is something that we had a tacit 22 the DCF valuations underlying the firtherest at the present of through 23 meant risk-free assets obtain full reparation through 24 interest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates, 25 to cover any risk-free investment that could have been 26 but-for. I'm concentrating on the but-for. So forget 27 THE PRESIDENT: But that wa	6	We have a premise A: that paragraphs 766 and 767 of	6	MR GOSIS: It's simpler to see it in the resubmission than
 9 paragraph 767; that the investment was risk-free as from 10 21st October 2010. 11 We have premise B: that the interest rate awarded 12 under paragraph 767 is evidently not risk-free. These 13 are all verbatim quotations from the Resubmission Award. 14 Then we have the conclusion, also verbatim from the 15 Resubmission Award: that the Resubmission Tribunal will 16 Award interest after 21st October 2010 and this is 17 not verbatim because the reference is in a footnote in 18 that finding in the Award as per paragraph 767. 19 There is no way, to quote from MINE v Guinea, to go 20 from premise A to premise B to the conclusion. 21 Also and this is something that we had a tacit 22 exchange with Mr Polášek yesterday about what this 23 meant risk-free assets obtain full reparation through 24 interest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates, 25 to cover any risk-free investment that could have been 9 I'm so sorry, I didn't see that. Sorry. Sorry for 10 that. 11 MS MENAKER: Madam President, may I just say that Dr Abda 13 criticisms to Mr Kaczmarek's. 14 THE PRESIDENT: That's important. If you take the same 15 view so you can see from there that Compass would 16 choose a DCF approach to calculate the but-for, but it 17 didn't make a completely separate DCF model. Is that 18 criticised Mr Kaczmarek's DCF but also took a look at 22 the DCF valuations underlying the full reparation through 23 valuation, for instance. So it's not 24 THE PRESIDENT: But that was the actual value, not the 25 but-for. I'm concentrating on the but-for. So forget 	7	the Original Award were not annulled; that the	7	it is to see it in the first arbitration. But to
1021st October 2010.10that.11We have premise B: that the interest rate awarded11MS MENAKER: Madam President, may I just say that Dr Abda12under paragraph 767 is evidently not risk-free. These12never put in his own DCF model. So he just made13are all verbatim quotations from the Resubmission Award.14Then we have the conclusion, also verbatim from the15Resubmission Award: that the Resubmission Tribunal will15view so you can see from there that Compass would16Award interest after 21st October 2010 and this is16choose a DCF approach to calculate the but-for, but it17not verbatim because the reference is in a footnote in17didn't make a completely separate DCF model. Is that18that finding in the Award as per paragraph 767.18criticisms regarding Kaczmarek's DCF model. Is that19There is no way, to quote from MINE v Guinea, to go19a fair summary of what was before the Original Tribunal?20from premise A to premise B to the conclusion.20MR GOSIS: It is and it is not, because Mr Abdala not only21Also and this is something that we had a tacit21criticised Mr Kaczmarek's DCF but also took a look at22exchange with Mr Polášek yesterday about what this23valuation, for instance. So it's not24interest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates,25to cover any risk-free investment that could have been25to cover any risk-free investment that could have been25but-for. T'm concentrating on the but-for.	8	Resubmission Tribunal is not bound to apply	8	THE PRESIDENT: Oh, sorry that was the original arbitration.
1021st October 2010.10that.11We have premise B: that the interest rate awarded11MS MENAKER: Madam President, may I just say that Dr Abda12under paragraph 767 is evidently not risk-free. These12never put in his own DCF model. So he just made13are all verbatim quotations from the Resubmission Award.13criticisms to Mr Kaczmarek's.14Then we have the conclusion, also verbatim from the14THE PRESIDENT: That's important. If you take the same15Resubmission Award: that the Resubmission Tribunal will15view so you can see from there that Compass would16Award interest after 21st October 2010 and this is16choose a DCF approach to calculate the but-for, but it17not verbatim because the reference is in a footnote in17didn't make a completely separate DCF model. Is that18that finding in the Award as per paragraph 767.18criticisms regarding Kaczmarek's DCF model. Is that19There is no way, to quote from MINE v Guinea, to go19a fair summary of what was before the Original Tribunal?20from premise A to premise B to the conclusion.20MR GOSIS: It is and it is not, because Mr Abdala not only21Also and this is something that we had a tacit21criticised Mr Kaczmarek's DCF but also took a look at22exchange with Mr Polášek yesterday about what this22the DCF valuations underlying the fairness23meant risk-free assets obtain full reparation through23valuation, for instance. So it's not24	9	paragraph 767; that the investment was risk-free as from	9	I'm so sorry, I didn't see that. Sorry. Sorry for
12under paragraph 767 is evidently not risk-free. These12never put in his own DCF model. So he just made13are all verbatim quotations from the Resubmission Award.14Then we have the conclusion, also verbatim from the13criticisms to Mr Kaczmarek's.14Then we have the conclusion, also verbatim from the14THE PRESIDENT: That's important. If you take the same15Resubmission Award: that the Resubmission Tribunal will15view so you can see from there that Compass would16Award interest after 21st October 2010 and this is16choose a DCF approach to calculate the but-for, but it17not verbatim because the reference is in a footnote in17didn't make a completely separate DCF model. Is that18that finding in the Award as per paragraph 767.18criticisms regarding Kaczmarek's DCF model. Is that19There is no way, to quote from MINE v Guinea, to go19a fair summary of what was before the Original Tribunal?20from premise A to premise B to the conclusion.20MR GOSIS: It is and it is not, because Mr Abdala not only21Also and this is something that we had a tacit22the DCF valuations underlying the fairness23meant risk-free assets obtain full reparation through23valuation, for instance. So it's not24interest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates,24THE PRESIDENT: But that was the actual value, not the25to cover any risk-free investment that could have been25but-for. I'm concentrating on the but-for. So forget </td <td>10</td> <td>21st October 2010.</td> <td>10</td> <td>that.</td>	10	21st October 2010.	10	that.
13are all verbatim quotations from the Resubmission Award.13criticisms to Mr Kaczmarek's.14Then we have the conclusion, also verbatim from the13criticisms to Mr Kaczmarek's.15Resubmission Award: that the Resubmission Tribunal will16Award interest after 21st October 2010 and this is16Award interest after 21st October 2010 and this is16choose a DCF approach to calculate the but-for, but it17not verbatim because the reference is in a footnote in17didn't make a completely separate DCF model, but had18that finding in the Award as per paragraph 767.18criticisms regarding Kaczmarek's DCF model. Is that19There is no way, to quote from MINE v Guinea, to go19a fair summary of what was before the Original Tribunal?20from premise A to premise B to the conclusion.20MR GOSIS: It is and it is not, because Mr Abdala not only21Also and this is something that we had a tacit21criticised Mr Kaczmarek's DCF but also took a look at22exchange with Mr Polášek yesterday about what this22the DCF valuations underlying the23waluation, for instance. So it's not24interest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates,2525to cover any risk-free investment that could have been25but-for. I'm concentrating on the but-for. So forget	11	We have premise B: that the interest rate awarded	11	MS MENAKER: Madam President, may I just say that Dr Abdala
13are all verbatim quotations from the Resubmission Award.13criticisms to Mr Kaczmarek's.14Then we have the conclusion, also verbatim from the13criticisms to Mr Kaczmarek's.15Resubmission Award: that the Resubmission Tribunal will16Award interest after 21st October 2010 and this is16Award interest after 21st October 2010 and this is16choose a DCF approach to calculate the but-for, but it17not verbatim because the reference is in a footnote in17didn't make a completely separate DCF model, but had18that finding in the Award as per paragraph 767.18criticisms regarding Kaczmarek's DCF model. Is that19There is no way, to quote from MINE v Guinea, to go19a fair summary of what was before the Original Tribunal?20from premise A to premise B to the conclusion.20MR GOSIS: It is and it is not, because Mr Abdala not only21Also and this is something that we had a tacit21criticised Mr Kaczmarek's DCF but also took a look at22exchange with Mr Polášek yesterday about what this22the DCF valuations underlying the23waluation, for instance. So it's not24interest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates,2525to cover any risk-free investment that could have been25but-for. I'm concentrating on the but-for. So forget	12	-	12	never put in his own DCF model. So he just made
14Then we have the conclusion, also verbatim from the14THE PRESIDENT: That's important. If you take the same15Resubmission Award: that the Resubmission Tribunal will15view so you can see from there that Compass would16Award interest after 21st October 2010 and this is16choose a DCF approach to calculate the but-for, but it17not verbatim because the reference is in a footnote in17didn't make a completely separate DCF model, but had18that finding in the Award as per paragraph 767.18criticisms regarding Kaczmarek's DCF model. Is that19There is no way, to quote from MINE v Guinea, to go19a fair summary of what was before the Original Tribunal?20from premise A to premise B to the conclusion.20MR GOSIS: It is and it is not, because Mr Abdala not only21Also and this is something that we had a tacit21criticised Mr Kaczmarek's DCF but also took a look at23meant risk-free assets obtain full reparation through23valuation, for instance. So it's not24interest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates,25but-for. I'm concentrating on the but-for. So forget			13	
15Resubmission Award: that the Resubmission Tribunal will15view so you can see from there that Compass would16Award interest after 21st October 2010 and this is16choose a DCF approach to calculate the but-for, but it17not verbatim because the reference is in a footnote in16choose a DCF approach to calculate the but-for, but it18that finding in the Award as per paragraph 767.18criticisms regarding Kaczmarek's DCF model. Is that19There is no way, to quote from MINE v Guinea, to go19a fair summary of what was before the Original Tribunal?20from premise A to premise B to the conclusion.20MR GOSIS: It is and it is not, because Mr Abdala not only21Also and this is something that we had a tacit21criticised Mr Kaczmarek's DCF but also took a look at22exchange with Mr Polášek yesterday about what this23valuation, for instance. So it's not24interest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates,24THE PRESIDENT: But that was the actual value, not the25to cover any risk-free investment that could have been25but-for. I'm concentrating on the but-for. So forget		-	14	
16Award interest after 21st October 2010 and this is16choose a DCF approach to calculate the but-for, but it17not verbatim because the reference is in a footnote in16choose a DCF approach to calculate the but-for, but it18that finding in the Award as per paragraph 767.17didn't make a completely separate DCF model, but had19There is no way, to quote from MINE v Guinea, to go19a fair summary of what was before the Original Tribunal?20from premise A to premise B to the conclusion.20MR GOSIS: It is and it is not, because Mr Abdala not only21Also and this is something that we had a tacit21criticised Mr Kaczmarek's DCF but also took a look at22exchange with Mr Polášek yesterday about what this22the DCF valuations underlying the fairness23meant risk-free assets obtain full reparation through23valuation, for instance. So it's not24interest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates,25but-for. I'm concentrating on the but-for. So forget				
17not verbatim because the reference is in a footnote in17didn't make a completely separate DCF model, but had18that finding in the Award as per paragraph 767.18criticisms regarding Kaczmarek's DCF model. Is that19There is no way, to quote from MINE v Guinea, to go19a fair summary of what was before the Original Tribunal?20from premise A to premise B to the conclusion.19a fair summary of what was before the Original Tribunal?21Also and this is something that we had a tacit21criticised Mr Kaczmarek's DCF but also took a look at22exchange with Mr Polášek yesterday about what this22the DCF valuations underlying the fairness23meant risk-free assets obtain full reparation through23valuation, for instance. So it's not24interest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates,24THE PRESIDENT: But that was the actual value, not the25to cover any risk-free investment that could have been25but-for. I'm concentrating on the but-for. So forget				
18that finding in the Award as per paragraph 767.18criticisms regarding Kaczmarek's DCF model. Is that19There is no way, to quote from MINE v Guinea, to go19a fair summary of what was before the Original Tribunal?20from premise A to premise B to the conclusion.20MR GOSIS: It is and it is not, because Mr Abdala not only21Also and this is something that we had a tacit21criticised Mr Kaczmarek's DCF but also took a look at22exchange with Mr Polášek yesterday about what this22the DCF valuations underlying the fairness23meant risk-free assets obtain full reparation through23valuation, for instance. So it's not24interest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates,24THE PRESIDENT: But that was the actual value, not the25to cover any risk-free investment that could have been25but-for. I'm concentrating on the but-for. So forget				
19There is no way, to quote from MINE v Guinea, to go19a fair summary of what was before the Original Tribunal?20from premise A to premise B to the conclusion.20MR GOSIS: It is and it is not, because Mr Abdala not only21Also and this is something that we had a tacit21criticised Mr Kaczmarek's DCF but also took a look at22exchange with Mr Polášek yesterday about what this22the DCF valuations underlying the fairness23meant risk-free assets obtain full reparation through23valuation, for instance. So it's not24interest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates,24THE PRESIDENT: But that was the actual value, not the25to cover any risk-free investment that could have been25but-for. I'm concentrating on the but-for. So forget				
20from premise A to premise B to the conclusion.20MR GOSIS: It is and it is not, because Mr Abdala not only21Also and this is something that we had a tacit21criticised Mr Kaczmarek's DCF but also took a look at22exchange with Mr Polášek yesterday about what this22the DCF valuations underlying the fairness23meant risk-free assets obtain full reparation through23valuation, for instance. So it's not24interest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates,24THE PRESIDENT: But that was the actual value, not the25to cover any risk-free investment that could have been25but-for. I'm concentrating on the but-for. So forget				
21Also and this is something that we had a tacit21criticised Mr Kaczmarek's DCF but also took a look at22exchange with Mr Polášek yesterday about what this22the DCF valuations underlying the fairness23meant risk-free assets obtain full reparation through23valuation, for instance. So it's not24interest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates,24THE PRESIDENT: But that was the actual value, not the25to cover any risk-free investment that could have been25but-for. I'm concentrating on the but-for. So forget				
 exchange with Mr Polášek yesterday about what this meant risk-free assets obtain full reparation through interest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates, to cover any risk-free investment that could have been but-for. I'm concentrating on the but-for. So forget 				-
23meant risk-free assets obtain full reparation through23valuation, for instance. So it's not24interest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates,24THE PRESIDENT: But that was the actual value, not the25to cover any risk-free investment that could have been25but-for. I'm concentrating on the but-for. So forget				
24interest rates that provide returns at risk-free rates, to cover any risk-free investment that could have been24THE PRESIDENT: But that was the actual value, not the 2525to cover any risk-free investment that could have been25but-for. I'm concentrating on the but-for. So forget				
25to cover any risk-free investment that could have been25but-for. I'm concentrating on the but-for. So forget				
Page 30 Page 32	25	to cover any fisk-free investment that could have been	25	out-tor. The concentrating on the out-tor. So forget
		Page 30		Page 32

10:54 1	about the actual value. The but-for.	10:57 1	cash flows and \$222 million for lost value. And lost
2	Was there a distinct and separate but-for DCF model	2	cash flows is, of course, what has been re-termed in
3	by Compass, or was it just and I don't want to say	3	parlance before this Committee as "historical losses".
4	"just"; I mean, it's significant of course criticisms	4	Now we go to the resubmission proceeding: slide 62,
5	on Kaczmarek's DCF model?	5	slide 63. This is taken from Kaczmarek's fourth report,
6	MR GOSIS: It was criticisms to Kaczmarek's DCF.	6	which is the last report in the resubmission
7	THE PRESIDENT: Okay, good. So that point is settled, so	7	arbitration, table 13.
8	both parties agree.	8	You see we start the but-for under the DCF
9	MR GOSIS: Yes. So	9	analysis is the same 1,406.7 that we had in the first
10	THE PRESIDENT: Move on. Thank you.	10	-
11	MR GOSIS: Absolutely.	10	ends up with the enterprise value of the weighted
11	I don't know what level of detail the Chair was	11	
12	interested in getting on these calculations. But we	13	
13	just took the summary that appears in table 12 of the	13	
15	second report this belongs to the [original]	15	
16	arbitration if you go to slide 59. This explains the	16	
10	effect of some of the criticisms that Mr Abdala was	10	
18	making in the [original] arbitration to the original	18	
19	value, as seen by Claimant's valuation experts.	19	
20	So you see you have the changes the title of the	20	
21	table is self-explanatory: "Impact of Compass Lexecon's	21	DCF calculation performed by [Dr] Abdala, but there were
22	Alleged" it says "Mistakes": it refers to the	22	
23	criticisms identified by Compass. And it starts from	23	
24	an original valuation by Kaczmarek of \$1.451 billion,	24	
25	and the impact of those criticisms would lead to a final	25	-
	Page 33		Page 35
10:55 1	amount of \$1.406 billion.	10:59 1	We have at slide 69 a comparative between the
10:55 1	amount of \$1.406 billion. So the changes are then taken if we go to the	10:59 1 2	We have at slide 69 a comparative between the damages calculated by one expert and the other.
	amount of \$1.406 billion. So the changes are then taken if we go to the next slide (60), table 13, also from Mr Kaczmarek's		-
2	So the changes are then taken if we go to the	2	damages calculated by one expert and the other.
2 3	So the changes are then taken if we go to the next slide (60), table 13, also from Mr Kaczmarek's	2 3	damages calculated by one expert and the other. THE PRESIDENT: Stop there one minute because I need to make
2 3 4	So the changes are then taken if we go to the next slide (60), table 13, also from Mr Kaczmarek's second report, we see that it starts from the DCF of	2 3 4	damages calculated by one expert and the other. THE PRESIDENT: Stop there one minute because I need to make a note, sorry. (Pause) Please continue.
2 3 4 5	So the changes are then taken if we go to the next slide (60), table 13, also from Mr Kaczmarek's second report, we see that it starts from the DCF of \$1.406 billion, which we had in the last slide, which is	2 3 4 5	damages calculated by one expert and the other.THE PRESIDENT: Stop there one minute because I need to make a note, sorry. (Pause) Please continue.MR GOSIS: Absolutely.
2 3 4 5 6	So the changes are then taken if we go to the next slide (60), table 13, also from Mr Kaczmarek's second report, we see that it starts from the DCF of \$1.406 billion, which we had in the last slide, which is the result of these criticisms. We saw the 1,406.7.	2 3 4 5 6	damages calculated by one expert and the other. THE PRESIDENT: Stop there one minute because I need to make a note, sorry. (Pause) Please continue. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. So you see here these are tables 1 and 2 from the
2 3 4 5 6 7	So the changes are then taken if we go to the next slide (60), table 13, also from Mr Kaczmarek's second report, we see that it starts from the DCF of \$1.406 billion, which we had in the last slide, which is the result of these criticisms. We saw the 1,406.7. The revised valuation conclusions of Mr Kaczmarek start	2 3 4 5 6 7	damages calculated by one expert and the other. THE PRESIDENT: Stop there one minute because I need to make a note, sorry. (Pause) Please continue. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. So you see here these are tables 1 and 2 from the fourth Compass report from September 2018. And you see
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So the changes are then taken if we go to the next slide (60), table 13, also from Mr Kaczmarek's second report, we see that it starts from the DCF of \$1.406 billion, which we had in the last slide, which is the result of these criticisms. We saw the 1,406.7. The revised valuation conclusions of Mr Kaczmarek start from this 1,40[6].7 for the DCF analysis in the but-for scenario and 576.2 in the actual scenario. Then comparable public company, comparable	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	damages calculated by one expert and the other. THE PRESIDENT: Stop there one minute because I need to make a note, sorry. (Pause) Please continue. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. So you see here these are tables 1 and 2 from the fourth Compass report from September 2018. And you see here the calculation of the actual arithmetical impact of taking all of the conclusions by Mr Kaczmarek and all of the conclusions by Dr Abdala, and how that changes
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	So the changes are then taken if we go to the next slide (60), table 13, also from Mr Kaczmarek's second report, we see that it starts from the DCF of \$1.406 billion, which we had in the last slide, which is the result of these criticisms. We saw the 1,406.7. The revised valuation conclusions of Mr Kaczmarek start from this 1,40[6].7 for the DCF analysis in the but-for scenario and 576.2 in the actual scenario. Then comparable public company, comparable transactions. We have discussed how these have been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	damages calculated by one expert and the other. THE PRESIDENT: Stop there one minute because I need to make a note, sorry. (Pause) Please continue. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. So you see here these are tables 1 and 2 from the fourth Compass report from September 2018. And you see here the calculation of the actual arithmetical impact of taking all of the conclusions by Mr Kaczmarek and all of the conclusions by Dr Abdala, and how that changes the values that each of the parties is arguing.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	So the changes are then taken if we go to the next slide (60), table 13, also from Mr Kaczmarek's second report, we see that it starts from the DCF of \$1.406 billion, which we had in the last slide, which is the result of these criticisms. We saw the 1,406.7. The revised valuation conclusions of Mr Kaczmarek start from this 1,40[6].7 for the DCF analysis in the but-for scenario and 576.2 in the actual scenario. Then comparable public company, comparable transactions. We have discussed how these have been weighted, and the average resulting in Mr Kaczmarek's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	damages calculated by one expert and the other. THE PRESIDENT: Stop there one minute because I need to make a note, sorry. (Pause) Please continue. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. So you see here these are tables 1 and 2 from the fourth Compass report from September 2018. And you see here the calculation of the actual arithmetical impact of taking all of the conclusions by Mr Kaczmarek and all of the conclusions by Dr Abdala, and how that changes the values that each of the parties is arguing. In the comments I was making before about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So the changes are then taken if we go to the next slide (60), table 13, also from Mr Kaczmarek's second report, we see that it starts from the DCF of \$1.406 billion, which we had in the last slide, which is the result of these criticisms. We saw the 1,406.7. The revised valuation conclusions of Mr Kaczmarek start from this 1,40[6].7 for the DCF analysis in the but-for scenario and 576.2 in the actual scenario. Then comparable public company, comparable transactions. We have discussed how these have been weighted, and the average resulting in Mr Kaczmarek's calculation: this goes to 60%, 30%, 10%. Then it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	damages calculated by one expert and the other. THE PRESIDENT: Stop there one minute because I need to make a note, sorry. (Pause) Please continue. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. So you see here these are tables 1 and 2 from the fourth Compass report from September 2018. And you see here the calculation of the actual arithmetical impact of taking all of the conclusions by Mr Kaczmarek and all of the conclusions by Dr Abdala, and how that changes the values that each of the parties is arguing. In the comments I was making before about contradictions on the interest rate, you will note of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So the changes are then taken if we go to the next slide (60), table 13, also from Mr Kaczmarek's second report, we see that it starts from the DCF of \$1.406 billion, which we had in the last slide, which is the result of these criticisms. We saw the 1,406.7. The revised valuation conclusions of Mr Kaczmarek start from this 1,40[6].7 for the DCF analysis in the but-for scenario and 576.2 in the actual scenario. Then comparable public company, comparable transactions. We have discussed how these have been weighted, and the average resulting in Mr Kaczmarek's calculation: this goes to 60%, 30%, 10%. Then it's \$1,479.3 million for the but-for and 562.4 in the actual	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	damages calculated by one expert and the other. THE PRESIDENT: Stop there one minute because I need to make a note, sorry. (Pause) Please continue. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. So you see here these are tables 1 and 2 from the fourth Compass report from September 2018. And you see here the calculation of the actual arithmetical impact of taking all of the conclusions by Mr Kaczmarek and all of the conclusions by Dr Abdala, and how that changes the values that each of the parties is arguing. In the comments I was making before about contradictions on the interest rate, you will note of course that this speaks to the same chart that we're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So the changes are then taken if we go to the next slide (60), table 13, also from Mr Kaczmarek's second report, we see that it starts from the DCF of \$1.406 billion, which we had in the last slide, which is the result of these criticisms. We saw the 1,406.7. The revised valuation conclusions of Mr Kaczmarek start from this 1,40[6].7 for the DCF analysis in the but-for scenario and 576.2 in the actual scenario. Then comparable public company, comparable transactions. We have discussed how these have been weighted, and the average resulting in Mr Kaczmarek's calculation: this goes to 60%, 30%, 10%. Then it's \$1,479.3 million for the but-for and 562.4 in the actual scenario that we've discussed often throughout the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	damages calculated by one expert and the other. THE PRESIDENT: Stop there one minute because I need to make a note, sorry. (Pause) Please continue. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. So you see here these are tables 1 and 2 from the fourth Compass report from September 2018. And you see here the calculation of the actual arithmetical impact of taking all of the conclusions by Mr Kaczmarek and all of the conclusions by Dr Abdala, and how that changes the values that each of the parties is arguing. In the comments I was making before about contradictions on the interest rate, you will note of course that this speaks to the same chart that we're seeing here, where there's a discussion of the interest
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	So the changes are then taken if we go to the next slide (60), table 13, also from Mr Kaczmarek's second report, we see that it starts from the DCF of \$1.406 billion, which we had in the last slide, which is the result of these criticisms. We saw the 1,406.7. The revised valuation conclusions of Mr Kaczmarek start from this 1,40[6].7 for the DCF analysis in the but-for scenario and 576.2 in the actual scenario. Then comparable public company, comparable transactions. We have discussed how these have been weighted, and the average resulting in Mr Kaczmarek's calculation: this goes to 60%, 30%, 10%. Then it's \$1,479.3 million for the but-for and 562.4 in the actual scenario that we've discussed often throughout the hearing.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	damages calculated by one expert and the other. THE PRESIDENT: Stop there one minute because I need to make a note, sorry. (Pause) Please continue. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. So you see here these are tables 1 and 2 from the fourth Compass report from September 2018. And you see here the calculation of the actual arithmetical impact of taking all of the conclusions by Mr Kaczmarek and all of the conclusions by Dr Abdala, and how that changes the values that each of the parties is arguing. In the comments I was making before about contradictions on the interest rate, you will note of course that this speaks to the same chart that we're seeing here, where there's a discussion of the interest rate and what the rate is in the damages being sought,
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	So the changes are then taken if we go to the next slide (60), table 13, also from Mr Kaczmarek's second report, we see that it starts from the DCF of \$1.406 billion, which we had in the last slide, which is the result of these criticisms. We saw the 1,406.7. The revised valuation conclusions of Mr Kaczmarek start from this 1,40[6].7 for the DCF analysis in the but-for scenario and 576.2 in the actual scenario. Then comparable public company, comparable transactions. We have discussed how these have been weighted, and the average resulting in Mr Kaczmarek's calculation: this goes to 60%, 30%, 10%. Then it's \$1,479.3 million for the but-for and 562.4 in the actual scenario that we've discussed often throughout the hearing. You will see the next line in his calculation is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	damages calculated by one expert and the other. THE PRESIDENT: Stop there one minute because I need to make a note, sorry. (Pause) Please continue. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. So you see here these are tables 1 and 2 from the fourth Compass report from September 2018. And you see here the calculation of the actual arithmetical impact of taking all of the conclusions by Mr Kaczmarek and all of the conclusions by Dr Abdala, and how that changes the values that each of the parties is arguing. In the comments I was making before about contradictions on the interest rate, you will note of course that this speaks to the same chart that we're seeing here, where there's a discussion of the interest rate and what the rate is in the damages being sought, in the red column to the left by Mr Kaczmarek, in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So the changes are then taken if we go to the next slide (60), table 13, also from Mr Kaczmarek's second report, we see that it starts from the DCF of \$1.406 billion, which we had in the last slide, which is the result of these criticisms. We saw the 1,406.7. The revised valuation conclusions of Mr Kaczmarek start from this 1,40[6].7 for the DCF analysis in the but-for scenario and 576.2 in the actual scenario. Then comparable public company, comparable transactions. We have discussed how these have been weighted, and the average resulting in Mr Kaczmarek's calculation: this goes to 60%, 30%, 10%. Then it's \$1,479.3 million for the but-for and 562.4 in the actual scenario that we've discussed often throughout the hearing. You will see the next line in his calculation is "EEGSA['s] Net Debt", and this is actually the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	damages calculated by one expert and the other. THE PRESIDENT: Stop there one minute because I need to make a note, sorry. (Pause) Please continue. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. So you see here these are tables 1 and 2 from the fourth Compass report from September 2018. And you see here the calculation of the actual arithmetical impact of taking all of the conclusions by Mr Kaczmarek and all of the conclusions by Dr Abdala, and how that changes the values that each of the parties is arguing. In the comments I was making before about contradictions on the interest rate, you will note of course that this speaks to the same chart that we're seeing here, where there's a discussion of the interest rate and what the rate is in the damages being sought, in the red column to the left by Mr Kaczmarek, in the right column by Mr Abdala on the right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	So the changes are then taken if we go to the next slide (60), table 13, also from Mr Kaczmarek's second report, we see that it starts from the DCF of \$1.406 billion, which we had in the last slide, which is the result of these criticisms. We saw the 1,406.7. The revised valuation conclusions of Mr Kaczmarek start from this 1,40[6].7 for the DCF analysis in the but-for scenario and 576.2 in the actual scenario. Then comparable public company, comparable transactions. We have discussed how these have been weighted, and the average resulting in Mr Kaczmarek's calculation: this goes to 60%, 30%, 10%. Then it's \$1,479.3 million for the but-for and 562.4 in the actual scenario that we've discussed often throughout the hearing. You will see the next line in his calculation is "EEGSA['s] Net Debt", and this is actually the discussion about whether the cash flows to the entity or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	damages calculated by one expert and the other. THE PRESIDENT: Stop there one minute because I need to make a note, sorry. (Pause) Please continue. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. So you see here these are tables 1 and 2 from the fourth Compass report from September 2018. And you see here the calculation of the actual arithmetical impact of taking all of the conclusions by Mr Kaczmarek and all of the conclusions by Dr Abdala, and how that changes the values that each of the parties is arguing. In the comments I was making before about contradictions on the interest rate, you will note of course that this speaks to the same chart that we're seeing here, where there's a discussion of the interest rate and what the rate is in the damages being sought, in the red column to the left by Mr Kaczmarek, in the right column by Mr Abdala on the right. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. And when you say "Kaczmarek" and it
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	So the changes are then taken if we go to the next slide (60), table 13, also from Mr Kaczmarek's second report, we see that it starts from the DCF of \$1.406 billion, which we had in the last slide, which is the result of these criticisms. We saw the 1,406.7. The revised valuation conclusions of Mr Kaczmarek start from this 1,40[6].7 for the DCF analysis in the but-for scenario and 576.2 in the actual scenario. Then comparable public company, comparable transactions. We have discussed how these have been weighted, and the average resulting in Mr Kaczmarek's calculation: this goes to 60%, 30%, 10%. Then it's \$1,479.3 million for the but-for and 562.4 in the actual scenario that we've discussed often throughout the hearing. You will see the next line in his calculation is "EEGSA['s] Net Debt", and this is actually the discussion about whether the cash flows to the entity or cash flows to the shareholders	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 damages calculated by one expert and the other. THE PRESIDENT: Stop there one minute because I need to make a note, sorry. (Pause) Please continue. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. So you see here these are tables 1 and 2 from the fourth Compass report from September 2018. And you see here the calculation of the actual arithmetical impact of taking all of the conclusions by Mr Kaczmarek and all of the conclusions by Dr Abdala, and how that changes the values that each of the parties is arguing. In the comments I was making before about contradictions on the interest rate, you will note of course that this speaks to the same chart that we're seeing here, where there's a discussion of the interest rate and what the rate is in the damages being sought, in the red column to the left by Mr Kaczmarek, in the right column by Mr Abdala on the right. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. And when you say "Kaczmarek" and it says "DCF + Multiples", the part about "+ Multiples",
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	So the changes are then taken if we go to the next slide (60), table 13, also from Mr Kaczmarek's second report, we see that it starts from the DCF of \$1.406 billion, which we had in the last slide, which is the result of these criticisms. We saw the 1,406.7. The revised valuation conclusions of Mr Kaczmarek start from this 1,40[6].7 for the DCF analysis in the but-for scenario and 576.2 in the actual scenario. Then comparable public company, comparable transactions. We have discussed how these have been weighted, and the average resulting in Mr Kaczmarek's calculation: this goes to 60%, 30%, 10%. Then it's \$1,479.3 million for the but-for and 562.4 in the actual scenario that we've discussed often throughout the hearing. You will see the next line in his calculation is "EEGSA['s] Net Debt", and this is actually the discussion about whether the cash flows to the entity or cash flows to the shareholders THE PRESIDENT: Yes, perfectly aware.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 damages calculated by one expert and the other. THE PRESIDENT: Stop there one minute because I need to make a note, sorry. (Pause) Please continue. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. So you see here these are tables 1 and 2 from the fourth Compass report from September 2018. And you see here the calculation of the actual arithmetical impact of taking all of the conclusions by Mr Kaczmarek and all of the conclusions by Dr Abdala, and how that changes the values that each of the parties is arguing. In the comments I was making before about contradictions on the interest rate, you will note of course that this speaks to the same chart that we're seeing here, where there's a discussion of the interest rate and what the rate is in the damages being sought, in the red column to the left by Mr Kaczmarek, in the right column by Mr Abdala on the right. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. And when you say "Kaczmarek" and it says "DCF + Multiples", the part about "+ Multiples", that only affects the actual value; correct? There's no
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	So the changes are then taken if we go to the next slide (60), table 13, also from Mr Kaczmarek's second report, we see that it starts from the DCF of \$1.406 billion, which we had in the last slide, which is the result of these criticisms. We saw the 1,406.7. The revised valuation conclusions of Mr Kaczmarek start from this 1,40[6].7 for the DCF analysis in the but-for scenario and 576.2 in the actual scenario. Then comparable public company, comparable transactions. We have discussed how these have been weighted, and the average resulting in Mr Kaczmarek's calculation: this goes to 60%, 30%, 10%. Then it's \$1,479.3 million for the but-for and 562.4 in the actual scenario that we've discussed often throughout the hearing. You will see the next line in his calculation is "EEGSA['s] Net Debt", and this is actually the discussion about whether the cash flows to the entity or cash flows to the shareholders THE PRESIDENT: Yes, perfectly aware. MR GOSIS: he is reciting. So just to point that.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 damages calculated by one expert and the other. THE PRESIDENT: Stop there one minute because I need to make a note, sorry. (Pause) Please continue. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. So you see here these are tables 1 and 2 from the fourth Compass report from September 2018. And you see here the calculation of the actual arithmetical impact of taking all of the conclusions by Mr Kaczmarek and all of the conclusions by Dr Abdala, and how that changes the values that each of the parties is arguing. In the comments I was making before about contradictions on the interest rate, you will note of course that this speaks to the same chart that we're seeing here, where there's a discussion of the interest rate and what the rate is in the damages being sought, in the red column to the left by Mr Kaczmarek, in the right column by Mr Abdala on the right. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. And when you say "Kaczmarek" and it says "DCF + Multiples", the part about "+ Multiples", that only affects the actual value; correct? There's no multiples approach used to calculate the but-for?
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	So the changes are then taken if we go to the next slide (60), table 13, also from Mr Kaczmarek's second report, we see that it starts from the DCF of \$1.406 billion, which we had in the last slide, which is the result of these criticisms. We saw the 1,406.7. The revised valuation conclusions of Mr Kaczmarek start from this 1,40[6].7 for the DCF analysis in the but-for scenario and 576.2 in the actual scenario. Then comparable public company, comparable transactions. We have discussed how these have been weighted, and the average resulting in Mr Kaczmarek's calculation: this goes to 60%, 30%, 10%. Then it's \$1,479.3 million for the but-for and 562.4 in the actual scenario that we've discussed often throughout the hearing. You will see the next line in his calculation is "EEGSA['s] Net Debt", and this is actually the discussion about whether the cash flows to the entity or cash flows to the shareholders THE PRESIDENT: Yes, perfectly aware. MR GOSIS: he is reciting. So just to point that. (Slide 61) We go to table 14: we have the summary of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 damages calculated by one expert and the other. THE PRESIDENT: Stop there one minute because I need to make a note, sorry. (Pause) Please continue. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. So you see here these are tables 1 and 2 from the fourth Compass report from September 2018. And you see here the calculation of the actual arithmetical impact of taking all of the conclusions by Mr Kaczmarek and all of the conclusions by Dr Abdala, and how that changes the values that each of the parties is arguing. In the comments I was making before about contradictions on the interest rate, you will note of course that this speaks to the same chart that we're seeing here, where there's a discussion of the interest rate and what the rate is in the damages being sought, in the red column to the left by Mr Kaczmarek, in the right column by Mr Abdala on the right. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. And when you say "Kaczmarek" and it says "DCF + Multiples", the part about "+ Multiples", that only affects the actual value; correct? There's no multiples approach used to calculate the but-for? I mean, theoretically you could, but I think it's kind
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	So the changes are then taken if we go to the next slide (60), table 13, also from Mr Kaczmarek's second report, we see that it starts from the DCF of \$1.406 billion, which we had in the last slide, which is the result of these criticisms. We saw the 1,406.7. The revised valuation conclusions of Mr Kaczmarek start from this 1,40[6].7 for the DCF analysis in the but-for scenario and 576.2 in the actual scenario. Then comparable public company, comparable transactions. We have discussed how these have been weighted, and the average resulting in Mr Kaczmarek's calculation: this goes to 60%, 30%, 10%. Then it's \$1,479.3 million for the but-for and 562.4 in the actual scenario that we've discussed often throughout the hearing. You will see the next line in his calculation is "EEGSA['s] Net Debt", and this is actually the discussion about whether the cash flows to the entity or cash flows to the shareholders THE PRESIDENT: Yes, perfectly aware. MR GOSIS: he is reciting. So just to point that. (Slide 61) We go to table 14: we have the summary of revised damage conclusions by Mr Kaczmarek in the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 damages calculated by one expert and the other. THE PRESIDENT: Stop there one minute because I need to make a note, sorry. (Pause) Please continue. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. So you see here these are tables 1 and 2 from the fourth Compass report from September 2018. And you see here the calculation of the actual arithmetical impact of taking all of the conclusions by Mr Kaczmarek and all of the conclusions by Dr Abdala, and how that changes the values that each of the parties is arguing. In the comments I was making before about contradictions on the interest rate, you will note of course that this speaks to the same chart that we're seeing here, where there's a discussion of the interest rate and what the rate is in the damages being sought, in the red column to the left by Mr Kaczmarek, in the right column by Mr Abdala on the right. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. And when you say "Kaczmarek" and it says "DCF + Multiples", the part about "+ Multiples", that only affects the actual value; correct? There's no multiples approach used to calculate the but-for? I mean, theoretically you could, but I think it's kind of difficult.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	So the changes are then taken if we go to the next slide (60), table 13, also from Mr Kaczmarek's second report, we see that it starts from the DCF of \$1.406 billion, which we had in the last slide, which is the result of these criticisms. We saw the 1,406.7. The revised valuation conclusions of Mr Kaczmarek start from this 1,40[6].7 for the DCF analysis in the but-for scenario and 576.2 in the actual scenario. Then comparable public company, comparable transactions. We have discussed how these have been weighted, and the average resulting in Mr Kaczmarek's calculation: this goes to 60%, 30%, 10%. Then it's \$1,479.3 million for the but-for and 562.4 in the actual scenario that we've discussed often throughout the hearing. You will see the next line in his calculation is "EEGSA['s] Net Debt", and this is actually the discussion about whether the cash flows to the entity or cash flows to the shareholders THE PRESIDENT: Yes, perfectly aware. MR GOSIS: he is reciting. So just to point that. (Slide 61) We go to table 14: we have the summary of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 damages calculated by one expert and the other. THE PRESIDENT: Stop there one minute because I need to make a note, sorry. (Pause) Please continue. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. So you see here these are tables 1 and 2 from the fourth Compass report from September 2018. And you see here the calculation of the actual arithmetical impact of taking all of the conclusions by Mr Kaczmarek and all of the conclusions by Dr Abdala, and how that changes the values that each of the parties is arguing. In the comments I was making before about contradictions on the interest rate, you will note of course that this speaks to the same chart that we're seeing here, where there's a discussion of the interest rate and what the rate is in the damages being sought, in the red column to the left by Mr Kaczmarek, in the right column by Mr Abdala on the right. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. And when you say "Kaczmarek" and it says "DCF + Multiples", the part about "+ Multiples", that only affects the actual value; correct? There's no multiples approach used to calculate the but-for? I mean, theoretically you could, but I think it's kind
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	So the changes are then taken if we go to the next slide (60), table 13, also from Mr Kaczmarek's second report, we see that it starts from the DCF of \$1.406 billion, which we had in the last slide, which is the result of these criticisms. We saw the 1,406.7. The revised valuation conclusions of Mr Kaczmarek start from this 1,40[6].7 for the DCF analysis in the but-for scenario and 576.2 in the actual scenario. Then comparable public company, comparable transactions. We have discussed how these have been weighted, and the average resulting in Mr Kaczmarek's calculation: this goes to 60%, 30%, 10%. Then it's \$1,479.3 million for the but-for and 562.4 in the actual scenario that we've discussed often throughout the hearing. You will see the next line in his calculation is "EEGSA['s] Net Debt", and this is actually the discussion about whether the cash flows to the entity or cash flows to the shareholders THE PRESIDENT: Yes, perfectly aware. MR GOSIS: he is reciting. So just to point that. (Slide 61) We go to table 14: we have the summary of revised damage conclusions by Mr Kaczmarek in the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 damages calculated by one expert and the other. THE PRESIDENT: Stop there one minute because I need to make a note, sorry. (Pause) Please continue. MR GOSIS: Absolutely. So you see here these are tables 1 and 2 from the fourth Compass report from September 2018. And you see here the calculation of the actual arithmetical impact of taking all of the conclusions by Mr Kaczmarek and all of the conclusions by Dr Abdala, and how that changes the values that each of the parties is arguing. In the comments I was making before about contradictions on the interest rate, you will note of course that this speaks to the same chart that we're seeing here, where there's a discussion of the interest rate and what the rate is in the damages being sought, in the red column to the left by Mr Kaczmarek, in the right column by Mr Abdala on the right. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. And when you say "Kaczmarek" and it says "DCF + Multiples", the part about "+ Multiples", that only affects the actual value; correct? There's no multiples approach used to calculate the but-for? I mean, theoretically you could, but I think it's kind of difficult.

11:01 1	correct, Madam President, yes.	11:05 1	THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.
2	THE PRESIDENT: I can look at the other side: were multiples	2	MR GOSIS: We actually had a slide, I think, in our closing
3	used to establish the but-for? I think I've only seen	3	yesterday we showed it also in opening where there
4	cash flows projections, that was all.	4	was a chart with the
5	MS MENAKER: Let me confirm, because I thought whether	5	THE PRESIDENT: I think you did. I was just
6	he used all three methodologies for the but-for or	6	MR GOSIS: with the different methods being used by the
7	not which you could do, because absent the measures,	7	Claimant and methods used by the Respondent, and there
8	what would it be worth	8	was a specific reference that the fairness
9	THE PRESIDENT: It's difficult because how do you do it?	9	valuation was a DCF valuation.
10	You establish a new set of transactions and you look for	10	MS MENAKER: I'm sorry, would it assist I was looking for
11	other transactions based on	11	something, but while they're looking. So they did do
12	MS MENAKER: I believe there were Let me refresh our	12	a DCF there in you're asked about the ?
13	recollection so I can give you the accurate answer.	13	THE PRESIDENT: (Nods head).
14	MR GOSIS: If we go to slide 58 this is what Mr Kaczmarek	14	MS MENAKER: Yes, they did.
15	said he did. He does make for the but-for valuation,	15	THE PRESIDENT: Yes, I think that's common ground: both
16	he makes a weighted average of DCF comparable traded	16	parties agree.
17	companies, comparable transactions.	17	MR GOSIS: That's so, thank you. Thank you,
18	THE PRESIDENT: Okay. In theory, it's possible. It's just	18	Madam President.
19	a bit complicated, because the assumptions he used are	19	THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.
20	not that different in the but-for and the actual. But	20	Ms Menaker.
21	of course you could find another portfolio of	21	MS MENAKER: Thank you. Just one note for the transcript:
22	transactions that don't apply to the actual value but	22	that is the fact that there's the fairness
23	would be relevant for the but-for.	23	opinion, we have redacted that, given the
24	MR GOSIS: Which is why [Dr] Abdala one of the criticisms	24	confidentiality provision in the agreement itself. So
25	we had in one of the slides for the opening presentation	25	with the transcript we'll just need to do that; which we
	Page 37		Page 39
	1 age 57		r age 59
11:03 1	of Guatemala two days ago Mr Abdala said: for	11:06 1	can do later, as long as we have notice.
11:03 1 2	of Guatemala two days ago Mr Abdala said: for a project of this type, for purposes as you want to use	11:06 1 2	can do later, as long as we have notice. THE PRESIDENT: The thing that it existed or that it was
	• •		
2	a project of this type, for purposes as you want to use	2	THE PRESIDENT: The thing that it existed or that it was
2 3	a project of this type, for purposes as you want to use this for, you cannot use comparables; you have to do	23	THE PRESIDENT: The thing that it existed or that it was a DCF, or what is it?
2 3 4	a project of this type, for purposes as you want to use this for, you cannot use comparables; you have to do a DCF.	2 3 4	THE PRESIDENT: The thing that it existed or that it was a DCF, or what is it? MS MENAKER: The content. And I thought I have to
2 3 4 5	a project of this type, for purposes as you want to use this for, you cannot use comparables; you have to do a DCF. THE PRESIDENT: Yes.	2 3 4 5	THE PRESIDENT: The thing that it existed or that it was a DCF, or what is it? MS MENAKER: The content. And I thought I have to
2 3 4 5 6	 a project of this type, for purposes as you want to use this for, you cannot use comparables; you have to do a DCF. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MR GOSIS: And that's the precise reason for that criticism, which of course the Committee will have noted was not mentioned in the Resubmission [Award]. 	2 3 4 5 6	THE PRESIDENT: The thing that it existed or that it was a DCF, or what is it?MS MENAKER: The content. And I thought I have to double-check if it's even the name that it was
2 3 4 5 6 7	a project of this type, for purposes as you want to use this for, you cannot use comparables; you have to do a DCF.THE PRESIDENT: Yes.MR GOSIS: And that's the precise reason for that criticism, which of course the Committee will have noted was not	2 3 4 5 6 7	 THE PRESIDENT: The thing that it existed or that it was a DCF, or what is it? MS MENAKER: The content. And I thought I have to double-check if it's even the name that it was THE PRESIDENT: Ah, okay. MS MENAKER: Yes, I think it just says now in the unredacted version "fairness opinion".
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 a project of this type, for purposes as you want to use this for, you cannot use comparables; you have to do a DCF. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MR GOSIS: And that's the precise reason for that criticism, which of course the Committee will have noted was not mentioned in the Resubmission [Award]. THE PRESIDENT: Another minute, I need to make a note. (Pause) Thank you. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 THE PRESIDENT: The thing that it existed or that it was a DCF, or what is it? MS MENAKER: The content. And I thought I have to double-check if it's even the name that it was THE PRESIDENT: Ah, okay. MS MENAKER: Yes, I think it just says now in the unredacted version "fairness opinion".
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 a project of this type, for purposes as you want to use this for, you cannot use comparables; you have to do a DCF. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MR GOSIS: And that's the precise reason for that criticism, which of course the Committee will have noted was not mentioned in the Resubmission [Award]. THE PRESIDENT: Another minute, I need to make a note. (Pause) Thank you. MR GOSIS: I think the last slides we had on this, basically 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 THE PRESIDENT: The thing that it existed or that it was a DCF, or what is it? MS MENAKER: The content. And I thought I have to double-check if it's even the name that it was THE PRESIDENT: Ah, okay. MS MENAKER: Yes, I think it just says now in the unredacted version "fairness opinion". THE PRESIDENT: Okay, sorry. I will try to refer to it as a fairness opinion.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 a project of this type, for purposes as you want to use this for, you cannot use comparables; you have to do a DCF. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MR GOSIS: And that's the precise reason for that criticism, which of course the Committee will have noted was not mentioned in the Resubmission [Award]. THE PRESIDENT: Another minute, I need to make a note. (Pause) Thank you. MR GOSIS: I think the last slides we had on this, basically slides 72 and 73, are basically the [Resubmission] 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 THE PRESIDENT: The thing that it existed or that it was a DCF, or what is it? MS MENAKER: The content. And I thought I have to double-check if it's even the name that it was THE PRESIDENT: Ah, okay. MS MENAKER: Yes, I think it just says now in the unredacted version "fairness opinion". THE PRESIDENT: Okay, sorry. I will try to refer to it as a fairness opinion. MR GOSIS: This is something that we found as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 a project of this type, for purposes as you want to use this for, you cannot use comparables; you have to do a DCF. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MR GOSIS: And that's the precise reason for that criticism, which of course the Committee will have noted was not mentioned in the Resubmission [Award]. THE PRESIDENT: Another minute, I need to make a note. (Pause) Thank you. MR GOSIS: I think the last slides we had on this, basically slides 72 and 73, are basically the [Resubmission] Tribunal's only reflection on these matters. These are 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 THE PRESIDENT: The thing that it existed or that it was a DCF, or what is it? MS MENAKER: The content. And I thought I have to double-check if it's even the name that it was THE PRESIDENT: Ah, okay. MS MENAKER: Yes, I think it just says now in the unredacted version "fairness opinion". THE PRESIDENT: Okay, sorry. I will try to refer to it as a fairness opinion. MR GOSIS: This is something that we found as I mentioned, we should address now it's the last time
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 a project of this type, for purposes as you want to use this for, you cannot use comparables; you have to do a DCF. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MR GOSIS: And that's the precise reason for that criticism, which of course the Committee will have noted was not mentioned in the Resubmission [Award]. THE PRESIDENT: Another minute, I need to make a note. (Pause) Thank you. MR GOSIS: I think the last slides we had on this, basically slides 72 and 73, are basically the [Resubmission] Tribunal's only reflection on these matters. These are two of the four paragraphs in the Award that deal with 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 THE PRESIDENT: The thing that it existed or that it was a DCF, or what is it? MS MENAKER: The content. And I thought I have to double-check if it's even the name that it was THE PRESIDENT: Ah, okay. MS MENAKER: Yes, I think it just says now in the unredacted version "fairness opinion". THE PRESIDENT: Okay, sorry. I will try to refer to it as a fairness opinion. MR GOSIS: This is something that we found as I mentioned, we should address now it's the last time we refer to this particular thing. Because the document
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 a project of this type, for purposes as you want to use this for, you cannot use comparables; you have to do a DCF. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MR GOSIS: And that's the precise reason for that criticism, which of course the Committee will have noted was not mentioned in the Resubmission [Award]. THE PRESIDENT: Another minute, I need to make a note. (Pause) Thank you. MR GOSIS: I think the last slides we had on this, basically slides 72 and 73, are basically the [Resubmission] Tribunal's only reflection on these matters. These are two of the four paragraphs in the Award that deal with the calculation, the only ones dealing with the method 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 THE PRESIDENT: The thing that it existed or that it was a DCF, or what is it? MS MENAKER: The content. And I thought I have to double-check if it's even the name that it was THE PRESIDENT: Ah, okay. MS MENAKER: Yes, I think it just says now in the unredacted version "fairness opinion". THE PRESIDENT: Okay, sorry. I will try to refer to it as a fairness opinion. MR GOSIS: This is something that we found as I mentioned, we should address now it's the last time we refer to this particular thing. Because the document as uploaded in the depository of procedural materials
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 a project of this type, for purposes as you want to use this for, you cannot use comparables; you have to do a DCF. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MR GOSIS: And that's the precise reason for that criticism, which of course the Committee will have noted was not mentioned in the Resubmission [Award]. THE PRESIDENT: Another minute, I need to make a note. (Pause) Thank you. MR GOSIS: I think the last slides we had on this, basically slides 72 and 73, are basically the [Resubmission] Tribunal's only reflection on these matters. These are two of the four paragraphs in the Award that deal with the calculation, the only ones dealing with the method being used to arrive at this calculation. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 THE PRESIDENT: The thing that it existed or that it was a DCF, or what is it? MS MENAKER: The content. And I thought I have to double-check if it's even the name that it was THE PRESIDENT: Ah, okay. MS MENAKER: Yes, I think it just says now in the unredacted version "fairness opinion". THE PRESIDENT: Okay, sorry. I will try to refer to it as a fairness opinion. MR GOSIS: This is something that we found as I mentioned, we should address now it's the last time we refer to this particular thing. Because the document as uploaded in the depository of procedural materials we're looking at, it has all of those redactions in.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 a project of this type, for purposes as you want to use this for, you cannot use comparables; you have to do a DCF. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MR GOSIS: And that's the precise reason for that criticism, which of course the Committee will have noted was not mentioned in the Resubmission [Award]. THE PRESIDENT: Another minute, I need to make a note. (Pause) Thank you. MR GOSIS: I think the last slides we had on this, basically slides 72 and 73, are basically the [Resubmission] Tribunal's only reflection on these matters. These are two of the four paragraphs in the Award that deal with the calculation, the only ones dealing with the method being used to arrive at this calculation. This is, at least for present purposes, our answer 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 THE PRESIDENT: The thing that it existed or that it was a DCF, or what is it? MS MENAKER: The content. And I thought I have to double-check if it's even the name that it was THE PRESIDENT: Ah, okay. MS MENAKER: Yes, I think it just says now in the unredacted version "fairness opinion". THE PRESIDENT: Okay, sorry. I will try to refer to it as a fairness opinion. MR GOSIS: This is something that we found as I mentioned, we should address now it's the last time we refer to this particular thing. Because the document as uploaded in the depository of procedural materials we're looking at, it has all of those redactions in. And the end result is that we now know what we're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 a project of this type, for purposes as you want to use this for, you cannot use comparables; you have to do a DCF. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MR GOSIS: And that's the precise reason for that criticism, which of course the Committee will have noted was not mentioned in the Resubmission [Award]. THE PRESIDENT: Another minute, I need to make a note. (Pause) Thank you. MR GOSIS: I think the last slides we had on this, basically slides 72 and 73, are basically the [Resubmission] Tribunal's only reflection on these matters. These are two of the four paragraphs in the Award that deal with the calculation, the only ones dealing with the method being used to arrive at this calculation. This is, at least for present purposes, our answer to the Chair's question yesterday of how to walk through 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 THE PRESIDENT: The thing that it existed or that it was a DCF, or what is it? MS MENAKER: The content. And I thought I have to double-check if it's even the name that it was THE PRESIDENT: Ah, okay. MS MENAKER: Yes, I think it just says now in the unredacted version "fairness opinion". THE PRESIDENT: Okay, sorry. I will try to refer to it as a fairness opinion. MR GOSIS: This is something that we found as I mentioned, we should address now it's the last time we refer to this particular thing. Because the document as uploaded in the depository of procedural materials we're looking at, it has all of those redactions in. And the end result is that we now know what we're talking about, but I don't know if, when the transcript
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 a project of this type, for purposes as you want to use this for, you cannot use comparables; you have to do a DCF. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MR GOSIS: And that's the precise reason for that criticism, which of course the Committee will have noted was not mentioned in the Resubmission [Award]. THE PRESIDENT: Another minute, I need to make a note. (Pause) Thank you. MR GOSIS: I think the last slides we had on this, basically slides 72 and 73, are basically the [Resubmission] Tribunal's only reflection on these matters. These are two of the four paragraphs in the Award that deal with the calculation, the only ones dealing with the method being used to arrive at this calculation. This is, at least for present purposes, our answer to the Chair's question yesterday of how to walk through the evidence before the two tribunals on the issue of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 THE PRESIDENT: The thing that it existed or that it was a DCF, or what is it? MS MENAKER: The content. And I thought I have to double-check if it's even the name that it was THE PRESIDENT: Ah, okay. MS MENAKER: Yes, I think it just says now in the unredacted version "fairness opinion". THE PRESIDENT: Okay, sorry. I will try to refer to it as a fairness opinion. MR GOSIS: This is something that we found as I mentioned, we should address now it's the last time we refer to this particular thing. Because the document as uploaded in the depository of procedural materials we're looking at, it has all of those redactions in. And the end result is that we now know what we're talking about, but I don't know if, when the transcript gets redacted, the Committee will still get to see.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 a project of this type, for purposes as you want to use this for, you cannot use comparables; you have to do a DCF. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MR GOSIS: And that's the precise reason for that criticism, which of course the Committee will have noted was not mentioned in the Resubmission [Award]. THE PRESIDENT: Another minute, I need to make a note. (Pause) Thank you. MR GOSIS: I think the last slides we had on this, basically slides 72 and 73, are basically the [Resubmission] Tribunal's only reflection on these matters. These are two of the four paragraphs in the Award that deal with the calculation, the only ones dealing with the method being used to arrive at this calculation. This is, at least for present purposes, our answer to the Chair's question yesterday of how to walk through the evidence before the two tribunals on the issue of quantum. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 THE PRESIDENT: The thing that it existed or that it was a DCF, or what is it? MS MENAKER: The content. And I thought I have to double-check if it's even the name that it was THE PRESIDENT: Ah, okay. MS MENAKER: Yes, I think it just says now in the unredacted version "fairness opinion". THE PRESIDENT: Okay, sorry. I will try to refer to it as a fairness opinion. MR GOSIS: This is something that we found as I mentioned, we should address now it's the last time we refer to this particular thing. Because the document as uploaded in the depository of procedural materials we're looking at, it has all of those redactions in. And the end result is that we now know what we're talking about, but I don't know if, when the transcript gets redacted, the Committee will still get to see. So maybe there's a way to refer to "the fairness"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 a project of this type, for purposes as you want to use this for, you cannot use comparables; you have to do a DCF. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MR GOSIS: And that's the precise reason for that criticism, which of course the Committee will have noted was not mentioned in the Resubmission [Award]. THE PRESIDENT: Another minute, I need to make a note. (Pause) Thank you. MR GOSIS: I think the last slides we had on this, basically slides 72 and 73, are basically the [Resubmission] Tribunal's only reflection on these matters. These are two of the four paragraphs in the Award that deal with the calculation, the only ones dealing with the method being used to arrive at this calculation. This is, at least for present purposes, our answer to the Chair's question yesterday of how to walk through the evidence before the two tribunals on the issue of quantum. THE PRESIDENT: I've got a question regarding the rest of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 THE PRESIDENT: The thing that it existed or that it was a DCF, or what is it? MS MENAKER: The content. And I thought I have to double-check if it's even the name that it was THE PRESIDENT: Ah, okay. MS MENAKER: Yes, I think it just says now in the unredacted version "fairness opinion". THE PRESIDENT: Okay, sorry. I will try to refer to it as a fairness opinion. MR GOSIS: This is something that we found as I mentioned, we should address now it's the last time we refer to this particular thing. Because the document as uploaded in the depository of procedural materials we're looking at, it has all of those redactions in. And the end result is that we now know what we're talking about, but I don't know if, when the transcript gets redacted, the Committee will still get to see. So maybe there's a way to refer to "the fairness valuation" without any further reference, so that we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 a project of this type, for purposes as you want to use this for, you cannot use comparables; you have to do a DCF. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MR GOSIS: And that's the precise reason for that criticism, which of course the Committee will have noted was not mentioned in the Resubmission [Award]. THE PRESIDENT: Another minute, I need to make a note. (Pause) Thank you. MR GOSIS: I think the last slides we had on this, basically slides 72 and 73, are basically the [Resubmission] Tribunal's only reflection on these matters. These are two of the four paragraphs in the Award that deal with the calculation, the only ones dealing with the method being used to arrive at this calculation. This is, at least for present purposes, our answer to the Chair's question yesterday of how to walk through the evidence before the two tribunals on the issue of quantum. THE PRESIDENT: I've got a question regarding the rest of that paragraph 96. The valuation or 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 THE PRESIDENT: The thing that it existed or that it was a DCF, or what is it? MS MENAKER: The content. And I thought I have to double-check if it's even the name that it was THE PRESIDENT: Ah, okay. MS MENAKER: Yes, I think it just says now in the unredacted version "fairness opinion". THE PRESIDENT: Okay, sorry. I will try to refer to it as a fairness opinion. MR GOSIS: This is something that we found as I mentioned, we should address now it's the last time we refer to this particular thing. Because the document as uploaded in the depository of procedural materials we're looking at, it has all of those redactions in. And the end result is that we now know what we're talking about, but I don't know if, when the transcript gets redacted, the Committee will still get to see. So maybe there's a way to refer to "the fairness valuation" without any further reference, so that we [don't] redact everything; we still can read what the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 a project of this type, for purposes as you want to use this for, you cannot use comparables; you have to do a DCF. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MR GOSIS: And that's the precise reason for that criticism, which of course the Committee will have noted was not mentioned in the Resubmission [Award]. THE PRESIDENT: Another minute, I need to make a note. (Pause) Thank you. MR GOSIS: I think the last slides we had on this, basically slides 72 and 73, are basically the [Resubmission] Tribunal's only reflection on these matters. These are two of the four paragraphs in the Award that deal with the calculation, the only ones dealing with the method being used to arrive at this calculation. This is, at least for present purposes, our answer to the Chair's question yesterday of how to walk through the evidence before the two tribunals on the issue of quantum. THE PRESIDENT: I've got a question regarding the rest of that paragraph 96. The generation or watever, was 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 THE PRESIDENT: The thing that it existed or that it was a DCF, or what is it? MS MENAKER: The content. And I thought I have to double-check if it's even the name that it was THE PRESIDENT: Ah, okay. MS MENAKER: Yes, I think it just says now in the unredacted version "fairness opinion". THE PRESIDENT: Okay, sorry. I will try to refer to it as a fairness opinion. MR GOSIS: This is something that we found as I mentioned, we should address now it's the last time we refer to this particular thing. Because the document as uploaded in the depository of procedural materials we're looking at, it has all of those redactions in. And the end result is that we now know what we're talking about, but I don't know if, when the transcript gets redacted, the Committee will still get to see. So maybe there's a way to refer to "the fairness valuation" without any further reference, so that we (don't) redact everything; we still can read what the reference was for.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 a project of this type, for purposes as you want to use this for, you cannot use comparables; you have to do a DCF. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MR GOSIS: And that's the precise reason for that criticism, which of course the Committee will have noted was not mentioned in the Resubmission [Award]. THE PRESIDENT: Another minute, I need to make a note. (Pause) Thank you. MR GOSIS: I think the last slides we had on this, basically slides 72 and 73, are basically the [Resubmission] Tribunal's only reflection on these matters. These are two of the four paragraphs in the Award that deal with the calculation, the only ones dealing with the method being used to arrive at this calculation. This is, at least for present purposes, our answer to the Chair's question yesterday of how to walk through the evidence before the two tribunals on the issue of quantum. THE PRESIDENT: I've got a question regarding the rest of that paragraph 96. The price or whatever, was that based on a DCF? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 THE PRESIDENT: The thing that it existed or that it was a DCF, or what is it? MS MENAKER: The content. And I thought I have to double-check if it's even the name that it was THE PRESIDENT: Ah, okay. MS MENAKER: Yes, I think it just says now in the unredacted version "fairness opinion". THE PRESIDENT: Okay, sorry. I will try to refer to it as a fairness opinion. MR GOSIS: This is something that we found as I mentioned, we should address now it's the last time we refer to this particular thing. Because the document as uploaded in the depository of procedural materials we're looking at, it has all of those redactions in. And the end result is that we now know what we're talking about, but I don't know if, when the transcript gets redacted, the Committee will still get to see. So maybe there's a way to refer to "the fairness valuation" without any further reference, so that we [don't] redact everything; we still can read what the reference was for. THE PRESIDENT: Can we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 a project of this type, for purposes as you want to use this for, you cannot use comparables; you have to do a DCF. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MR GOSIS: And that's the precise reason for that criticism, which of course the Committee will have noted was not mentioned in the Resubmission [Award]. THE PRESIDENT: Another minute, I need to make a note. (Pause) Thank you. MR GOSIS: I think the last slides we had on this, basically slides 72 and 73, are basically the [Resubmission] Tribunal's only reflection on these matters. These are two of the four paragraphs in the Award that deal with the calculation, the only ones dealing with the method being used to arrive at this calculation. This is, at least for present purposes, our answer to the Chair's question yesterday of how to walk through the evidence before the two tribunals on the issue of quantum. THE PRESIDENT: I've got a question regarding the rest of that paragraph 96. The generation or watever, was 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 THE PRESIDENT: The thing that it existed or that it was a DCF, or what is it? MS MENAKER: The content. And I thought I have to double-check if it's even the name that it was THE PRESIDENT: Ah, okay. MS MENAKER: Yes, I think it just says now in the unredacted version "fairness opinion". THE PRESIDENT: Okay, sorry. I will try to refer to it as a fairness opinion. MR GOSIS: This is something that we found as I mentioned, we should address now it's the last time we refer to this particular thing. Because the document as uploaded in the depository of procedural materials we're looking at, it has all of those redactions in. And the end result is that we now know what we're talking about, but I don't know if, when the transcript gets redacted, the Committee will still get to see. So maybe there's a way to refer to "the fairness valuation" without any further reference, so that we (don't) redact everything; we still can read what the reference was for.

11:08 1	entire paragraphs struck out, and it's difficult to make	11:10 1	Which means you can project you can value the
2	sense of it.	2	company you have perfect foresight, so you know what
3	THE PRESIDENT: Would it be okay if we replaced any	3	the future holds, and that is your projection. Which
4	reference to this valuation as "the fairness	4	means your but-for always equals your actual, and hence
5	opinion" or you agree on the semantics. I don't	5	no damages. Because you had perfect foresight, you
6	know. You agree on something that we all know what it	6	would know in the future.
7	is, but it doesn't identify	7	It makes no sense. But that was his primary
8	having something redacted, we have something that's	8	contention. And you will see that throughout his
9	meaningful to us and that doesn't reveal any	9	reports and you will see it at the hearing: he talks
10	confidential information.	10	about the "perfect foresight". And that's where he kept
10	Would that be acceptable?	10	coming and saying: there would be no damages, because if
11	MS MENAKER: That's acceptable for us. And the latter part,	11	you do forecast, you would know what it would be and it
12	as long as if we do get into a discussion of the	12	would match the actual.
13	content, then we'll look at the necessity for	13	So as far as what Navigant, what Mr Kaczmarek did,
15	redactions. But if we're just referencing it, yes,	14	in order to establish the but-for cash flows from 2010
16	that's fine.	15	to 2013, he had to of course look at what was the
10	THE PRESIDENT: Is that okay? Yes? Good.	10	company's revenue and what was the company's cost, or to
18	MS MENAKER: Thank you. So just to begin with a comment to	18	forecast the revenues and the cost.
10	follow up on your question regarding the lack of a DCF	10	When you look at the revenues of the company, the
20	model from Dr Abdala, which I do think is an important	20	revenues are in the electricity tariff. The vast
20	point and was discussed at length in the resubmission	20	portion of that is a pass-through because the company
21	hearing in particular.	21	pays for the electricity that's generated and passes it
23	There was a discussion where Dr Abdala is being	22	on to the consumers.
23	questioned about that, and he insisted that it would be	23	You have the generation, the transmission and the
25	impossible to do a DCF in the but-for scenario and to	25	distributors. EEGSA was a distributor, so the last in
	Page 41		Page 43
11:09 1	project future cash flows. And his insistence was: it	11:12 1	line. They get the money from the clients, the
11:09 1 2	project future cash flows. And his insistence was: it would be impossible because you cannot know what the	11:12 1 2	line. They get the money from the clients, the customers. But a lot of that is then passed through to
2	would be impossible because you cannot know what the	2	customers. But a lot of that is then passed through to
2 3	would be impossible because you cannot know what the future tariff periods would be, you cannot know what a tariff in the future would be. We said: well, that's okay; you never know what your	2 3	customers. But a lot of that is then passed through to the electricity generators. The portion that they
2 3 4	would be impossible because you cannot know what the future tariff periods would be, you cannot know what a tariff in the future would be.	2 3 4	customers. But a lot of that is then passed through to the electricity generators. The portion that they retain for their service is called the "VAD": it's the
2 3 4 5	would be impossible because you cannot know what the future tariff periods would be, you cannot know what a tariff in the future would be. We said: well, that's okay; you never know what your	2 3 4 5	customers. But a lot of that is then passed through to the electricity generators. The portion that they retain for their service is called the "VAD": it's the value added for distribution. And that's the value that they are adding, as they're distributing the electricity to the final user.
2 3 4 5 6	would be impossible because you cannot know what the future tariff periods would be, you cannot know what a tariff in the future would be. We said: well, that's okay; you never know what your future cash flows are, no matter what kind of business.	2 3 4 5 6	customers. But a lot of that is then passed through to the electricity generators. The portion that they retain for their service is called the "VAD": it's the value added for distribution. And that's the value that they are adding, as they're distributing the electricity
2 3 4 5 6 7	 would be impossible because you cannot know what the future tariff periods would be, you cannot know what a tariff in the future would be. We said: well, that's okay; you never know what your future cash flows are, no matter what kind of business. And in fact, in this particular business it's a regulated utility: they have a lot more certainty than many, many other businesses around the world. Everyone 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	customers. But a lot of that is then passed through to the electricity generators. The portion that they retain for their service is called the "VAD": it's the value added for distribution. And that's the value that they are adding, as they're distributing the electricity to the final user. So when you're talking about their income, that's what you're looking at, is that VAD.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 would be impossible because you cannot know what the future tariff periods would be, you cannot know what a tariff in the future would be. We said: well, that's okay; you never know what your future cash flows are, no matter what kind of business. And in fact, in this particular business it's a regulated utility: they have a lot more certainty than many, many other businesses around the world. Everyone can do it; it's whether your assumptions are reasonable. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	customers. But a lot of that is then passed through to the electricity generators. The portion that they retain for their service is called the "VAD": it's the value added for distribution. And that's the value that they are adding, as they're distributing the electricity to the final user. So when you're talking about their income, that's what you're looking at, is that VAD. So for 2010-2013, the VAD that he used for the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 would be impossible because you cannot know what the future tariff periods would be, you cannot know what a tariff in the future would be. We said: well, that's okay; you never know what your future cash flows are, no matter what kind of business. And in fact, in this particular business it's a regulated utility: they have a lot more certainty than many, many other businesses around the world. Everyone can do it; it's whether your assumptions are reasonable. Because at any one point, you should be able to value 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	customers. But a lot of that is then passed through to the electricity generators. The portion that they retain for their service is called the "VAD": it's the value added for distribution. And that's the value that they are adding, as they're distributing the electricity to the final user. So when you're talking about their income, that's what you're looking at, is that VAD. So for 2010-2013, the VAD that he used for the income was on the basis of the Bates White study.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 would be impossible because you cannot know what the future tariff periods would be, you cannot know what a tariff in the future would be. We said: well, that's okay; you never know what your future cash flows are, no matter what kind of business. And in fact, in this particular business it's a regulated utility: they have a lot more certainty than many, many other businesses around the world. Everyone can do it; it's whether your assumptions are reasonable. Because at any one point, you should be able to value the business. You could sell at any one point. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	customers. But a lot of that is then passed through to the electricity generators. The portion that they retain for their service is called the "VAD": it's the value added for distribution. And that's the value that they are adding, as they're distributing the electricity to the final user. So when you're talking about their income, that's what you're looking at, is that VAD. So for 2010-2013, the VAD that he used for the income was on the basis of the Bates White study. Bates White, as you know, was the consultant engaged by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 would be impossible because you cannot know what the future tariff periods would be, you cannot know what a tariff in the future would be. We said: well, that's okay; you never know what your future cash flows are, no matter what kind of business. And in fact, in this particular business it's a regulated utility: they have a lot more certainty than many, many other businesses around the world. Everyone can do it; it's whether your assumptions are reasonable. Because at any one point, you should be able to value the business. You could sell at any one point. And there was this back-and-forth, and he kept 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	customers. But a lot of that is then passed through to the electricity generators. The portion that they retain for their service is called the "VAD": it's the value added for distribution. And that's the value that they are adding, as they're distributing the electricity to the final user. So when you're talking about their income, that's what you're looking at, is that VAD. So for 2010-2013, the VAD that he used for the income was on the basis of the Bates White study. Bates White, as you know, was the consultant engaged by EEGSA that had been pre-qualified by the CNEE, which was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 would be impossible because you cannot know what the future tariff periods would be, you cannot know what a tariff in the future would be. We said: well, that's okay; you never know what your future cash flows are, no matter what kind of business. And in fact, in this particular business it's a regulated utility: they have a lot more certainty than many, many other businesses around the world. Everyone can do it; it's whether your assumptions are reasonable. Because at any one point, you should be able to value the business. You could sell at any one point. And there was this back-and-forth, and he kept insisting: no, it cannot be done. He did not want to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	customers. But a lot of that is then passed through to the electricity generators. The portion that they retain for their service is called the "VAD": it's the value added for distribution. And that's the value that they are adding, as they're distributing the electricity to the final user. So when you're talking about their income, that's what you're looking at, is that VAD. So for 2010-2013, the VAD that he used for the income was on the basis of the Bates White study. Bates White, as you know, was the consultant engaged by EEGSA that had been pre-qualified by the CNEE, which was the electricity regulator under the framework, that was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 would be impossible because you cannot know what the future tariff periods would be, you cannot know what a tariff in the future would be. We said: well, that's okay; you never know what your future cash flows are, no matter what kind of business. And in fact, in this particular business it's a regulated utility: they have a lot more certainty than many, many other businesses around the world. Everyone can do it; it's whether your assumptions are reasonable. Because at any one point, you should be able to value the business. You could sell at any one point. And there was this back-and-forth, and he kept insisting: no, it cannot be done. He did not want to take a stance on that. So he just simply refused to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	customers. But a lot of that is then passed through to the electricity generators. The portion that they retain for their service is called the "VAD": it's the value added for distribution. And that's the value that they are adding, as they're distributing the electricity to the final user. So when you're talking about their income, that's what you're looking at, is that VAD. So for 2010-2013, the VAD that he used for the income was on the basis of the Bates White study. Bates White, as you know, was the consultant engaged by EEGSA that had been pre-qualified by the CNEE, which was the electricity regulator under the framework, that was tasked with preparing the VAD study. So the electricity
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 would be impossible because you cannot know what the future tariff periods would be, you cannot know what a tariff in the future would be. We said: well, that's okay; you never know what your future cash flows are, no matter what kind of business. And in fact, in this particular business it's a regulated utility: they have a lot more certainty than many, many other businesses around the world. Everyone can do it; it's whether your assumptions are reasonable. Because at any one point, you should be able to value the business. You could sell at any one point. And there was this back-and-forth, and he kept insisting: no, it cannot be done. He did not want to take a stance on that. So he just simply refused to accept that you could do a DCF. And there at one point 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	customers. But a lot of that is then passed through to the electricity generators. The portion that they retain for their service is called the "VAD": it's the value added for distribution. And that's the value that they are adding, as they're distributing the electricity to the final user. So when you're talking about their income, that's what you're looking at, is that VAD. So for 2010-2013, the VAD that he used for the income was on the basis of the Bates White study. Bates White, as you know, was the consultant engaged by EEGSA that had been pre-qualified by the CNEE, which was the electricity regulator under the framework, that was tasked with preparing the VAD study. So the electricity distributor, in consultation with its pre-qualified
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 would be impossible because you cannot know what the future tariff periods would be, you cannot know what a tariff in the future would be. We said: well, that's okay; you never know what your future cash flows are, no matter what kind of business. And in fact, in this particular business it's a regulated utility: they have a lot more certainty than many, many other businesses around the world. Everyone can do it; it's whether your assumptions are reasonable. Because at any one point, you should be able to value the business. You could sell at any one point. And there was this back-and-forth, and he kept insisting: no, it cannot be done. He did not want to take a stance on that. So he just simply refused to accept that you could do a DCF. And there at one point he did say: yes you know, when I said, "If you were 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	customers. But a lot of that is then passed through to the electricity generators. The portion that they retain for their service is called the "VAD": it's the value added for distribution. And that's the value that they are adding, as they're distributing the electricity to the final user. So when you're talking about their income, that's what you're looking at, is that VAD. So for 2010-2013, the VAD that he used for the income was on the basis of the Bates White study. Bates White, as you know, was the consultant engaged by EEGSA that had been pre-qualified by the CNEE, which was the electricity regulator under the framework, that was tasked with preparing the VAD study. So the electricity distributor, in consultation with its pre-qualified consultant, prepares the VAD study. The CNEE, which is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 would be impossible because you cannot know what the future tariff periods would be, you cannot know what a tariff in the future would be. We said: well, that's okay; you never know what your future cash flows are, no matter what kind of business. And in fact, in this particular business it's a regulated utility: they have a lot more certainty than many, many other businesses around the world. Everyone can do it; it's whether your assumptions are reasonable. Because at any one point, you should be able to value the business. You could sell at any one point. And there was this back-and-forth, and he kept insisting: no, it cannot be done. He did not want to take a stance on that. So he just simply refused to accept that you could do a DCF. And there at one point he did say: yes you know, when I said, "If you were hired, if you engaged somebody to purchase this company, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	customers. But a lot of that is then passed through to the electricity generators. The portion that they retain for their service is called the "VAD": it's the value added for distribution. And that's the value that they are adding, as they're distributing the electricity to the final user. So when you're talking about their income, that's what you're looking at, is that VAD. So for 2010-2013, the VAD that he used for the income was on the basis of the Bates White study. Bates White, as you know, was the consultant engaged by EEGSA that had been pre-qualified by the CNEE, which was the electricity regulator under the framework, that was tasked with preparing the VAD study. So the electricity distributor, in consultation with its pre-qualified consultant, prepares the VAD study. The CNEE, which is the regulator, looks at that VAD study, can provide
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 would be impossible because you cannot know what the future tariff periods would be, you cannot know what a tariff in the future would be. We said: well, that's okay; you never know what your future cash flows are, no matter what kind of business. And in fact, in this particular business it's a regulated utility: they have a lot more certainty than many, many other businesses around the world. Everyone can do it; it's whether your assumptions are reasonable. Because at any one point, you should be able to value the business. You could sell at any one point. And there was this back-and-forth, and he kept insisting: no, it cannot be done. He did not want to take a stance on that. So he just simply refused to accept that you could do a DCF. And there at one point he did say: yes you know, when I said, "If you were hired, if you engaged somebody to purchase this company, how would you tell them what type of bid to make for 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	customers. But a lot of that is then passed through to the electricity generators. The portion that they retain for their service is called the "VAD": it's the value added for distribution. And that's the value that they are adding, as they're distributing the electricity to the final user. So when you're talking about their income, that's what you're looking at, is that VAD. So for 2010-2013, the VAD that he used for the income was on the basis of the Bates White study. Bates White, as you know, was the consultant engaged by EEGSA that had been pre-qualified by the CNEE, which was the electricity regulator under the framework, that was tasked with preparing the VAD study. So the electricity distributor, in consultation with its pre-qualified consultant, prepares the VAD study. The CNEE, which is the regulator, looks at that VAD study, can provide comments. They're supposed to then go back and forth.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 would be impossible because you cannot know what the future tariff periods would be, you cannot know what a tariff in the future would be. We said: well, that's okay; you never know what your future cash flows are, no matter what kind of business. And in fact, in this particular business it's a regulated utility: they have a lot more certainty than many, many other businesses around the world. Everyone can do it; it's whether your assumptions are reasonable. Because at any one point, you should be able to value the business. You could sell at any one point. And there was this back-and-forth, and he kept insisting: no, it cannot be done. He did not want to take a stance on that. So he just simply refused to accept that you could do a DCF. And there at one point he did say: yes you know, when I said, "If you were hired, if you engaged somebody to purchase this company, how would you tell them what type of bid to make for it?", and then he did say, "Well, yes, in that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	customers. But a lot of that is then passed through to the electricity generators. The portion that they retain for their service is called the "VAD": it's the value added for distribution. And that's the value that they are adding, as they're distributing the electricity to the final user. So when you're talking about their income, that's what you're looking at, is that VAD. So for 2010-2013, the VAD that he used for the income was on the basis of the Bates White study. Bates White, as you know, was the consultant engaged by EEGSA that had been pre-qualified by the CNEE, which was the electricity regulator under the framework, that was tasked with preparing the VAD study. So the electricity distributor, in consultation with its pre-qualified consultant, prepares the VAD study. The CNEE, which is the regulator, looks at that VAD study, can provide comments. They're supposed to then go back and forth. And if they can't agree on those comments, it goes to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 would be impossible because you cannot know what the future tariff periods would be, you cannot know what a tariff in the future would be. We said: well, that's okay; you never know what your future cash flows are, no matter what kind of business. And in fact, in this particular business it's a regulated utility: they have a lot more certainty than many, many other businesses around the world. Everyone can do it; it's whether your assumptions are reasonable. Because at any one point, you should be able to value the business. You could sell at any one point. And there was this back-and-forth, and he kept insisting: no, it cannot be done. He did not want to take a stance on that. So he just simply refused to accept that you could do a DCF. And there at one point he did say: yes you know, when I said, "If you were hired, if you engaged somebody to purchase this company, how would you tell them what type of bid to make for it?", and then he did say, "Well, yes, in that circumstance I would need to do that. But you can't do 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	customers. But a lot of that is then passed through to the electricity generators. The portion that they retain for their service is called the "VAD": it's the value added for distribution. And that's the value that they are adding, as they're distributing the electricity to the final user. So when you're talking about their income, that's what you're looking at, is that VAD. So for 2010-2013, the VAD that he used for the income was on the basis of the Bates White study. Bates White, as you know, was the consultant engaged by EEGSA that had been pre-qualified by the CNEE, which was the electricity regulator under the framework, that was tasked with preparing the VAD study. So the electricity distributor, in consultation with its pre-qualified consultant, prepares the VAD study. The CNEE, which is the regulator, looks at that VAD study, can provide comments. They're supposed to then go back and forth. And if they can't agree on those comments, it goes to an expert committee who then decides on those issues.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 would be impossible because you cannot know what the future tariff periods would be, you cannot know what a tariff in the future would be. We said: well, that's okay; you never know what your future cash flows are, no matter what kind of business. And in fact, in this particular business it's a regulated utility: they have a lot more certainty than many, many other businesses around the world. Everyone can do it; it's whether your assumptions are reasonable. Because at any one point, you should be able to value the business. You could sell at any one point. And there was this back-and-forth, and he kept insisting: no, it cannot be done. He did not want to take a stance on that. So he just simply refused to accept that you could do a DCF. And there at one point he did say: yes you know, when I said, "If you were hired, if you engaged somebody to purchase this company, how would you tell them what type of bid to make for it?", and then he did say, "Well, yes, in that circumstance I would need to do that. But you can't do that here". 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	customers. But a lot of that is then passed through to the electricity generators. The portion that they retain for their service is called the "VAD": it's the value added for distribution. And that's the value that they are adding, as they're distributing the electricity to the final user. So when you're talking about their income, that's what you're looking at, is that VAD. So for 2010-2013, the VAD that he used for the income was on the basis of the Bates White study. Bates White, as you know, was the consultant engaged by EEGSA that had been pre-qualified by the CNEE, which was the electricity regulator under the framework, that was tasked with preparing the VAD study. So the electricity distributor, in consultation with its pre-qualified consultant, prepares the VAD study. The CNEE, which is the regulator, looks at that VAD study, can provide comments. They're supposed to then go back and forth. And if they can't agree on those comments, it goes to an expert committee who then decides on those issues. And that was all part of the original arbitration.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 would be impossible because you cannot know what the future tariff periods would be, you cannot know what a tariff in the future would be. We said: well, that's okay; you never know what your future cash flows are, no matter what kind of business. And in fact, in this particular business it's a regulated utility: they have a lot more certainty than many, many other businesses around the world. Everyone can do it; it's whether your assumptions are reasonable. Because at any one point, you should be able to value the business. You could sell at any one point. And there was this back-and-forth, and he kept insisting: no, it cannot be done. He did not want to take a stance on that. So he just simply refused to accept that you could do a DCF. And there at one point he did say: yes you know, when I said, "If you were hired, if you engaged somebody to purchase this company, how would you tell them what type of bid to make for it?", and then he did say, "Well, yes, in that circumstance I would need to do that. But you can't do that here". 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	customers. But a lot of that is then passed through to the electricity generators. The portion that they retain for their service is called the "VAD": it's the value added for distribution. And that's the value that they are adding, as they're distributing the electricity to the final user. So when you're talking about their income, that's what you're looking at, is that VAD. So for 2010-2013, the VAD that he used for the income was on the basis of the Bates White study. Bates White, as you know, was the consultant engaged by EEGSA that had been pre-qualified by the CNEE, which was the electricity regulator under the framework, that was tasked with preparing the VAD study. So the electricity distributor, in consultation with its pre-qualified consultant, prepares the VAD study. The CNEE, which is the regulator, looks at that VAD study, can provide comments. They're supposed to then go back and forth. And if they can't agree on those comments, it goes to an expert committee who then decides on those issues. And that was all part of the original arbitration. Ultimately the Original Tribunal agreed that but for
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 would be impossible because you cannot know what the future tariff periods would be, you cannot know what a tariff in the future would be. We said: well, that's okay; you never know what your future cash flows are, no matter what kind of business. And in fact, in this particular business it's a regulated utility: they have a lot more certainty than many, many other businesses around the world. Everyone can do it; it's whether your assumptions are reasonable. Because at any one point, you should be able to value the business. You could sell at any one point. And there was this back-and-forth, and he kept insisting: no, it cannot be done. He did not want to take a stance on that. So he just simply refused to accept that you could do a DCF. And there at one point he did say: yes you know, when I said, "If you were hired, if you engaged somebody to purchase this company, how would you tell them what type of bid to make for it?", and then he did say, "Well, yes, in that circumstance I would need to do that. But you can't do that here". 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	customers. But a lot of that is then passed through to the electricity generators. The portion that they retain for their service is called the "VAD": it's the value added for distribution. And that's the value that they are adding, as they're distributing the electricity to the final user. So when you're talking about their income, that's what you're looking at, is that VAD. So for 2010-2013, the VAD that he used for the income was on the basis of the Bates White study. Bates White, as you know, was the consultant engaged by EEGSA that had been pre-qualified by the CNEE, which was the electricity regulator under the framework, that was tasked with preparing the VAD study. So the electricity distributor, in consultation with its pre-qualified consultant, prepares the VAD study. The CNEE, which is the regulator, looks at that VAD study, can provide comments. They're supposed to then go back and forth. And if they can't agree on those comments, it goes to an expert committee who then decides on those issues. And that was all part of the original arbitration. Ultimately the Original Tribunal agreed that but for the breach, had Guatemala not breached the treaty, the
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 would be impossible because you cannot know what the future tariff periods would be, you cannot know what a tariff in the future would be. We said: well, that's okay; you never know what your future cash flows are, no matter what kind of business. And in fact, in this particular business it's a regulated utility: they have a lot more certainty than many, many other businesses around the world. Everyone can do it; it's whether your assumptions are reasonable. Because at any one point, you should be able to value the business. You could sell at any one point. And there was this back-and-forth, and he kept insisting: no, it cannot be done. He did not want to take a stance on that. So he just simply refused to accept that you could do a DCF. And there at one point he did say: yes you know, when I said, "If you were hired, if you engaged somebody to purchase this company, how would you tell them what type of bid to make for it?", and then he did say, "Well, yes, in that circumstance I would need to do that. But you can't do that here". 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	customers. But a lot of that is then passed through to the electricity generators. The portion that they retain for their service is called the "VAD": it's the value added for distribution. And that's the value that they are adding, as they're distributing the electricity to the final user. So when you're talking about their income, that's what you're looking at, is that VAD. So for 2010-2013, the VAD that he used for the income was on the basis of the Bates White study. Bates White, as you know, was the consultant engaged by EEGSA that had been pre-qualified by the CNEE, which was the electricity regulator under the framework, that was tasked with preparing the VAD study. So the electricity distributor, in consultation with its pre-qualified consultant, prepares the VAD study. The CNEE, which is the regulator, looks at that VAD study, can provide comments. They're supposed to then go back and forth. And if they can't agree on those comments, it goes to an expert committee who then decides on those issues. And that was all part of the original arbitration. Ultimately the Original Tribunal agreed that but for
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 would be impossible because you cannot know what the future tariff periods would be, you cannot know what a tariff in the future would be. We said: well, that's okay; you never know what your future cash flows are, no matter what kind of business. And in fact, in this particular business it's a regulated utility: they have a lot more certainty than many, many other businesses around the world. Everyone can do it; it's whether your assumptions are reasonable. Because at any one point, you should be able to value the business. You could sell at any one point. And there was this back-and-forth, and he kept insisting: no, it cannot be done. He did not want to take a stance on that. So he just simply refused to accept that you could do a DCF. And there at one point he did say: yes you know, when I said, "If you were hired, if you engaged somebody to purchase this company, how would you tell them what type of bid to make for it?", and then he did say, "Well, yes, in that circumstance I would need to do that. But you can't do that here". 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	customers. But a lot of that is then passed through to the electricity generators. The portion that they retain for their service is called the "VAD": it's the value added for distribution. And that's the value that they are adding, as they're distributing the electricity to the final user. So when you're talking about their income, that's what you're looking at, is that VAD. So for 2010-2013, the VAD that he used for the income was on the basis of the Bates White study. Bates White, as you know, was the consultant engaged by EEGSA that had been pre-qualified by the CNEE, which was the electricity regulator under the framework, that was tasked with preparing the VAD study. So the electricity distributor, in consultation with its pre-qualified consultant, prepares the VAD study. The CNEE, which is the regulator, looks at that VAD study, can provide comments. They're supposed to then go back and forth. And if they can't agree on those comments, it goes to an expert committee who then decides on those issues. And that was all part of the original arbitration. Ultimately the Original Tribunal agreed that but for the breach, had Guatemala not breached the treaty, the

		1	
11:14 1	Dates White study, which was the final Dates White	11:17 1	formasset
	Bates White study, which was the final Bates White study. Instead Guatemala set the VAD at a rate pursuant		forecasted.
2		2	Typically, one would look at the most recent actual
3	to their own VAD study, which was called the	3	costs, which would have been as of the valuation date,
4	Sigla study. So the differential between those two VADs	4	2010. He did not do that. He instead took EEGSA's
5	became our damages for that historical loss period.	5	actual costs from the end of the year in 2007 and
6	For the 2010-2013 period, because that VAD didn't	6	projected those forward. The reason he did that was
7	change, and the Original Tribunal had decided and	7	because the new tariff or the new VAD that had been
8	that was not annulled that they breached by not	8	adopted in 2008 was cut by 50% from the previous VAD and
9	adopting the Bates White VAD, that VAD remained in place	9	had decreased EEGSA's revenues by approximately 40%. In
10	for the five years; it doesn't change. So that was the	10	reaction to that, EEGSA took severe cost-cutting
11	income, that was the revenue for 2010-2013. So he did	11	measures.
12	not have to forecast that revenue.	12	So when you looked from 2010 forward, the costs were
13	The revenue in the VAD study is in real terms, so he	13	significantly lower. If he had used that as the cost
14	had to add an inflation adjustment to convert it to	14	basis to project forward, EEGSA's costs would have been
15	nominal terms, and he did that by using the producer	15	lower, which again would mean that the but-for value
16	price index. Dr Abdala initially did not object to	16	would be higher, Claimant's damages would be higher,
17	using the PPI to adjust for inflation. Later he	17	when really what you're trying to do is you're saying:
18	suggested that Mr Kaczmarek should have incorporated	18	but for the breach, in the absence of the breach, we
19	a local currency inflation element. But had	19	would not have taken those cost-cutting measures.
20	Mr Kaczmarek done that, it would have had the effect of	20	So we did not take, like, an unfair advantage by
21	increasing the VAD, and thus increasing the but-for	21	using those most recent costs. We went to pre-breach,
22	scenario cash flows and Claimant's damages.	22	2007, took those actual costs, projected them forward;
23	THE PRESIDENT: Was that one of the four criticisms? Is	23	projecting them forward only using an inflation rate and
24	that one of them?	24	the forecast for the growth in EEGSA's customer base,
25	MS MENAKER: No, because it would have or was it,	25	which also was taken from the Bates White VAD report.
	Page 45		Page 47
11.15 1	actually? I'm sorry	11.12 1	Mr Kaczmarak than had the ERIT earnings before
11:15 1	actually? I'm sorry.	11:18 1	Mr Kaczmarek then had the EBIT, earnings before
2	THE PRESIDENT: Because I kind of have three clear in my	2	interest and taxation, which is just taking the revenues
2 3	THE PRESIDENT: Because I kind of have three clear in my head; the fourth somehow escapes me. So can you, at	2 3	interest and taxation, which is just taking the revenues minus the costs. So then he had to deal with taxes. He
2 3 4	THE PRESIDENT: Because I kind of have three clear in my head; the fourth somehow escapes me. So can you, at some point, refresh my memory of what the four	2 3 4	interest and taxation, which is just taking the revenues minus the costs. So then he had to deal with taxes. He assumed an effective income tax rate of 38%, which was
2 3 4 5	THE PRESIDENT: Because I kind of have three clear in my head; the fourth somehow escapes me. So can you, at some point, refresh my memory of what the four criticisms were.	2 3 4 5	interest and taxation, which is just taking the revenues minus the costs. So then he had to deal with taxes. He assumed an effective income tax rate of 38%, which was based on EEGSA's historical effective tax rate over
2 3 4 5 6	THE PRESIDENT: Because I kind of have three clear in my head; the fourth somehow escapes me. So can you, at some point, refresh my memory of what the four criticisms were.MR GOSIS: If I may, while we are in this small	2 3 4 5 6	interest and taxation, which is just taking the revenues minus the costs. So then he had to deal with taxes. He assumed an effective income tax rate of 38%, which was based on EEGSA's historical effective tax rate over five years prior to the valuation date. We note and
2 3 4 5 6 7	THE PRESIDENT: Because I kind of have three clear in my head; the fourth somehow escapes me. So can you, at some point, refresh my memory of what the four criticisms were.MR GOSIS: If I may, while we are in this small interruption.	2 3 4 5 6 7	interest and taxation, which is just taking the revenues minus the costs. So then he had to deal with taxes. He assumed an effective income tax rate of 38%, which was based on EEGSA's historical effective tax rate over five years prior to the valuation date. We note and this is all in the reports that the corporate tax
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE PRESIDENT: Because I kind of have three clear in my head; the fourth somehow escapes me. So can you, at some point, refresh my memory of what the four criticisms were.MR GOSIS: If I may, while we are in this small interruption.We have refrained from arguing the merits of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	interest and taxation, which is just taking the revenues minus the costs. So then he had to deal with taxes. He assumed an effective income tax rate of 38%, which was based on EEGSA's historical effective tax rate over five years prior to the valuation date. We note and this is all in the reports that the corporate tax rate in Guatemala was 31%. So this was a conservative
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE PRESIDENT: Because I kind of have three clear in my head; the fourth somehow escapes me. So can you, at some point, refresh my memory of what the four criticisms were.MR GOSIS: If I may, while we are in this small interruption.We have refrained from arguing the merits of the damages calculation by one party or the other. You have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	interest and taxation, which is just taking the revenues minus the costs. So then he had to deal with taxes. He assumed an effective income tax rate of 38%, which was based on EEGSA's historical effective tax rate over five years prior to the valuation date. We note and this is all in the reports that the corporate tax rate in Guatemala was 31%. So this was a conservative assumption, because again it results in a reduction in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE PRESIDENT: Because I kind of have three clear in my head; the fourth somehow escapes me. So can you, at some point, refresh my memory of what the four criticisms were.MR GOSIS: If I may, while we are in this small interruption.We have refrained from arguing the merits of the damages calculation by one party or the other. You have the transcript where we've just discussed today. We're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	interest and taxation, which is just taking the revenues minus the costs. So then he had to deal with taxes. He assumed an effective income tax rate of 38%, which was based on EEGSA's historical effective tax rate over five years prior to the valuation date. We note and this is all in the reports that the corporate tax rate in Guatemala was 31%. So this was a conservative assumption, because again it results in a reduction in EEGSA's cash flows.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 THE PRESIDENT: Because I kind of have three clear in my head; the fourth somehow escapes me. So can you, at some point, refresh my memory of what the four criticisms were. MR GOSIS: If I may, while we are in this small interruption. We have refrained from arguing the merits of the damages calculation by one party or the other. You have the transcript where we've just discussed today. We're just looking at the slides: this is what they said, this 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	interest and taxation, which is just taking the revenues minus the costs. So then he had to deal with taxes. He assumed an effective income tax rate of 38%, which was based on EEGSA's historical effective tax rate over five years prior to the valuation date. We note and this is all in the reports that the corporate tax rate in Guatemala was 31%. So this was a conservative assumption, because again it results in a reduction in EEGSA's cash flows. Then he had to deal with capex, capital
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE PRESIDENT: Because I kind of have three clear in my head; the fourth somehow escapes me. So can you, at some point, refresh my memory of what the four criticisms were.MR GOSIS: If I may, while we are in this small interruption.We have refrained from arguing the merits of the damages calculation by one party or the other. You have the transcript where we've just discussed today. We're just looking at the slides: this is what they said, this is what other party said; this is what Mr Kaczmarek	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	interest and taxation, which is just taking the revenues minus the costs. So then he had to deal with taxes. He assumed an effective income tax rate of 38%, which was based on EEGSA's historical effective tax rate over five years prior to the valuation date. We note and this is all in the reports that the corporate tax rate in Guatemala was 31%. So this was a conservative assumption, because again it results in a reduction in EEGSA's cash flows. Then he had to deal with capex, capital expenditures, and he used the capex projections that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 THE PRESIDENT: Because I kind of have three clear in my head; the fourth somehow escapes me. So can you, at some point, refresh my memory of what the four criticisms were. MR GOSIS: If I may, while we are in this small interruption. We have refrained from arguing the merits of the damages calculation by one party or the other. You have the transcript where we've just discussed today. We're just looking at the slides: this is what they said, this is what other party said; this is what Mr Kaczmarek said, this is what [Dr] Abdala said. We did not engage 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	interest and taxation, which is just taking the revenues minus the costs. So then he had to deal with taxes. He assumed an effective income tax rate of 38%, which was based on EEGSA's historical effective tax rate over five years prior to the valuation date. We note and this is all in the reports that the corporate tax rate in Guatemala was 31%. So this was a conservative assumption, because again it results in a reduction in EEGSA's cash flows. Then he had to deal with capex, capital expenditures, and he used the capex projections that were in DECA II's forecast, which is at C-1145. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 THE PRESIDENT: Because I kind of have three clear in my head; the fourth somehow escapes me. So can you, at some point, refresh my memory of what the four criticisms were. MR GOSIS: If I may, while we are in this small interruption. We have refrained from arguing the merits of the damages calculation by one party or the other. You have the transcript where we've just discussed today. We're just looking at the slides: this is what they said, this is what other party said; this is what Mr Kaczmarek said, this is what [Dr] Abdala said. We did not engage in any argument as to reasonableness of Mr Kaczmarek's 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	interest and taxation, which is just taking the revenues minus the costs. So then he had to deal with taxes. He assumed an effective income tax rate of 38%, which was based on EEGSA's historical effective tax rate over five years prior to the valuation date. We note and this is all in the reports that the corporate tax rate in Guatemala was 31%. So this was a conservative assumption, because again it results in a reduction in EEGSA's cash flows. Then he had to deal with capex, capital expenditures, and he used the capex projections that were in DECA II's forecast, which is at C-1145. The Original Tribunal had agreed with his capex forecast,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 THE PRESIDENT: Because I kind of have three clear in my head; the fourth somehow escapes me. So can you, at some point, refresh my memory of what the four criticisms were. MR GOSIS: If I may, while we are in this small interruption. We have refrained from arguing the merits of the damages calculation by one party or the other. You have the transcript where we've just discussed today. We're just looking at the slides: this is what they said, this is what other party said; this is what Mr Kaczmarek said, this is what [Dr] Abdala said. We did not engage in any argument as to reasonableness of Mr Kaczmarek's calculations or not. And we are hearing now a litany of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	interest and taxation, which is just taking the revenues minus the costs. So then he had to deal with taxes. He assumed an effective income tax rate of 38%, which was based on EEGSA's historical effective tax rate over five years prior to the valuation date. We note and this is all in the reports that the corporate tax rate in Guatemala was 31%. So this was a conservative assumption, because again it results in a reduction in EEGSA's cash flows. Then he had to deal with capex, capital expenditures, and he used the capex projections that were in DECA II's forecast, which is at C-1145. The Original Tribunal had agreed with his capex forecast, which was also used for the earlier period, and it was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 THE PRESIDENT: Because I kind of have three clear in my head; the fourth somehow escapes me. So can you, at some point, refresh my memory of what the four criticisms were. MR GOSIS: If I may, while we are in this small interruption. We have refrained from arguing the merits of the damages calculation by one party or the other. You have the transcript where we've just discussed today. We're just looking at the slides: this is what they said, this is what other party said; this is what Mr Kaczmarek said, this is what [Dr] Abdala said. We did not engage in any argument as to reasonableness of Mr Kaczmarek's calculations or not. And we are hearing now a litany of criticisms to [Dr] Abdala's calculations, which I think 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	interest and taxation, which is just taking the revenues minus the costs. So then he had to deal with taxes. He assumed an effective income tax rate of 38%, which was based on EEGSA's historical effective tax rate over five years prior to the valuation date. We note and this is all in the reports that the corporate tax rate in Guatemala was 31%. So this was a conservative assumption, because again it results in a reduction in EEGSA's cash flows. Then he had to deal with capex, capital expenditures, and he used the capex projections that were in DECA II's forecast, which is at C-1145. The Original Tribunal had agreed with his capex forecast, which was also used for the earlier period, and it was not disputed by the Respondent's experts in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 THE PRESIDENT: Because I kind of have three clear in my head; the fourth somehow escapes me. So can you, at some point, refresh my memory of what the four criticisms were. MR GOSIS: If I may, while we are in this small interruption. We have refrained from arguing the merits of the damages calculation by one party or the other. You have the transcript where we've just discussed today. We're just looking at the slides: this is what they said, this is what other party said; this is what Mr Kaczmarek said, this is what [Dr] Abdala said. We did not engage in any argument as to reasonableness of Mr Kaczmarek's calculations or not. And we are hearing now a litany of criticisms to [Dr] Abdala's calculations, which I think are beyond the scope of seeing what one side or the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	interest and taxation, which is just taking the revenues minus the costs. So then he had to deal with taxes. He assumed an effective income tax rate of 38%, which was based on EEGSA's historical effective tax rate over five years prior to the valuation date. We note and this is all in the reports that the corporate tax rate in Guatemala was 31%. So this was a conservative assumption, because again it results in a reduction in EEGSA's cash flows. Then he had to deal with capex, capital expenditures, and he used the capex projections that were in DECA II's forecast, which is at C-1145. The Original Tribunal had agreed with his capex forecast, which was also used for the earlier period, and it was not disputed by the Respondent's experts in the resubmitted arbitration or at any other time.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 THE PRESIDENT: Because I kind of have three clear in my head; the fourth somehow escapes me. So can you, at some point, refresh my memory of what the four criticisms were. MR GOSIS: If I may, while we are in this small interruption. We have refrained from arguing the merits of the damages calculation by one party or the other. You have the transcript where we've just discussed today. We're just looking at the slides: this is what they said, this is what other party said; this is what Mr Kaczmarek said, this is what [Dr] Abdala said. We did not engage in any argument as to reasonableness of Mr Kaczmarek's calculations or not. And we are hearing now a litany of criticisms to [Dr] Abdala's calculations, which I think are beyond the scope of seeing what one side or the other was saying. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	interest and taxation, which is just taking the revenues minus the costs. So then he had to deal with taxes. He assumed an effective income tax rate of 38%, which was based on EEGSA's historical effective tax rate over five years prior to the valuation date. We note and this is all in the reports that the corporate tax rate in Guatemala was 31%. So this was a conservative assumption, because again it results in a reduction in EEGSA's cash flows. Then he had to deal with capex, capital expenditures, and he used the capex projections that were in DECA II's forecast, which is at C-1145. The Original Tribunal had agreed with his capex forecast, which was also used for the earlier period, and it was not disputed by the Respondent's experts in the resubmitted arbitration or at any other time. He then added back in depreciation and amortisation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 THE PRESIDENT: Because I kind of have three clear in my head; the fourth somehow escapes me. So can you, at some point, refresh my memory of what the four criticisms were. MR GOSIS: If I may, while we are in this small interruption. We have refrained from arguing the merits of the damages calculation by one party or the other. You have the transcript where we've just discussed today. We're just looking at the slides: this is what they said, this is what other party said; this is what Mr Kaczmarek said, this is what [Dr] Abdala said. We did not engage in any argument as to reasonableness of Mr Kaczmarek's calculations or not. And we are hearing now a litany of criticisms to [Dr] Abdala's calculations, which I think are beyond the scope of seeing what one side or the other was saying. If it's irrelevant to the Committee, then 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	interest and taxation, which is just taking the revenues minus the costs. So then he had to deal with taxes. He assumed an effective income tax rate of 38%, which was based on EEGSA's historical effective tax rate over five years prior to the valuation date. We note and this is all in the reports that the corporate tax rate in Guatemala was 31%. So this was a conservative assumption, because again it results in a reduction in EEGSA's cash flows. Then he had to deal with capex, capital expenditures, and he used the capex projections that were in DECA II's forecast, which is at C-1145. The Original Tribunal had agreed with his capex forecast, which was also used for the earlier period, and it was not disputed by the Respondent's experts in the resubmitted arbitration or at any other time. He then added back in depreciation and amortisation as non-cash expenses. And then the projections are
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 THE PRESIDENT: Because I kind of have three clear in my head; the fourth somehow escapes me. So can you, at some point, refresh my memory of what the four criticisms were. MR GOSIS: If I may, while we are in this small interruption. We have refrained from arguing the merits of the damages calculation by one party or the other. You have the transcript where we've just discussed today. We're just looking at the slides: this is what they said, this is what other party said; this is what Mr Kaczmarek said, this is what [Dr] Abdala said. We did not engage in any argument as to reasonableness of Mr Kaczmarek's calculations or not. And we are hearing now a litany of criticisms to [Dr] Abdala's calculations, which I think are beyond the scope of seeing what one side or the other was saying. If it's irrelevant to the Committee, then THE PRESIDENT: I haven't heard anything that I deem 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	interest and taxation, which is just taking the revenues minus the costs. So then he had to deal with taxes. He assumed an effective income tax rate of 38%, which was based on EEGSA's historical effective tax rate over five years prior to the valuation date. We note and this is all in the reports that the corporate tax rate in Guatemala was 31%. So this was a conservative assumption, because again it results in a reduction in EEGSA's cash flows. Then he had to deal with capex, capital expenditures, and he used the capex projections that were in DECA II's forecast, which is at C-1145. The Original Tribunal had agreed with his capex forecast, which was also used for the earlier period, and it was not disputed by the Respondent's experts in the resubmitted arbitration or at any other time. He then added back in depreciation and amortisation as non-cash expenses. And then the projections are based on the capex projections and the anticipated
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 THE PRESIDENT: Because I kind of have three clear in my head; the fourth somehow escapes me. So can you, at some point, refresh my memory of what the four criticisms were. MR GOSIS: If I may, while we are in this small interruption. We have refrained from arguing the merits of the damages calculation by one party or the other. You have the transcript where we've just discussed today. We're just looking at the slides: this is what they said, this is what other party said; this is what Mr Kaczmarek said, this is what [Dr] Abdala said. We did not engage in any argument as to reasonableness of Mr Kaczmarek's calculations or not. And we are hearing now a litany of criticisms to [Dr] Abdala's calculations, which I think are beyond the scope of seeing what one side or the other was saying. If it's irrelevant to the Committee, then THE PRESIDENT: I haven't heard anything that I deem improper. So please do continue. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	interest and taxation, which is just taking the revenues minus the costs. So then he had to deal with taxes. He assumed an effective income tax rate of 38%, which was based on EEGSA's historical effective tax rate over five years prior to the valuation date. We note and this is all in the reports that the corporate tax rate in Guatemala was 31%. So this was a conservative assumption, because again it results in a reduction in EEGSA's cash flows. Then he had to deal with capex, capital expenditures, and he used the capex projections that were in DECA II's forecast, which is at C-1145. The Original Tribunal had agreed with his capex forecast, which was also used for the earlier period, and it was not disputed by the Respondent's experts in the resubmitted arbitration or at any other time. He then added back in depreciation and amortisation as non-cash expenses. And then the projections are based on the capex projections and the anticipated useful life of the assets of the company. And then
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 THE PRESIDENT: Because I kind of have three clear in my head; the fourth somehow escapes me. So can you, at some point, refresh my memory of what the four criticisms were. MR GOSIS: If I may, while we are in this small interruption. We have refrained from arguing the merits of the damages calculation by one party or the other. You have the transcript where we've just discussed today. We're just looking at the slides: this is what they said, this is what other party said; this is what Mr Kaczmarek said, this is what [Dr] Abdala said. We did not engage in any argument as to reasonableness of Mr Kaczmarek's calculations or not. And we are hearing now a litany of criticisms to [Dr] Abdala's calculations, which I think are beyond the scope of seeing what one side or the other was saying. If it's irrelevant to the Committee, then THE PRESIDENT: I haven't heard anything that I deem improper. So please do continue. MS MENAKER: Thank you. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	interest and taxation, which is just taking the revenues minus the costs. So then he had to deal with taxes. He assumed an effective income tax rate of 38%, which was based on EEGSA's historical effective tax rate over five years prior to the valuation date. We note and this is all in the reports that the corporate tax rate in Guatemala was 31%. So this was a conservative assumption, because again it results in a reduction in EEGSA's cash flows. Then he had to deal with capex, capital expenditures, and he used the capex projections that were in DECA II's forecast, which is at C-1145. The Original Tribunal had agreed with his capex forecast, which was also used for the earlier period, and it was not disputed by the Respondent's experts in the resubmitted arbitration or at any other time. He then added back in depreciation and amortisation as non-cash expenses. And then the projections are based on the capex projections and the anticipated useful life of the assets of the company. And then finally, there was an adjustment for working capital,
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 THE PRESIDENT: Because I kind of have three clear in my head; the fourth somehow escapes me. So can you, at some point, refresh my memory of what the four criticisms were. MR GOSIS: If I may, while we are in this small interruption. We have refrained from arguing the merits of the damages calculation by one party or the other. You have the transcript where we've just discussed today. We're just looking at the slides: this is what they said, this is what other party said; this is what Mr Kaczmarek said, this is what [Dr] Abdala said. We did not engage in any argument as to reasonableness of Mr Kaczmarek's calculations or not. And we are hearing now a litany of criticisms to [Dr] Abdala's calculations, which I think are beyond the scope of seeing what one side or the other was saying. If it's irrelevant to the Committee, then THE PRESIDENT: I haven't heard anything that I deem improper. So please do continue. MS MENAKER: Thank you. So that was on the revenue side. So then he had to 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	interest and taxation, which is just taking the revenues minus the costs. So then he had to deal with taxes. He assumed an effective income tax rate of 38%, which was based on EEGSA's historical effective tax rate over five years prior to the valuation date. We note and this is all in the reports that the corporate tax rate in Guatemala was 31%. So this was a conservative assumption, because again it results in a reduction in EEGSA's cash flows. Then he had to deal with capex, capital expenditures, and he used the capex projections that were in DECA II's forecast, which is at C-1145. The Original Tribunal had agreed with his capex forecast, which was also used for the earlier period, and it was not disputed by the Respondent's experts in the resubmitted arbitration or at any other time. He then added back in depreciation and amortisation as non-cash expenses. And then the projections are based on the capex projections and the anticipated useful life of the assets of the company. And then finally, there was an adjustment for working capital, and then that gave you the free cash flows to the firm.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 THE PRESIDENT: Because I kind of have three clear in my head; the fourth somehow escapes me. So can you, at some point, refresh my memory of what the four criticisms were. MR GOSIS: If I may, while we are in this small interruption. We have refrained from arguing the merits of the damages calculation by one party or the other. You have the transcript where we've just discussed today. We're just looking at the slides: this is what they said, this is what other party said; this is what Mr Kaczmarek said, this is what [Dr] Abdala said. We did not engage in any argument as to reasonableness of Mr Kaczmarek's calculations or not. And we are hearing now a litany of criticisms to [Dr] Abdala's calculations, which I think are beyond the scope of seeing what one side or the other was saying. If it's irrelevant to the Committee, then THE PRESIDENT: I haven't heard anything that I deem improper. So please do continue. MS MENAKER: Thank you. So that was on the revenue side. So then he had to forecast the costs in the but-for scenario from 2010 to 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	interest and taxation, which is just taking the revenues minus the costs. So then he had to deal with taxes. He assumed an effective income tax rate of 38%, which was based on EEGSA's historical effective tax rate over five years prior to the valuation date. We note and this is all in the reports that the corporate tax rate in Guatemala was 31%. So this was a conservative assumption, because again it results in a reduction in EEGSA's cash flows. Then he had to deal with capex, capital expenditures, and he used the capex projections that were in DECA II's forecast, which is at C-1145. The Original Tribunal had agreed with his capex forecast, which was also used for the earlier period, and it was not disputed by the Respondent's experts in the resubmitted arbitration or at any other time. He then added back in depreciation and amortisation as non-cash expenses. And then the projections are based on the capex projections and the anticipated useful life of the assets of the company. And then finally, there was an adjustment for working capital, and then that gave you the free cash flows to the firm. Then you took those free cash flows and you have to
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 THE PRESIDENT: Because I kind of have three clear in my head; the fourth somehow escapes me. So can you, at some point, refresh my memory of what the four criticisms were. MR GOSIS: If I may, while we are in this small interruption. We have refrained from arguing the merits of the damages calculation by one party or the other. You have the transcript where we've just discussed today. We're just looking at the slides: this is what they said, this is what other party said; this is what Mr Kaczmarek said, this is what [Dr] Abdala said. We did not engage in any argument as to reasonableness of Mr Kaczmarek's calculations or not. And we are hearing now a litany of criticisms to [Dr] Abdala's calculations, which I think are beyond the scope of seeing what one side or the other was saying. If it's irrelevant to the Committee, then THE PRESIDENT: I haven't heard anything that I deem improper. So please do continue. MS MENAKER: Thank you. So that was on the revenue side. So then he had to 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	interest and taxation, which is just taking the revenues minus the costs. So then he had to deal with taxes. He assumed an effective income tax rate of 38%, which was based on EEGSA's historical effective tax rate over five years prior to the valuation date. We note and this is all in the reports that the corporate tax rate in Guatemala was 31%. So this was a conservative assumption, because again it results in a reduction in EEGSA's cash flows. Then he had to deal with capex, capital expenditures, and he used the capex projections that were in DECA II's forecast, which is at C-1145. The Original Tribunal had agreed with his capex forecast, which was also used for the earlier period, and it was not disputed by the Respondent's experts in the resubmitted arbitration or at any other time. He then added back in depreciation and amortisation as non-cash expenses. And then the projections are based on the capex projections and the anticipated useful life of the assets of the company. And then finally, there was an adjustment for working capital, and then that gave you the free cash flows to the firm.

11:20	1	discount rate. The discount rate was EECS A's WACC	11:23 1	It's alide 67 of our presentation to day, taken from
11:20		discount rate. The discount rate was EEGSA's WACC.		It's slide 67 of our presentation today, taken from
	2	EEGSA's WACC, also it's actually calculated by the	2	pages 8 and 9 of the fourth Compass report in the $(DEA 20)$ V_{c} illust the fourth of the fourt
	3	regulatory agency, the CNEE: they put out a resolution.	3	resubmission (REA-29). You will see there are four
	4	Because pursuant to the resolution, the WACC is also	4	elements being discussed. There is (i), "Cash flows and
	5	supposed to be the rate of return. And there's	5	discount rate". And basically, you have here the
	6	a ceiling and a floor: I believe it needed to fall	6	discussion. TECO was a shareholder of EEGSA, and so the
	7	within 7-13%, and EEGSA's WACC was 8.8% for that time.	7	cash flows should be
	8	So it's discounted back at that time, and there was no	8	THE PRESIDENT: Give me one minute, if possible.
	9	dispute between the parties' experts or parties on the	9	MR GOSIS: Sure. (Pause)
	10	discount rate.	10	THE PRESIDENT: Yes.
	11	So that was how he calculated the but-for cash flows	11	MR GOSIS: Thank you.
	12	for that period.	12	So the first one is the "Cash flows and discount
	13	THE PRESIDENT: Were [Dr] Abdala's criticisms regarding the	13	rate". TECO was a shareholder to EEGSA, so any damages
	14	calculation of the free cash flows new in the	14	it could claim should be free cash flows to the
	15	resubmission proceedings?	15	shareholder. The Committee will remember there was
	16	MS MENAKER: Yes. In the original proceeding there was no	16	a net debt in the range of \$87 million at EEGSA. So of
	17	criticism that the cash flows had been calculated to the	17	course that is a significant difference if you measure
	18	firm. It was in the resubmission proceeding that he	18	cash flows to the entity or cash flows to the
	19	argued that they should have been calculated to the	19	shareholder.
	20	shareholder rather than to the firm. So that was a new	20	The second one is "Operating Costs", you have in
	21	criticism that was first raised in the resubmission	21	(ii) here. Basically here what Dr Abdala is saying is
	22	proceeding.	22	the valuation by Mr Kaczmarek uses its own assumptions
	23	THE PRESIDENT: And the other three?	23	instead of the ones that the Original Tribunal had used
	24	MS MENAKER: They were all new for the resubmission	24	for calculation of the historical losses. If you were
	25	proceeding.	25	to use the Bates White VAD calculation, this is the
		Page 49		Page 51
		rage 49		rage 51
11:21	1	THE PRESIDENT: They were new?	11:25 1	result it should have obtained, instead of the own
11:21		THE PRESIDENT: They were new? MS MENAKER: Yes.	11:25 1	result it should have obtained, instead of the own assumptions by Mr Kaczmarek.
11:21	2	MS MENAKER: Yes.	2	assumptions by Mr Kaczmarek.
11:21	2 3	MS MENAKER: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Of course, because Dr Abdala's standpoint	2 3	assumptions by Mr Kaczmarek. (Slide 68) The third one is and this is the third
11:21	2 3 4	MS MENAKER: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Of course, because Dr Abdala's standpoint before was: it's impossible to project anything. And	2 3 4	assumptions by Mr Kaczmarek. (Slide 68) The third one is and this is the third and fourth. You will remember a snippet from the
11:21	2 3 4 5	MS MENAKER: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Of course, because Dr Abdala's standpoint before was: it's impossible to project anything. And now there was at least certainty that the breach had	2 3 4 5	assumptions by Mr Kaczmarek. (Slide 68) The third one is and this is the third and fourth. You will remember a snippet from the transcript of the resubmission hearing and the questions
11:21	2 3 4 5 6	MS MENAKER: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Of course, because Dr Abdala's standpoint before was: it's impossible to project anything. And now there was at least certainty that the breach had occurred. Is that?	2 3 4 5 6	assumptions by Mr Kaczmarek. (Slide 68) The third one is and this is the third and fourth. You will remember a snippet from the transcript of the resubmission hearing and the questions by Dr Alexandrov was to whether or not these were
11:21	2 3 4 5 6 7	MS MENAKER: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Of course, because Dr Abdala's standpoint before was: it's impossible to project anything. And now there was at least certainty that the breach had occurred. Is that? MS MENAKER: Not quite, Madam President. Because when he	2 3 4 5 6 7	assumptions by Mr Kaczmarek. (Slide 68) The third one is and this is the third and fourth. You will remember a snippet from the transcript of the resubmission hearing and the questions by Dr Alexandrov was to whether or not these were "washed out".
11:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS MENAKER: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Of course, because Dr Abdala's standpoint before was: it's impossible to project anything. And now there was at least certainty that the breach had occurred. Is that? MS MENAKER: Not quite, Madam President. Because when he was saying it was impossible to do anything, that was at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	assumptions by Mr Kaczmarek. (Slide 68) The third one is and this is the third and fourth. You will remember a snippet from the transcript of the resubmission hearing and the questions by Dr Alexandrov was to whether or not these were "washed out". There is the "Elasticity effect". And Dr Abdala
11:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS MENAKER: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Of course, because Dr Abdala's standpoint before was: it's impossible to project anything. And now there was at least certainty that the breach had occurred. Is that? MS MENAKER: Not quite, Madam President. Because when he was saying it was impossible to do anything, that was at the resubmission hearing.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	assumptions by Mr Kaczmarek. (Slide 68) The third one is and this is the third and fourth. You will remember a snippet from the transcript of the resubmission hearing and the questions by Dr Alexandrov was to whether or not these were "washed out". There is the "Elasticity effect". And Dr Abdala says: well, the Original Tribunal does not address these
11:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS MENAKER: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Of course, because Dr Abdala's standpoint before was: it's impossible to project anything. And now there was at least certainty that the breach had occurred. Is that? MS MENAKER: Not quite, Madam President. Because when he was saying it was impossible to do anything, that was at the resubmission hearing. THE PRESIDENT: Oh, already? I'm sorry.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	assumptions by Mr Kaczmarek. (Slide 68) The third one is and this is the third and fourth. You will remember a snippet from the transcript of the resubmission hearing and the questions by Dr Alexandrov was to whether or not these were "washed out". There is the "Elasticity effect". And Dr Abdala says: well, the Original Tribunal does not address these elasticity effects:
11:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS MENAKER: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Of course, because Dr Abdala's standpoint before was: it's impossible to project anything. And now there was at least certainty that the breach had occurred. Is that? MS MENAKER: Not quite, Madam President. Because when he was saying it was impossible to do anything, that was at the resubmission hearing. THE PRESIDENT: Oh, already? I'm sorry. MS MENAKER: That was the resubmission hearing. So he had	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	assumptions by Mr Kaczmarek. (Slide 68) The third one is and this is the third and fourth. You will remember a snippet from the transcript of the resubmission hearing and the questions by Dr Alexandrov was to whether or not these were "washed out". There is the "Elasticity effect". And Dr Abdala says: well, the Original Tribunal does not address these elasticity effects: " since in the historical period these errors are
11:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS MENAKER: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Of course, because Dr Abdala's standpoint before was: it's impossible to project anything. And now there was at least certainty that the breach had occurred. Is that? MS MENAKER: Not quite, Madam President. Because when he was saying it was impossible to do anything, that was at the resubmission hearing. THE PRESIDENT: Oh, already? I'm sorry. MS MENAKER: That was the resubmission hearing. So he had calculated again, he had made a calculation of TECO's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	assumptions by Mr Kaczmarek. (Slide 68) The third one is and this is the third and fourth. You will remember a snippet from the transcript of the resubmission hearing and the questions by Dr Alexandrov was to whether or not these were "washed out". There is the "Elasticity effect". And Dr Abdala says: well, the Original Tribunal does not address these elasticity effects: " since in the historical period these errors are not present; they only appear in the projections for
11:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 MS MENAKER: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Of course, because Dr Abdala's standpoint before was: it's impossible to project anything. And now there was at least certainty that the breach had occurred. Is that? MS MENAKER: Not quite, Madam President. Because when he was saying it was impossible to do anything, that was at the resubmission hearing. THE PRESIDENT: Oh, already? I'm sorry. MS MENAKER: That was the resubmission hearing. So he had calculated again, he had made a calculation of TECO's damages in the original arbitration and he had raised 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	assumptions by Mr Kaczmarek. (Slide 68) The third one is and this is the third and fourth. You will remember a snippet from the transcript of the resubmission hearing and the questions by Dr Alexandrov was to whether or not these were "washed out". There is the "Elasticity effect". And Dr Abdala says: well, the Original Tribunal does not address these elasticity effects: " since in the historical period these errors are not present; they only appear in the projections for 2010 onwards."
11:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 MS MENAKER: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Of course, because Dr Abdala's standpoint before was: it's impossible to project anything. And now there was at least certainty that the breach had occurred. Is that? MS MENAKER: Not quite, Madam President. Because when he was saying it was impossible to do anything, that was at the resubmission hearing. THE PRESIDENT: Oh, already? I'm sorry. MS MENAKER: That was the resubmission hearing. So he had calculated again, he had made a calculation of TECO's damages in the original arbitration and he had raised a number of different issues. He did not raise any of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	assumptions by Mr Kaczmarek. (Slide 68) The third one is and this is the third and fourth. You will remember a snippet from the transcript of the resubmission hearing and the questions by Dr Alexandrov was to whether or not these were "washed out". There is the "Elasticity effect". And Dr Abdala says: well, the Original Tribunal does not address these elasticity effects: " since in the historical period these errors are not present; they only appear in the projections for 2010 onwards." I'm reading halfway through the paragraph there.
11:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 MS MENAKER: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Of course, because Dr Abdala's standpoint before was: it's impossible to project anything. And now there was at least certainty that the breach had occurred. Is that? MS MENAKER: Not quite, Madam President. Because when he was saying it was impossible to do anything, that was at the resubmission hearing. THE PRESIDENT: Oh, already? I'm sorry. MS MENAKER: That was the resubmission hearing. So he had calculated again, he had made a calculation of TECO's damages in the original arbitration and he had raised a number of different issues. He did not raise any of these issues. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	assumptions by Mr Kaczmarek. (Slide 68) The third one is and this is the third and fourth. You will remember a snippet from the transcript of the resubmission hearing and the questions by Dr Alexandrov was to whether or not these were "washed out". There is the "Elasticity effect". And Dr Abdala says: well, the Original Tribunal does not address these elasticity effects: " since in the historical period these errors are not present; they only appear in the projections for 2010 onwards." I'm reading halfway through the paragraph there. The fourth one, "Converting the [value added to
11:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 MS MENAKER: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Of course, because Dr Abdala's standpoint before was: it's impossible to project anything. And now there was at least certainty that the breach had occurred. Is that? MS MENAKER: Not quite, Madam President. Because when he was saying it was impossible to do anything, that was at the resubmission hearing. THE PRESIDENT: Oh, already? I'm sorry. MS MENAKER: That was the resubmission hearing. So he had calculated again, he had made a calculation of TECO's damages in the original arbitration and he had raised a number of different issues. He did not raise any of these issues. So those issues and criticisms that he raised in the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	assumptions by Mr Kaczmarek. (Slide 68) The third one is and this is the third and fourth. You will remember a snippet from the transcript of the resubmission hearing and the questions by Dr Alexandrov was to whether or not these were "washed out". There is the "Elasticity effect". And Dr Abdala says: well, the Original Tribunal does not address these elasticity effects: " since in the historical period these errors are not present; they only appear in the projections for 2010 onwards." I'm reading halfway through the paragraph there. The fourth one, "Converting the [value added to distributor] to nominal monetary terms". (Pause)
11:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 MS MENAKER: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Of course, because Dr Abdala's standpoint before was: it's impossible to project anything. And now there was at least certainty that the breach had occurred. Is that? MS MENAKER: Not quite, Madam President. Because when he was saying it was impossible to do anything, that was at the resubmission hearing. THE PRESIDENT: Oh, already? I'm sorry. MS MENAKER: That was the resubmission hearing. So he had calculated again, he had made a calculation of TECO's damages in the original arbitration and he had raised a number of different issues. He did not raise any of these issues. So those issues and criticisms that he raised in the original arbitration were all fully ventilated by the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	assumptions by Mr Kaczmarek. (Slide 68) The third one is and this is the third and fourth. You will remember a snippet from the transcript of the resubmission hearing and the questions by Dr Alexandrov was to whether or not these were "washed out". There is the "Elasticity effect". And Dr Abdala says: well, the Original Tribunal does not address these elasticity effects: " since in the historical period these errors are not present; they only appear in the projections for 2010 onwards." I'm reading halfway through the paragraph there. The fourth one, "Converting the [value added to distributor] to nominal monetary terms". (Pause) Let's go to (iv) now, "Converting the VAD to nominal
11:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 MS MENAKER: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Of course, because Dr Abdala's standpoint before was: it's impossible to project anything. And now there was at least certainty that the breach had occurred. Is that? MS MENAKER: Not quite, Madam President. Because when he was saying it was impossible to do anything, that was at the resubmission hearing. THE PRESIDENT: Oh, already? I'm sorry. MS MENAKER: That was the resubmission hearing. So he had calculated again, he had made a calculation of TECO's damages in the original arbitration and he had raised a number of different issues. He did not raise any of these issues. So those issues and criticisms that he raised in the original arbitration were all fully ventilated by the parties. The Tribunal then adopted Mr Kaczmarek's 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	assumptions by Mr Kaczmarek. (Slide 68) The third one is and this is the third and fourth. You will remember a snippet from the transcript of the resubmission hearing and the questions by Dr Alexandrov was to whether or not these were "washed out". There is the "Elasticity effect". And Dr Abdala says: well, the Original Tribunal does not address these elasticity effects: " since in the historical period these errors are not present; they only appear in the projections for 2010 onwards." I'm reading halfway through the paragraph there. The fourth one, "Converting the [value added to distributor] to nominal monetary terms". (Pause) Let's go to (iv) now, "Converting the VAD to nominal monetary terms". And these are the two, 3.7, 3.8, that
11:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 MS MENAKER: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Of course, because Dr Abdala's standpoint before was: it's impossible to project anything. And now there was at least certainty that the breach had occurred. Is that? MS MENAKER: Not quite, Madam President. Because when he was saying it was impossible to do anything, that was at the resubmission hearing. THE PRESIDENT: Oh, already? I'm sorry. MS MENAKER: That was the resubmission hearing. So he had calculated again, he had made a calculation of TECO's damages in the original arbitration and he had raised a number of different issues. He did not raise any of these issues. So those issues and criticisms that he raised in the original arbitration were all fully ventilated by the parties. The Tribunal then adopted Mr Kaczmarek's model. And then, coming back, he is raising these new 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 assumptions by Mr Kaczmarek. (Slide 68) The third one is and this is the third and fourth. You will remember a snippet from the transcript of the resubmission hearing and the questions by Dr Alexandrov was to whether or not these were "washed out". There is the "Elasticity effect". And Dr Abdala says: well, the Original Tribunal does not address these elasticity effects: " since in the historical period these errors are not present; they only appear in the projections for 2010 onwards." I'm reading halfway through the paragraph there. The fourth one, "Converting the [value added to distributor] to nominal monetary terms". (Pause) Let's go to (iv) now, "Converting the VAD to nominal monetary terms". And these are the two, 3.7, 3.8, that that net out in a balance of the 0.1 million.
11:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 MS MENAKER: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Of course, because Dr Abdala's standpoint before was: it's impossible to project anything. And now there was at least certainty that the breach had occurred. Is that? MS MENAKER: Not quite, Madam President. Because when he was saying it was impossible to do anything, that was at the resubmission hearing. THE PRESIDENT: Oh, already? I'm sorry. MS MENAKER: That was the resubmission hearing. So he had calculated again, he had made a calculation of TECO's damages in the original arbitration and he had raised a number of different issues. He did not raise any of these issues. So those issues and criticisms that he raised in the original arbitration were all fully ventilated by the parties. The Tribunal then adopted Mr Kaczmarek's model. And then, coming back, he is raising these new four additional criticisms that had not been made 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 assumptions by Mr Kaczmarek. (Slide 68) The third one is and this is the third and fourth. You will remember a snippet from the transcript of the resubmission hearing and the questions by Dr Alexandrov was to whether or not these were "washed out". There is the "Elasticity effect". And Dr Abdala says: well, the Original Tribunal does not address these elasticity effects: " since in the historical period these errors are not present; they only appear in the projections for 2010 onwards." I'm reading halfway through the paragraph there. The fourth one, "Converting the [value added to distributor] to nominal monetary terms". (Pause) Let's go to (iv) now, "Converting the VAD to nominal monetary terms". And these are the two, 3.7, 3.8, that that net out in a balance of the 0.1 million. So issues (i) plus (ii) minus (iii) plus (iv) result
11:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 MS MENAKER: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Of course, because Dr Abdala's standpoint before was: it's impossible to project anything. And now there was at least certainty that the breach had occurred. Is that? MS MENAKER: Not quite, Madam President. Because when he was saying it was impossible to do anything, that was at the resubmission hearing. THE PRESIDENT: Oh, already? I'm sorry. MS MENAKER: That was the resubmission hearing. So he had calculated again, he had made a calculation of TECO's damages in the original arbitration and he had raised a number of different issues. He did not raise any of these issues. So those issues and criticisms that he raised in the original arbitration were all fully ventilated by the parties. The Tribunal then adopted Mr Kaczmarek's model. And then, coming back, he is raising these new four additional criticisms that had not been made before. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 assumptions by Mr Kaczmarek. (Slide 68) The third one is and this is the third and fourth. You will remember a snippet from the transcript of the resubmission hearing and the questions by Dr Alexandrov was to whether or not these were "washed out". There is the "Elasticity effect". And Dr Abdala says: well, the Original Tribunal does not address these elasticity effects: " since in the historical period these errors are not present; they only appear in the projections for 2010 onwards." I'm reading halfway through the paragraph there. The fourth one, "Converting the [value added to distributor] to nominal monetary terms". (Pause) Let's go to (iv) now, "Converting the VAD to nominal monetary terms". And these are the two, 3.7, 3.8, that that net out in a balance of the 0.1 million. So issues (i) plus (ii) minus (iii) plus (iv) result in the difference between the 26.8 and the 18.6.
11:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 MS MENAKER: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Of course, because Dr Abdala's standpoint before was: it's impossible to project anything. And now there was at least certainty that the breach had occurred. Is that? MS MENAKER: Not quite, Madam President. Because when he was saying it was impossible to do anything, that was at the resubmission hearing. THE PRESIDENT: Oh, already? I'm sorry. MS MENAKER: That was the resubmission hearing. So he had calculated again, he had made a calculation of TECO's damages in the original arbitration and he had raised a number of different issues. He did not raise any of these issues. So those issues and criticisms that he raised in the original arbitration were all fully ventilated by the parties. The Tribunal then adopted Mr Kaczmarek's model. And then, coming back, he is raising these new four additional criticisms that had not been made before. THE PRESIDENT: You wanted to ask something? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 assumptions by Mr Kaczmarek. (Slide 68) The third one is and this is the third and fourth. You will remember a snippet from the transcript of the resubmission hearing and the questions by Dr Alexandrov was to whether or not these were "washed out". There is the "Elasticity effect". And Dr Abdala says: well, the Original Tribunal does not address these elasticity effects: " since in the historical period these errors are not present; they only appear in the projections for 2010 onwards." I'm reading halfway through the paragraph there. The fourth one, "Converting the [value added to distributor] to nominal monetary terms". (Pause) Let's go to (iv) now, "Converting the VAD to nominal monetary terms". And these are the two, 3.7, 3.8, that that net out in a balance of the 0.1 million. So issues (i) plus (ii) minus (iii) plus (iv) result in the difference between the 26.8 and the 18.6. THE PRESIDENT: The 8 million.
11:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 MS MENAKER: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Of course, because Dr Abdala's standpoint before was: it's impossible to project anything. And now there was at least certainty that the breach had occurred. Is that? MS MENAKER: Not quite, Madam President. Because when he was saying it was impossible to do anything, that was at the resubmission hearing. THE PRESIDENT: Oh, already? I'm sorry. MS MENAKER: That was the resubmission hearing. So he had calculated again, he had made a calculation of TECO's damages in the original arbitration and he had raised a number of different issues. He did not raise any of these issues. So those issues and criticisms that he raised in the original arbitration were all fully ventilated by the parties. The Tribunal then adopted Mr Kaczmarek's model. And then, coming back, he is raising these new four additional criticisms that had not been made before. THE PRESIDENT: You wanted to ask something? MR GOSIS: Yes, in response to your question before, where 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 assumptions by Mr Kaczmarek. (Slide 68) The third one is and this is the third and fourth. You will remember a snippet from the transcript of the resubmission hearing and the questions by Dr Alexandrov was to whether or not these were "washed out". There is the "Elasticity effect". And Dr Abdala says: well, the Original Tribunal does not address these elasticity effects: " since in the historical period these errors are not present; they only appear in the projections for 2010 onwards." I'm reading halfway through the paragraph there. The fourth one, "Converting the [value added to distributor] to nominal monetary terms". (Pause) Let's go to (iv) now, "Converting the VAD to nominal monetary terms". And these are the two, 3.7, 3.8, that that net out in a balance of the 0.1 million. So issues (i) plus (ii) minus (iii) plus (iv) result in the difference between the 26.8 and the 18.6. THE PRESIDENT: The 8 million. MR GOSIS: Yes. Thank you so much.
11:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 MS MENAKER: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Of course, because Dr Abdala's standpoint before was: it's impossible to project anything. And now there was at least certainty that the breach had occurred. Is that? MS MENAKER: Not quite, Madam President. Because when he was saying it was impossible to do anything, that was at the resubmission hearing. THE PRESIDENT: Oh, already? I'm sorry. MS MENAKER: That was the resubmission hearing. So he had calculated again, he had made a calculation of TECO's damages in the original arbitration and he had raised a number of different issues. He did not raise any of these issues. So those issues and criticisms that he raised in the original arbitration were all fully ventilated by the parties. The Tribunal then adopted Mr Kaczmarek's model. And then, coming back, he is raising these new four additional criticisms that had not been made before. THE PRESIDENT: You wanted to ask something? MR GOSIS: Yes, in response to your question before, where we would have these four and why there were four. And 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 assumptions by Mr Kaczmarek. (Slide 68) The third one is and this is the third and fourth. You will remember a snippet from the transcript of the resubmission hearing and the questions by Dr Alexandrov was to whether or not these were "washed out". There is the "Elasticity effect". And Dr Abdala says: well, the Original Tribunal does not address these elasticity effects: " since in the historical period these errors are not present; they only appear in the projections for 2010 onwards." The reading halfway through the paragraph there. The fourth one, "Converting the [value added to distributor] to nominal monetary terms". (Pause) Let's go to (iv) now, "Converting the VAD to nominal monetary terms". And these are the two, 3.7, 3.8, that that net out in a balance of the 0.1 million. So issues (i) plus (ii) minus (iii) plus (iv) result in the difference between the 26.8 and the 18.6. THE PRESIDENT: The 8 million. THE PRESIDENT: Then we did hear the parties commenting on
11:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 MS MENAKER: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Of course, because Dr Abdala's standpoint before was: it's impossible to project anything. And now there was at least certainty that the breach had occurred. Is that? MS MENAKER: Not quite, Madam President. Because when he was saying it was impossible to do anything, that was at the resubmission hearing. THE PRESIDENT: Oh, already? I'm sorry. MS MENAKER: That was the resubmission hearing. So he had calculated again, he had made a calculation of TECO's damages in the original arbitration and he had raised a number of different issues. He did not raise any of these issues. So those issues and criticisms that he raised in the original arbitration were all fully ventilated by the parties. The Tribunal then adopted Mr Kaczmarek's model. And then, coming back, he is raising these new four additional criticisms that had not been made before. THE PRESIDENT: You wanted to ask something? MR GOSIS: Yes, in response to your question before, where 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 assumptions by Mr Kaczmarek. (Slide 68) The third one is and this is the third and fourth. You will remember a snippet from the transcript of the resubmission hearing and the questions by Dr Alexandrov was to whether or not these were "washed out". There is the "Elasticity effect". And Dr Abdala says: well, the Original Tribunal does not address these elasticity effects: " since in the historical period these errors are not present; they only appear in the projections for 2010 onwards." I'm reading halfway through the paragraph there. The fourth one, "Converting the [value added to distributor] to nominal monetary terms". (Pause) Let's go to (iv) now, "Converting the VAD to nominal monetary terms". And these are the two, 3.7, 3.8, that that net out in a balance of the 0.1 million. So issues (i) plus (ii) minus (iii) plus (iv) result in the difference between the 26.8 and the 18.6. THE PRESIDENT: The 8 million. MR GOSIS: Yes. Thank you so much.

		0		
11:27 1	criticisms have been dealt with. It seems that TECO was	11:43	1	Dr Abdala agreed that that was not how the transaction
2	suggesting that somehow [Dr] Abdala conceded that some		2	was structured; that even though there were different
3	of the criticisms didn't really have that much of		3	shareholders in DECA II, the purchase was for the
4	an impact, after the expert conferencing.		4	entirety and it was subject to the entirety, and so that
5	Can we please hear both parties: what are their		5	was used.
6	views on whether all the criticism still stood after the		6	Again, I reiterate that that criticism was never one
7	conferencing or whether there was some kind of common		7	that was raised in the original arbitration, so was
	ground that they weren't that significant, while others			-
8			8	something that was newly raised by Dr Abdala in the
9	still stood? What are the parties' views?		9	resubmission.
10	MS MENAKER: Just one second, if that's okay.		10	With respect to the costs, there, as I explained,
11	THE PRESIDENT: Sure. We've been going for one and a half		11	Mr Kaczmarek had forecasted the costs in the but-for
12	hours: would you like to break, and then you can prepare		12	scenario looking at EEGSA's actual costs, what it would
13	the answer properly? Would you like to break for		13	have incurred in costs absent the measures and going
14	ten minutes?		14	back to the pre-measure date, whereas Dr Abdala wanted
15	MS MENAKER: Yes.	1	15	to use the costs of a hypothetical company. Which then
16	DR TORTEROLA: (In English) That's a good idea, I think.	1	16	was discussed, as that would not make sense because,
17	And in addition to that, I was wondering whether we will	1	17	while you set the VAD based on a model efficient
18	have time for other questions by the Tribunal, besides	1	18	company, if what we're trying to establish is: what
19	this point. I think that there are at least one or two	1	19	would EEGSA really have earned absent the breach, you
20	for Guatemala that would be important to bring to the	2	20	should look at what its revenues would have been but
21	attention of the Annulment Committee before we finish	2	21	what it costs would have been, and you look at actual
22	the hearing.	2	22	costs.
23	THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Just ten minutes, and I think that's	2	23	And that was debated as well and, in our view,
24	necessary anyway to	2	24	understood that it would make no sense to use
25	DR TORTEROLA: No, it's alright. These are two different	2	25	hypothetical costs in that instance.
	-			
	Page 53			Page 55
11.00.1		11.45		
11:28 1	things. I'm just	11:45		THE PRESIDENT: Okay. One thing is what you think more
2	THE PRESIDENT: Okay, good.	2	2	appropriate. Did Dr Abdala concede that point?
2 3	THE PRESIDENT: Okay, good. (11.28 am)		2 3 1	appropriate. Did Dr Abdala concede that point? MS MENAKER: I would have to see if it was an express
2 3 4	THE PRESIDENT: Okay, good. (11.28 am) (A short break)	2	2 3 1 4	appropriate. Did Dr Abdala concede that point? MS MENAKER: I would have to see if it was an express concession. I understood from the tenor of the hearing
2 3	THE PRESIDENT: Okay, good. (11.28 am) (A short break) (11.42 am)	2	2 3 1 4 5	appropriate. Did Dr Abdala concede that point? MS MENAKER: I would have to see if it was an express concession. I understood from the tenor of the hearing that that is how I would have perceived it. But we
2 3 4 5 6	THE PRESIDENT: Okay, good. (11.28 am) (A short break) (11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker.		2 3 1 4 5 6	appropriate. Did Dr Abdala concede that point? MS MENAKER: I would have to see if it was an express concession. I understood from the tenor of the hearing
2 3 4 5 6 7	THE PRESIDENT: Okay, good. (11.28 am) (A short break) (11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker. MS MENAKER: Would you like me in the first instance to		2 3 1 4 5 6 7	appropriate. Did Dr Abdala concede that point? MS MENAKER: I would have to see if it was an express concession. I understood from the tenor of the hearing that that is how I would have perceived it. But we would have to I will not say that he conceded it per se.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE PRESIDENT: Okay, good. (11.28 am) (A short break) (11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker. MS MENAKER: Would you like me in the first instance to answer that last question?		2 3 1 4 5 6 7 8 7	appropriate. Did Dr Abdala concede that point? MS MENAKER: I would have to see if it was an express concession. I understood from the tenor of the hearing that that is how I would have perceived it. But we would have to I will not say that he conceded it per se. THE PRESIDENT: When you say that Dr Abdala suggested using
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE PRESIDENT: Okay, good. (11.28 am) (A short break) (11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker. MS MENAKER: Would you like me in the first instance to answer that last question? THE PRESIDENT: Yes.		2 3 1 4 5 6 7 8 7 9	appropriate. Did Dr Abdala concede that point? MS MENAKER: I would have to see if it was an express concession. I understood from the tenor of the hearing that that is how I would have perceived it. But we would have to I will not say that he conceded it per se. THE PRESIDENT: When you say that Dr Abdala suggested using the hypothetical company's opex, was that equal to using
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE PRESIDENT: Okay, good. (11.28 am) (A short break) (11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker. MS MENAKER: Would you like me in the first instance to answer that last question? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MS MENAKER: So the answer is: yes. (Pause) By the end of		2 3 1 4 5 6 7 8 7 8 7 9 0	appropriate. Did Dr Abdala concede that point? MS MENAKER: I would have to see if it was an express concession. I understood from the tenor of the hearing that that is how I would have perceived it. But we would have to I will not say that he conceded it per se. THE PRESIDENT: When you say that Dr Abdala suggested using the hypothetical company's opex, was that equal to using what was forecasted in the Bates White study, or was he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE PRESIDENT: Okay, good. (11.28 am) (A short break) (11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker. MS MENAKER: Would you like me in the first instance to answer that last question? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MS MENAKER: So the answer is: yes. (Pause) By the end of the hearing, in our view, all of those criticisms had		2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 7 9 0 1	appropriate. Did Dr Abdala concede that point? MS MENAKER: I would have to see if it was an express concession. I understood from the tenor of the hearing that that is how I would have perceived it. But we would have to I will not say that he conceded it per se. THE PRESIDENT: When you say that Dr Abdala suggested using the hypothetical company's opex, was that equal to using what was forecasted in the Bates White study, or was he referring to another hypothetical company?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 THE PRESIDENT: Okay, good. (11.28 am) (A short break) (11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker. MS MENAKER: Would you like me in the first instance to answer that last question? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MS MENAKER: So the answer is: yes. (Pause) By the end of the hearing, in our view, all of those criticisms had essentially been addressed or fallen away. And there 		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 8 7 8 7 9 0 1 1 2	appropriate. Did Dr Abdala concede that point? MS MENAKER: I would have to see if it was an express concession. I understood from the tenor of the hearing that that is how I would have perceived it. But we would have to I will not say that he conceded it per se. THE PRESIDENT: When you say that Dr Abdala suggested using the hypothetical company's opex, was that equal to using what was forecasted in the Bates White study, or was he referring to another hypothetical company? MS MENAKER: I don't believe that he let me double-check
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 THE PRESIDENT: Okay, good. (11.28 am) (A short break) (11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker. MS MENAKER: Would you like me in the first instance to answer that last question? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MS MENAKER: So the answer is: yes. (Pause) By the end of the hearing, in our view, all of those criticisms had essentially been addressed or fallen away. And there were you heard or you saw yesterday and I'll turn 		2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 7 7 8 7 9 0 1 2 1 3	 appropriate. Did Dr Abdala concede that point? MS MENAKER: I would have to see if it was an express concession. I understood from the tenor of the hearing that that is how I would have perceived it. But we would have to I will not say that he conceded it per se. THE PRESIDENT: When you say that Dr Abdala suggested using the hypothetical company's opex, was that equal to using what was forecasted in the Bates White study, or was he referring to another hypothetical company? MS MENAKER: I don't believe that he let me double-check I don't know that he picked it up from that study in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 THE PRESIDENT: Okay, good. (11.28 am) (A short break) (11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker. MS MENAKER: Would you like me in the first instance to answer that last question? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MS MENAKER: So the answer is: yes. (Pause) By the end of the hearing, in our view, all of those criticisms had essentially been addressed or fallen away. And there were you heard or you saw yesterday and I'll turn over to Mr Polášek for any detail but with respect to 		2 1 3 1 5 6 7 7 8 7 9 0 1 1 2 1 3 4	 appropriate. Did Dr Abdala concede that point? MS MENAKER: I would have to see if it was an express concession. I understood from the tenor of the hearing that that is how I would have perceived it. But we would have to I will not say that he conceded it per se. THE PRESIDENT: When you say that Dr Abdala suggested using the hypothetical company's opex, was that equal to using what was forecasted in the Bates White study, or was he referring to another hypothetical company? MS MENAKER: I don't believe that he let me double-check I don't know that he picked it up from that study in particular. Yes, let me double-check.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 THE PRESIDENT: Okay, good. (11.28 am) (A short break) (11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker. MS MENAKER: Would you like me in the first instance to answer that last question? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MS MENAKER: So the answer is: yes. (Pause) By the end of the hearing, in our view, all of those criticisms had essentially been addressed or fallen away. And there were you heard or you saw yesterday and I'll turn over to Mr Polášek for any detail but with respect to the one particular adjustment on inflation and		2 1 3 1 5 6 7 7 8 7 9 0 1 1 2 1 3 4	appropriate. Did Dr Abdala concede that point? MS MENAKER: I would have to see if it was an express concession. I understood from the tenor of the hearing that that is how I would have perceived it. But we would have to I will not say that he conceded it per se. THE PRESIDENT: When you say that Dr Abdala suggested using the hypothetical company's opex, was that equal to using what was forecasted in the Bates White study, or was he referring to another hypothetical company? MS MENAKER: I don't believe that he let me double-check I don't know that he picked it up from that study in particular. Yes, let me double-check. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. And a follow-up question: what costs
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 THE PRESIDENT: Okay, good. (11.28 am) (A short break) (11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker. MS MENAKER: Would you like me in the first instance to answer that last question? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MS MENAKER: So the answer is: yes. (Pause) By the end of the hearing, in our view, all of those criticisms had essentially been addressed or fallen away. And there were you heard or you saw yesterday and I'll turn over to Mr Polášek for any detail but with respect to the one particular adjustment on inflation and elasticity of demand, they washed out, and both experts		2 1 3 1 4 5 6 7 7 8 7 7 8 7 7 8 7 7 8 7 7 1 2 1 3 3 4 5 7 7	 appropriate. Did Dr Abdala concede that point? MS MENAKER: I would have to see if it was an express concession. I understood from the tenor of the hearing that that is how I would have perceived it. But we would have to I will not say that he conceded it per se. THE PRESIDENT: When you say that Dr Abdala suggested using the hypothetical company's opex, was that equal to using what was forecasted in the Bates White study, or was he referring to another hypothetical company? MS MENAKER: I don't believe that he let me double-check I don't know that he picked it up from that study in particular. Yes, let me double-check.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 THE PRESIDENT: Okay, good. (11.28 am) (A short break) (11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker. MS MENAKER: Would you like me in the first instance to answer that last question? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MS MENAKER: So the answer is: yes. (Pause) By the end of the hearing, in our view, all of those criticisms had essentially been addressed or fallen away. And there were you heard or you saw yesterday and I'll turn over to Mr Polášek for any detail but with respect to the one particular adjustment on inflation and elasticity of demand, they washed out, and both experts in conferencing said as much. 		2 1 3 1 5 6 7 7 8 7 9 0 1 1 2 1 3 4 5 7 6	appropriate. Did Dr Abdala concede that point? MS MENAKER: I would have to see if it was an express concession. I understood from the tenor of the hearing that that is how I would have perceived it. But we would have to I will not say that he conceded it per se. THE PRESIDENT: When you say that Dr Abdala suggested using the hypothetical company's opex, was that equal to using what was forecasted in the Bates White study, or was he referring to another hypothetical company? MS MENAKER: I don't believe that he let me double-check I don't know that he picked it up from that study in particular. Yes, let me double-check. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. And a follow-up question: what costs
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 THE PRESIDENT: Okay, good. (11.28 am) (A short break) (11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker. MS MENAKER: Would you like me in the first instance to answer that last question? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MS MENAKER: So the answer is: yes. (Pause) By the end of the hearing, in our view, all of those criticisms had essentially been addressed or fallen away. And there were you heard or you saw yesterday and I'll turn over to Mr Polášek for any detail but with respect to the one particular adjustment on inflation and elasticity of demand, they washed out, and both experts in conferencing said as much. There was an exchange with respect to the cash flows 		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 7 8 7 2 1 3 4 5 5 7 8 1 7 8 8	 appropriate. Did Dr Abdala concede that point? MS MENAKER: I would have to see if it was an express concession. I understood from the tenor of the hearing that that is how I would have perceived it. But we would have to I will not say that he conceded it per se. THE PRESIDENT: When you say that Dr Abdala suggested using the hypothetical company's opex, was that equal to using what was forecasted in the Bates White study, or was he referring to another hypothetical company? MS MENAKER: I don't believe that he let me double-check I don't know that he picked it up from that study in particular. Yes, let me double-check. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. And a follow-up question: what costs did the Original Tribunal use to calculate the historical damages? In the but-for, not the actual. MS MENAKER: In the but-for.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 THE PRESIDENT: Okay, good. (11.28 am) (A short break) (11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker. MS MENAKER: Would you like me in the first instance to answer that last question? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MS MENAKER: So the answer is: yes. (Pause) By the end of the hearing, in our view, all of those criticisms had essentially been addressed or fallen away. And there were you heard or you saw yesterday and I'll turn over to Mr Polášek for any detail but with respect to the one particular adjustment on inflation and elasticity of demand, they washed out, and both experts in conferencing said as much. 		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 7 8 7 7 8 1 7 7 8 8 1 9 9 7	 appropriate. Did Dr Abdala concede that point? MS MENAKER: I would have to see if it was an express concession. I understood from the tenor of the hearing that that is how I would have perceived it. But we would have to I will not say that he conceded it per se. THE PRESIDENT: When you say that Dr Abdala suggested using the hypothetical company's opex, was that equal to using what was forecasted in the Bates White study, or was he referring to another hypothetical company? MS MENAKER: I don't believe that he let me double-check I don't know that he picked it up from that study in particular. Yes, let me double-check. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. And a follow-up question: what costs did the Original Tribunal use to calculate the historical damages? In the but-for, not the actual. MS MENAKER: In the but-for. THE PRESIDENT: In the but-for.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 THE PRESIDENT: Okay, good. (11.28 am) (A short break) (11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker. MS MENAKER: Would you like me in the first instance to answer that last question? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MS MENAKER: So the answer is: yes. (Pause) By the end of the hearing, in our view, all of those criticisms had essentially been addressed or fallen away. And there were you heard or you saw yesterday and I'll turn over to Mr Polášek for any detail but with respect to the one particular adjustment on inflation and elasticity of demand, they washed out, and both experts in conferencing said as much. There was an exchange with respect to the cash flows 		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 7 8 7 7 8 1 7 7 8 8 1 9 9 7	 appropriate. Did Dr Abdala concede that point? MS MENAKER: I would have to see if it was an express concession. I understood from the tenor of the hearing that that is how I would have perceived it. But we would have to I will not say that he conceded it per se. THE PRESIDENT: When you say that Dr Abdala suggested using the hypothetical company's opex, was that equal to using what was forecasted in the Bates White study, or was he referring to another hypothetical company? MS MENAKER: I don't believe that he let me double-check I don't know that he picked it up from that study in particular. Yes, let me double-check. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. And a follow-up question: what costs did the Original Tribunal use to calculate the historical damages? In the but-for, not the actual. MS MENAKER: In the but-for.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 THE PRESIDENT: Okay, good. (11.28 am) (A short break) (11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker. MS MENAKER: Would you like me in the first instance to answer that last question? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MS MENAKER: So the answer is: yes. (Pause) By the end of the hearing, in our view, all of those criticisms had essentially been addressed or fallen away. And there were you heard or you saw yesterday and I'll turn over to Mr Polášek for any detail but with respect to the one particular adjustment on inflation and elasticity of demand, they washed out, and both experts in conferencing said as much. There was an exchange with respect to the cash flows to equity as opposed to the cash flows to the firm,		2 3 1 4 5 6 7 7 8 7 9 9 0 1 2 1 3 4 7 7 8 1 9 7 8 1 9 7 1 1 9 7 1 1	 appropriate. Did Dr Abdala concede that point? MS MENAKER: I would have to see if it was an express concession. I understood from the tenor of the hearing that that is how I would have perceived it. But we would have to I will not say that he conceded it per se. THE PRESIDENT: When you say that Dr Abdala suggested using the hypothetical company's opex, was that equal to using what was forecasted in the Bates White study, or was he referring to another hypothetical company? MS MENAKER: I don't believe that he let me double-check I don't know that he picked it up from that study in particular. Yes, let me double-check. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. And a follow-up question: what costs did the Original Tribunal use to calculate the historical damages? In the but-for, not the actual. MS MENAKER: In the but-for. THE PRESIDENT: In the but-for.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 THE PRESIDENT: Okay, good. (11.28 am) (A short break) (11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker. MS MENAKER: Would you like me in the first instance to answer that last question? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MS MENAKER: So the answer is: yes. (Pause) By the end of the hearing, in our view, all of those criticisms had essentially been addressed or fallen away. And there were you heard or you saw yesterday and I'll turn over to Mr Polášek for any detail but with respect to the one particular adjustment on inflation and elasticity of demand, they washed out, and both experts in conferencing said as much. There was an exchange with respect to the cash flows to equity as opposed to the cash flows to the firm, where the arbitrators were questioning Dr Abdala and		2 1 3 1 5 6 7 7 8 7 9 0 1 1 2 1 3 3 4 5 5 7 6 7 7 8 1 9 7 1 1	 appropriate. Did Dr Abdala concede that point? MS MENAKER: I would have to see if it was an express concession. I understood from the tenor of the hearing that that is how I would have perceived it. But we would have to I will not say that he conceded it per se. THE PRESIDENT: When you say that Dr Abdala suggested using the hypothetical company's opex, was that equal to using what was forecasted in the Bates White study, or was he referring to another hypothetical company? MS MENAKER: I don't believe that he let me double-check I don't know that he picked it up from that study in particular. Yes, let me double-check. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. And a follow-up question: what costs did the Original Tribunal use to calculate the historical damages? In the but-for, not the actual. MS MENAKER: In the but-for. THE PRESIDENT: In the but-for.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 THE PRESIDENT: Okay, good. (11.28 am) (A short break) (11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker. MS MENAKER: Would you like me in the first instance to answer that last question? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MS MENAKER: So the answer is: yes. (Pause) By the end of the hearing, in our view, all of those criticisms had essentially been addressed or fallen away. And there were you heard or you saw yesterday and I'll turn over to Mr Polášek for any detail but with respect to the one particular adjustment on inflation and elasticity of demand, they washed out, and both experts in conferencing said as much. There was an exchange with respect to the cash flows to equity as opposed to the cash flows to the firm, where the arbitrators were questioning Dr Abdala and saying: isn't it the case that it would only be cash 	2 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	2 1 3 1 5 6 7 7 8 7 7 8 9 0 1 2 1 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 1 7 8 1 1 2 1 1 2	 appropriate. Did Dr Abdala concede that point? MS MENAKER: I would have to see if it was an express concession. I understood from the tenor of the hearing that that is how I would have perceived it. But we would have to I will not say that he conceded it per se. THE PRESIDENT: When you say that Dr Abdala suggested using the hypothetical company's opex, was that equal to using what was forecasted in the Bates White study, or was he referring to another hypothetical company? MS MENAKER: I don't believe that he let me double-check I don't know that he picked it up from that study in particular. Yes, let me double-check. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. And a follow-up question: what costs did the Original Tribunal use to calculate the historical damages? In the but-for, not the actual. MS MENAKER: In the but-for. THE PRESIDENT: In the but-for. MS MENAKER: Right, in the but-for.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 THE PRESIDENT: Okay, good. (11.28 am) (A short break) (11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker. MS MENAKER: Would you like me in the first instance to answer that last question? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MS MENAKER: So the answer is: yes. (Pause) By the end of the hearing, in our view, all of those criticisms had essentially been addressed or fallen away. And there were you heard or you saw yesterday and I'll turn over to Mr Polášek for any detail but with respect to the one particular adjustment on inflation and elasticity of demand, they washed out, and both experts in conferencing said as much. There was an exchange with respect to the cash flows to equity as opposed to the cash flows to the firm, where the arbitrators were questioning Dr Abdala and saying: isn't it the case that it would only be cash flows to the shareholder if there were a number of 	2 2 3 3 4 4 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	2 1 3 1 5 6 7 7 8 7 7 8 9 0 1 1 2 1 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 1 9 0 1 1 2 3	 appropriate. Did Dr Abdala concede that point? MS MENAKER: I would have to see if it was an express concession. I understood from the tenor of the hearing that that is how I would have perceived it. But we would have to I will not say that he conceded it per se. THE PRESIDENT: When you say that Dr Abdala suggested using the hypothetical company's opex, was that equal to using what was forecasted in the Bates White study, or was he referring to another hypothetical company? MS MENAKER: I don't believe that he let me double-check I don't know that he picked it up from that study in particular. Yes, let me double-check. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. And a follow-up question: what costs did the Original Tribunal use to calculate the historical damages? In the but-for, not the actual. MS MENAKER: In the but-for. THE PRESIDENT: In the but-for. MS MENAKER: Right, in the but-for. Again, I will triple-check, but given that we maintained the same methodology throughout, I am nearly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 THE PRESIDENT: Okay, good. (11.28 am) (A short break) (11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker. MS MENAKER: Would you like me in the first instance to answer that last question? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MS MENAKER: So the answer is: yes. (Pause) By the end of the hearing, in our view, all of those criticisms had essentially been addressed or fallen away. And there were you heard or you saw yesterday and I'll turn over to Mr Polášek for any detail but with respect to the one particular adjustment on inflation and elasticity of demand, they washed out, and both experts in conferencing said as much. There was an exchange with respect to the cash flows to equity as opposed to the cash flows to the firm, where the arbitrators were questioning Dr Abdala and saying: isn't it the case that it would only be cash flows to the shareholder if there were a number of different sales and you were using the weighted average 	2 2 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	2 3 1 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 0 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 1 7 8 1 9 1 1 2 3 4 1 2 3 4 3 4	 appropriate. Did Dr Abdala concede that point? MS MENAKER: I would have to see if it was an express concession. I understood from the tenor of the hearing that that is how I would have perceived it. But we would have to I will not say that he conceded it per se. THE PRESIDENT: When you say that Dr Abdala suggested using the hypothetical company's opex, was that equal to using what was forecasted in the Bates White study, or was he referring to another hypothetical company? MS MENAKER: I don't believe that he let me double-check I don't know that he picked it up from that study in particular. Yes, let me double-check. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. And a follow-up question: what costs did the Original Tribunal use to calculate the historical damages? In the but-for, not the actual. MS MENAKER: Right, in the but-for. MS MENAKER: Right, in the but-for. Again, I will triple-check, but given that we maintained the same methodology throughout, I am nearly certain that they would have used EEGSA's actual costs
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 THE PRESIDENT: Okay, good. (11.28 am) (A short break) (11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker. MS MENAKER: Would you like me in the first instance to answer that last question? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MS MENAKER: So the answer is: yes. (Pause) By the end of the hearing, in our view, all of those criticisms had essentially been addressed or fallen away. And there were you heard or you saw yesterday and I'll turn over to Mr Polášek for any detail but with respect to the one particular adjustment on inflation and elasticity of demand, they washed out, and both experts in conferencing said as much. There was an exchange with respect to the cash flows to equity as opposed to the cash flows to the firm, where the arbitrators were questioning Dr Abdala and saying: isn't it the case that it would only be cash flows to the shareholder if there were a number of different sales and you were using the weighted average cost of capital, the WACC, of the shareholder rather 	2 2 3 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	2 3 1 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 0 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 1 7 8 1 9 1 1 2 3 4 1 2 3 4 3 4	appropriate. Did Dr Abdala concede that point? MS MENAKER: I would have to see if it was an express concession. I understood from the tenor of the hearing that that is how I would have perceived it. But we would have to I will not say that he conceded it per se. THE PRESIDENT: When you say that Dr Abdala suggested using the hypothetical company's opex, was that equal to using what was forecasted in the Bates White study, or was he referring to another hypothetical company? MS MENAKER: I don't believe that he let me double-check I don't know that he picked it up from that study in particular. Yes, let me double-check. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. And a follow-up question: what costs did the Original Tribunal use to calculate the historical damages? In the but-for, not the actual. MS MENAKER: In the but-for. THE PRESIDENT: In the but-for. MS MENAKER: Right, in the but-for. Again, I will triple-check, but given that we maintained the same methodology throughout, I am nearly certain that they would have used EEGSA's actual costs in order to move forward, just like Mr Kaczmarek did to

11:47 1	company's costs in the but for scenario, they were using	11:49 1	been bigger.
11.47 1	company's costs in the but-for scenario, they were using the actual costs. And because our methodology didn't	11.49 1	MS MENAKER: But they could have they may have projected
2	change and like I said, this was a new objection	2	it again as of an earlier date. Because we used it's
			the same date, excuse me. We used the end of the year
4	raised by Guatemala in the resubmission proceeding that	4	
5	they had not raised in the original arbitration.	5	2007, which is prior to the VAD being adopted in
6	But I can also confirm that at our next break	6	August 1st 2008. So for historical costs from 2008 to
7	THE PRESIDENT: But they could have used the Bates White	7	2010, you could still do that same forecast, bringing
8	costs, for example, in the but-for?	8	the 2007 actual costs up to 2010, which is what he would
9	MS MENAKER: I don't believe so.	9	have done in the original arbitration. And then he just
10	THE PRESIDENT: That they could or that they did?	10	brought it forward from 2010 to 2013, still forecasting
11	MS MENAKER: I'm sorry?	11	off that same date, the 2007 actual costs.
12	THE PRESIDENT: That they could have used it or that they	12	THE PRESIDENT: Well, if those were but those wouldn't
13	did use it?	13	be it would be the actual costs before the measures
14	MS MENAKER: Did not use it.	14	were implemented?
15	THE PRESIDENT: They did not use it. If you can just	15	MS MENAKER: It is before the measures.
16	confirm	16	THE PRESIDENT: Okay. Yes, I get it. I get it.
17	MS MENAKER: But I will confirm that.	17	MS MENAKER: Because the measures is August 1st 2008.
18	THE PRESIDENT: what approach they used to calculate the	18	THE PRESIDENT: Good. So it would still be a but-for,
19	costs in the but-for scenario of the historical loss.	19	because it was a reality in 2007, not a reality in 2008.
20	MS MENAKER: Right.	20	MS MENAKER: Correct. And as I'm speaking through it,
21	THE PRESIDENT: Do you understand the question? You look at	21	I think that has to have been the case, because the
22	me kind of	22	model was the same, right? So in the Original Tribunal,
23	Let's go through this together. So the historical	23	you had the cash flows: they just cut it off at 2010 and
24	loss that was decided by the Original Tribunal, they	24	then it continues through. And it's not like the
25	also had to do a but-for and an actual value. And the	25	methodologies for doing those but-for cash flows for
	Page 57		Page 59
	I age 57		1 age 39
			-
11:48 1	difference for the period 2008-2010, that was the	11:51 1	costs changed: he didn't change that in his model.
11:48 1 2	difference for the period 2008-2010, that was the damages awarded, and those were the \$21 million. I'd	11:51 1 2	
	-		costs changed: he didn't change that in his model.
2	damages awarded, and those were the \$21 million. I'd	2	costs changed: he didn't change that in his model. THE PRESIDENT: Okay, thank you.
2 3	damages awarded, and those were the \$21 million. I'd like to know how they construed the but-for scenario and	2 3	costs changed: he didn't change that in his model. THE PRESIDENT: Okay, thank you. MS MENAKER: Then the only other thing that I would note in
2 3 4	damages awarded, and those were the \$21 million. I'd like to know how they construed the but-for scenario and what approach they used to determining the cost.	2 3 4	costs changed: he didn't change that in his model. THE PRESIDENT: Okay, thank you. MS MENAKER: Then the only other thing that I would note in response to your question is that the Tribunal, as
2 3 4 5	damages awarded, and those were the \$21 million. I'd like to know how they construed the but-for scenario and what approach they used to determining the cost. Is that clearer now?	2 3 4 5	costs changed: he didn't change that in his model. THE PRESIDENT: Okay, thank you. MS MENAKER: Then the only other thing that I would note in response to your question is that the Tribunal, as Mr Polášek showed yesterday, was alert to these four
2 3 4 5 6	damages awarded, and those were the \$21 million. I'd like to know how they construed the but-for scenario and what approach they used to determining the cost. Is that clearer now? MR GOSIS: It is clear. I don't know that we will have	2 3 4 5 6	costs changed: he didn't change that in his model. THE PRESIDENT: Okay, thank you. MS MENAKER: Then the only other thing that I would note in response to your question is that the Tribunal, as Mr Polášek showed yesterday, was alert to these four issues that were out there, and you saw that they
2 3 4 5 6 7	damages awarded, and those were the \$21 million. I'd like to know how they construed the but-for scenario and what approach they used to determining the cost. Is that clearer now?MR GOSIS: It is clear. I don't know that we will have a definitive answer by 2.00 pm.	2 3 4 5 6 7	costs changed: he didn't change that in his model. THE PRESIDENT: Okay, thank you. MS MENAKER: Then the only other thing that I would note in response to your question is that the Tribunal, as Mr Polášek showed yesterday, was alert to these four issues that were out there, and you saw that they looked when you set them off all against one another,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	damages awarded, and those were the \$21 million. I'd like to know how they construed the but-for scenario and what approach they used to determining the cost. Is that clearer now?MR GOSIS: It is clear. I don't know that we will have a definitive answer by 2.00 pm.THE PRESIDENT: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	costs changed: he didn't change that in his model. THE PRESIDENT: Okay, thank you. MS MENAKER: Then the only other thing that I would note in response to your question is that the Tribunal, as Mr Polášek showed yesterday, was alert to these four issues that were out there, and you saw that they looked when you set them off all against one another, as you noted, the impact was, I believe, \$18.2 million,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 damages awarded, and those were the \$21 million. I'd like to know how they construed the but-for scenario and what approach they used to determining the cost. Is that clearer now? MR GOSIS: It is clear. I don't know that we will have a definitive answer by 2.00 pm. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MR GOSIS: But we have some thoughts on this point that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	costs changed: he didn't change that in his model. THE PRESIDENT: Okay, thank you. MS MENAKER: Then the only other thing that I would note in response to your question is that the Tribunal, as Mr Polášek showed yesterday, was alert to these four issues that were out there, and you saw that they looked when you set them off all against one another, as you noted, the impact was, I believe, \$18.2 million, and there's a footnote to that effect in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 damages awarded, and those were the \$21 million. I'd like to know how they construed the but-for scenario and what approach they used to determining the cost. Is that clearer now? MR GOSIS: It is clear. I don't know that we will have a definitive answer by 2.00 pm. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MR GOSIS: But we have some thoughts on this point that I think address the concerns by the Chair. They do not 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	costs changed: he didn't change that in his model. THE PRESIDENT: Okay, thank you. MS MENAKER: Then the only other thing that I would note in response to your question is that the Tribunal, as Mr Polášek showed yesterday, was alert to these four issues that were out there, and you saw that they looked when you set them off all against one another, as you noted, the impact was, I believe, \$18.2 million, and there's a footnote to that effect in the Resubmission Award, noting that that is the difference.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 damages awarded, and those were the \$21 million. I'd like to know how they construed the but-for scenario and what approach they used to determining the cost. Is that clearer now? MR GOSIS: It is clear. I don't know that we will have a definitive answer by 2.00 pm. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MR GOSIS: But we have some thoughts on this point that I think address the concerns by the Chair. They do not speak specifically to this form of the question, but to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	costs changed: he didn't change that in his model. THE PRESIDENT: Okay, thank you. MS MENAKER: Then the only other thing that I would note in response to your question is that the Tribunal, as Mr Polášek showed yesterday, was alert to these four issues that were out there, and you saw that they looked when you set them off all against one another, as you noted, the impact was, I believe, \$18.2 million, and there's a footnote to that effect in the Resubmission Award, noting that that is the difference. THE PRESIDENT: The \$8 million?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 damages awarded, and those were the \$21 million. I'd like to know how they construed the but-for scenario and what approach they used to determining the cost. Is that clearer now? MR GOSIS: It is clear. I don't know that we will have a definitive answer by 2.00 pm. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MR GOSIS: But we have some thoughts on this point that I think address the concerns by the Chair. They do not speak specifically to this form of the question, but to a different angle that shows the same consequences. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	costs changed: he didn't change that in his model. THE PRESIDENT: Okay, thank you. MS MENAKER: Then the only other thing that I would note in response to your question is that the Tribunal, as Mr Polášek showed yesterday, was alert to these four issues that were out there, and you saw that they looked when you set them off all against one another, as you noted, the impact was, I believe, \$18.2 million, and there's a footnote to that effect in the Resubmission Award, noting that that is the difference. THE PRESIDENT: The \$8 million? MR POLÁŠEK: This is on slide 99 of TECO's opening
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 damages awarded, and those were the \$21 million. I'd like to know how they construed the but-for scenario and what approach they used to determining the cost. Is that clearer now? MR GOSIS: It is clear. I don't know that we will have a definitive answer by 2.00 pm. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MR GOSIS: But we have some thoughts on this point that I think address the concerns by the Chair. They do not speak specifically to this form of the question, but to a different angle that shows the same consequences. Whenever the Committee considers it is our time to address this. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 costs changed: he didn't change that in his model. THE PRESIDENT: Okay, thank you. MS MENAKER: Then the only other thing that I would note in response to your question is that the Tribunal, as Mr Polášek showed yesterday, was alert to these four issues that were out there, and you saw that they looked when you set them off all against one another, as you noted, the impact was, I believe, \$18.2 million, and there's a footnote to that effect in the Resubmission Award, noting that that is the difference. THE PRESIDENT: The \$8 million? MR POLÁŠEK: This is on slide 99 of TECO's opening presentation, which shows the paragraph where the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 damages awarded, and those were the \$21 million. I'd like to know how they construed the but-for scenario and what approach they used to determining the cost. Is that clearer now? MR GOSIS: It is clear. I don't know that we will have a definitive answer by 2.00 pm. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MR GOSIS: But we have some thoughts on this point that I think address the concerns by the Chair. They do not speak specifically to this form of the question, but to a different angle that shows the same consequences. Whenever the Committee considers it is our time to address this. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	costs changed: he didn't change that in his model. THE PRESIDENT: Okay, thank you. MS MENAKER: Then the only other thing that I would note in response to your question is that the Tribunal, as Mr Polášek showed yesterday, was alert to these four issues that were out there, and you saw that they looked when you set them off all against one another, as you noted, the impact was, I believe, \$18.2 million, and there's a footnote to that effect in the Resubmission Award, noting that that is the difference. THE PRESIDENT: The \$8 million? MR POLÁŠEK: This is on slide 99 of TECO's opening presentation, which shows the paragraph where the Tribunal made its ruling. This is paragraph 138. Let's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 damages awarded, and those were the \$21 million. I'd like to know how they construed the but-for scenario and what approach they used to determining the cost. Is that clearer now? MR GOSIS: It is clear. I don't know that we will have a definitive answer by 2.00 pm. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MR GOSIS: But we have some thoughts on this point that I think address the concerns by the Chair. They do not speak specifically to this form of the question, but to a different angle that shows the same consequences. Whenever the Committee considers it is our time to address this. MS MENAKER: I just note: we will confirm, but I do think 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 costs changed: he didn't change that in his model. THE PRESIDENT: Okay, thank you. MS MENAKER: Then the only other thing that I would note in response to your question is that the Tribunal, as Mr Polášek showed yesterday, was alert to these four issues that were out there, and you saw that they looked when you set them off all against one another, as you noted, the impact was, I believe, \$18.2 million, and there's a footnote to that effect in the Resubmission Award, noting that that is the difference. THE PRESIDENT: The \$8 million? MR POLÁŠEK: This is on slide 99 of TECO's opening presentation, which shows the paragraph where the Tribunal made its ruling. This is paragraph 138. Let's see if we can maybe put that on the screen. We will go
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 damages awarded, and those were the \$21 million. I'd like to know how they construed the but-for scenario and what approach they used to determining the cost. Is that clearer now? MR GOSIS: It is clear. I don't know that we will have a definitive answer by 2.00 pm. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MR GOSIS: But we have some thoughts on this point that I think address the concerns by the Chair. They do not speak specifically to this form of the question, but to a different angle that shows the same consequences. Whenever the Committee considers it is our time to address this. MS MENAKER: I just note: we will confirm, but I do think they did use the actual costs in the but-for scenario to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 costs changed: he didn't change that in his model. THE PRESIDENT: Okay, thank you. MS MENAKER: Then the only other thing that I would note in response to your question is that the Tribunal, as Mr Polášek showed yesterday, was alert to these four issues that were out there, and you saw that they looked when you set them off all against one another, as you noted, the impact was, I believe, \$18.2 million, and there's a footnote to that effect in the Resubmission Award, noting that that is the difference. THE PRESIDENT: The \$8 million? MR POLÁŠEK: This is on slide 99 of TECO's opening presentation, which shows the paragraph where the Tribunal made its ruling. This is paragraph 138. Let's see if we can maybe put that on the screen. We will go to slide 99.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 damages awarded, and those were the \$21 million. I'd like to know how they construed the but-for scenario and what approach they used to determining the cost. Is that clearer now? MR GOSIS: It is clear. I don't know that we will have a definitive answer by 2.00 pm. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MR GOSIS: But we have some thoughts on this point that I think address the concerns by the Chair. They do not speak specifically to this form of the question, but to a different angle that shows the same consequences. Whenever the Committee considers it is our time to address this. MS MENAKER: I just note: we will confirm, but I do think they did use the actual costs in the but-for scenario to calculate historical losses in the original arbitration, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 costs changed: he didn't change that in his model. THE PRESIDENT: Okay, thank you. MS MENAKER: Then the only other thing that I would note in response to your question is that the Tribunal, as Mr Polášek showed yesterday, was alert to these four issues that were out there, and you saw that they looked when you set them off all against one another, as you noted, the impact was, I believe, \$18.2 million, and there's a footnote to that effect in the Resubmission Award, noting that that is the difference. THE PRESIDENT: The \$8 million? MR POLÁŠEK: This is on slide 99 of TECO's opening presentation, which shows the paragraph where the Tribunal made its ruling. This is paragraph 138. Let's see if we can maybe put that on the screen. We will go to slide 99. Okay. So on the right-hand side, Resubmission
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 damages awarded, and those were the \$21 million. I'd like to know how they construed the but-for scenario and what approach they used to determining the cost. Is that clearer now? MR GOSIS: It is clear. I don't know that we will have a definitive answer by 2.00 pm. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MR GOSIS: But we have some thoughts on this point that I think address the concerns by the Chair. They do not speak specifically to this form of the question, but to a different angle that shows the same consequences. Whenever the Committee considers it is our time to address this. MS MENAKER: I just note: we will confirm, but I do think they did use the actual costs in the but-for scenario to calculate historical losses in the original arbitration, because again, Mr Kaczmarek's methodology did not change 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 costs changed: he didn't change that in his model. THE PRESIDENT: Okay, thank you. MS MENAKER: Then the only other thing that I would note in response to your question is that the Tribunal, as Mr Polášek showed yesterday, was alert to these four issues that were out there, and you saw that they looked when you set them off all against one another, as you noted, the impact was, I believe, \$18.2 million, and there's a footnote to that effect in the Resubmission Award, noting that that is the difference. THE PRESIDENT: The \$8 million? MR POLÁŠEK: This is on slide 99 of TECO's opening presentation, which shows the paragraph where the Tribunal made its ruling. This is paragraph 138. Let's see if we can maybe put that on the screen. We will go to slide 99. Okay. So on the right-hand side, Resubmission Award, paragraph 138. This is just an excerpt of that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 damages awarded, and those were the \$21 million. I'd like to know how they construed the but-for scenario and what approach they used to determining the cost. Is that clearer now? MR GOSIS: It is clear. I don't know that we will have a definitive answer by 2.00 pm. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MR GOSIS: But we have some thoughts on this point that I think address the concerns by the Chair. They do not speak specifically to this form of the question, but to a different angle that shows the same consequences. Whenever the Committee considers it is our time to address this. MS MENAKER: I just note: we will confirm, but I do think they did use the actual costs in the but-for scenario to calculate historical losses in the original arbitration, because again, Mr Kaczmarek's methodology did not change throughout. So I think that assumption was similar, was 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 costs changed: he didn't change that in his model. THE PRESIDENT: Okay, thank you. MS MENAKER: Then the only other thing that I would note in response to your question is that the Tribunal, as Mr Polášek showed yesterday, was alert to these four issues that were out there, and you saw that they looked when you set them off all against one another, as you noted, the impact was, I believe, \$18.2 million, and there's a footnote to that effect in the Resubmission Award, noting that that is the difference. THE PRESIDENT: The \$8 million? MR POLÁŠEK: This is on slide 99 of TECO's opening presentation, which shows the paragraph where the Tribunal made its ruling. This is paragraph 138. Let's see if we can maybe put that on the screen. We will go to slide 99. Okay. So on the right-hand side, Resubmission Award, paragraph 138. This is just an excerpt of that long paragraph. That's the reasoning, or part of the Tribunal's reasoning.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 damages awarded, and those were the \$21 million. I'd like to know how they construed the but-for scenario and what approach they used to determining the cost. Is that clearer now? MR GOSIS: It is clear. I don't know that we will have a definitive answer by 2.00 pm. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MR GOSIS: But we have some thoughts on this point that I think address the concerns by the Chair. They do not speak specifically to this form of the question, but to a different angle that shows the same consequences. Whenever the Committee considers it is our time to address this. MS MENAKER: I just note: we will confirm, but I do think they did use the actual costs in the but-for scenario to calculate historical losses in the original arbitration, because again, Mr Kaczmarek's methodology did not change throughout. So I think that assumption was similar, was the same, but I will confirm that; we'll look. THE PRESIDENT: The actual costs, Ms Menaker, you just told 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 costs changed: he didn't change that in his model. THE PRESIDENT: Okay, thank you. MS MENAKER: Then the only other thing that I would note in response to your question is that the Tribunal, as Mr Polášek showed yesterday, was alert to these four issues that were out there, and you saw that they looked when you set them off all against one another, as you noted, the impact was, I believe, \$18.2 million, and there's a footnote to that effect in the Resubmission Award, noting that that is the difference. THE PRESIDENT: The \$8 million? MR POLÁŠEK: This is on slide 99 of TECO's opening presentation, which shows the paragraph where the Tribunal made its ruling. This is paragraph 138. Let's see if we can maybe put that on the screen. We will go to slide 99. Okay. So on the right-hand side, Resubmission Award, paragraph 138. This is just an excerpt of that long paragraph. That's the reasoning, or part of the Tribunal's reasoning. There is a footnote to Day 1; it's highlighted.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 damages awarded, and those were the \$21 million. I'd like to know how they construed the but-for scenario and what approach they used to determining the cost. Is that clearer now? MR GOSIS: It is clear. I don't know that we will have a definitive answer by 2.00 pm. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MR GOSIS: But we have some thoughts on this point that I think address the concerns by the Chair. They do not speak specifically to this form of the question, but to a different angle that shows the same consequences. Whenever the Committee considers it is our time to address this. MS MENAKER: I just note: we will confirm, but I do think they did use the actual costs in the but-for scenario to calculate historical losses in the original arbitration, because again, Mr Kaczmarek's methodology did not change throughout. So I think that assumption was similar, was the same, but I will confirm that; we'll look. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	 costs changed: he didn't change that in his model. THE PRESIDENT: Okay, thank you. MS MENAKER: Then the only other thing that I would note in response to your question is that the Tribunal, as Mr Polášek showed yesterday, was alert to these four issues that were out there, and you saw that they looked when you set them off all against one another, as you noted, the impact was, I believe, \$18.2 million, and there's a footnote to that effect in the Resubmission Award, noting that that is the difference. THE PRESIDENT: The \$8 million? MR POLÁŠEK: This is on slide 99 of TECO's opening presentation, which shows the paragraph where the Tribunal made its ruling. This is paragraph 138. Let's see if we can maybe put that on the screen. We will go to slide 99. Okay. So on the right-hand side, Resubmission Award, paragraph 138. This is just an excerpt of that long paragraph. That's the reasoning, or part of the Tribunal's reasoning.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 damages awarded, and those were the \$21 million. I'd like to know how they construed the but-for scenario and what approach they used to determining the cost. Is that clearer now? MR GOSIS: It is clear. I don't know that we will have a definitive answer by 2.00 pm. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MR GOSIS: But we have some thoughts on this point that I think address the concerns by the Chair. They do not speak specifically to this form of the question, but to a different angle that shows the same consequences. Whenever the Committee considers it is our time to address this. MS MENAKER: I just note: we will confirm, but I do think they did use the actual costs in the but-for scenario to calculate historical losses in the original arbitration, because again, Mr Kaczmarek's methodology did not change throughout. So I think that assumption was similar, was the same, but I will confirm that; we'll look. THE PRESIDENT: The actual costs, Ms Menaker, you just told me those actual costs were brought down because of the measures introduced. So it wouldn't have made sense 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 costs changed: he didn't change that in his model. THE PRESIDENT: Okay, thank you. MS MENAKER: Then the only other thing that I would note in response to your question is that the Tribunal, as Mr Polášek showed yesterday, was alert to these four issues that were out there, and you saw that they looked when you set them off all against one another, as you noted, the impact was, I believe, \$18.2 million, and there's a footnote to that effect in the Resubmission Award, noting that that is the difference. THE PRESIDENT: The \$8 million? MR POLÁŠEK: This is on slide 99 of TECO's opening presentation, which shows the paragraph where the Tribunal made its ruling. This is paragraph 138. Let's see if we can maybe put that on the screen. We will go to slide 99. Okay. So on the right-hand side, Resubmission Award, paragraph 138. This is just an excerpt of that long paragraph. That's the reasoning, or part of the Tribunal's reasoning. There is a footnote to Day 1; it's highlighted. It's page 91 in the transcript, [lines] 4 and 7. That is a reference to Dr Abdala's four criticisms, and the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 damages awarded, and those were the \$21 million. I'd like to know how they construed the but-for scenario and what approach they used to determining the cost. Is that clearer now? MR GOSIS: It is clear. I don't know that we will have a definitive answer by 2.00 pm. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. MR GOSIS: But we have some thoughts on this point that I think address the concerns by the Chair. They do not speak specifically to this form of the question, but to a different angle that shows the same consequences. Whenever the Committee considers it is our time to address this. MS MENAKER: I just note: we will confirm, but I do think they did use the actual costs in the but-for scenario to calculate historical losses in the original arbitration, because again, Mr Kaczmarek's methodology did not change throughout. So I think that assumption was similar, was the same, but I will confirm that; we'll look. THE PRESIDENT: The actual costs, Ms Menaker, you just told me those actual costs were brought down because of the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 costs changed: he didn't change that in his model. THE PRESIDENT: Okay, thank you. MS MENAKER: Then the only other thing that I would note in response to your question is that the Tribunal, as Mr Polášek showed yesterday, was alert to these four issues that were out there, and you saw that they looked when you set them off all against one another, as you noted, the impact was, I believe, \$18.2 million, and there's a footnote to that effect in the Resubmission Award, noting that that is the difference. THE PRESIDENT: The \$8 million? MR POLÁŠEK: This is on slide 99 of TECO's opening presentation, which shows the paragraph where the Tribunal made its ruling. This is paragraph 138. Let's see if we can maybe put that on the screen. We will go to slide 99. Okay. So on the right-hand side, Resubmission Award, paragraph 138. This is just an excerpt of that long paragraph. That's the reasoning, or part of the Tribunal's reasoning. There is a footnote to Day 1; it's highlighted. It's page 91 in the transcript, [lines] 4 and 7. That

Page 58

		1	
11.50 1		11.55 1	
11:52 1	\$26 million to \$18.2 million. Not zero; 18.2. That's	11:55 1	MR GOSIS: So we have it it's, I think, slide 100 of
2	all the impacts together, according to him.	2	TECO's opening presentation where this citation appears.
3	So what this tells you is that the Tribunal was	3	So these are two completely different things. It's
4	aware of these criticisms and considered them, because	4	one thing to say whether the transaction would be with
5	it included a footnote to that portion of the transcript	5	the individual shareholders, which may or may not reach
6	where those were discussed. So we know that this is not	6	100% of the equity in the entity, and a very different
7	something that the Tribunal omitted, did not consider;	7	thing to establish how the price to each of those
8	"forgot", as Guatemala puts it. We have a footnote	8	shareholders is established.
9	right there which cites those criticisms and the amount.	9	There's no admission by Dr Abdala not that
10	THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.	10	there's any reason to make an admission that the fact
11	I think Guatemala wants to add something?	11	that the purchaser was different, that each transaction
12	MS MENAKER: Sure. I just will ask if they want to add, or	12	was calculated differently, would have any impact on
13	did you want us to comment on their statements about the	13	whether you would make the calculation based on free
14	alleged contradictions in the Award? Mr Polášek had	14	cash flows to the shareholder or the entity. There's
15	something to say about that. Would you like to hear	15	nothing in this transcript or anywhere else we've heard
16	that now or after?	16	with an admission that this criticism should be reduced.
17	THE PRESIDENT: One second. Let me just see what	17	That's the first thing we want to say.
18	Guatemala	18	THE PRESIDENT: Okay. Regarding the opex, was that dealt
19	MR GOSIS: No, it is just: we understood the Committee asked	19	with at all? Was there anything resembling a possible
20	a question of both of the parties. You heard TECO on	20	admission, concession, or nothing of the kind?
21	this point; you heard us on the contradictions. We're	21	MR GOSIS: No, there were no post-hearing briefs, there were
22	in the hands of the Committee whether you would prefer	22	no further reports by the experts. There's no reduction
23	that they respond to the contradictions and then us on	23	from the petitum in the last submission by each of the
24	this issue, or us on this issue and then them on the	24	parties and
25	contradictions.	25	THE PRESIDENT: But was opex dealt with during the hearing,
_			
			D (2
	Page 61		Page 63
	Page 61		Fage 65
11.54 1		11.57 1	
11:54 1	THE PRESIDENT: Is it Guatemala's understanding that the	11:57 1	opex in the but-for scenario?
2	THE PRESIDENT: Is it Guatemala's understanding that the first criticism, regarding whether the cash flow to the	2	opex in the but-for scenario? MR GOSIS: Yes, because the discussion and the
2 3	THE PRESIDENT: Is it Guatemala's understanding that the first criticism, regarding whether the cash flow to the equity or to the enterprise, and thus whether the return	2 3	opex in the but-for scenario? MR GOSIS: Yes, because the discussion and the examination we saw a snippet of some of the
2 3 4	THE PRESIDENT: Is it Guatemala's understanding that the first criticism, regarding whether the cash flow to the equity or to the enterprise, and thus whether the return on the equity or rather the WACC should be used as	2 3 4	opex in the but-for scenario? MR GOSIS: Yes, because the discussion and the examination we saw a snippet of some of the questions those were the four questions that
2 3 4 5	THE PRESIDENT: Is it Guatemala's understanding that the first criticism, regarding whether the cash flow to the equity or to the enterprise, and thus whether the return on the equity or rather the WACC should be used as a discounting factor, did [Dr] Abdala somehow waive that	2 3 4 5	opex in the but-for scenario? MR GOSIS: Yes, because the discussion and the examination we saw a snippet of some of the questions those were the four questions that Dr Alexandrov and then Arbitrator Lowe said: these are
2 3 4 5 6	THE PRESIDENT: Is it Guatemala's understanding that the first criticism, regarding whether the cash flow to the equity or to the enterprise, and thus whether the return on the equity or rather the WACC should be used as a discounting factor, did [Dr] Abdala somehow waive that criticism?	2 3 4 5 6	opex in the but-for scenario? MR GOSIS: Yes, because the discussion and the examination we saw a snippet of some of the questions those were the four questions that Dr Alexandrov and then Arbitrator Lowe said: these are the things we need to delve into. So they addressed
2 3 4 5 6 7	THE PRESIDENT: Is it Guatemala's understanding that the first criticism, regarding whether the cash flow to the equity or to the enterprise, and thus whether the return on the equity or rather the WACC should be used as a discounting factor, did [Dr] Abdala somehow waive that criticism? MR GOSIS: Not at all.	2 3 4 5 6 7	opex in the but-for scenario? MR GOSIS: Yes, because the discussion and the examination we saw a snippet of some of the questions those were the four questions that Dr Alexandrov and then Arbitrator Lowe said: these are the things we need to delve into. So they addressed we didn't read through the entirety of the discussion on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE PRESIDENT: Is it Guatemala's understanding that the first criticism, regarding whether the cash flow to the equity or to the enterprise, and thus whether the return on the equity or rather the WACC should be used as a discounting factor, did [Dr] Abdala somehow waive that criticism? MR GOSIS: Not at all. THE PRESIDENT: Not at all?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	opex in the but-for scenario? MR GOSIS: Yes, because the discussion and the examination we saw a snippet of some of the questions those were the four questions that Dr Alexandrov and then Arbitrator Lowe said: these are the things we need to delve into. So they addressed we didn't read through the entirety of the discussion on each of the four, but there was reference that the four
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE PRESIDENT: Is it Guatemala's understanding that the first criticism, regarding whether the cash flow to the equity or to the enterprise, and thus whether the return on the equity or rather the WACC should be used as a discounting factor, did [Dr] Abdala somehow waive that criticism? MR GOSIS: Not at all. THE PRESIDENT: Not at all? MR GOSIS: Absolutely not.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	opex in the but-for scenario? MR GOSIS: Yes, because the discussion and the examination we saw a snippet of some of the questions those were the four questions that Dr Alexandrov and then Arbitrator Lowe said: these are the things we need to delve into. So they addressed we didn't read through the entirety of the discussion on each of the four, but there was reference that the four we discussed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 THE PRESIDENT: Is it Guatemala's understanding that the first criticism, regarding whether the cash flow to the equity or to the enterprise, and thus whether the return on the equity or rather the WACC should be used as a discounting factor, did [Dr] Abdala somehow waive that criticism? MR GOSIS: Not at all. THE PRESIDENT: Not at all? MR GOSIS: Absolutely not. THE PRESIDENT: Good. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	opex in the but-for scenario? MR GOSIS: Yes, because the discussion and the examination we saw a snippet of some of the questions those were the four questions that Dr Alexandrov and then Arbitrator Lowe said: these are the things we need to delve into. So they addressed we didn't read through the entirety of the discussion on each of the four, but there was reference that the four we discussed THE PRESIDENT: Okay. But they were all addressed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE PRESIDENT: Is it Guatemala's understanding that the first criticism, regarding whether the cash flow to the equity or to the enterprise, and thus whether the return on the equity or rather the WACC should be used as a discounting factor, did [Dr] Abdala somehow waive that criticism? MR GOSIS: Not at all. THE PRESIDENT: Not at all? MR GOSIS: Absolutely not. THE PRESIDENT: Good. MR GOSIS: The very short discussion on this we could	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	opex in the but-for scenario? MR GOSIS: Yes, because the discussion and the examination we saw a snippet of some of the questions those were the four questions that Dr Alexandrov and then Arbitrator Lowe said: these are the things we need to delve into. So they addressed we didn't read through the entirety of the discussion on each of the four, but there was reference that the four we discussed THE PRESIDENT: Okay. But they were all addressed. Do you agree that the elasticity and inflation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE PRESIDENT: Is it Guatemala's understanding that the first criticism, regarding whether the cash flow to the equity or to the enterprise, and thus whether the return on the equity or rather the WACC should be used as a discounting factor, did [Dr] Abdala somehow waive that criticism? MR GOSIS: Not at all. THE PRESIDENT: Not at all? MR GOSIS: Absolutely not. THE PRESIDENT: Good. MR GOSIS: The very short discussion on this we could perhaps summarise as follows: one of the parties was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 opex in the but-for scenario? MR GOSIS: Yes, because the discussion and the examination we saw a snippet of some of the questions those were the four questions that Dr Alexandrov and then Arbitrator Lowe said: these are the things we need to delve into. So they addressed we didn't read through the entirety of the discussion on each of the four, but there was reference that the four we discussed THE PRESIDENT: Okay. But they were all addressed. Do you agree that the elasticity and inflation criticisms, that these two wash somehow out, they cancel
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 THE PRESIDENT: Is it Guatemala's understanding that the first criticism, regarding whether the cash flow to the equity or to the enterprise, and thus whether the return on the equity or rather the WACC should be used as a discounting factor, did [Dr] Abdala somehow waive that criticism? MR GOSIS: Not at all. THE PRESIDENT: Not at all? MR GOSIS: Absolutely not. THE PRESIDENT: Good. MR GOSIS: The very short discussion on this we could perhaps summarise as follows: one of the parties was making a case for 26.8 million, and the other was 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	opex in the but-for scenario? MR GOSIS: Yes, because the discussion and the examination we saw a snippet of some of the questions those were the four questions that Dr Alexandrov and then Arbitrator Lowe said: these are the things we need to delve into. So they addressed we didn't read through the entirety of the discussion on each of the four, but there was reference that the four we discussed THE PRESIDENT: Okay. But they were all addressed. Do you agree that the elasticity and inflation criticisms, that these two wash somehow out, they cancel each other out, and that Mr Abdala said here that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 THE PRESIDENT: Is it Guatemala's understanding that the first criticism, regarding whether the cash flow to the equity or to the enterprise, and thus whether the return on the equity or rather the WACC should be used as a discounting factor, did [Dr] Abdala somehow waive that criticism? MR GOSIS: Not at all. THE PRESIDENT: Not at all? MR GOSIS: Absolutely not. THE PRESIDENT: Good. MR GOSIS: The very short discussion on this we could perhaps summarise as follows: one of the parties was making a case for 26.8 million, and the other was saying, "No, it should be 18.6". 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 opex in the but-for scenario? MR GOSIS: Yes, because the discussion and the examination we saw a snippet of some of the questions those were the four questions that Dr Alexandrov and then Arbitrator Lowe said: these are the things we need to delve into. So they addressed we didn't read through the entirety of the discussion on each of the four, but there was reference that the four we discussed THE PRESIDENT: Okay. But they were all addressed. Do you agree that the elasticity and inflation criticisms, that these two wash somehow out, they cancel each other out, and that Mr Abdala said here that the only difference is 0.1 million, and that's negligible?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 THE PRESIDENT: Is it Guatemala's understanding that the first criticism, regarding whether the cash flow to the equity or to the enterprise, and thus whether the return on the equity or rather the WACC should be used as a discounting factor, did [Dr] Abdala somehow waive that criticism? MR GOSIS: Not at all. THE PRESIDENT: Not at all? MR GOSIS: Absolutely not. THE PRESIDENT: Good. MR GOSIS: The very short discussion on this we could perhaps summarise as follows: one of the parties was making a case for 26.8 million, and the other was saying, "No, it should be 18.6". THE PRESIDENT: That was the starting point. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	opex in the but-for scenario? MR GOSIS: Yes, because the discussion and the examination we saw a snippet of some of the questions those were the four questions that Dr Alexandrov and then Arbitrator Lowe said: these are the things we need to delve into. So they addressed we didn't read through the entirety of the discussion on each of the four, but there was reference that the four we discussed THE PRESIDENT: Okay. But they were all addressed. Do you agree that the elasticity and inflation criticisms, that these two wash somehow out, they cancel each other out, and that Mr Abdala said here that the only difference is 0.1 million, and that's negligible? MR GOSIS: Yes. And we showed yesterday a portion
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 THE PRESIDENT: Is it Guatemala's understanding that the first criticism, regarding whether the cash flow to the equity or to the enterprise, and thus whether the return on the equity or rather the WACC should be used as a discounting factor, did [Dr] Abdala somehow waive that criticism? MR GOSIS: Not at all. THE PRESIDENT: Not at all? MR GOSIS: Absolutely not. THE PRESIDENT: Good. MR GOSIS: The very short discussion on this we could perhaps summarise as follows: one of the parties was making a case for 26.8 million, and the other was saying, "No, it should be 18.6". THE PRESIDENT: That was the starting point. MR GOSIS: It's still the final point. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 opex in the but-for scenario? MR GOSIS: Yes, because the discussion and the examination we saw a snippet of some of the questions those were the four questions that Dr Alexandrov and then Arbitrator Lowe said: these are the things we need to delve into. So they addressed we didn't read through the entirety of the discussion on each of the four, but there was reference that the four we discussed THE PRESIDENT: Okay. But they were all addressed. Do you agree that the elasticity and inflation criticisms, that these two wash somehow out, they cancel each other out, and that Mr Abdala said here that the only difference is 0.1 million, and that's negligible? MR GOSIS: Yes. And we showed yesterday a portion I think it was 251 and 252 of Dr Abdala's last
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 THE PRESIDENT: Is it Guatemala's understanding that the first criticism, regarding whether the cash flow to the equity or to the enterprise, and thus whether the return on the equity or rather the WACC should be used as a discounting factor, did [Dr] Abdala somehow waive that criticism? MR GOSIS: Not at all. THE PRESIDENT: Not at all? MR GOSIS: Absolutely not. THE PRESIDENT: Good. MR GOSIS: The very short discussion on this we could perhaps summarise as follows: one of the parties was making a case for 26.8 million, and the other was saying, "No, it should be 18.6". THE PRESIDENT: That was the starting point. MR GOSIS: It's still the final point. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. But in between 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	opex in the but-for scenario? MR GOSIS: Yes, because the discussion and the examination we saw a snippet of some of the questions those were the four questions that Dr Alexandrov and then Arbitrator Lowe said: these are the things we need to delve into. So they addressed we didn't read through the entirety of the discussion on each of the four, but there was reference that the four we discussed THE PRESIDENT: Okay. But they were all addressed. Do you agree that the elasticity and inflation criticisms, that these two wash somehow out, they cancel each other out, and that Mr Abdala said here that the only difference is 0.1 million, and that's negligible? MR GOSIS: Yes. And we showed yesterday a portion I think it was 251 and 252 of Dr Abdala's last report. That was always netted out. If you see the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 THE PRESIDENT: Is it Guatemala's understanding that the first criticism, regarding whether the cash flow to the equity or to the enterprise, and thus whether the return on the equity or rather the WACC should be used as a discounting factor, did [Dr] Abdala somehow waive that criticism? MR GOSIS: Not at all. THE PRESIDENT: Not at all? MR GOSIS: Absolutely not. THE PRESIDENT: Good. MR GOSIS: The very short discussion on this we could perhaps summarise as follows: one of the parties was making a case for 26.8 million, and the other was saying, "No, it should be 18.6". THE PRESIDENT: That was the starting point. MR GOSIS: It's still the final point. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. But in between MR GOSIS: Nothing changed. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 opex in the but-for scenario? MR GOSIS: Yes, because the discussion and the examination we saw a snippet of some of the questions those were the four questions that Dr Alexandrov and then Arbitrator Lowe said: these are the things we need to delve into. So they addressed we didn't read through the entirety of the discussion on each of the four, but there was reference that the four we discussed THE PRESIDENT: Okay. But they were all addressed. Do you agree that the elasticity and inflation criticisms, that these two wash somehow out, they cancel each other out, and that Mr Abdala said here that the only difference is 0.1 million, and that's negligible? MR GOSIS: Yes. And we showed yesterday a portion I think it was 251 and 252 of Dr Abdala's last report. That was always netted out. If you see the reference
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 THE PRESIDENT: Is it Guatemala's understanding that the first criticism, regarding whether the cash flow to the equity or to the enterprise, and thus whether the return on the equity or rather the WACC should be used as a discounting factor, did [Dr] Abdala somehow waive that criticism? MR GOSIS: Not at all. THE PRESIDENT: Not at all? MR GOSIS: Absolutely not. THE PRESIDENT: Good. MR GOSIS: The very short discussion on this we could perhaps summarise as follows: one of the parties was making a case for 26.8 million, and the other was saying, "No, it should be 18.6". THE PRESIDENT: That was the starting point. MR GOSIS: It's still the final point. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. But in between MR GOSIS: Nothing changed. THE PRESIDENT: there was some discussion. And 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 opex in the but-for scenario? MR GOSIS: Yes, because the discussion and the examination we saw a snippet of some of the questions those were the four questions that Dr Alexandrov and then Arbitrator Lowe said: these are the things we need to delve into. So they addressed we didn't read through the entirety of the discussion on each of the four, but there was reference that the four we discussed THE PRESIDENT: Okay. But they were all addressed. Do you agree that the elasticity and inflation criticisms, that these two wash somehow out, they cancel each other out, and that Mr Abdala said here that the only difference is 0.1 million, and that's negligible? MR GOSIS: Yes. And we showed yesterday a portion I think it was 251 and 252 of Dr Abdala's last report. That was always netted out. If you see the reference THE PRESIDENT: Because I know it was a discussion with
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 THE PRESIDENT: Is it Guatemala's understanding that the first criticism, regarding whether the cash flow to the equity or to the enterprise, and thus whether the return on the equity or rather the WACC should be used as a discounting factor, did [Dr] Abdala somehow waive that criticism? MR GOSIS: Not at all. THE PRESIDENT: Not at all? MR GOSIS: Absolutely not. THE PRESIDENT: Good. MR GOSIS: The very short discussion on this we could perhaps summarise as follows: one of the parties was making a case for 26.8 million, and the other was saying, "No, it should be 18.6". THE PRESIDENT: That was the starting point. MR GOSIS: It's still the final point. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. But in between MR GOSIS: Nothing changed. THE PRESIDENT: there was some discussion. And I remember that was part of an examination carried out 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 opex in the but-for scenario? MR GOSIS: Yes, because the discussion and the examination we saw a snippet of some of the questions those were the four questions that Dr Alexandrov and then Arbitrator Lowe said: these are the things we need to delve into. So they addressed we didn't read through the entirety of the discussion on each of the four, but there was reference that the four we discussed THE PRESIDENT: Okay. But they were all addressed. Do you agree that the elasticity and inflation criticisms, that these two wash somehow out, they cancel each other out, and that Mr Abdala said here that the only difference is 0.1 million, and that's negligible? MR GOSIS: Yes. And we showed yesterday a portion I think it was 251 and 252 of Dr Abdala's last report. That was always netted out. If you see the reference THE PRESIDENT: Because I know it was a discussion with Kaczmarek. But then Abdala was given the opportunity to
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 THE PRESIDENT: Is it Guatemala's understanding that the first criticism, regarding whether the cash flow to the equity or to the enterprise, and thus whether the return on the equity or rather the WACC should be used as a discounting factor, did [Dr] Abdala somehow waive that criticism? MR GOSIS: Not at all. THE PRESIDENT: Not at all? MR GOSIS: Absolutely not. THE PRESIDENT: Good. MR GOSIS: The very short discussion on this we could perhaps summarise as follows: one of the parties was making a case for 26.8 million, and the other was saying, "No, it should be 18.6". THE PRESIDENT: That was the starting point. MR GOSIS: It's still the final point. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. But in between MR GOSIS: Nothing changed. THE PRESIDENT: there was some discussion. And I remember that was part of an examination carried out by Dr Alexandrov, so questions from the Tribunal, 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 opex in the but-for scenario? MR GOSIS: Yes, because the discussion and the examination we saw a snippet of some of the questions those were the four questions that Dr Alexandrov and then Arbitrator Lowe said: these are the things we need to delve into. So they addressed we didn't read through the entirety of the discussion on each of the four, but there was reference that the four we discussed THE PRESIDENT: Okay. But they were all addressed. Do you agree that the elasticity and inflation criticisms, that these two wash somehow out, they cancel each other out, and that Mr Abdala said here that the only difference is 0.1 million, and that's negligible? MR GOSIS: Yes. And we showed yesterday a portion I think it was 251 and 252 of Dr Abdala's last report. That was always netted out. If you see the reference THE PRESIDENT: Because I know it was a discussion with Kaczmarek. But then Abdala was given the opportunity to comment on that?
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 THE PRESIDENT: Is it Guatemala's understanding that the first criticism, regarding whether the cash flow to the equity or to the enterprise, and thus whether the return on the equity or rather the WACC should be used as a discounting factor, did [Dr] Abdala somehow waive that criticism? MR GOSIS: Not at all. THE PRESIDENT: Not at all? MR GOSIS: Absolutely not. THE PRESIDENT: Good. MR GOSIS: The very short discussion on this we could perhaps summarise as follows: one of the parties was making a case for 26.8 million, and the other was saying, "No, it should be 18.6". THE PRESIDENT: That was the starting point. MR GOSIS: It's still the final point. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. But in between MR GOSIS: Nothing changed. THE PRESIDENT: there was some discussion. And I remember that was part of an examination carried out by Dr Alexandrov, so questions from the Tribunal, saying, "But how would a third party reasonably 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 opex in the but-for scenario? MR GOSIS: Yes, because the discussion and the examination we saw a snippet of some of the questions those were the four questions that Dr Alexandrov and then Arbitrator Lowe said: these are the things we need to delve into. So they addressed we didn't read through the entirety of the discussion on each of the four, but there was reference that the four we discussed THE PRESIDENT: Okay. But they were all addressed. Do you agree that the elasticity and inflation criticisms, that these two wash somehow out, they cancel each other out, and that Mr Abdala said here that the only difference is 0.1 million, and that's negligible? MR GOSIS: Yes. And we showed yesterday a portion I think it was 251 and 252 of Dr Abdala's last report. That was always netted out. If you see the reference THE PRESIDENT: Because I know it was a discussion with Kaczmarek. But then Abdala was given the opportunity to comment on that? MR GOSIS: If we can go to REA-25, that's the third Compass
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 THE PRESIDENT: Is it Guatemala's understanding that the first criticism, regarding whether the cash flow to the equity or to the enterprise, and thus whether the return on the equity or rather the WACC should be used as a discounting factor, did [Dr] Abdala somehow waive that criticism? MR GOSIS: Not at all. THE PRESIDENT: Not at all? MR GOSIS: Absolutely not. THE PRESIDENT: Good. MR GOSIS: The very short discussion on this we could perhaps summarise as follows: one of the parties was making a case for 26.8 million, and the other was saying, "No, it should be 18.6". THE PRESIDENT: That was the starting point. MR GOSIS: It's still the final point. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. But in between MR GOSIS: Nothing changed. THE PRESIDENT: there was some discussion. And I remember that was part of an examination carried out by Dr Alexandrov, so questions from the Tribunal, saying, "But how would a third party reasonably establish the value? Would it value each shareholder's 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 opex in the but-for scenario? MR GOSIS: Yes, because the discussion and the examination we saw a snippet of some of the questions those were the four questions that Dr Alexandrov and then Arbitrator Lowe said: these are the things we need to delve into. So they addressed we didn't read through the entirety of the discussion on each of the four, but there was reference that the four we discussed THE PRESIDENT: Okay. But they were all addressed. Do you agree that the elasticity and inflation criticisms, that these two wash somehow out, they cancel each other out, and that Mr Abdala said here that the only difference is 0.1 million, and that's negligible? MR GOSIS: Yes. And we showed yesterday a portion I think it was 251 and 252 of Dr Abdala's last report. That was always netted out. If you see the reference THE PRESIDENT: Because I know it was a discussion with Kaczmarek. But then Abdala was given the opportunity to comment on that? MR GOSIS: If we can go to REA-25, that's the third Compass report, page I think it's going to be 80, there's
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 THE PRESIDENT: Is it Guatemala's understanding that the first criticism, regarding whether the cash flow to the equity or to the enterprise, and thus whether the return on the equity or rather the WACC should be used as a discounting factor, did [Dr] Abdala somehow waive that criticism? MR GOSIS: Not at all. THE PRESIDENT: Not at all? MR GOSIS: Absolutely not. THE PRESIDENT: Good. MR GOSIS: The very short discussion on this we could perhaps summarise as follows: one of the parties was making a case for 26.8 million, and the other was saying, "No, it should be 18.6". THE PRESIDENT: That was the starting point. MR GOSIS: It's still the final point. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. But in between MR GOSIS: Nothing changed. THE PRESIDENT: there was some discussion. And I remember that was part of an examination carried out by Dr Alexandrov, so questions from the Tribunal, saying, "But how would a third party reasonably establish the value? Would it value each shareholder's share in the company or would it do it as a whole?" 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 opex in the but-for scenario? MR GOSIS: Yes, because the discussion and the examination we saw a snippet of some of the questions those were the four questions that Dr Alexandrov and then Arbitrator Lowe said: these are the things we need to delve into. So they addressed we didn't read through the entirety of the discussion on each of the four, but there was reference that the four we discussed THE PRESIDENT: Okay. But they were all addressed. Do you agree that the elasticity and inflation criticisms, that these two wash somehow out, they cancel each other out, and that Mr Abdala said here that the only difference is 0.1 million, and that's negligible? MR GOSIS: Yes. And we showed yesterday a portion I think it was 251 and 252 of Dr Abdala's last report. That was always netted out. If you see the reference THE PRESIDENT: Because I know it was a discussion with Kaczmarek. But then Abdala was given the opportunity to comment on that? MR GOSIS: If we can go to REA-25, that's the third Compass report, page I think it's going to be 80, there's a chart there. (Pause)
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 THE PRESIDENT: Is it Guatemala's understanding that the first criticism, regarding whether the cash flow to the equity or to the enterprise, and thus whether the return on the equity or rather the WACC should be used as a discounting factor, did [Dr] Abdala somehow waive that criticism? MR GOSIS: Not at all. THE PRESIDENT: Not at all? MR GOSIS: Absolutely not. THE PRESIDENT: Good. MR GOSIS: The very short discussion on this we could perhaps summarise as follows: one of the parties was making a case for 26.8 million, and the other was saying, "No, it should be 18.6". THE PRESIDENT: That was the starting point. MR GOSIS: It's still the final point. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. But in between MR GOSIS: Nothing changed. THE PRESIDENT: there was some discussion. And I remember that was part of an examination carried out by Dr Alexandrov, so questions from the Tribunal, saying, "But how would a third party reasonably establish the value? Would it value each shareholder's 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 opex in the but-for scenario? MR GOSIS: Yes, because the discussion and the examination we saw a snippet of some of the questions those were the four questions that Dr Alexandrov and then Arbitrator Lowe said: these are the things we need to delve into. So they addressed we didn't read through the entirety of the discussion on each of the four, but there was reference that the four we discussed THE PRESIDENT: Okay. But they were all addressed. Do you agree that the elasticity and inflation criticisms, that these two wash somehow out, they cancel each other out, and that Mr Abdala said here that the only difference is 0.1 million, and that's negligible? MR GOSIS: Yes. And we showed yesterday a portion I think it was 251 and 252 of Dr Abdala's last report. That was always netted out. If you see the reference THE PRESIDENT: Because I know it was a discussion with Kaczmarek. But then Abdala was given the opportunity to comment on that? MR GOSIS: If we can go to REA-25, that's the third Compass report, page I think it's going to be 80, there's

11:59 1	Dr Abdala. There's four criticisms but there's three	12:02 1	It goes to the but-for value as it was presented by
2	lines, because everything is netted out. And that	2	Guatemala, nothing else. The but-for value.
3	explains the difference between 26.8 and 18.2.	3	They identify two alleged premises. Both of
4	What Dr Abdala was opining in the last report is	4	those
	that when you take the aggregation of all of these four	5	THE PRESIDENT: Okay, "they" is Guatemala, not the Tribunal?
5	criticisms, that justifies the difference between 26.8	6	MR POLÁŠEK: They, Guatemala, not TECO.
6	and 18.2: it's 3.7 one way, 3.8 on the other. That	7	Guatemala identifies two alleged premises. Both of
7	-		those, all of those paragraphs are contained exclusively
8	difference is already accounted for in the difference.	8	
9	Thank you, Madam President.	9	in the part of the Award that deals with res judicata,
10	5 5 5	10	nowhere else. And the question that was before the
11	helpful, both sides.	11	Tribunal there is whether the Original Tribunal's
12		12	decisions on the historical damages are res judicata
13		13	with respect to the loss of value damages. That was the
14		14	question.
15		15	As part of that question, what the Tribunal was
16	5	16	doing there is it was looking at whether, in light of
17	0	17	the Original Tribunal's rulings, there might be other
18		18	factors that, if the Original Tribunal had had those, it
19		19	might have ruled differently. So that's why you see
20		20	this language in there: whether it is possible, whether
21	-	21	it might be possible, that it cannot be assumed, and so
22		22	forth.
23		23	So basically the Tribunal concluded that: yes, there
24	elasticity of demand and inflation. And each of those	24	might have been other things that the Original Tribunal
25	individually, one was \$3.7 million up, the other was	25	could have considered, and it set forth what those other
	Page 65		Page 67
	1 4ge 05		1 age 07
12:01 1	\$3.8 million down, or vice versa. One was 3.7 one way,	12:04 1	things could have been, and then it proceeded from that
12:01 1	\$3.8 million down, or vice versa. One was 3.7 one way, the other was 3.8 the other way.	12:04 1 2	things could have been, and then it proceeded from that to conclude that there was no res judicata. That's what
			-
2	the other was 3.8 the other way. And that's what was discussed at the hearing. That's the discussion where Dr Abdala agreed and you	2	to conclude that there was no res judicata. That's what
2 3	the other was 3.8 the other way. And that's what was discussed at the hearing.	2 3	to conclude that there was no res judicata. That's what the Original Tribunal was doing in that section.
2 3 4	the other was 3.8 the other way. And that's what was discussed at the hearing. That's the discussion where Dr Abdala agreed and you	2 3 4	to conclude that there was no res judicata. That's what the Original Tribunal was doing in that section. The Original Tribunal was not setting forth any
2 3 4 5	the other was 3.8 the other way. And that's what was discussed at the hearing. That's the discussion where Dr Abdala agreed and you will see it in the transcript he agreed that these	2 3 4 5	to conclude that there was no res judicata. That's what the Original Tribunal was doing in that section. The Original Tribunal was not setting forth any premises or anything on which its own analysis of
2 3 4 5 6	the other was 3.8 the other way. And that's what was discussed at the hearing. That's the discussion where Dr Abdala agreed and you will see it in the transcript he agreed that these "washed out". That's the term that was used by the experts. The reason why they wash out is that	2 3 4 5 6	to conclude that there was no res judicata. That's what the Original Tribunal was doing in that section. The Original Tribunal was not setting forth any premises or anything on which its own analysis of quantum would be based. That analysis is provided in
2 3 4 5 6 7	the other was 3.8 the other way. And that's what was discussed at the hearing. That's the discussion where Dr Abdala agreed and you will see it in the transcript he agreed that these "washed out". That's the term that was used by the experts. The reason why they wash out is that individually they are the same number, except in	2 3 4 5 6 7	to conclude that there was no res judicata. That's what the Original Tribunal was doing in that section. The Original Tribunal was not setting forth any premises or anything on which its own analysis of quantum would be based. That analysis is provided in an entirely different section of the Award. That
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the other was 3.8 the other way. And that's what was discussed at the hearing. That's the discussion where Dr Abdala agreed and you will see it in the transcript he agreed that these "washed out". That's the term that was used by the experts. The reason why they wash out is that individually they are the same number, except in opposite directions. On this slide the number you are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	to conclude that there was no res judicata. That's what the Original Tribunal was doing in that section. The Original Tribunal was not setting forth any premises or anything on which its own analysis of quantum would be based. That analysis is provided in an entirely different section of the Award. That section does not cite back to the res judicata or does not espouse these alleged premises.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the other was 3.8 the other way. And that's what was discussed at the hearing. That's the discussion where Dr Abdala agreed and you will see it in the transcript he agreed that these "washed out". That's the term that was used by the experts. The reason why they wash out is that individually they are the same number, except in opposite directions. On this slide the number you are seeing might be different because we might be looking at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	to conclude that there was no res judicata. That's what the Original Tribunal was doing in that section. The Original Tribunal was not setting forth any premises or anything on which its own analysis of quantum would be based. That analysis is provided in an entirely different section of the Award. That section does not cite back to the res judicata or does not espouse these alleged premises.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the other was 3.8 the other way. And that's what was discussed at the hearing. That's the discussion where Dr Abdala agreed and you will see it in the transcript he agreed that these "washed out". That's the term that was used by the experts. The reason why they wash out is that individually they are the same number, except in opposite directions. On this slide the number you are seeing might be different because we might be looking at the cumulative impact or it's broken out in a maybe	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	to conclude that there was no res judicata. That's what the Original Tribunal was doing in that section. The Original Tribunal was not setting forth any premises or anything on which its own analysis of quantum would be based. That analysis is provided in an entirely different section of the Award. That section does not cite back to the res judicata or does not espouse these alleged premises. That's because it was open to the Resubmission Tribunal to make its own conclusion. And that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the other was 3.8 the other way. And that's what was discussed at the hearing. That's the discussion where Dr Abdala agreed and you will see it in the transcript he agreed that these "washed out". That's the term that was used by the experts. The reason why they wash out is that individually they are the same number, except in opposite directions. On this slide the number you are seeing might be different because we might be looking at the cumulative impact or it's broken out in a maybe slightly different way.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	to conclude that there was no res judicata. That's what the Original Tribunal was doing in that section. The Original Tribunal was not setting forth any premises or anything on which its own analysis of quantum would be based. That analysis is provided in an entirely different section of the Award. That section does not cite back to the res judicata or does not espouse these alleged premises. That's because it was open to the Resubmission Tribunal to make its own conclusion. And that conclusion could have been that whereas the Original
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the other was 3.8 the other way. And that's what was discussed at the hearing. That's the discussion where Dr Abdala agreed and you will see it in the transcript he agreed that these "washed out". That's the term that was used by the experts. The reason why they wash out is that individually they are the same number, except in opposite directions. On this slide the number you are seeing might be different because we might be looking at the cumulative impact or it's broken out in a maybe slightly different way. But at the hearing it was made clear that those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	to conclude that there was no res judicata. That's what the Original Tribunal was doing in that section. The Original Tribunal was not setting forth any premises or anything on which its own analysis of quantum would be based. That analysis is provided in an entirely different section of the Award. That section does not cite back to the res judicata or does not espouse these alleged premises. That's because it was open to the Resubmission Tribunal to make its own conclusion. And that conclusion could have been that whereas the Original Tribunal considered the evidence that was before the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the other was 3.8 the other way. And that's what was discussed at the hearing. That's the discussion where Dr Abdala agreed and you will see it in the transcript he agreed that these "washed out". That's the term that was used by the experts. The reason why they wash out is that individually they are the same number, except in opposite directions. On this slide the number you are seeing might be different because we might be looking at the cumulative impact or it's broken out in a maybe slightly different way. But at the hearing it was made clear that those criticisms wash out.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	to conclude that there was no res judicata. That's what the Original Tribunal was doing in that section. The Original Tribunal was not setting forth any premises or anything on which its own analysis of quantum would be based. That analysis is provided in an entirely different section of the Award. That section does not cite back to the res judicata or does not espouse these alleged premises. That's because it was open to the Resubmission Tribunal to make its own conclusion. And that conclusion could have been that whereas the Original Tribunal considered the evidence that was before the Original Tribunal insufficient for awarding loss of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 the other was 3.8 the other way. And that's what was discussed at the hearing. That's the discussion where Dr Abdala agreed and you will see it in the transcript he agreed that these "washed out". That's the term that was used by the experts. The reason why they wash out is that individually they are the same number, except in opposite directions. On this slide the number you are seeing might be different because we might be looking at the cumulative impact or it's broken out in a maybe slightly different way. But at the hearing it was made clear that those criticisms wash out. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to conclude that there was no res judicata. That's what the Original Tribunal was doing in that section. The Original Tribunal was not setting forth any premises or anything on which its own analysis of quantum would be based. That analysis is provided in an entirely different section of the Award. That section does not cite back to the res judicata or does not espouse these alleged premises. That's because it was open to the Resubmission Tribunal to make its own conclusion. And that conclusion could have been that whereas the Original Tribunal considered the evidence that was before the Original Tribunal insufficient for awarding loss of value damages, this Tribunal, the Resubmission Tribunal,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 the other was 3.8 the other way. And that's what was discussed at the hearing. That's the discussion where Dr Abdala agreed and you will see it in the transcript he agreed that these "washed out". That's the term that was used by the experts. The reason why they wash out is that individually they are the same number, except in opposite directions. On this slide the number you are seeing might be different because we might be looking at the cumulative impact or it's broken out in a maybe slightly different way. But at the hearing it was made clear that those criticisms wash out. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I do not have any further questions on damages or 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	to conclude that there was no res judicata. That's what the Original Tribunal was doing in that section. The Original Tribunal was not setting forth any premises or anything on which its own analysis of quantum would be based. That analysis is provided in an entirely different section of the Award. That section does not cite back to the res judicata or does not espouse these alleged premises. That's because it was open to the Resubmission Tribunal to make its own conclusion. And that conclusion could have been that whereas the Original Tribunal considered the evidence that was before the Original Tribunal insufficient for awarding loss of value damages, this Tribunal, the Resubmission Tribunal, reaches a different conclusion and considers that that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 the other was 3.8 the other way. And that's what was discussed at the hearing. That's the discussion where Dr Abdala agreed and you will see it in the transcript he agreed that these "washed out". That's the term that was used by the experts. The reason why they wash out is that individually they are the same number, except in opposite directions. On this slide the number you are seeing might be different because we might be looking at the cumulative impact or it's broken out in a maybe slightly different way. But at the hearing it was made clear that those criticisms wash out. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I do not have any further questions on damages or interest. I thought Mr Polášek had said he had 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	to conclude that there was no res judicata. That's what the Original Tribunal was doing in that section. The Original Tribunal was not setting forth any premises or anything on which its own analysis of quantum would be based. That analysis is provided in an entirely different section of the Award. That section does not cite back to the res judicata or does not espouse these alleged premises. That's because it was open to the Resubmission Tribunal to make its own conclusion. And that conclusion could have been that whereas the Original Tribunal considered the evidence that was before the Original Tribunal insufficient for awarding loss of value damages, this Tribunal, the Resubmission Tribunal, reaches a different conclusion and considers that that evidence is sufficient. It was open to the Resubmission
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 the other was 3.8 the other way. And that's what was discussed at the hearing. That's the discussion where Dr Abdala agreed and you will see it in the transcript he agreed that these "washed out". That's the term that was used by the experts. The reason why they wash out is that individually they are the same number, except in opposite directions. On this slide the number you are seeing might be different because we might be looking at the cumulative impact or it's broken out in a maybe slightly different way. But at the hearing it was made clear that those criticisms wash out. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I do not have any further questions on damages or interest. I thought Mr Polášek had said he had something prepared regarding the inconsistencies, the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	to conclude that there was no res judicata. That's what the Original Tribunal was doing in that section. The Original Tribunal was not setting forth any premises or anything on which its own analysis of quantum would be based. That analysis is provided in an entirely different section of the Award. That section does not cite back to the res judicata or does not espouse these alleged premises. That's because it was open to the Resubmission Tribunal to make its own conclusion. And that conclusion could have been that whereas the Original Tribunal considered the evidence that was before the Original Tribunal insufficient for awarding loss of value damages, this Tribunal, the Resubmission Tribunal, reaches a different conclusion and considers that that evidence is sufficient. It was open to the Resubmission Tribunal to make that decision, in theory.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 the other was 3.8 the other way. And that's what was discussed at the hearing. That's the discussion where Dr Abdala agreed and you will see it in the transcript he agreed that these "washed out". That's the term that was used by the experts. The reason why they wash out is that individually they are the same number, except in opposite directions. On this slide the number you are seeing might be different because we might be looking at the cumulative impact or it's broken out in a maybe slightly different way. But at the hearing it was made clear that those criticisms wash out. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I do not have any further questions on damages or interest. I thought Mr Polášek had said he had something prepared regarding the inconsistencies, the alleged inconsistencies and contradiction of the Award. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	to conclude that there was no res judicata. That's what the Original Tribunal was doing in that section. The Original Tribunal was not setting forth any premises or anything on which its own analysis of quantum would be based. That analysis is provided in an entirely different section of the Award. That section does not cite back to the res judicata or does not espouse these alleged premises. That's because it was open to the Resubmission Tribunal to make its own conclusion. And that conclusion could have been that whereas the Original Tribunal considered the evidence that was before the Original Tribunal insufficient for awarding loss of value damages, this Tribunal, the Resubmission Tribunal, reaches a different conclusion and considers that that evidence is sufficient. It was open to the Resubmission Tribunal to make that decision, in theory. In fact, we know that the Resubmission Tribunal did
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 the other was 3.8 the other way. And that's what was discussed at the hearing. That's the discussion where Dr Abdala agreed and you will see it in the transcript he agreed that these "washed out". That's the term that was used by the experts. The reason why they wash out is that individually they are the same number, except in opposite directions. On this slide the number you are seeing might be different because we might be looking at the cumulative impact or it's broken out in a maybe slightly different way. But at the hearing it was made clear that those criticisms wash out. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I do not have any further questions on damages or interest. I thought Mr Polášek had said he had something prepared regarding the inconsistencies, the alleged inconsistencies and contradiction of the Award. Is it very long? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	to conclude that there was no res judicata. That's what the Original Tribunal was doing in that section. The Original Tribunal was not setting forth any premises or anything on which its own analysis of quantum would be based. That analysis is provided in an entirely different section of the Award. That section does not cite back to the res judicata or does not espouse these alleged premises. That's because it was open to the Resubmission Tribunal to make its own conclusion. And that conclusion could have been that whereas the Original Tribunal considered the evidence that was before the Original Tribunal insufficient for awarding loss of value damages, this Tribunal, the Resubmission Tribunal, reaches a different conclusion and considers that that evidence is sufficient. It was open to the Resubmission Tribunal to make that decision, in theory. In fact, we know that the Resubmission Tribunal did
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 the other was 3.8 the other way. And that's what was discussed at the hearing. That's the discussion where Dr Abdala agreed and you will see it in the transcript he agreed that these "washed out". That's the term that was used by the experts. The reason why they wash out is that individually they are the same number, except in opposite directions. On this slide the number you are seeing might be different because we might be looking at the cumulative impact or it's broken out in a maybe slightly different way. But at the hearing it was made clear that those criticisms wash out. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I do not have any further questions on damages or interest. I thought Mr Polášek had said he had something prepared regarding the inconsistencies, the alleged inconsistencies and contradiction of the Award. Is it very long? MR POLÁŠEK: No, it is very short, in fact. I would just, 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	to conclude that there was no res judicata. That's what the Original Tribunal was doing in that section. The Original Tribunal was not setting forth any premises or anything on which its own analysis of quantum would be based. That analysis is provided in an entirely different section of the Award. That section does not cite back to the res judicata or does not espouse these alleged premises. That's because it was open to the Resubmission Tribunal to make its own conclusion. And that conclusion could have been that whereas the Original Tribunal considered the evidence that was before the Original Tribunal insufficient for awarding loss of value damages, this Tribunal, the Resubmission Tribunal, reaches a different conclusion and considers that that evidence is sufficient. It was open to the Resubmission Tribunal to make that decision, in theory. In fact, we know that the Resubmission Tribunal did not only consider the evidence before the Original Tribunal. And we know that because in the reasoning
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 the other was 3.8 the other way. And that's what was discussed at the hearing. That's the discussion where Dr Abdala agreed and you will see it in the transcript he agreed that these "washed out". That's the term that was used by the experts. The reason why they wash out is that individually they are the same number, except in opposite directions. On this slide the number you are seeing might be different because we might be looking at the cumulative impact or it's broken out in a maybe slightly different way. But at the hearing it was made clear that those criticisms wash out. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I do not have any further questions on damages or interest. I thought Mr Polášek had said he had something prepared regarding the inconsistencies, the alleged inconsistencies and contradiction of the Award. Is it very long? MR POLÁŠEK: No, it is very short, in fact. I would just, by way of summary 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	to conclude that there was no res judicata. That's what the Original Tribunal was doing in that section. The Original Tribunal was not setting forth any premises or anything on which its own analysis of quantum would be based. That analysis is provided in an entirely different section of the Award. That section does not cite back to the res judicata or does not espouse these alleged premises. That's because it was open to the Resubmission Tribunal to make its own conclusion. And that conclusion could have been that whereas the Original Tribunal considered the evidence that was before the Original Tribunal insufficient for awarding loss of value damages, this Tribunal, the Resubmission Tribunal, reaches a different conclusion and considers that that evidence is sufficient. It was open to the Resubmission Tribunal to make that decision, in theory. In fact, we know that the Resubmission Tribunal did not only consider the evidence before the Original Tribunal. And we know that because in the reasoning
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 the other was 3.8 the other way. And that's what was discussed at the hearing. That's the discussion where Dr Abdala agreed and you will see it in the transcript he agreed that these "washed out". That's the term that was used by the experts. The reason why they wash out is that individually they are the same number, except in opposite directions. On this slide the number you are seeing might be different because we might be looking at the cumulative impact or it's broken out in a maybe slightly different way. But at the hearing it was made clear that those criticisms wash out. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I do not have any further questions on damages or interest. I thought Mr Polášek had said he had something prepared regarding the inconsistencies, the alleged inconsistencies and contradiction of the Award. Is it very long? MR POLÁŠEK: No, it is very short, in fact. I would just, by way of summary THE PRESIDENT: Since you did the effort, it's fine if you 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	to conclude that there was no res judicata. That's what the Original Tribunal was doing in that section. The Original Tribunal was not setting forth any premises or anything on which its own analysis of quantum would be based. That analysis is provided in an entirely different section of the Award. That section does not cite back to the res judicata or does not espouse these alleged premises. That's because it was open to the Resubmission Tribunal to make its own conclusion. And that conclusion could have been that whereas the Original Tribunal considered the evidence that was before the Original Tribunal insufficient for awarding loss of value damages, this Tribunal, the Resubmission Tribunal, reaches a different conclusion and considers that that evidence is sufficient. It was open to the Resubmission Tribunal to make that decision, in theory. In fact, we know that the Resubmission Tribunal did not only consider the evidence before the Original Tribunal. And we know that because in the reasoning that's set forth in the other section of the Award, where the reasoning on loss of value damages actually is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 the other was 3.8 the other way. And that's what was discussed at the hearing. That's the discussion where Dr Abdala agreed and you will see it in the transcript he agreed that these "washed out". That's the term that was used by the experts. The reason why they wash out is that individually they are the same number, except in opposite directions. On this slide the number you are seeing might be different because we might be looking at the cumulative impact or it's broken out in a maybe slightly different way. But at the hearing it was made clear that those criticisms wash out. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I do not have any further questions on damages or interest. I thought Mr Polášek had said he had something prepared regarding the inconsistencies, the alleged inconsistencies and contradiction of the Award. Is it very long? MR POLÁŠEK: No, it is very short, in fact. I would just, by way of summary THE PRESIDENT: Since you did the effort, it's fine if you address it, of course. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	to conclude that there was no res judicata. That's what the Original Tribunal was doing in that section. The Original Tribunal was not setting forth any premises or anything on which its own analysis of quantum would be based. That analysis is provided in an entirely different section of the Award. That section does not cite back to the res judicata or does not espouse these alleged premises. That's because it was open to the Resubmission Tribunal to make its own conclusion. And that conclusion could have been that whereas the Original Tribunal considered the evidence that was before the Original Tribunal insufficient for awarding loss of value damages, this Tribunal, the Resubmission Tribunal, reaches a different conclusion and considers that that evidence is sufficient. It was open to the Resubmission Tribunal to make that decision, in theory. In fact, we know that the Resubmission Tribunal did not only consider the evidence before the Original Tribunal. And we know that because in the reasoning that's set forth in the other section of the Award, where the reasoning on loss of value damages actually is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 the other was 3.8 the other way. And that's what was discussed at the hearing. That's the discussion where Dr Abdala agreed and you will see it in the transcript he agreed that these "washed out". That's the term that was used by the experts. The reason why they wash out is that individually they are the same number, except in opposite directions. On this slide the number you are seeing might be different because we might be looking at the cumulative impact or it's broken out in a maybe slightly different way. But at the hearing it was made clear that those criticisms wash out. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I do not have any further questions on damages or interest. I thought Mr Polášek had said he had something prepared regarding the inconsistencies, the alleged inconsistencies and contradiction of the Award. Is it very long? MR POLÁŠEK: No, it is very short, in fact. I would just, by way of summary THE PRESIDENT: Since you did the effort, it's fine if you address it, of course. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	to conclude that there was no res judicata. That's what the Original Tribunal was doing in that section. The Original Tribunal was not setting forth any premises or anything on which its own analysis of quantum would be based. That analysis is provided in an entirely different section of the Award. That section does not cite back to the res judicata or does not espouse these alleged premises. That's because it was open to the Resubmission Tribunal to make its own conclusion. And that conclusion could have been that whereas the Original Tribunal considered the evidence that was before the Original Tribunal insufficient for awarding loss of value damages, this Tribunal, the Resubmission Tribunal, reaches a different conclusion and considers that that evidence is sufficient. It was open to the Resubmission Tribunal to make that decision, in theory. In fact, we know that the Resubmission Tribunal did not only consider the evidence before the Original Tribunal. And we know that because in the reasoning that's set forth in the other section of the Award, where the reasoning on loss of value damages actually is stated, there are references to Kaczmarek's fourth

1			
12:05 1	arbitration, to Abdala's testimony at the hearing; there	12:09 1 less responsive, because it will be more general and	
12.05 1	are references to the record before the Resubmission	2 a reiteration of some things you've heard over the last	
3	Tribunal.	3 couple of days.	
4	So this notion that there are these two premises	4 So it might be more helpful if there are specific	
5	that somehow are contradicted by the Resubmission	5 I mean, at this point I think it's a foregone conclusion	
6	Tribunal's conclusion on damages, it's just not	6 we'll have to answer in writing. So if there are	
7	supported, it's not in the Award. That's all I have to	7 specific things that you might have a follow-up question	on
8	say on this.	8 to, or that it would really help to hear the parties'	_
9	THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.	9 views on now, maybe if you would identify them and t	
10		10 we would each take a few minutes to answer that. That	ıt
11	1	11 would be one suggestion.	
12		12 Then the only other reaction that I had is just	
13		13 a little bit of concern that I had expressed earlier in	
14	,	14 the hearing that of course Guatemala may choose who	mever
15		15 it wants to address the Tribunal, that's not the issue,	
16		but we're not here to hear witness testimony. So if	
17	top of my head. I think that there are a couple of	17 it's legal argument, fine, but not witness testimony.	
18	things that can be taken advantage of the fact that we	18 When he was talking about what they knew, that's	
19	have, for example, the state representatives here: for	19 factual.	
20	example, how Guatemala I think it's question 13 or	20 THE PRESIDENT: I understand.	
21	something got to know about Mr Alexandrov's	21 (Interpreted) How long have you been the	
22	situation. Let me see if I can find the question.	22 Attorney General?	
23	And also I have some I mean, we are prepared to	23 MR GÓMEZ GONZÁLEZ: (Interpreted) Thank you,	
24	respond to the 24 questions, we are prepared to go	24 Madam President. I have been in this position for two	
25	through each of them one by one. But otherwise, I think	and a half months. So a person in our team was going	to
	D (1)	7 7	
	Page 69	Page 71	
12:08 1	that we can express, convey to the Annulment Committee	12:11 1 refer to the facts; it's not that we were going to have	
2	some general thoughts about the different topics, kind	2 a witness.	
3	of the first thoughts, and we can complement things	3 THE PRESIDENT: But at any rate, whoever is going to address	s
4	separately in writing. That's an idea, a suggestion.	4 this does not have firsthand knowledge as a witness, as	
5	THE PRESIDENT: Would you agree?	5 a potential direct witness.	
6	Would you then suggest, for example, that we allot	6 DR TORTEROLA: Mr Smith, myself and Ms Karla Liquez, the	е
7	30 minutes to each party and they give us an overall	7 members of the Office of the Attorney General, all of	
8	answer to some of the questions, and the rest would be	8 them were direct witnesses of the facts.	
9	submitted in writing? Is that?	9 THE PRESIDENT: (In English) We need to have a chat, yes.	
10	DR TORTEROLA: Maybe what I was suggesting is	10 Let's break for five minutes.	
11	five/ten minutes for different topics we have a chunk	11 (12.12 pm)	
12	of different topics that can be discussed, I think	12 (A short break)	
13	and provide an opportunity for the other side. Yes,	13 (12.22 pm)	
14	exactly.	14 THE PRESIDENT: The Committee understands that Guatemala	a has
15	THE PRESIDENT: So would you say like five minutes for each	15 strong feelings that it would like to address	
16	of the sections that are included?	16 question 10, I believe it would be, and provide	
17	DR TORTEROLA: For example. And to provide the other party	17 an answer through one of Guatemala's I don't know if	
18	an opportunity to comment on it.	18 it would be the Procurador General del Estado or it	
19	THE PRESIDENT: So there's a level playing ground here.	19 would be someone else from Respondent's team who would	
20	DR TORTEROLA: Yes.	20 answer. They feel strongly that we should take this	
21	THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker, what would be your suggestion?	21 opportunity now that we have them here, they have made	
22	MS MENAKER: I think in smaller doses might be more	the effort of coming over to the hearing, to hear them	
23	efficient. I'm in the Committee's hands, of course. If	23 on this point. And the Committee feels sympathetic and	
24	you want to give the parties 30 minutes each, that's	24 understands that need and that wish.	
25	fine. But that runs the risk it will be maybe, perhaps,	25 This is a very important point to both parties,	
	Page 70	Page 72	

12:22	Guatemala's knowledge or deemed knowledge of	12:25 1	the question is very specific, and I don't see a way
	circumstances which might have given rise to doubts as	2	
3		3	
2		4	
4	-	5	-
6		6	
7		7	
8	-	8	
Ģ		9	
10	o something about how they feel about this case. We are	10	
1	happy to hear them too, now that we've got the	11	respond to it.
12	2 opportunity to hear them if they feel comfortable	12	THE PRESIDENT: So you have a specific date or range of
1.		13	-
14		14	
1:		15	
10		16	
1'	-	17	8
1		18	
19		19	
20	-	20	
2	-	21	
22	•	22	•
23 24		23 24	*
24		24	
<i>–</i> .	100 know, and that they only realit once the	20	I would say with respect to question 10 we were
	Page 73		Page 75
12:24	resubmission proceeding, at least they were closed.	12:27 1	going to raise it when we got to that we did have
	I don't know whether the Award was issued or whatever;	2	· · ·
	that's a bit blurry in my memory. But I think they said	3	
	4 that they could not have raised it at any significant	4	
	5 point during the resubmission proceeding.	5	
	5 That is an allegation not supported by evidence and	6	-
	7 we do not want to hear witness evidence on that point.	7	
	8 This is not the proper time to do that.9 So if anything during the answers to this question	8	
1		9 10	
1		10	-
1		11	
1		12	
1		14	с .
1	-	15	-
1		16	
1		17	Okay? No new evidence.
1	8 did not know at the time of the proceeding that is	18	DR TORTEROLA: I don't know, I have to hear I don't know
1	9 what they have alleged that is fine. Responding with	19	how to respond that I don't know that I know
2	a date of when they learnt something or their knowledge,	20	something that I don't know, or that my client
2		21	THE PRESIDENT: Or you can say simply, "We did not know".
2	2 DR TORTEROLA: If you'll allow me.	22	5
2		23	
2		24	
2	5 respond to the question. Because it seems to me that	25	should have known of these challenges.
	Page 74		Page 76

-		1	
12.20 1	MC MENAZED, Sum	12.22 1	6
12:30 1	MS MENAKER: Sure.	12:33 1	for you.
2	PROFESSOR JONES: The second part of the question talks	2	But in particular, you might recall when Ms Young
3	about deemed knowledge. That is what the President is	3	was arguing yesterday or I think it was yesterday
4	asking TECO to deal with. Your argument in response is	4	on slide 11 she showed that other states brought
5	intended to deal with when you say you should be deemed	5	challenges and it was in direct response to other
6	to have had knowledge or not.	6	disqualification proposals being made, which showed that
7	DR TORTEROLA: That is a very different question than the	7	these things were reported in the press quickly.
8	one that is addressed in the questions that we received	8	For instance, in Burlington v Ecuador and we put
9	yesterday. And if that is the question, I will not	9	this on the screen for your convenience. You have
10	answer that today. That requires more work on our side.	10	Burlington v Ecuador. And there
11	The question is substantially different, the one	11	DR TORTEROLA: But that case is irrelevant. It's not about
12	that has been put to us. It's not the deemed knowledge;	12	this case. I mean, when is that, that happened?
13	that is Claimant's position. We have a different	13	I think that the question is very specific: when did
14	position: when is the real date that Guatemala got	14	that happen in our case?
15	knowledge of the situation?	15	THE PRESIDENT: Mr Torterola, let Ms Menaker continue.
16	PROFESSOR JONES: The first sentence frames the second part	16	The point that you were making is: well, this was
17	of the question: the issue of Guatemala's deemed	17	public knowledge, and other states did use the
18	knowledge. That is all that question deals with.	18	opportunity that they got this information to challenge;
19	If you want us to amend the question, we are happy	19	right? Is that what you're saying?
20	to do so. If there's misunderstanding from that that	20	MS MENAKER: Precisely, yes.
21	first sentence is not the question. The question is in	21	THE PRESIDENT: Then continue. It's an argument.
22	the second sentence.	22	MS MENAKER: The first example was Burlington v Ecuador,
23	PROFESSOR BOO: The question is framed in a way to allow you	23	where Ecuador is stating that it became aware of repeat $V_{i} = \tilde{V}_{i}$
24	to identify for us where in the record, where in the	24	appointments of Professor Vicuña by Freshfields through
25	evidence shows when you knew or when you did not know.	25	an article that was published in a newsletter.
	Page 77		Page 79
12:32 1	If you don't, then the deeming will kick in, and then	12:34 1	Excuse me, so this is not about knowledge of
2	you have to answer the second part of the question.	2	a challenge but it shows that information about what was
3	DR TORTEROLA: We think that who has to prove the date at	3	
4	which Guatemala got knowledge of this situation is	4	IA Reporter, that respondent states that are involved in
5	Claimant. So if Claimant doesn't want to demonstrate	5	investor-state arbitrations keep abreast of and they
6	that and they would like us not to respond to that, we	6	• • •
7	are not going to respond to that. But we should not	7	was published in the same publications that we rely on
8	be	8	6
9	THE PRESIDENT: Let's hear TECO on the second question.	9	
10	DR TORTEROLA: shifting the burden of proof. I mean,	10	
11	I think that we are shifting the burden of proof, and we	11	
12	are not prepared to do that here.	12	
13	THE PRESIDENT: We already heard the parties on who has the	13	
14	burden of proof, whether this is a requirement or	14	0
15	defence; we've already heard the parties on that point.	15	
16	So, Ms Menaker, please.	16	
17	MS MENAKER: Thank you. And I won't repeat that, but	17	<i>c c</i>
18	obviously we disagree. Obviously we don't have the	18	
19	burden to prove when Guatemala had knowledge; they have	19	•
20	to bring something promptly.	20	
21	So as to when they should be deemed to have	21	
22	knowledge of these challenges, it's as soon as that information was publicly reported, which was very close	22 23	
23 24	mornation was publicly reported, which was very close	23	But even if you want to take the proposition that
	in time to when those challenges were brought. And we	24	you are entitled to disregard publicly available facts
25			you are entitled to disregard publicly available facts

12:36 1	give rise to justifiable doubts as to a manifest lack of	12:39 1	to answer. So I just wanted to first off clarify that
2	independence or impartiality, until someone else comes	2	point.
3	up with an argument that they do I mean, that's what	3	Then the second part of the question is what
4	they are saying here. But even then, as soon as someone	4	Ms Menaker has just stated. And first off, that's not
5	else came up with that argument in this case,	5	when Guatemala came to know of this. It has, in the
6	Pakistan it was reported, and you can see here that	6	first question, to do with what Guatemala came to know
7	the references they are citing are to, again, GAR	7	or did not come to know of. And the Claimant in their
8	articles, IA Reporter articles.	8	presentations and Ms Menaker said that that was
9	Then when Pakistan challenges Dr Alexandrov for the	9	discussed at the time, as to whether these circumstances
10	second time and they raise the new fact and this is	10	should have been or should not have been subject to
11	a new fact in this particular circumstance: what they	11	disclosure within the legal community.
12	were relying on was that he had resigned in the SolEs	12	So the issue of deemed knowledge and I'd like
13	v Spain arbitration as a result of a challenge based on	13	this to be on the record and the possibility that
14	similar circumstances, and were arguing that that was	14	Mr Blackaby might have known and we don't know what
15	relevant, that that was indicative of his lack of	15	Mr Blackaby knew or did not know, or how he judged that.
16	independence and impartiality. And they brought that	16	So according to Ms Menaker's words, possibly Mr Blackaby
17	again, they said their knowledge was triggered by the	17	considered that that was not a situation that needed to
18	GAR articles, and those were published very shortly	18	be divulged to Guatemala. But what I can say is that
19	after those challenges were made.	19	Guatemala did not become aware of it through Mr Blackaby
20	So these are widely reported. Respondent states in	20	or Freshfields.
21	investor-state arbitrations follow this, and then they	21	So let's now
22	react in accordance to it.	22	THE PRESIDENT: That is in what they've already said and
23	So even if you took the challenges, when should	23	what is in the memorial. Because they said Guatemala
24	Guatemala be deemed to have known about them? Well,	24	only knew of this later; that they said.
25	when they were widely reported. And we have all of	25	DR TORTEROLA: Okay. Well, let's go on to what's just been
	Page 81		Page 83
12:38 1	those dates in the record and we can compile them for	12:41 1	said.
12:38 1	those dates in the record and we can compile them for you. We have on a slide all of those. And we also, of	12:41 1	said. If we read what is said about the Eiser case
	-		
2	you. We have on a slide all of those. And we also, of	2	If we read what is said about the Eiser case
2 3	you. We have on a slide all of those. And we also, of course (Pause)	2 3	If we read what is said about the Eiser case which was presented to the Committee wrongly. What
2 3 4	you. We have on a slide all of those. And we also, of course (Pause)As I said before, this is on the premise that we're	2 3 4	If we read what is said about the Eiser case which was presented to the Committee wrongly. What paragraph 50 actually says is that Spain
2 3 4 5	you. We have on a slide all of those. And we also, of course (Pause)As I said before, this is on the premise that we're talking about your question in particular, when did they	2 3 4 5	If we read what is said about the Eiser case which was presented to the Committee wrongly. What paragraph 50 actually says is that Spain THE PRESIDENT: Could you share it again, just so we read
2 3 4 5 6	you. We have on a slide all of those. And we also, of course (Pause)As I said before, this is on the premise that we're talking about your question in particular, when did they have knowledge of these particular challenges, and not	2 3 4 5 6	If we read what is said about the Eiser case which was presented to the Committee wrongly. What paragraph 50 actually says is that Spain THE PRESIDENT: Could you share it again, just so we read the same?
2 3 4 5 6 7	you. We have on a slide all of those. And we also, of course (Pause)As I said before, this is on the premise that we're talking about your question in particular, when did they have knowledge of these particular challenges, and not of the underlying facts, which we've also addressed separately.	2 3 4 5 6 7	If we read what is said about the Eiser case which was presented to the Committee wrongly. What paragraph 50 actually says is that Spain THE PRESIDENT: Could you share it again, just so we read the same? DR TORTEROLA: (In English) It's not my presentation. It's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 you. We have on a slide all of those. And we also, of course (Pause) As I said before, this is on the premise that we're talking about your question in particular, when did they have knowledge of these particular challenges, and not of the underlying facts, which we've also addressed separately. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	If we read what is said about the Eiser case which was presented to the Committee wrongly. What paragraph 50 actually says is that Spain THE PRESIDENT: Could you share it again, just so we read the same? DR TORTEROLA: (In English) It's not my presentation. It's your slide. THE PRESIDENT: I am asking TECO.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 you. We have on a slide all of those. And we also, of course (Pause) As I said before, this is on the premise that we're talking about your question in particular, when did they have knowledge of these particular challenges, and not of the underlying facts, which we've also addressed separately. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Your comment on this, Mr Torterola? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	If we read what is said about the Eiser case which was presented to the Committee wrongly. What paragraph 50 actually says is that Spain THE PRESIDENT: Could you share it again, just so we read the same? DR TORTEROLA: (In English) It's not my presentation. It's your slide.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 you. We have on a slide all of those. And we also, of course (Pause) As I said before, this is on the premise that we're talking about your question in particular, when did they have knowledge of these particular challenges, and not of the underlying facts, which we've also addressed separately. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Your comment on this, Mr Torterola? DR TORTEROLA: Okay. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	If we read what is said about the Eiser case which was presented to the Committee wrongly. What paragraph 50 actually says is that Spain THE PRESIDENT: Could you share it again, just so we read the same? DR TORTEROLA: (In English) It's not my presentation. It's your slide. THE PRESIDENT: I am asking TECO. DR TORTEROLA: If you can show that slide.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 you. We have on a slide all of those. And we also, of course (Pause) As I said before, this is on the premise that we're talking about your question in particular, when did they have knowledge of these particular challenges, and not of the underlying facts, which we've also addressed separately. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Your comment on this, Mr Torterola? DR TORTEROLA: Okay. (Interpreted) Well, first of all, I'd like to point 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	If we read what is said about the Eiser case which was presented to the Committee wrongly. What paragraph 50 actually says is that Spain THE PRESIDENT: Could you share it again, just so we read the same? DR TORTEROLA: (In English) It's not my presentation. It's your slide. THE PRESIDENT: I am asking TECO. DR TORTEROLA: If you can show that slide. THE PRESIDENT: Can you share that again? DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) Okay. So if you read that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 you. We have on a slide all of those. And we also, of course (Pause) As I said before, this is on the premise that we're talking about your question in particular, when did they have knowledge of these particular challenges, and not of the underlying facts, which we've also addressed separately. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Your comment on this, Mr Torterola? DR TORTEROLA: Okay. (Interpreted) Well, first of all, I'd like to point out that the question actually says two different things 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	If we read what is said about the Eiser case which was presented to the Committee wrongly. What paragraph 50 actually says is that Spain THE PRESIDENT: Could you share it again, just so we read the same? DR TORTEROLA: (In English) It's not my presentation. It's your slide. THE PRESIDENT: I am asking TECO. DR TORTEROLA: If you can show that slide. THE PRESIDENT: Can you share that again? DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) Okay. So if you read that paragraph, nowhere does it say that Spain asked anybody,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 you. We have on a slide all of those. And we also, of course (Pause) As I said before, this is on the premise that we're talking about your question in particular, when did they have knowledge of these particular challenges, and not of the underlying facts, which we've also addressed separately. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Your comment on this, Mr Torterola? DR TORTEROLA: Okay. (Interpreted) Well, first of all, I'd like to point out that the question actually says two different things to what the Annulment Committee says it's saying. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	If we read what is said about the Eiser case which was presented to the Committee wrongly. What paragraph 50 actually says is that Spain THE PRESIDENT: Could you share it again, just so we read the same? DR TORTEROLA: (In English) It's not my presentation. It's your slide. THE PRESIDENT: I am asking TECO. DR TORTEROLA: If you can show that slide. THE PRESIDENT: Can you share that again? DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) Okay. So if you read that paragraph, nowhere does it say that Spain asked anybody, nor did they request information from the tribunal. In
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 you. We have on a slide all of those. And we also, of course (Pause) As I said before, this is on the premise that we're talking about your question in particular, when did they have knowledge of these particular challenges, and not of the underlying facts, which we've also addressed separately. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Your comment on this, Mr Torterola? DR TORTEROLA: Okay. (Interpreted) Well, first of all, I'd like to point out that the question actually says two different things to what the Annulment Committee says it's saying. The first question and maybe if I had a Spanish 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 If we read what is said about the Eiser case which was presented to the Committee wrongly. What paragraph 50 actually says is that Spain THE PRESIDENT: Could you share it again, just so we read the same? DR TORTEROLA: (In English) It's not my presentation. It's your slide. THE PRESIDENT: I am asking TECO. DR TORTEROLA: If you can show that slide. THE PRESIDENT: Can you share that again? DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) Okay. So if you read that paragraph, nowhere does it say that Spain asked anybody, nor did they request information from the tribunal. In Eiser the same situation arises as we have before us in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 you. We have on a slide all of those. And we also, of course (Pause) As I said before, this is on the premise that we're talking about your question in particular, when did they have knowledge of these particular challenges, and not of the underlying facts, which we've also addressed separately. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Your comment on this, Mr Torterola? DR TORTEROLA: Okay. (Interpreted) Well, first of all, I'd like to point out that the question actually says two different things to what the Annulment Committee says it's saying. The first question and maybe if I had a Spanish version of it, I could follow it more closely. Because 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	If we read what is said about the Eiser case which was presented to the Committee wrongly. What paragraph 50 actually says is that Spain THE PRESIDENT: Could you share it again, just so we read the same? DR TORTEROLA: (In English) It's not my presentation. It's your slide. THE PRESIDENT: I am asking TECO. DR TORTEROLA: If you can show that slide. THE PRESIDENT: Can you share that again? DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) Okay. So if you read that paragraph, nowhere does it say that Spain asked anybody, nor did they request information from the tribunal. In Eiser the same situation arises as we have before us in this case. The award had been issued. Spain was unable
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 you. We have on a slide all of those. And we also, of course (Pause) As I said before, this is on the premise that we're talking about your question in particular, when did they have knowledge of these particular challenges, and not of the underlying facts, which we've also addressed separately. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Your comment on this, Mr Torterola? DR TORTEROLA: Okay. (Interpreted) Well, first of all, I'd like to point out that the question actually says two different things to what the Annulment Committee says it's saying. The first question and maybe if I had a Spanish version of it, I could follow it more closely. Because question 10: 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	If we read what is said about the Eiser case which was presented to the Committee wrongly. What paragraph 50 actually says is that Spain THE PRESIDENT: Could you share it again, just so we read the same? DR TORTEROLA: (In English) It's not my presentation. It's your slide. THE PRESIDENT: I am asking TECO. DR TORTEROLA: If you can show that slide. THE PRESIDENT: Can you share that again? DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) Okay. So if you read that paragraph, nowhere does it say that Spain asked anybody, nor did they request information from the tribunal. In Eiser the same situation arises as we have before us in this case. The award had been issued. Spain was unable to put forward a challenge because they hadn't been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 you. We have on a slide all of those. And we also, of course (Pause) As I said before, this is on the premise that we're talking about your question in particular, when did they have knowledge of these particular challenges, and not of the underlying facts, which we've also addressed separately. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Your comment on this, Mr Torterola? DR TORTEROLA: Okay. (Interpreted) Well, first of all, I'd like to point out that the question actually says two different things to what the Annulment Committee says it's saying. The first question and maybe if I had a Spanish version of it, I could follow it more closely. Because question 10: "Dr Alexandrov 'routinely faced challenges' when 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	If we read what is said about the Eiser case which was presented to the Committee wrongly. What paragraph 50 actually says is that Spain THE PRESIDENT: Could you share it again, just so we read the same? DR TORTEROLA: (In English) It's not my presentation. It's your slide. THE PRESIDENT: I am asking TECO. DR TORTEROLA: If you can show that slide. THE PRESIDENT: Can you share that again? DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) Okay. So if you read that paragraph, nowhere does it say that Spain asked anybody, nor did they request information from the tribunal. In Eiser the same situation arises as we have before us in this case. The award had been issued. Spain was unable to put forward a challenge because they hadn't been apprised of the information.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 you. We have on a slide all of those. And we also, of course (Pause) As I said before, this is on the premise that we're talking about your question in particular, when did they have knowledge of these particular challenges, and not of the underlying facts, which we've also addressed separately. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Your comment on this, Mr Torterola? DR TORTEROLA: Okay. (Interpreted) Well, first of all, I'd like to point out that the question actually says two different things to what the Annulment Committee says it's saying. The first question and maybe if I had a Spanish version of it, I could follow it more closely. Because question 10: "Dr Alexandrov 'routinely faced challenges' when did Guatemala first come to know of this?" 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 If we read what is said about the Eiser case which was presented to the Committee wrongly. What paragraph 50 actually says is that Spain THE PRESIDENT: Could you share it again, just so we read the same? DR TORTEROLA: (In English) It's not my presentation. It's your slide. THE PRESIDENT: I am asking TECO. DR TORTEROLA: If you can show that slide. THE PRESIDENT: Can you share that again? DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) Okay. So if you read that paragraph, nowhere does it say that Spain asked anybody, nor did they request information from the tribunal. In Eiser the same situation arises as we have before us in this case. The award had been issued. Spain was unable to put forward a challenge because they hadn't been apprised of the information. In Eiser, contrary to what Ms Menaker has just said,
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 you. We have on a slide all of those. And we also, of course (Pause) As I said before, this is on the premise that we're talking about your question in particular, when did they have knowledge of these particular challenges, and not of the underlying facts, which we've also addressed separately. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Your comment on this, Mr Torterola? DR TORTEROLA: Okay. (Interpreted) Well, first of all, I'd like to point out that the question actually says two different things to what the Annulment Committee says it's saying. The first question and maybe if I had a Spanish version of it, I could follow it more closely. Because question 10: "Dr Alexandrov 'routinely faced challenges' when did Guatemala first come to know of this?" Guatemala. And what we're talking about here in 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	If we read what is said about the Eiser case which was presented to the Committee wrongly. What paragraph 50 actually says is that Spain THE PRESIDENT: Could you share it again, just so we read the same? DR TORTEROLA: (In English) It's not my presentation. It's your slide. THE PRESIDENT: I am asking TECO. DR TORTEROLA: If you can show that slide. THE PRESIDENT: Can you share that again? DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) Okay. So if you read that paragraph, nowhere does it say that Spain asked anybody, nor did they request information from the tribunal. In Eiser the same situation arises as we have before us in this case. The award had been issued. Spain was unable to put forward a challenge because they hadn't been apprised of the information. In Eiser, contrary to what Ms Menaker has just said, and has read bits of it, that situation is exactly the
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 you. We have on a slide all of those. And we also, of course (Pause) As I said before, this is on the premise that we're talking about your question in particular, when did they have knowledge of these particular challenges, and not of the underlying facts, which we've also addressed separately. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Your comment on this, Mr Torterola? DR TORTEROLA: Okay. (Interpreted) Well, first of all, I'd like to point out that the question actually says two different things to what the Annulment Committee says it's saying. The first question and maybe if I had a Spanish version of it, I could follow it more closely. Because question 10: "Dr Alexandrov 'routinely faced challenges' when did Guatemala first come to know of this?" Guatemala. And what we're talking about here in this case is what Guatemala could hypothetically have 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	If we read what is said about the Eiser case which was presented to the Committee wrongly. What paragraph 50 actually says is that Spain THE PRESIDENT: Could you share it again, just so we read the same? DR TORTEROLA: (In English) It's not my presentation. It's your slide. THE PRESIDENT: I am asking TECO. DR TORTEROLA: If you can show that slide. THE PRESIDENT: Can you share that again? DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) Okay. So if you read that paragraph, nowhere does it say that Spain asked anybody, nor did they request information from the tribunal. In Eiser the same situation arises as we have before us in this case. The award had been issued. Spain was unable to put forward a challenge because they hadn't been apprised of the information. In Eiser, contrary to what Ms Menaker has just said, and has read bits of it, that situation is exactly the same as the situation we had before us before. Spain
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 you. We have on a slide all of those. And we also, of course (Pause) As I said before, this is on the premise that we're talking about your question in particular, when did they have knowledge of these particular challenges, and not of the underlying facts, which we've also addressed separately. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Your comment on this, Mr Torterola? DR TORTEROLA: Okay. (Interpreted) Well, first of all, I'd like to point out that the question actually says two different things to what the Annulment Committee says it's saying. The first question and maybe if I had a Spanish version of it, I could follow it more closely. Because question 10: "Dr Alexandrov 'routinely faced challenges' when did Guatemala first come to know of this?" Guatemala. And what we're talking about here in this case is what Guatemala could hypothetically have been apprised of. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	If we read what is said about the Eiser case which was presented to the Committee wrongly. What paragraph 50 actually says is that Spain THE PRESIDENT: Could you share it again, just so we read the same? DR TORTEROLA: (In English) It's not my presentation. It's your slide. THE PRESIDENT: I am asking TECO. DR TORTEROLA: If you can show that slide. THE PRESIDENT: Can you share that again? DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) Okay. So if you read that paragraph, nowhere does it say that Spain asked anybody, nor did they request information from the tribunal. In Eiser the same situation arises as we have before us in this case. The award had been issued. Spain was unable to put forward a challenge because they hadn't been apprised of the information. In Eiser, contrary to what Ms Menaker has just said, and has read bits of it, that situation is exactly the same as the situation we had before us before. Spain was not aware until after the award had been handed
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 you. We have on a slide all of those. And we also, of course (Pause) As I said before, this is on the premise that we're talking about your question in particular, when did they have knowledge of these particular challenges, and not of the underlying facts, which we've also addressed separately. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Your comment on this, Mr Torterola? DR TORTEROLA: Okay. (Interpreted) Well, first of all, I'd like to point out that the question actually says two different things to what the Annulment Committee says it's saying. The first question and maybe if I had a Spanish version of it, I could follow it more closely. Because question 10: "Dr Alexandrov 'routinely faced challenges' when did Guatemala first come to know of this?" Guatemala. And what we're talking about here in this case is what Guatemala could hypothetically have been apprised of. So the first question doesn't refer to deemed 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	If we read what is said about the Eiser case which was presented to the Committee wrongly. What paragraph 50 actually says is that Spain THE PRESIDENT: Could you share it again, just so we read the same? DR TORTEROLA: (In English) It's not my presentation. It's your slide. THE PRESIDENT: I am asking TECO. DR TORTEROLA: If you can show that slide. THE PRESIDENT: Can you share that again? DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) Okay. So if you read that paragraph, nowhere does it say that Spain asked anybody, nor did they request information from the tribunal. In Eiser the same situation arises as we have before us in this case. The award had been issued. Spain was unable to put forward a challenge because they hadn't been apprised of the information. In Eiser, contrary to what Ms Menaker has just said, and has read bits of it, that situation is exactly the same as the situation we had before us before. Spain was not aware until after the award had been handed down.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 you. We have on a slide all of those. And we also, of course (Pause) As I said before, this is on the premise that we're talking about your question in particular, when did they have knowledge of these particular challenges, and not of the underlying facts, which we've also addressed separately. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Your comment on this, Mr Torterola? DR TORTEROLA: Okay. (Interpreted) Well, first of all, I'd like to point out that the question actually says two different things to what the Annulment Committee says it's saying. The first question and maybe if I had a Spanish version of it, I could follow it more closely. Because question 10: "Dr Alexandrov 'routinely faced challenges' when did Guatemala first come to know of this?" Guatemala. And what we're talking about here in this case is what Guatemala could hypothetically have been apprised of. So the first question doesn't refer to deemed knowledge but it refers to [actual] knowledge. That's 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 If we read what is said about the Eiser case which was presented to the Committee wrongly. What paragraph 50 actually says is that Spain THE PRESIDENT: Could you share it again, just so we read the same? DR TORTEROLA: (In English) It's not my presentation. It's your slide. THE PRESIDENT: I am asking TECO. DR TORTEROLA: If you can show that slide. THE PRESIDENT: Can you share that again? DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) Okay. So if you read that paragraph, nowhere does it say that Spain asked anybody, nor did they request information from the tribunal. In Eiser the same situation arises as we have before us in this case. The award had been issued. Spain was unable to put forward a challenge because they hadn't been apprised of the information. In Eiser, contrary to what Ms Menaker has just said, and has read bits of it, that situation is exactly the same as the situation we had before us before. Spain was not aware until after the award had been handed down. THE PRESIDENT: (Interpreted) I'm sorry, I'm not following
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 you. We have on a slide all of those. And we also, of course (Pause) As I said before, this is on the premise that we're talking about your question in particular, when did they have knowledge of these particular challenges, and not of the underlying facts, which we've also addressed separately. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Your comment on this, Mr Torterola? DR TORTEROLA: Okay. (Interpreted) Well, first of all, I'd like to point out that the question actually says two different things to what the Annulment Committee says it's saying. The first question and maybe if I had a Spanish version of it, I could follow it more closely. Because question 10: "Dr Alexandrov 'routinely faced challenges' when did Guatemala first come to know of this?" Guatemala. And what we're talking about here in this case is what Guatemala could hypothetically have been apprised of. So the first question doesn't refer to deemed 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	If we read what is said about the Eiser case which was presented to the Committee wrongly. What paragraph 50 actually says is that Spain THE PRESIDENT: Could you share it again, just so we read the same? DR TORTEROLA: (In English) It's not my presentation. It's your slide. THE PRESIDENT: I am asking TECO. DR TORTEROLA: If you can show that slide. THE PRESIDENT: Can you share that again? DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) Okay. So if you read that paragraph, nowhere does it say that Spain asked anybody, nor did they request information from the tribunal. In Eiser the same situation arises as we have before us in this case. The award had been issued. Spain was unable to put forward a challenge because they hadn't been apprised of the information. In Eiser, contrary to what Ms Menaker has just said, and has read bits of it, that situation is exactly the same as the situation we had before us before. Spain was not aware until after the award had been handed down.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 you. We have on a slide all of those. And we also, of course (Pause) As I said before, this is on the premise that we're talking about your question in particular, when did they have knowledge of these particular challenges, and not of the underlying facts, which we've also addressed separately. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Your comment on this, Mr Torterola? DR TORTEROLA: Okay. (Interpreted) Well, first of all, I'd like to point out that the question actually says two different things to what the Annulment Committee says it's saying. The first question and maybe if I had a Spanish version of it, I could follow it more closely. Because question 10: "Dr Alexandrov 'routinely faced challenges' when did Guatemala first come to know of this?" Guatemala. And what we're talking about here in this case is what Guatemala could hypothetically have been apprised of. So the first question doesn't refer to deemed knowledge but it refers to [actual] knowledge. That's 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 If we read what is said about the Eiser case which was presented to the Committee wrongly. What paragraph 50 actually says is that Spain THE PRESIDENT: Could you share it again, just so we read the same? DR TORTEROLA: (In English) It's not my presentation. It's your slide. THE PRESIDENT: I am asking TECO. DR TORTEROLA: If you can show that slide. THE PRESIDENT: Can you share that again? DR TORTEROLA: (Interpreted) Okay. So if you read that paragraph, nowhere does it say that Spain asked anybody, nor did they request information from the tribunal. In Eiser the same situation arises as we have before us in this case. The award had been issued. Spain was unable to put forward a challenge because they hadn't been apprised of the information. In Eiser, contrary to what Ms Menaker has just said, and has read bits of it, that situation is exactly the same as the situation we had before us before. Spain was not aware until after the award had been handed down. THE PRESIDENT: (Interpreted) I'm sorry, I'm not following

12:43 1	according to Spain and this is Spain's allegation	12:47	1	the Attorney General office subscribed to the GAR or any
12.45 1	the facts surrounding the close relationship between		2	other subscription-based source of information.
3	Dr Alexandrov and Brattle only came to light after the		2 3	Had that information been in the public domain, then
4	award was rendered, and then it explained when that		4	that information would have been available. But if it's
5	moment was. And it refers to the public reports of the		5	closed sources, then it wouldn't have been published in
	relationships that came out in 2017.		5 6	the media in Guatemala. And information was being
6 7	DR TORTEROLA: What I'm saying is that the Claimant's		7	requested here. But here we're being asked to inform
8	counsel has just said that this information was		8	you of what we knew of and what we did not know of, and
9	requested by Spain, and that somehow or other, when it		o 9	basically that is the basis of my comment.
10	was requested as part of the proceeding. And when it		0	THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.
10	was requested as part of the proceeding, we were told			PROFESSOR JONES: Can I just say that what you've just
11	what could have been done by the parties that have	1	2	submitted is a good example of why, in my own view, the
12	access to that information, but didn't. But that's not		3	answers to the questions the Tribunal has posed would
13	what it says here in paragraph 50.		.5	best be dealt with in writing, for this reason: that you
14	I'm not sure if I'm expressing myself clearly.		.4	have sensibly, because you're speaking orally gone
15	THE PRESIDENT: Would you agree that Spain, in		.6	back over a number of matters that are already within
10	paragraph 50 this is according to what the committee		7	your existing submissions.
17	believes Spain is saying: that the facts surrounding the	1		What we are looking for in the answers to the
18	close relationship between Dr Alexandrov and Brattle		9	questions is a compilation of what has already been said
20	were facts that only came to light through the challenge		20	and what is already in the record regarding these
20	that was put forward as a result of a case involving		.0	questions, so that we can pull together in one place
21	Pakistan in 2017. Do you agree that that's what the		2	from the submissions, from the oral presentations here,
22	committee is saying with respect to Spain's opinion?		3	from the slides where we can find the answers to
23	DR TORTEROLA: But that's not what I'm referring to. What		.3	these questions.
25	I'm referring to is that we are being told and the		5	I think it demonstrates, at least for me, why there
25	The referring to is that we are being told and the	2	.5	i linik it demonstrates, at least for me, why there
	Page 85			Page 87
12:45 1	slide title states that respondent states request	12:49	1	will be real value in each party putting together in
12:45 1	slide title states that respondent states request information "Respondent States Regularly Rely On	12:49		will be real value in each party putting together in a holistic way for us rather than re-arguing what
2	information "Respondent States Regularly Rely On	2	1 2 3	a holistic way for us rather than re-arguing what
	information "Respondent States Regularly Rely On Industry Media", that's the title. And the parties	2	2	
2 3	information "Respondent States Regularly Rely On	2	2 3	a holistic way for us rather than re-arguing what we've already heard where we can find the answers to
2 3 4	information "Respondent States Regularly Rely On Industry Media", that's the title. And the parties asked Mr Alexandrov in the actual proceeding, requested	2	2 3 4	a holistic way for us rather than re-arguing what we've already heard where we can find the answers to these questions.
2 3 4 5	information "Respondent States Regularly Rely On Industry Media", that's the title. And the parties asked Mr Alexandrov in the actual proceeding, requested information; or at least that's how I understood it.	2	2 3 4 5	a holistic way for us rather than re-arguing what we've already heard where we can find the answers to these questions. So thank you for that. It just enabled me to
2 3 4 5 6	information "Respondent States Regularly Rely On Industry Media", that's the title. And the parties asked Mr Alexandrov in the actual proceeding, requested information; or at least that's how I understood it. But perhaps I am mistaken.	22	2 3 4 5 6 7	a holistic way for us rather than re-arguing what we've already heard where we can find the answers to these questions. So thank you for that. It just enabled me to clarify in my own mind how best I will be helped by the
2 3 4 5 6 7	 information "Respondent States Regularly Rely On Industry Media", that's the title. And the parties asked Mr Alexandrov in the actual proceeding, requested information; or at least that's how I understood it. But perhaps I am mistaken. So I think the argument that's being put forward 		2 3 4 5 6 7	a holistic way for us rather than re-arguing what we've already heard where we can find the answers to these questions. So thank you for that. It just enabled me to clarify in my own mind how best I will be helped by the answers to the questions in writing.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 information "Respondent States Regularly Rely On Industry Media", that's the title. And the parties asked Mr Alexandrov in the actual proceeding, requested information; or at least that's how I understood it. But perhaps I am mistaken. So I think the argument that's being put forward here is that when the states wanted to inform themselves 		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a holistic way for us rather than re-arguing what we've already heard where we can find the answers to these questions. So thank you for that. It just enabled me to clarify in my own mind how best I will be helped by the answers to the questions in writing. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, thank you very much. I was just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 information "Respondent States Regularly Rely On Industry Media", that's the title. And the parties asked Mr Alexandrov in the actual proceeding, requested information; or at least that's how I understood it. But perhaps I am mistaken. So I think the argument that's being put forward here is that when the states wanted to inform themselves of a given situation, they ask for that information. 		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	a holistic way for us rather than re-arguing what we've already heard where we can find the answers to these questions. So thank you for that. It just enabled me to clarify in my own mind how best I will be helped by the answers to the questions in writing. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, thank you very much. I was just answering the comments or responding to the comments
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 information "Respondent States Regularly Rely On Industry Media", that's the title. And the parties asked Mr Alexandrov in the actual proceeding, requested information; or at least that's how I understood it. But perhaps I am mistaken. So I think the argument that's being put forward here is that when the states wanted to inform themselves of a given situation, they ask for that information. That's what I have understood it. And I believe that 		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1	a holistic way for us rather than re-arguing what we've already heard where we can find the answers to these questions. So thank you for that. It just enabled me to clarify in my own mind how best I will be helped by the answers to the questions in writing. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, thank you very much. I was just answering the comments or responding to the comments made by Ms Menaker. And if I've repeated myself, then
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 information "Respondent States Regularly Rely On Industry Media", that's the title. And the parties asked Mr Alexandrov in the actual proceeding, requested information; or at least that's how I understood it. But perhaps I am mistaken. So I think the argument that's being put forward here is that when the states wanted to inform themselves of a given situation, they ask for that information. That's what I have understood it. And I believe that Eiser is in the same situation as we are in here. And 		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2	 a holistic way for us rather than re-arguing what we've already heard where we can find the answers to these questions. So thank you for that. It just enabled me to clarify in my own mind how best I will be helped by the answers to the questions in writing. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, thank you very much. I was just answering the comments or responding to the comments made by Ms Menaker. And if I've repeated myself, then I apologise. PROFESSOR JONES: No, no, no, I'm not criticising you for repeating what you've already said. It's a natural
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 information "Respondent States Regularly Rely On Industry Media", that's the title. And the parties asked Mr Alexandrov in the actual proceeding, requested information; or at least that's how I understood it. But perhaps I am mistaken. So I think the argument that's being put forward here is that when the states wanted to inform themselves of a given situation, they ask for that information. That's what I have understood it. And I believe that Eiser is in the same situation as we are in here. And Guatemala has been apprised of the information once the actual proceeding was over, and that's what I'm saying here, in this case. 		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4	 a holistic way for us rather than re-arguing what we've already heard where we can find the answers to these questions. So thank you for that. It just enabled me to clarify in my own mind how best I will be helped by the answers to the questions in writing. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, thank you very much. I was just answering the comments or responding to the comments made by Ms Menaker. And if I've repeated myself, then I apologise. PROFESSOR JONES: No, no, no, I'm not criticising you for repeating what you've already said. It's a natural consequence of the exchange that occurred. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 information "Respondent States Regularly Rely On Industry Media", that's the title. And the parties asked Mr Alexandrov in the actual proceeding, requested information; or at least that's how I understood it. But perhaps I am mistaken. So I think the argument that's being put forward here is that when the states wanted to inform themselves of a given situation, they ask for that information. That's what I have understood it. And I believe that Eiser is in the same situation as we are in here. And Guatemala has been apprised of the information once the actual proceeding was over, and that's what I'm saying here, in this case. Paragraph 50 I believe doesn't correspond to what 		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5	 a holistic way for us rather than re-arguing what we've already heard where we can find the answers to these questions. So thank you for that. It just enabled me to clarify in my own mind how best I will be helped by the answers to the questions in writing. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, thank you very much. I was just answering the comments or responding to the comments made by Ms Menaker. And if I've repeated myself, then I apologise. PROFESSOR JONES: No, no, no, I'm not criticising you for repeating what you've already said. It's a natural consequence of the exchange that occurred. Thank you. DR TORTEROLA: Thank you very much, Professor Jones.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 information "Respondent States Regularly Rely On Industry Media", that's the title. And the parties asked Mr Alexandrov in the actual proceeding, requested information; or at least that's how I understood it. But perhaps I am mistaken. So I think the argument that's being put forward here is that when the states wanted to inform themselves of a given situation, they ask for that information. That's what I have understood it. And I believe that Eiser is in the same situation as we are in here. And Guatemala has been apprised of the information once the actual proceeding was over, and that's what I'm saying here, in this case. Paragraph 50 I believe doesn't correspond to what was said, or what I understood to have been said. 		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5	 a holistic way for us rather than re-arguing what we've already heard where we can find the answers to these questions. So thank you for that. It just enabled me to clarify in my own mind how best I will be helped by the answers to the questions in writing. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, thank you very much. I was just answering the comments or responding to the comments made by Ms Menaker. And if I've repeated myself, then I apologise. PROFESSOR JONES: No, no, no, I'm not criticising you for repeating what you've already said. It's a natural consequence of the exchange that occurred. Thank you. DR TORTEROLA: Thank you very much, Professor Jones. PROFESSOR BOO: Actually the cases that have been suggested
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 information "Respondent States Regularly Rely On Industry Media", that's the title. And the parties asked Mr Alexandrov in the actual proceeding, requested information; or at least that's how I understood it. But perhaps I am mistaken. So I think the argument that's being put forward here is that when the states wanted to inform themselves of a given situation, they ask for that information. That's what I have understood it. And I believe that Eiser is in the same situation as we are in here. And Guatemala has been apprised of the information once the actual proceeding was over, and that's what I'm saying here, in this case. Paragraph 50 I believe doesn't correspond to what was said, or what I understood to have been said. A party may find itself in a situation where information 		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 a holistic way for us rather than re-arguing what we've already heard where we can find the answers to these questions. So thank you for that. It just enabled me to clarify in my own mind how best I will be helped by the answers to the questions in writing. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, thank you very much. I was just answering the comments or responding to the comments made by Ms Menaker. And if I've repeated myself, then I apologise. PROFESSOR JONES: No, no, no, I'm not criticising you for repeating what you've already said. It's a natural consequence of the exchange that occurred. Thank you. DR TORTEROLA: Thank you very much, Professor Jones. PROFESSOR BOO: Actually the cases that have been suggested by the Claimant's side talk about the relationship
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 information "Respondent States Regularly Rely On Industry Media", that's the title. And the parties asked Mr Alexandrov in the actual proceeding, requested information; or at least that's how I understood it. But perhaps I am mistaken. So I think the argument that's being put forward here is that when the states wanted to inform themselves of a given situation, they ask for that information. That's what I have understood it. And I believe that Eiser is in the same situation as we are in here. And Guatemala has been apprised of the information once the actual proceeding was over, and that's what I'm saying here, in this case. Paragraph 50 I believe doesn't correspond to what was said, or what I understood to have been said. A party may find itself in a situation where information 		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 a holistic way for us rather than re-arguing what we've already heard where we can find the answers to these questions. So thank you for that. It just enabled me to clarify in my own mind how best I will be helped by the answers to the questions in writing. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, thank you very much. I was just answering the comments or responding to the comments made by Ms Menaker. And if I've repeated myself, then I apologise. PROFESSOR JONES: No, no, no, I'm not criticising you for repeating what you've already said. It's a natural consequence of the exchange that occurred. Thank you. DR TORTEROLA: Thank you very much, Professor Jones. PROFESSOR BOO: Actually the cases that have been suggested by the Claimant's side talk about the relationship between Alexandrov and Brattle. Which is the case,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 information "Respondent States Regularly Rely On Industry Media", that's the title. And the parties asked Mr Alexandrov in the actual proceeding, requested information; or at least that's how I understood it. But perhaps I am mistaken. So I think the argument that's being put forward here is that when the states wanted to inform themselves of a given situation, they ask for that information. That's what I have understood it. And I believe that Eiser is in the same situation as we are in here. And Guatemala has been apprised of the information once the actual proceeding was over, and that's what I'm saying here, in this case. Paragraph 50 I believe doesn't correspond to what was said, or what I understood to have been said. A party may find itself in a situation where information comes to light once the situation or the proceeding is ended, and that's the situation that we are in here. 		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 a holistic way for us rather than re-arguing what we've already heard where we can find the answers to these questions. So thank you for that. It just enabled me to clarify in my own mind how best I will be helped by the answers to the questions in writing. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, thank you very much. I was just answering the comments or responding to the comments made by Ms Menaker. And if I've repeated myself, then I apologise. PROFESSOR JONES: No, no, no, I'm not criticising you for repeating what you've already said. It's a natural consequence of the exchange that occurred. Thank you. DR TORTEROLA: Thank you very much, Professor Jones. PROFESSOR BOO: Actually the cases that have been suggested by the Claimant's side talk about the relationship between Alexandrov and Brattle. Which is the case, given the date of the case that is in the public domain
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 information "Respondent States Regularly Rely On Industry Media", that's the title. And the parties asked Mr Alexandrov in the actual proceeding, requested information; or at least that's how I understood it. But perhaps I am mistaken. So I think the argument that's being put forward here is that when the states wanted to inform themselves of a given situation, they ask for that information. That's what I have understood it. And I believe that Eiser is in the same situation as we are in here. And Guatemala has been apprised of the information once the actual proceeding was over, and that's what I'm saying here, in this case. Paragraph 50 I believe doesn't correspond to what was said, or what I understood to have been said. A party may find itself in a situation where information comes to light once the situation that we are in here. On this slide you can see a number of references 		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	 a holistic way for us rather than re-arguing what we've already heard where we can find the answers to these questions. So thank you for that. It just enabled me to clarify in my own mind how best I will be helped by the answers to the questions in writing. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, thank you very much. I was just answering the comments or responding to the comments made by Ms Menaker. And if I've repeated myself, then I apologise. PROFESSOR JONES: No, no, no, I'm not criticising you for repeating what you've already said. It's a natural consequence of the exchange that occurred. Thank you. DR TORTEROLA: Thank you very much, Professor Jones. PROFESSOR BOO: Actually the cases that have been suggested by the Claimant's side talk about the relationship between Alexandrov and Brattle. Which is the case, given the date of the case that is in the public domain relating between Kaczmarek and Mr Alexandrov, where
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 information "Respondent States Regularly Rely On Industry Media", that's the title. And the parties asked Mr Alexandrov in the actual proceeding, requested information; or at least that's how I understood it. But perhaps I am mistaken. So I think the argument that's being put forward here is that when the states wanted to inform themselves of a given situation, they ask for that information. That's what I have understood it. And I believe that Eiser is in the same situation as we are in here. And Guatemala has been apprised of the information once the actual proceeding was over, and that's what I'm saying here, in this case. Paragraph 50 I believe doesn't correspond to what was said, or what I understood to have been said. A party may find itself in a situation where information comes to light once the situation or the proceeding is ended, and that's the situation that we are in here. On this slide you can see a number of references provided, and they are to information that are closed 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 20 2	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1	 a holistic way for us rather than re-arguing what we've already heard where we can find the answers to these questions. So thank you for that. It just enabled me to clarify in my own mind how best I will be helped by the answers to the questions in writing. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, thank you very much. I was just answering the comments or responding to the comments made by Ms Menaker. And if I've repeated myself, then I apologise. PROFESSOR JONES: No, no, no, I'm not criticising you for repeating what you've already said. It's a natural consequence of the exchange that occurred. Thank you. DR TORTEROLA: Thank you very much, Professor Jones. PROFESSOR BOO: Actually the cases that have been suggested by the Claimant's side talk about the relationship between Alexandrov and Brattle. Which is the case, given the date of the case that is in the public domain relating between Kaczmarek and Mr Alexandrov, where he was challenged? Did you give me the date for that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 information "Respondent States Regularly Rely On Industry Media", that's the title. And the parties asked Mr Alexandrov in the actual proceeding, requested information; or at least that's how I understood it. But perhaps I am mistaken. So I think the argument that's being put forward here is that when the states wanted to inform themselves of a given situation, they ask for that information. That's what I have understood it. And I believe that Eiser is in the same situation as we are in here. And Guatemala has been apprised of the information once the actual proceeding was over, and that's what I'm saying here, in this case. Paragraph 50 I believe doesn't correspond to what was said, or what I understood to have been said. A party may find itself in a situation where information comes to light once the situation or the proceeding is ended, and that's the situation that we are in here. On this slide you can see a number of references provided, and they are to information that are closed systems that you had to subscribe to. It's not publicly 	22 33 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 22 22	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2	 a holistic way for us rather than re-arguing what we've already heard where we can find the answers to these questions. So thank you for that. It just enabled me to clarify in my own mind how best I will be helped by the answers to the questions in writing. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, thank you very much. I was just answering the comments or responding to the comments made by Ms Menaker. And if I've repeated myself, then I apologise. PROFESSOR JONES: No, no, no, I'm not criticising you for repeating what you've already said. It's a natural consequence of the exchange that occurred. Thank you. DR TORTEROLA: Thank you very much, Professor Jones. PROFESSOR BOO: Actually the cases that have been suggested by the Claimant's side talk about the relationship between Alexandrov and Brattle. Which is the case, given the date of the case that is in the public domain relating between Kaczmarek and Mr Alexandrov, where he was challenged? Did you give me the date for that one?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 information "Respondent States Regularly Rely On Industry Media", that's the title. And the parties asked Mr Alexandrov in the actual proceeding, requested information; or at least that's how I understood it. But perhaps I am mistaken. So I think the argument that's being put forward here is that when the states wanted to inform themselves of a given situation, they ask for that information. That's what I have understood it. And I believe that Eiser is in the same situation as we are in here. And Guatemala has been apprised of the information once the actual proceeding was over, and that's what I'm saying here, in this case. Paragraph 50 I believe doesn't correspond to what was said, or what I understood to have been said. A party may find itself in a situation where information comes to light once the situation or the proceeding is ended, and that's the situation that we are in here. On this slide you can see a number of references provided, and they are to information that are closed systems that you had to subscribe to. It's not publicly available information. The Attorney General's Office 	22 33 22 55 66 77 88 99 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 22 22 22 22	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3	 a holistic way for us rather than re-arguing what we've already heard where we can find the answers to these questions. So thank you for that. It just enabled me to clarify in my own mind how best I will be helped by the answers to the questions in writing. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, thank you very much. I was just answering the comments or responding to the comments made by Ms Menaker. And if I've repeated myself, then I apologise. PROFESSOR JONES: No, no, no, I'm not criticising you for repeating what you've already said. It's a natural consequence of the exchange that occurred. Thank you. DR TORTEROLA: Thank you very much, Professor Jones. PROFESSOR BOO: Actually the cases that have been suggested by the Claimant's side talk about the relationship between Alexandrov and Brattle. Which is the case, given the date of the case that is in the public domain relating between Kaczmarek and Mr Alexandrov, where he was challenged? Did you give me the date for that one? I ask this because the relationship is different.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 information "Respondent States Regularly Rely On Industry Media", that's the title. And the parties asked Mr Alexandrov in the actual proceeding, requested information; or at least that's how I understood it. But perhaps I am mistaken. So I think the argument that's being put forward here is that when the states wanted to inform themselves of a given situation, they ask for that information. That's what I have understood it. And I believe that Eiser is in the same situation as we are in here. And Guatemala has been apprised of the information once the actual proceeding was over, and that's what I'm saying here, in this case. Paragraph 50 I believe doesn't correspond to what was said, or what I understood to have been said. A party may find itself in a situation where information comes to light once the situation or the proceeding is ended, and that's the situation that we are in here. On this slide you can see a number of references provided, and they are to information that are closed systems that you had to subscribe to. It's not publicly available information. The Attorney General's Office doesn't have access to these subscription-based sources 	22 33 4 5 6 7 8 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 22 22 22 24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4	 a holistic way for us rather than re-arguing what we've already heard where we can find the answers to these questions. So thank you for that. It just enabled me to clarify in my own mind how best I will be helped by the answers to the questions in writing. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, thank you very much. I was just answering the comments or responding to the comments made by Ms Menaker. And if I've repeated myself, then I apologise. PROFESSOR JONES: No, no, no, I'm not criticising you for repeating what you've already said. It's a natural consequence of the exchange that occurred. Thank you. DR TORTEROLA: Thank you very much, Professor Jones. PROFESSOR BOO: Actually the cases that have been suggested by the Claimant's side talk about the relationship between Alexandrov and Brattle. Which is the case, given the date of the case that is in the public domain relating between Kaczmarek and Mr Alexandrov, where he was challenged? Did you give me the date for that one? I ask this because the relationship is different. So when did that come into the public domain? Public
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 information "Respondent States Regularly Rely On Industry Media", that's the title. And the parties asked Mr Alexandrov in the actual proceeding, requested information; or at least that's how I understood it. But perhaps I am mistaken. So I think the argument that's being put forward here is that when the states wanted to inform themselves of a given situation, they ask for that information. That's what I have understood it. And I believe that Eiser is in the same situation as we are in here. And Guatemala has been apprised of the information once the actual proceeding was over, and that's what I'm saying here, in this case. Paragraph 50 I believe doesn't correspond to what was said, or what I understood to have been said. A party may find itself in a situation where information comes to light once the situation or the proceeding is ended, and that's the situation that we are in here. On this slide you can see a number of references provided, and they are to information that are closed systems that you had to subscribe to. It's not publicly available information. The Attorney General's Office 	22 33 22 55 66 77 88 99 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 22 22 22 22	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4	 a holistic way for us rather than re-arguing what we've already heard where we can find the answers to these questions. So thank you for that. It just enabled me to clarify in my own mind how best I will be helped by the answers to the questions in writing. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, thank you very much. I was just answering the comments or responding to the comments made by Ms Menaker. And if I've repeated myself, then I apologise. PROFESSOR JONES: No, no, no, I'm not criticising you for repeating what you've already said. It's a natural consequence of the exchange that occurred. Thank you. DR TORTEROLA: Thank you very much, Professor Jones. PROFESSOR BOO: Actually the cases that have been suggested by the Claimant's side talk about the relationship between Alexandrov and Brattle. Which is the case, given the date of the case that is in the public domain relating between Kaczmarek and Mr Alexandrov, where he was challenged? Did you give me the date for that one? I ask this because the relationship is different.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 information "Respondent States Regularly Rely On Industry Media", that's the title. And the parties asked Mr Alexandrov in the actual proceeding, requested information; or at least that's how I understood it. But perhaps I am mistaken. So I think the argument that's being put forward here is that when the states wanted to inform themselves of a given situation, they ask for that information. That's what I have understood it. And I believe that Eiser is in the same situation as we are in here. And Guatemala has been apprised of the information once the actual proceeding was over, and that's what I'm saying here, in this case. Paragraph 50 I believe doesn't correspond to what was said, or what I understood to have been said. A party may find itself in a situation where information comes to light once the situation or the proceeding is ended, and that's the situation that we are in here. On this slide you can see a number of references provided, and they are to information that are closed systems that you had to subscribe to. It's not publicly available information. The Attorney General's Office doesn't have access to these subscription-based sources 	22 33 4 5 6 7 8 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 22 22 22 24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4	 a holistic way for us rather than re-arguing what we've already heard where we can find the answers to these questions. So thank you for that. It just enabled me to clarify in my own mind how best I will be helped by the answers to the questions in writing. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, thank you very much. I was just answering the comments or responding to the comments made by Ms Menaker. And if I've repeated myself, then I apologise. PROFESSOR JONES: No, no, no, I'm not criticising you for repeating what you've already said. It's a natural consequence of the exchange that occurred. Thank you. DR TORTEROLA: Thank you very much, Professor Jones. PROFESSOR BOO: Actually the cases that have been suggested by the Claimant's side talk about the relationship between Alexandrov and Brattle. Which is the case, given the date of the case that is in the public domain relating between Kaczmarek and Mr Alexandrov, where he was challenged? Did you give me the date for that one? I ask this because the relationship is different. So when did that come into the public domain? Public

12:51 1	THE PRESIDENT: That is TCC, it's the square, right? The	12:54 1	Once all these challenges come forward, it doesn't
2		2	matter that it's not with Mr Kaczmarek, because anybody
3	-	3	
4		4	based on double-hatting with an expert.
5		5	
6		6	simply look and see: who's our expert? Kaczmarek. Let
7		7	me check: do they have any overlapping cases? You would
8		8	have instantaneously found or you would have asked
9		9	
10		10	
11		11	would have gotten your answer.
12		12	
13		13	
14		14	
15		15	
16		16	
17	-	17	
18		18	
19		19	
20	-	20	-
21		21	
22		22	
23		23	
24		24	
25		25	
		_	
	Page 89		Page 91
12:52 1	a legal argument that you could have come up with years	12:55 1	should have known, then you have to bring a challenge
2	ago, right?	2	soon after that. You can't wait and say, "We didn't
23	ago, right? Because the first person that challenged, which was		soon after that. You can't wait and say, "We didn't think it was problematic. We could have"
2 3 4	ago, right? Because the first person that challenged, which was then Pakistan in TCC, they were relying on information	2 3 4	soon after that. You can't wait and say, "We didn't think it was problematic. We could have" PROFESSOR BOO: It's okay. I understand the argument.
2 3 4 5	ago, right? Because the first person that challenged, which was then Pakistan in TCC, they were relying on information they learnt about this double-hatting relationship that	2 3 4 5	soon after that. You can't wait and say, "We didn't think it was problematic. We could have"PROFESSOR BOO: It's okay. I understand the argument.MS MENAKER: You see what I mean? And then wait till
2 3 4 5 6	ago, right? Because the first person that challenged, which was then Pakistan in TCC, they were relying on information they learnt about this double-hatting relationship that Dr Alexandrov had with The Brattle Group. And the issue	2 3 4 5 6	 soon after that. You can't wait and say, "We didn't think it was problematic. We could have" PROFESSOR BOO: It's okay. I understand the argument. MS MENAKER: You see what I mean? And then wait till someone else comes up with a legal argument and say that
2 3 4 5 6 7	ago, right? Because the first person that challenged, which was then Pakistan in TCC, they were relying on information they learnt about this double-hatting relationship that Dr Alexandrov had with The Brattle Group. And the issue there was when they learnt of that relationship, and you	2 3 4 5 6 7	 soon after that. You can't wait and say, "We didn't think it was problematic. We could have" PROFESSOR BOO: It's okay. I understand the argument. MS MENAKER: You see what I mean? And then wait till someone else comes up with a legal argument and say that that legal argument is your new fact, and then do it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ago, right? Because the first person that challenged, which was then Pakistan in TCC, they were relying on information they learnt about this double-hatting relationship that Dr Alexandrov had with The Brattle Group. And the issue there was when they learnt of that relationship, and you look back to when that information became public.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 soon after that. You can't wait and say, "We didn't think it was problematic. We could have" PROFESSOR BOO: It's okay. I understand the argument. MS MENAKER: You see what I mean? And then wait till someone else comes up with a legal argument and say that that legal argument is your new fact, and then do it. But even hypothetically, if we were to consider that to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 8 9	ago, right? Because the first person that challenged, which was then Pakistan in TCC, they were relying on information they learnt about this double-hatting relationship that Dr Alexandrov had with The Brattle Group. And the issue there was when they learnt of that relationship, and you look back to when that information became public. What other people are then doing is saying: okay,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 soon after that. You can't wait and say, "We didn't think it was problematic. We could have" PROFESSOR BOO: It's okay. I understand the argument. MS MENAKER: You see what I mean? And then wait till someone else comes up with a legal argument and say that that legal argument is your new fact, and then do it. But even hypothetically, if we were to consider that to be the new fact, this has got to be enough, because then
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 9	ago, right? Because the first person that challenged, which was then Pakistan in TCC, they were relying on information they learnt about this double-hatting relationship that Dr Alexandrov had with The Brattle Group. And the issue there was when they learnt of that relationship, and you look back to when that information became public. What other people are then doing is saying: okay, I have that same problem, but really I didn't even know	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 soon after that. You can't wait and say, "We didn't think it was problematic. We could have" PROFESSOR BOO: It's okay. I understand the argument. MS MENAKER: You see what I mean? And then wait till someone else comes up with a legal argument and say that that legal argument is your new fact, and then do it. But even hypothetically, if we were to consider that to be the new fact, this has got to be enough, because then you're looking at someone who is bringing a challenge
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	ago, right? Because the first person that challenged, which was then Pakistan in TCC, they were relying on information they learnt about this double-hatting relationship that Dr Alexandrov had with The Brattle Group. And the issue there was when they learnt of that relationship, and you look back to when that information became public. What other people are then doing is saying: okay, I have that same problem, but really I didn't even know about it until someone else came up with this legal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 soon after that. You can't wait and say, "We didn't think it was problematic. We could have" PROFESSOR BOO: It's okay. I understand the argument. MS MENAKER: You see what I mean? And then wait till someone else comes up with a legal argument and say that that legal argument is your new fact, and then do it. But even hypothetically, if we were to consider that to be the new fact, this has got to be enough, because then you're looking at someone who is bringing a challenge based on that legal argument.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 11	ago, right? Because the first person that challenged, which was then Pakistan in TCC, they were relying on information they learnt about this double-hatting relationship that Dr Alexandrov had with The Brattle Group. And the issue there was when they learnt of that relationship, and you look back to when that information became public. What other people are then doing is saying: okay, I have that same problem, but really I didn't even know about it until someone else came up with this legal argument and then that legal argument was reported in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 soon after that. You can't wait and say, "We didn't think it was problematic. We could have" PROFESSOR BOO: It's okay. I understand the argument. MS MENAKER: You see what I mean? And then wait till someone else comes up with a legal argument and say that that legal argument is your new fact, and then do it. But even hypothetically, if we were to consider that to be the new fact, this has got to be enough, because then you're looking at someone who is bringing a challenge based on that legal argument. Yes?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	ago, right? Because the first person that challenged, which was then Pakistan in TCC, they were relying on information they learnt about this double-hatting relationship that Dr Alexandrov had with The Brattle Group. And the issue there was when they learnt of that relationship, and you look back to when that information became public. What other people are then doing is saying: okay, I have that same problem, but really I didn't even know about it until someone else came up with this legal argument and then that legal argument was reported in the press as a challenge, and then I thought: aha,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 soon after that. You can't wait and say, "We didn't think it was problematic. We could have" PROFESSOR BOO: It's okay. I understand the argument. MS MENAKER: You see what I mean? And then wait till someone else comes up with a legal argument and say that that legal argument is your new fact, and then do it. But even hypothetically, if we were to consider that to be the new fact, this has got to be enough, because then you're looking at someone who is bringing a challenge based on that legal argument. Yes? PROFESSOR JONES: I think you are guilty of the same
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	ago, right? Because the first person that challenged, which was then Pakistan in TCC, they were relying on information they learnt about this double-hatting relationship that Dr Alexandrov had with The Brattle Group. And the issue there was when they learnt of that relationship, and you look back to when that information became public. What other people are then doing is saying: okay, I have that same problem, but really I didn't even know about it until someone else came up with this legal argument and then that legal argument was reported in the press as a challenge, and then I thought: aha, here's something I can look into. So I look into it and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 soon after that. You can't wait and say, "We didn't think it was problematic. We could have" PROFESSOR BOO: It's okay. I understand the argument. MS MENAKER: You see what I mean? And then wait till someone else comes up with a legal argument and say that that legal argument is your new fact, and then do it. But even hypothetically, if we were to consider that to be the new fact, this has got to be enough, because then you're looking at someone who is bringing a challenge based on that legal argument. Yes? PROFESSOR JONES: I think you are guilty of the same repetition of which I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	ago, right? Because the first person that challenged, which was then Pakistan in TCC, they were relying on information they learnt about this double-hatting relationship that Dr Alexandrov had with The Brattle Group. And the issue there was when they learnt of that relationship, and you look back to when that information became public. What other people are then doing is saying: okay, I have that same problem, but really I didn't even know about it until someone else came up with this legal argument and then that legal argument was reported in the press as a challenge, and then I thought: aha, here's something I can look into. So I look into it and then I find: yes, because he is a very prolific	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 soon after that. You can't wait and say, "We didn't think it was problematic. We could have" PROFESSOR BOO: It's okay. I understand the argument. MS MENAKER: You see what I mean? And then wait till someone else comes up with a legal argument and say that that legal argument is your new fact, and then do it. But even hypothetically, if we were to consider that to be the new fact, this has got to be enough, because then you're looking at someone who is bringing a challenge based on that legal argument. Yes? PROFESSOR JONES: I think you are guilty of the same repetition of which I MS MENAKER: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	ago, right? Because the first person that challenged, which was then Pakistan in TCC, they were relying on information they learnt about this double-hatting relationship that Dr Alexandrov had with The Brattle Group. And the issue there was when they learnt of that relationship, and you look back to when that information became public. What other people are then doing is saying: okay, I have that same problem, but really I didn't even know about it until someone else came up with this legal argument and then that legal argument was reported in the press as a challenge, and then I thought: aha, here's something I can look into. So I look into it and then I find: yes, because he is a very prolific arbitrator, he deals with these quantum experts, I also	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 soon after that. You can't wait and say, "We didn't think it was problematic. We could have" PROFESSOR BOO: It's okay. I understand the argument. MS MENAKER: You see what I mean? And then wait till someone else comes up with a legal argument and say that that legal argument is your new fact, and then do it. But even hypothetically, if we were to consider that to be the new fact, this has got to be enough, because then you're looking at someone who is bringing a challenge based on that legal argument. Yes? PROFESSOR JONES: I think you are guilty of the same repetition of which I MS MENAKER: Okay. PROFESSOR JONES: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 ago, right? Because the first person that challenged, which was then Pakistan in TCC, they were relying on information they learnt about this double-hatting relationship that Dr Alexandrov had with The Brattle Group. And the issue there was when they learnt of that relationship, and you look back to when that information became public. What other people are then doing is saying: okay, I have that same problem, but really I didn't even know about it until someone else came up with this legal argument and then that legal argument was reported in the press as a challenge, and then I thought: aha, here's something I can look into. So I look into it and then I find: yes, because he is a very prolific arbitrator, he deals with these quantum experts, I also have a problem here, I have found a relationship, so 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 soon after that. You can't wait and say, "We didn't think it was problematic. We could have" PROFESSOR BOO: It's okay. I understand the argument. MS MENAKER: You see what I mean? And then wait till someone else comes up with a legal argument and say that that legal argument is your new fact, and then do it. But even hypothetically, if we were to consider that to be the new fact, this has got to be enough, because then you're looking at someone who is bringing a challenge based on that legal argument. Yes? PROFESSOR JONES: I think you are guilty of the same repetition of which I MS MENAKER: Okay. PROFESSOR JONES: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	ago, right? Because the first person that challenged, which was then Pakistan in TCC, they were relying on information they learnt about this double-hatting relationship that Dr Alexandrov had with The Brattle Group. And the issue there was when they learnt of that relationship, and you look back to when that information became public. What other people are then doing is saying: okay, I have that same problem, but really I didn't even know about it until someone else came up with this legal argument and then that legal argument was reported in the press as a challenge, and then I thought: aha, here's something I can look into. So I look into it and then I find: yes, because he is a very prolific arbitrator, he deals with these quantum experts, I also have a problem here, I have found a relationship, so I'll make a challenge.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 soon after that. You can't wait and say, "We didn't think it was problematic. We could have" PROFESSOR BOO: It's okay. I understand the argument. MS MENAKER: You see what I mean? And then wait till someone else comes up with a legal argument and say that that legal argument is your new fact, and then do it. But even hypothetically, if we were to consider that to be the new fact, this has got to be enough, because then you're looking at someone who is bringing a challenge based on that legal argument. Yes? PROFESSOR JONES: I think you are guilty of the same repetition of which I MS MENAKER: Okay. PROFESSOR JONES: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Is there any point in the questions that you'd like
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	ago, right? Because the first person that challenged, which was then Pakistan in TCC, they were relying on information they learnt about this double-hatting relationship that Dr Alexandrov had with The Brattle Group. And the issue there was when they learnt of that relationship, and you look back to when that information became public. What other people are then doing is saying: okay, I have that same problem, but really I didn't even know about it until someone else came up with this legal argument and then that legal argument was reported in the press as a challenge, and then I thought: aha, here's something I can look into. So I look into it and then I find: yes, because he is a very prolific arbitrator, he deals with these quantum experts, I also have a problem here, I have found a relationship, so I'll make a challenge. And then you see these challenges. So in Eiser they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 soon after that. You can't wait and say, "We didn't think it was problematic. We could have" PROFESSOR BOO: It's okay. I understand the argument. MS MENAKER: You see what I mean? And then wait till someone else comes up with a legal argument and say that that legal argument is your new fact, and then do it. But even hypothetically, if we were to consider that to be the new fact, this has got to be enough, because then you're looking at someone who is bringing a challenge based on that legal argument. Yes? PROFESSOR JONES: I think you are guilty of the same repetition of which I MS MENAKER: Okay. PROFESSOR JONES: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Is there any point in the questions that you'd like us to clarify? Is there anything that you don't think
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	ago, right? Because the first person that challenged, which was then Pakistan in TCC, they were relying on information they learnt about this double-hatting relationship that Dr Alexandrov had with The Brattle Group. And the issue there was when they learnt of that relationship, and you look back to when that information became public. What other people are then doing is saying: okay, I have that same problem, but really I didn't even know about it until someone else came up with this legal argument and then that legal argument was reported in the press as a challenge, and then I thought: aha, here's something I can look into. So I look into it and then I find: yes, because he is a very prolific arbitrator, he deals with these quantum experts, I also have a problem here, I have found a relationship, so I'll make a challenge. And then you see these challenges. So in Eiser they bring it, but on the basis of his relationship with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 soon after that. You can't wait and say, "We didn't think it was problematic. We could have" PROFESSOR BOO: It's okay. I understand the argument. MS MENAKER: You see what I mean? And then wait till someone else comes up with a legal argument and say that that legal argument is your new fact, and then do it. But even hypothetically, if we were to consider that to be the new fact, this has got to be enough, because then you're looking at someone who is bringing a challenge based on that legal argument. Yes? PROFESSOR JONES: I think you are guilty of the same repetition of which I MS MENAKER: Okay. PROFESSOR JONES: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Is there any point in the questions that you'd like us to clarify? Is there anything that you don't think is clear enough and you want to use this opportunity to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 20 21	 ago, right? Because the first person that challenged, which was then Pakistan in TCC, they were relying on information they learnt about this double-hatting relationship that Dr Alexandrov had with The Brattle Group. And the issue there was when they learnt of that relationship, and you look back to when that information became public. What other people are then doing is saying: okay, I have that same problem, but really I didn't even know about it until someone else came up with this legal argument and then that legal argument was reported in the press as a challenge, and then I thought: aha, here's something I can look into. So I look into it and then I find: yes, because he is a very prolific arbitrator, he deals with these quantum experts, I also have a problem here, I have found a relationship, so I'll make a challenge. And then you see these challenges. So in Eiser they bring it, but on the basis of his relationship with a different expert; Misen, you see a different expert; 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 soon after that. You can't wait and say, "We didn't think it was problematic. We could have" PROFESSOR BOO: It's okay. I understand the argument. MS MENAKER: You see what I mean? And then wait till someone else comes up with a legal argument and say that that legal argument is your new fact, and then do it. But even hypothetically, if we were to consider that to be the new fact, this has got to be enough, because then you're looking at someone who is bringing a challenge based on that legal argument. Yes? PROFESSOR JONES: I think you are guilty of the same repetition of which I MS MENAKER: Okay. PROFESSOR JONES: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Is there any point in the questions that you'd like us to clarify? Is there anything that you don't think is clear enough and you want to use this opportunity to clarify?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ago, right? Because the first person that challenged, which was then Pakistan in TCC, they were relying on information they learnt about this double-hatting relationship that Dr Alexandrov had with The Brattle Group. And the issue there was when they learnt of that relationship, and you look back to when that information became public. What other people are then doing is saying: okay, I have that same problem, but really I didn't even know about it until someone else came up with this legal argument and then that legal argument was reported in the press as a challenge, and then I thought: aha, here's something I can look into. So I look into it and then I find: yes, because he is a very prolific arbitrator, he deals with these quantum experts, I also have a problem here, I have found a relationship, so I'll make a challenge. And then you see these challenges. So in Eiser they bring it, but on the basis of his relationship with a different expert; Misen, you see a different expert; here you see a different expert.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 soon after that. You can't wait and say, "We didn't think it was problematic. We could have" PROFESSOR BOO: It's okay. I understand the argument. MS MENAKER: You see what I mean? And then wait till someone else comes up with a legal argument and say that that legal argument is your new fact, and then do it. But even hypothetically, if we were to consider that to be the new fact, this has got to be enough, because then you're looking at someone who is bringing a challenge based on that legal argument. Yes? PROFESSOR JONES: I think you are guilty of the same repetition of which I MS MENAKER: Okay. PROFESSOR JONES: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Is there any point in the questions that you'd like us to clarify? Is there anything that you don't think is clear enough and you want to use this opportunity to clarify? DR TORTEROLA: (In English) Are you talking about this
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	ago, right? Because the first person that challenged, which was then Pakistan in TCC, they were relying on information they learnt about this double-hatting relationship that Dr Alexandrov had with The Brattle Group. And the issue there was when they learnt of that relationship, and you look back to when that information became public. What other people are then doing is saying: okay, I have that same problem, but really I didn't even know about it until someone else came up with this legal argument and then that legal argument was reported in the press as a challenge, and then I thought: aha, here's something I can look into. So I look into it and then I find: yes, because he is a very prolific arbitrator, he deals with these quantum experts, I also have a problem here, I have found a relationship, so I'll make a challenge. Mnd then you see these challenges. So in Eiser they bring it, but on the basis of his relationship with a different expert; Misen, you see a different expert; here you see a different expert. But it is enough even if you disregard which we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 soon after that. You can't wait and say, "We didn't think it was problematic. We could have" PROFESSOR BOO: It's okay. I understand the argument. MS MENAKER: You see what I mean? And then wait till someone else comes up with a legal argument and say that that legal argument is your new fact, and then do it. But even hypothetically, if we were to consider that to be the new fact, this has got to be enough, because then you're looking at someone who is bringing a challenge based on that legal argument. Yes? PROFESSOR JONES: I think you are guilty of the same repetition of which I MS MENAKER: Okay. PROFESSOR JONES: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Is there any point in the questions that you'd like us to clarify? Is there anything that you don't think is clear enough and you want to use this opportunity to clarify? DR TORTEROLA: (In English) Are you talking about this question or any other question?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	ago, right? Because the first person that challenged, which was then Pakistan in TCC, they were relying on information they learnt about this double-hatting relationship that Dr Alexandrov had with The Brattle Group. And the issue there was when they learnt of that relationship, and you look back to when that information became public. What other people are then doing is saying: okay, I have that same problem, but really I didn't even know about it until someone else came up with this legal argument and then that legal argument was reported in the press as a challenge, and then I thought: aha, here's something I can look into. So I look into it and then I find: yes, because he is a very prolific arbitrator, he deals with these quantum experts, I also have a problem here, I have found a relationship, so I'll make a challenge. And then you see these challenges. So in Eiser they bring it, but on the basis of his relationship with a different expert; Misen, you see a different expert; here you see a different expert. But it is enough even if you disregard which we say of course you can't disregard all the public	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 soon after that. You can't wait and say, "We didn't think it was problematic. We could have" PROFESSOR BOO: It's okay. I understand the argument. MS MENAKER: You see what I mean? And then wait till someone else comes up with a legal argument and say that that legal argument is your new fact, and then do it. But even hypothetically, if we were to consider that to be the new fact, this has got to be enough, because then you're looking at someone who is bringing a challenge based on that legal argument. Yes? PROFESSOR JONES: I think you are guilty of the same repetition of which I MS MENAKER: Okay. PROFESSOR JONES: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Is there any point in the questions that you'd like us to clarify? Is there anything that you don't think is clear enough and you want to use this opportunity to clarify? DR TORTEROLA: (In English) Are you talking about this question or any other questions now.
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	ago, right? Because the first person that challenged, which was then Pakistan in TCC, they were relying on information they learnt about this double-hatting relationship that Dr Alexandrov had with The Brattle Group. And the issue there was when they learnt of that relationship, and you look back to when that information became public. What other people are then doing is saying: okay, I have that same problem, but really I didn't even know about it until someone else came up with this legal argument and then that legal argument was reported in the press as a challenge, and then I thought: aha, here's something I can look into. So I look into it and then I find: yes, because he is a very prolific arbitrator, he deals with these quantum experts, I also have a problem here, I have found a relationship, so I'll make a challenge. And then you see these challenges. So in Eiser they bring it, but on the basis of his relationship with a different expert; Misen, you see a different expert; here you see a different expert. But it is enough even if you disregard which we say of course you can't disregard all the public	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 soon after that. You can't wait and say, "We didn't think it was problematic. We could have" PROFESSOR BOO: It's okay. I understand the argument. MS MENAKER: You see what I mean? And then wait till someone else comes up with a legal argument and say that that legal argument is your new fact, and then do it. But even hypothetically, if we were to consider that to be the new fact, this has got to be enough, because then you're looking at someone who is bringing a challenge based on that legal argument. Yes? PROFESSOR JONES: I think you are guilty of the same repetition of which I MS MENAKER: Okay. PROFESSOR JONES: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Is there any point in the questions that you'd like us to clarify? Is there anything that you don't think is clear enough and you want to use this opportunity to clarify? DR TORTEROLA: (In English) Are you talking about this question or any other question?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	ago, right? Because the first person that challenged, which was then Pakistan in TCC, they were relying on information they learnt about this double-hatting relationship that Dr Alexandrov had with The Brattle Group. And the issue there was when they learnt of that relationship, and you look back to when that information became public. What other people are then doing is saying: okay, I have that same problem, but really I didn't even know about it until someone else came up with this legal argument and then that legal argument was reported in the press as a challenge, and then I thought: aha, here's something I can look into. So I look into it and then I find: yes, because he is a very prolific arbitrator, he deals with these quantum experts, I also have a problem here, I have found a relationship, so I'll make a challenge. And then you see these challenges. So in Eiser they bring it, but on the basis of his relationship with a different expert; Misen, you see a different expert; here you see a different expert. But it is enough even if you disregard which we say of course you can't disregard all the public	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 soon after that. You can't wait and say, "We didn't think it was problematic. We could have" PROFESSOR BOO: It's okay. I understand the argument. MS MENAKER: You see what I mean? And then wait till someone else comes up with a legal argument and say that that legal argument is your new fact, and then do it. But even hypothetically, if we were to consider that to be the new fact, this has got to be enough, because then you're looking at someone who is bringing a challenge based on that legal argument. Yes? PROFESSOR JONES: I think you are guilty of the same repetition of which I MS MENAKER: Okay. PROFESSOR JONES: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Is there any point in the questions that you'd like us to clarify? Is there anything that you don't think is clear enough and you want to use this opportunity to clarify? DR TORTEROLA: (In English) Are you talking about this question or any other questions now.

12:56	1	I mean, we have noticed things here and there. I would	12:59 1	to decide.
12.50	2	not be prepared right now. And there might be also	2	PROFESSOR JONES: Might a way of dealing with this be for
	3	inconsistencies in between I think there is a Spanish	3	leave to be sought for additional authorities to be used
	4	version and an English version? No, only English?	4	and an explanation provided as to why those legal
	5	THE PRESIDENT: Only in English. I'm so sorry.	5	authorities are sought to be deployed, and either party
	6	5 DR TORTEROLA: Okay. Someone has in my team a version in		can do that, and then the [Committee] decides whether to
	7			grant leave or not? Would that be appropriate?
	8	sake of someone.	7 8	DR TORTEROLA: Normally, Professor Jones, I have no concerns
	9	Anyways, we will write back to you if we have	9	with legal authorities being introduced. In this case
	10	concerns about the questions. At this point I'm not in	10	this issue has been that problematic that I really would
	10	a position to quickly respond.	10	like to consult with the authorities, with my client,
	12	THE PRESIDENT: Okay.	11	before I can respond.
	12	Ms Menaker?	12	Normally, in my person, I'm not afraid of the legal
	13	MS MENAKER: I have one question. It's not on the content.	13	authorities. But this cannot be my position; it has to
	15	But I see that a lot of questions for instance, even	15	be the position of Guatemala, in a situation in which
	16	question 1 you call for examples of situations or	16	the entire thing is being dealt so egotistically that we
	17	case law; in other places ask you for jurisprudence.	10	don't want some information to be in the record.
	18	In answering these questions, we would like to	18	PROFESSOR JONES: All I am suggesting is
	10 19	introduce supplemental legal authorities if it's in	13	DR TORTEROLA: I understand what you're suggesting.
	20	direct response to your question. Particularly if the	20	PROFESSOR JONES: no new legal authorities without leave,
	20 21	issue hasn't been briefed, they may not be on the	20	and leave has to be sought to explain why it is needed.
	21	record. So I wanted to make clear that that was your	21	Then either party has the right to make an application,
	22	explanation and that is permissible.	22	and the [Committee] will decide on the basis of that.
	23 24	THE PRESIDENT: Let us hear the other party, because perhaps	23 24	(Pause)
	24 25	they too wish to include more.	24	THE PRESIDENT: It seems like a sensible approach. If you
	23	incy too wish to include more.	25	THE INESTIDENT. It seems like a sensible approach. If you
		Page 93		Page 95
12:58		DR TORTEROLA: I was conferencing with my colleagues here;	13:00 1	identify a number of cases that are relevant for
	2	I didn't hear what was said. Let me read the transcript	2	answering one of the questions, you write to the
	3	and	3	Committee and say, "We have identified three cases that
	4	MS MENAKER: I can briefly just respond that in light of the	4	are responsive to question 5, and this is a new question
	5	questions where the Committee is asking for examples or	5	and it had not been brought up earlier and this is why
	6	case law or situations or jurisprudence, some of these	6	we could not file it before, and these are the reasons
	7	are questions that have not been answered in the	7	why we want to file it now". And we will hear the other
	8	parties' briefs, and we would then expect that we would	8	party: perhaps they agree or they do not agree, we don't
	9	need to offer supplemental legal authorities that are	9	know. And then we will take a prompt decision.
	10	not currently on the record in order to answer those	10	PROFESSOR BOO: In my view, it would be simpler if both of
	11	and/or to elaborate.	11	you can agree on which questions that you will think you
	12	You asked, for instance: for "promptly", what has	12	require legal authority, and that's it, so that there
	13	been the longest term allowed? We have lots of	13	won't be further need for us to consider applications.
	14	jurisprudence on the record, but I think if we're going	14	This procedure is actually in our procedural order, so
	15	to take a survey to say the longest, it might be that we	15	it's not new. So if you can agree on which particular
	16	introduce a new legal authority.	16	issue there both sides want to put in additional legal
	17	THE PRESIDENT: I think Guatemala had a similar concern	17	authorities, then so be it.
	18 10	a couple of days ago, right?	18	THE PRESIDENT: It may happen that once you have a chance to
	19 20	DR TORTEROLA: Yes. And the answer was: no, we thought that it use only the information that uses in the record	19 20	go through the questions, and you relax and you get some
	20	it was only the information that was in the record.	20	sleep, then you may talk to each other and say, "What do
	21 22	So what I suggest is that, again, I will not respond to that right away. I will take my time. I will look	21 22	you think? Do we open the gate to new" I don't know. If you can agree on things, it's always welcomed by the
	<i>LL</i>	to that right away; I will take my time. I will look		
		into this issue and whether it would be appropriate to	22	Committee If you don't agree than you make analific
	23	into this issue and whether it would be appropriate to use legal authorities or not. At the end of the day	23	Committee. If you don't agree, then you make specific submissions to us for leave to submit new evidence, and
	23 24	use legal authorities or not. At the end of the day,	24	submissions to us for leave to submit new evidence, and
	23			

Т

13:02 1	Legal authorities, I'm saying, not evidence.	13:05 1	things that might not be contained in the questions put
2	MS MENAKER: Just for the avoidance of doubt, if we were to	2	by the Committee.
3	make that [application], is it sufficient to say, "We	3	THE PRESIDENT: Such as?
4	would like to submit XYZ case for question 1", for	4	DR TORTEROLA: Nothing that comes immediately, unless my
5	instance, or do you want us to actually state why those	5	colleague would like to elaborate on that. But just to
6	cases are relevant to question 1?	6	give the parties the flexibility to have some
7	THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please do provide a couple of	7	THE PRESIDENT: Tell us now, please. Mr Gosis?
8	sentences, so that we understand	8	MR GOSIS: If we were to include the two questions which we
9	MS MENAKER: That's perfectly fine. I just don't want to	9	addressed earlier which are not part of the
10	because then one party may consider then you to be using	10	24 questions, the issues of the Code of Conduct, the
11	that and briefing before having that admitted to the	11	issues of the inconsistencies, which are not
12	record. I just want to be absolutely clear what is the	12	specifically addressed in these 24 but were among the
13	scope of the application.	13	two questions we received yesterday, that would probably
14	THE PRESIDENT: I'm sure we will all be reasonable.	14	cover everything out. If this is only limited to these
15	MS MENAKER: Okay.	15	24 questions, those are areas, especially the
16	THE PRESIDENT: We have been so far, and we will continue	16	inconsistencies and the
17	being reasonable.	17	THE PRESIDENT: But you did provide an answer, right?
18	DR TORTEROLA: Agreed.	18	I think I've written it down somewhere that you said
19	THE PRESIDENT: Any other question?	19	or it should be in the transcript if I haven't.
20	MS MENAKER: No, thank you.	20	My question was regarding Rule 10(a)(vi): since when
21	THE PRESIDENT: Any other question?	21	was this part of the draft? And you said: since the
22	DR TORTEROLA: We don't have questions.	22	second version. But then you came and said: this was
23	THE PRESIDENT: No. Good.	23	
24	So let us then, please, agree on a reasonable time	24	
25	period for the filing of these answers to the questions,	25	provide an answer.
	Page 97		Page 99
13:03 1	and perhaps also a limit to the length of these answers;	13:06 1	MR GOSIS: I was referring specifically to not the issue of
13:03 1 2	and perhaps also a limit to the length of these answers; just something like a range of pages, so we don't end up	13:06 1 2	MR GOSIS: I was referring specifically to not the issue of the code as much as the issue of the inconsistencies on
13:03 1 2 3	just something like a range of pages, so we don't end up		
2	just something like a range of pages, so we don't end up with 200 pages. I don't want one of you to be filing	2	the code as much as the issue of the inconsistencies on
2 3	just something like a range of pages, so we don't end up with 200 pages. I don't want one of you to be filing 200 pages and 15 on the other side.	2 3	the code as much as the issue of the inconsistencies on the reasoning in the Award, the arguments by TECO that we heard, to have a chance to comment back on that.
2 3 4 5	just something like a range of pages, so we don't end up with 200 pages. I don't want one of you to be filing 200 pages and 15 on the other side. So what do you think	2 3 4	the code as much as the issue of the inconsistencies on the reasoning in the Award, the arguments by TECO that
2 3 4	just something like a range of pages, so we don't end up with 200 pages. I don't want one of you to be filing 200 pages and 15 on the other side. So what do you think MS MENAKER: I actually did have one other question, since	2 3 4 5	the code as much as the issue of the inconsistencies on the reasoning in the Award, the arguments by TECO that we heard, to have a chance to comment back on that. THE PRESIDENT: I think you've had more than ample
2 3 4 5 6 7	 just something like a range of pages, so we don't end up with 200 pages. I don't want one of you to be filing 200 pages and 15 on the other side. So what do you think MS MENAKER: I actually did have one other question, since we're talking about pages. Are you anticipating that 	2 3 4 5 6	the code as much as the issue of the inconsistencies on the reasoning in the Award, the arguments by TECO that we heard, to have a chance to comment back on that. THE PRESIDENT: I think you've had more than ample opportunity to address that. And we have got both parties' submissions in writing, they are really
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 just something like a range of pages, so we don't end up with 200 pages. I don't want one of you to be filing 200 pages and 15 on the other side. So what do you think MS MENAKER: I actually did have one other question, since we're talking about pages. Are you anticipating that the post-hearing briefs are limited to answering these 	2 3 4 5 6 7	the code as much as the issue of the inconsistencies on the reasoning in the Award, the arguments by TECO that we heard, to have a chance to comment back on that. THE PRESIDENT: I think you've had more than ample opportunity to address that. And we have got both parties' submissions in writing, they are really excellent quality, and you have seen that we have been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 just something like a range of pages, so we don't end up with 200 pages. I don't want one of you to be filing 200 pages and 15 on the other side. So what do you think MS MENAKER: I actually did have one other question, since we're talking about pages. Are you anticipating that the post-hearing briefs are limited to answering these 24 questions or like, what is the scope? Is that the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the code as much as the issue of the inconsistencies on the reasoning in the Award, the arguments by TECO that we heard, to have a chance to comment back on that. THE PRESIDENT: I think you've had more than ample opportunity to address that. And we have got both parties' submissions in writing, they are really excellent quality, and you have seen that we have been through them, read them, and we are well aware of what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 just something like a range of pages, so we don't end up with 200 pages. I don't want one of you to be filing 200 pages and 15 on the other side. So what do you think MS MENAKER: I actually did have one other question, since we're talking about pages. Are you anticipating that the post-hearing briefs are limited to answering these 24 questions or like, what is the scope? Is that the limit, or does it go beyond; and if so, to what extent? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the code as much as the issue of the inconsistencies on the reasoning in the Award, the arguments by TECO that we heard, to have a chance to comment back on that. THE PRESIDENT: I think you've had more than ample opportunity to address that. And we have got both parties' submissions in writing, they are really excellent quality, and you have seen that we have been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 just something like a range of pages, so we don't end up with 200 pages. I don't want one of you to be filing 200 pages and 15 on the other side. So what do you think MS MENAKER: I actually did have one other question, since we're talking about pages. Are you anticipating that the post-hearing briefs are limited to answering these 24 questions or like, what is the scope? Is that the limit, or does it go beyond; and if so, to what extent? PROFESSOR JONES: We are not proposing any post-hearing 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the code as much as the issue of the inconsistencies on the reasoning in the Award, the arguments by TECO that we heard, to have a chance to comment back on that. THE PRESIDENT: I think you've had more than ample opportunity to address that. And we have got both parties' submissions in writing, they are really excellent quality, and you have seen that we have been through them, read them, and we are well aware of what the parties say. So I don't believe that the Committee needs further briefing on that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 just something like a range of pages, so we don't end up with 200 pages. I don't want one of you to be filing 200 pages and 15 on the other side. So what do you think MS MENAKER: I actually did have one other question, since we're talking about pages. Are you anticipating that the post-hearing briefs are limited to answering these 24 questions or like, what is the scope? Is that the limit, or does it go beyond; and if so, to what extent? PROFESSOR JONES: We are not proposing any post-hearing briefs. We're proposing only answers to questions. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 the code as much as the issue of the inconsistencies on the reasoning in the Award, the arguments by TECO that we heard, to have a chance to comment back on that. THE PRESIDENT: I think you've had more than ample opportunity to address that. And we have got both parties' submissions in writing, they are really excellent quality, and you have seen that we have been through them, read them, and we are well aware of what the parties say. So I don't believe that the Committee needs further briefing on that. So let's stick to the 24 questions. And I believe
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 just something like a range of pages, so we don't end up with 200 pages. I don't want one of you to be filing 200 pages and 15 on the other side. So what do you think MS MENAKER: I actually did have one other question, since we're talking about pages. Are you anticipating that the post-hearing briefs are limited to answering these 24 questions or like, what is the scope? Is that the limit, or does it go beyond; and if so, to what extent? PROFESSOR JONES: We are not proposing any post-hearing briefs. We're proposing only answers to questions. THE PRESIDENT: Answers to the questions, yes. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 the code as much as the issue of the inconsistencies on the reasoning in the Award, the arguments by TECO that we heard, to have a chance to comment back on that. THE PRESIDENT: I think you've had more than ample opportunity to address that. And we have got both parties' submissions in writing, they are really excellent quality, and you have seen that we have been through them, read them, and we are well aware of what the parties say. So I don't believe that the Committee needs further briefing on that. So let's stick to the 24 questions. And I believe there was a specific answer about since when this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 just something like a range of pages, so we don't end up with 200 pages. I don't want one of you to be filing 200 pages and 15 on the other side. So what do you think MS MENAKER: I actually did have one other question, since we're talking about pages. Are you anticipating that the post-hearing briefs are limited to answering these 24 questions or like, what is the scope? Is that the limit, or does it go beyond; and if so, to what extent? PROFESSOR JONES: We are not proposing any post-hearing briefs. We're proposing only answers to questions. THE PRESIDENT: Answers to the questions, yes. MS MENAKER: That's critical. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 the code as much as the issue of the inconsistencies on the reasoning in the Award, the arguments by TECO that we heard, to have a chance to comment back on that. THE PRESIDENT: I think you've had more than ample opportunity to address that. And we have got both parties' submissions in writing, they are really excellent quality, and you have seen that we have been through them, read them, and we are well aware of what the parties say. So I don't believe that the Committee needs further briefing on that. So let's stick to the 24 questions. And I believe
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 just something like a range of pages, so we don't end up with 200 pages. I don't want one of you to be filing 200 pages and 15 on the other side. So what do you think MS MENAKER: I actually did have one other question, since we're talking about pages. Are you anticipating that the post-hearing briefs are limited to answering these 24 questions or like, what is the scope? Is that the limit, or does it go beyond; and if so, to what extent? PROFESSOR JONES: We are not proposing any post-hearing briefs. We're proposing only answers to questions. THE PRESIDENT: Answers to the questions, yes. MS MENAKER: That's critical. THE PRESIDENT: It pretty much covers, I think, most of the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 the code as much as the issue of the inconsistencies on the reasoning in the Award, the arguments by TECO that we heard, to have a chance to comment back on that. THE PRESIDENT: I think you've had more than ample opportunity to address that. And we have got both parties' submissions in writing, they are really excellent quality, and you have seen that we have been through them, read them, and we are well aware of what the parties say. So I don't believe that the Committee needs further briefing on that. So let's stick to the 24 questions. And I believe there was a specific answer about since when this wording is part of the drafting procedure, since when is this something that was discussed. And I think you said
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 just something like a range of pages, so we don't end up with 200 pages. I don't want one of you to be filing 200 pages and 15 on the other side. So what do you think MS MENAKER: I actually did have one other question, since we're talking about pages. Are you anticipating that the post-hearing briefs are limited to answering these 24 questions or like, what is the scope? Is that the limit, or does it go beyond; and if so, to what extent? PROFESSOR JONES: We are not proposing any post-hearing briefs. We're proposing only answers to questions. THE PRESIDENT: Answers to the questions, yes. MS MENAKER: That's critical. THE PRESIDENT: It pretty much covers, I think, most of the areas that have been Because earlier in the morning 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 the code as much as the issue of the inconsistencies on the reasoning in the Award, the arguments by TECO that we heard, to have a chance to comment back on that. THE PRESIDENT: I think you've had more than ample opportunity to address that. And we have got both parties' submissions in writing, they are really excellent quality, and you have seen that we have been through them, read them, and we are well aware of what the parties say. So I don't believe that the Committee needs further briefing on that. So let's stick to the 24 questions. And I believe there was a specific answer about since when this wording is part of the drafting procedure, since when is this something that was discussed. And I think you said something, and then you came to me and you said even
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 just something like a range of pages, so we don't end up with 200 pages. I don't want one of you to be filing 200 pages and 15 on the other side. So what do you think MS MENAKER: I actually did have one other question, since we're talking about pages. Are you anticipating that the post-hearing briefs are limited to answering these 24 questions or like, what is the scope? Is that the limit, or does it go beyond; and if so, to what extent? PROFESSOR JONES: We are not proposing any post-hearing briefs. We're proposing only answers to questions. THE PRESIDENT: Answers to the questions, yes. MS MENAKER: That's critical. THE PRESIDENT: It pretty much covers, I think, most of the areas that have been Because earlier in the morning we covered lots of things about the Award and the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the code as much as the issue of the inconsistencies on the reasoning in the Award, the arguments by TECO that we heard, to have a chance to comment back on that. THE PRESIDENT: I think you've had more than ample opportunity to address that. And we have got both parties' submissions in writing, they are really excellent quality, and you have seen that we have been through them, read them, and we are well aware of what the parties say. So I don't believe that the Committee needs further briefing on that. So let's stick to the 24 questions. And I believe there was a specific answer about since when this wording is part of the drafting procedure, since when is this something that was discussed. And I think you said something, and then you came to me and you said even earlier.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 just something like a range of pages, so we don't end up with 200 pages. I don't want one of you to be filing 200 pages and 15 on the other side. So what do you think MS MENAKER: I actually did have one other question, since we're talking about pages. Are you anticipating that the post-hearing briefs are limited to answering these 24 questions or like, what is the scope? Is that the limit, or does it go beyond; and if so, to what extent? PROFESSOR JONES: We are not proposing any post-hearing briefs. We're proposing only answers to questions. THE PRESIDENT: Answers to the questions, yes. MS MENAKER: That's critical. THE PRESIDENT: It pretty much covers, I think, most of the areas that have been Because earlier in the morning we covered lots of things about the Award and the inconsistencies; this covers the rest. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 the code as much as the issue of the inconsistencies on the reasoning in the Award, the arguments by TECO that we heard, to have a chance to comment back on that. THE PRESIDENT: I think you've had more than ample opportunity to address that. And we have got both parties' submissions in writing, they are really excellent quality, and you have seen that we have been through them, read them, and we are well aware of what the parties say. So I don't believe that the Committee needs further briefing on that. So let's stick to the 24 questions. And I believe there was a specific answer about since when this wording is part of the drafting procedure, since when is this something that was discussed. And I think you said something, and then you came to me and you said even
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 just something like a range of pages, so we don't end up with 200 pages. I don't want one of you to be filing 200 pages and 15 on the other side. So what do you think MS MENAKER: I actually did have one other question, since we're talking about pages. Are you anticipating that the post-hearing briefs are limited to answering these 24 questions or like, what is the scope? Is that the limit, or does it go beyond; and if so, to what extent? PROFESSOR JONES: We are not proposing any post-hearing briefs. We're proposing only answers to questions. THE PRESIDENT: Answers to the questions, yes. MS MENAKER: That's critical. THE PRESIDENT: It pretty much covers, I think, most of the areas that have been Because earlier in the morning we covered lots of things about the Award and the inconsistencies; this covers the rest. MS MENAKER: That's a big clarification. So 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 the code as much as the issue of the inconsistencies on the reasoning in the Award, the arguments by TECO that we heard, to have a chance to comment back on that. THE PRESIDENT: I think you've had more than ample opportunity to address that. And we have got both parties' submissions in writing, they are really excellent quality, and you have seen that we have been through them, read them, and we are well aware of what the parties say. So I don't believe that the Committee needs further briefing on that. So let's stick to the 24 questions. And I believe there was a specific answer about since when this wording is part of the drafting procedure, since when is this something that was discussed. And I think you said something, and then you came to me and you said even earlier. DR TORTEROLA: For that there has been a very specific response and it is on the record.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 just something like a range of pages, so we don't end up with 200 pages. I don't want one of you to be filing 200 pages and 15 on the other side. So what do you think MS MENAKER: I actually did have one other question, since we're talking about pages. Are you anticipating that the post-hearing briefs are limited to answering these 24 questions or like, what is the scope? Is that the limit, or does it go beyond; and if so, to what extent? PROFESSOR JONES: We are not proposing any post-hearing briefs. We're proposing only answers to questions. THE PRESIDENT: Answers to the questions, yes. MS MENAKER: That's critical. THE PRESIDENT: It pretty much covers, I think, most of the areas that have been Because earlier in the morning we covered lots of things about the Award and the inconsistencies; this covers the rest. MS MENAKER: That's a big clarification. So THE PRESIDENT: Is there any area that you would have been 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 the code as much as the issue of the inconsistencies on the reasoning in the Award, the arguments by TECO that we heard, to have a chance to comment back on that. THE PRESIDENT: I think you've had more than ample opportunity to address that. And we have got both parties' submissions in writing, they are really excellent quality, and you have seen that we have been through them, read them, and we are well aware of what the parties say. So I don't believe that the Committee needs further briefing on that. So let's stick to the 24 questions. And I believe there was a specific answer about since when this wording is part of the drafting procedure, since when is this something that was discussed. And I think you said something, and then you came to me and you said even earlier. DR TORTEROLA: For that there has been a very specific response and it is on the record. I think it's on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 just something like a range of pages, so we don't end up with 200 pages. I don't want one of you to be filing 200 pages and 15 on the other side. So what do you think MS MENAKER: I actually did have one other question, since we're talking about pages. Are you anticipating that the post-hearing briefs are limited to answering these 24 questions or like, what is the scope? Is that the limit, or does it go beyond; and if so, to what extent? PROFESSOR JONES: We are not proposing any post-hearing briefs. We're proposing only answers to questions. THE PRESIDENT: Answers to the questions, yes. MS MENAKER: That's critical. THE PRESIDENT: It pretty much covers, I think, most of the areas that have been Because earlier in the morning we covered lots of things about the Award and the inconsistencies; this covers the rest. MS MENAKER: That's a big clarification. So THE PRESIDENT: Is there any area that you would have been expected to have been given the opportunity? Because we 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 the code as much as the issue of the inconsistencies on the reasoning in the Award, the arguments by TECO that we heard, to have a chance to comment back on that. THE PRESIDENT: I think you've had more than ample opportunity to address that. And we have got both parties' submissions in writing, they are really excellent quality, and you have seen that we have been through them, read them, and we are well aware of what the parties say. So I don't believe that the Committee needs further briefing on that. So let's stick to the 24 questions. And I believe there was a specific answer about since when this wording is part of the drafting procedure, since when is this something that was discussed. And I think you said something, and then you came to me and you said even earlier. DR TORTEROLA: For that there has been a very specific response and it is on the record. I think it's on the record, yes. Good.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 just something like a range of pages, so we don't end up with 200 pages. I don't want one of you to be filing 200 pages and 15 on the other side. So what do you think MS MENAKER: I actually did have one other question, since we're talking about pages. Are you anticipating that the post-hearing briefs are limited to answering these 24 questions or like, what is the scope? Is that the limit, or does it go beyond; and if so, to what extent? PROFESSOR JONES: We are not proposing any post-hearing briefs. We're proposing only answers to questions. THE PRESIDENT: Answers to the questions, yes. MS MENAKER: That's critical. THE PRESIDENT: It pretty much covers, I think, most of the areas that have been Because earlier in the morning we covered lots of things about the Award and the inconsistencies; this covers the rest. MS MENAKER: That's a big clarification. So THE PRESIDENT: Is there any area that you would have been expected to have been given the opportunity? Because we don't impose a strict limitation if there is something 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 the code as much as the issue of the inconsistencies on the reasoning in the Award, the arguments by TECO that we heard, to have a chance to comment back on that. THE PRESIDENT: I think you've had more than ample opportunity to address that. And we have got both parties' submissions in writing, they are really excellent quality, and you have seen that we have been through them, read them, and we are well aware of what the parties say. So I don't believe that the Committee needs further briefing on that. So let's stick to the 24 questions. And I believe there was a specific answer about since when this wording is part of the drafting procedure, since when is this something that was discussed. And I think you said something, and then you came to me and you said even earlier. DR TORTEROLA: For that there has been a very specific response and it is on the record. I think it's on the record, yes. Good. So let's go back to the initial question: what's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 just something like a range of pages, so we don't end up with 200 pages. I don't want one of you to be filing 200 pages and 15 on the other side. So what do you think MS MENAKER: I actually did have one other question, since we're talking about pages. Are you anticipating that the post-hearing briefs are limited to answering these 24 questions or like, what is the scope? Is that the limit, or does it go beyond; and if so, to what extent? PROFESSOR JONES: We are not proposing any post-hearing briefs. We're proposing only answers to questions. THE PRESIDENT: Answers to the questions, yes. MS MENAKER: That's critical. THE PRESIDENT: It pretty much covers, I think, most of the areas that have been Because earlier in the morning we covered lots of things about the Award and the inconsistencies; this covers the rest. MS MENAKER: That's a big clarification. So THE PRESIDENT: Is there any area that you would have been expected to have been given the opportunity? Because we don't impose a strict limitation if there is something that you would like to have addressed. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 the code as much as the issue of the inconsistencies on the reasoning in the Award, the arguments by TECO that we heard, to have a chance to comment back on that. THE PRESIDENT: I think you've had more than ample opportunity to address that. And we have got both parties' submissions in writing, they are really excellent quality, and you have seen that we have been through them, read them, and we are well aware of what the parties say. So I don't believe that the Committee needs further briefing on that. So let's stick to the 24 questions. And I believe there was a specific answer about since when this wording is part of the drafting procedure, since when is this something that was discussed. And I think you said something, and then you came to me and you said even earlier. DR TORTEROLA: For that there has been a very specific response and it is on the record. I think it's on the record, yes. Good. So let's go back to the initial question: what's a reasonable range of pages to provide a proper answer?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 just something like a range of pages, so we don't end up with 200 pages. I don't want one of you to be filing 200 pages and 15 on the other side. So what do you think MS MENAKER: I actually did have one other question, since we're talking about pages. Are you anticipating that the post-hearing briefs are limited to answering these 24 questions or like, what is the scope? Is that the limit, or does it go beyond; and if so, to what extent? PROFESSOR JONES: We are not proposing any post-hearing briefs. We're proposing only answers to questions. THE PRESIDENT: Answers to the questions, yes. MS MENAKER: That's critical. THE PRESIDENT: It pretty much covers, I think, most of the areas that have been Because earlier in the morning we covered lots of things about the Award and the inconsistencies; this covers the rest. MS MENAKER: That's a big clarification. So THE PRESIDENT: Is there any area that you would have been expected to have been given the opportunity? Because we don't impose a strict limitation if there is something 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 the code as much as the issue of the inconsistencies on the reasoning in the Award, the arguments by TECO that we heard, to have a chance to comment back on that. THE PRESIDENT: I think you've had more than ample opportunity to address that. And we have got both parties' submissions in writing, they are really excellent quality, and you have seen that we have been through them, read them, and we are well aware of what the parties say. So I don't believe that the Committee needs further briefing on that. So let's stick to the 24 questions. And I believe there was a specific answer about since when this wording is part of the drafting procedure, since when is this something that was discussed. And I think you said something, and then you came to me and you said even earlier. DR TORTEROLA: For that there has been a very specific response and it is on the record. I think it's on the record, yes. Good. So let's go back to the initial question: what's

Page 98

5			
13:08 1	Annulment Committee?	13:10 1	So on that question, for example, would you want us
2	THE PRESIDENT: I mean, the submissions are really, really	2	to skip it? Would you want us to briefly summarise our
3	long and there's a lot of repetition in them.	3	position?
4	PROFESSOR JONES: We have to divide it up by questions,	4	THE PRESIDENT: It is not expected that you provide
5	don't we? We can't give you a limit to the total amount	5	an answer. If you wish to provide an answer, you are
6	of pages you will devote to answering all the questions.	6	welcome. This is one of the examples where I think one
7	So why don't we say three pages per question?	7	question was more addressed because we have clear
8	MS MENAKER: Then we could give a total amount of pages!	8	what one party says; we'd like to have a reply by the
9	THE PRESIDENT: There are 24 questions: some are addressed	9	other, because it's not clear to us what the other party
10	to one party, some to the other. TECO's examples on	10	thinks.
11	situations of $52(1)(a)$, it's their submission and they	11	PROFESSOR BOO: If I may suggest, it might be even better if
12	must have some idea of to what situations this is	12	you go by the different sections, because we categorised
13	intended to apply, according to their interpretation.	12	them in different sections. So you decide which of
13	So I don't know. Would you say 50 pages, would that	13	those questions you want to tackle more or less.
14	be something reasonable?	14	Because there are six sections. So just seven or
			-
16	PROFESSOR JONES: It's got to be per question.	16	eight pages per section, or whatever it is.
17	DR TORTEROLA: Yes, I was more inclined with the number that	17	THE PRESIDENT: You were working two months on your
18	Professor Jones suggested. I would like at least to be	18	submissions; we were two hours on these questions.
19	100 pages.	19	These don't mean to be a straitjacket. But this
20	THE PRESIDENT: 100 pages?	20	reflects our concerns, our areas of concern. So to the
21	DR TORTEROLA: Yes. I think otherwise, for 24 [questions],	21	extent it is possible, please follow the logic that is
22	50 pages is going to be too short.	22	there. Don't feel you are in a straitjacket and you
23	THE PRESIDENT: You say 100	23	need to answer all of them. You've got some freedom and
24	PROFESSOR JONES: The problem is, if you get 100 pages and	24	liberty to address them as you see fit.
25	you decide to do half a page on all the questions except	25	And please make it something I don't want to
	D 101		D ₁ 102
	Page 101		Page 103
13:09 1	one, we'll get a whole pile of crap on the one you	13:12 1	impose a limit of three pages per question. There's
13:09 1 2	one, we'll get a whole pile of crap on the one you choose to spend a lot of time on. This just doesn't	13:12 1 2	impose a limit of three pages per question. There's some liberty in there. But also try to have something
2	choose to spend a lot of time on. This just doesn't	2	some liberty in there. But also try to have something
2 3	choose to spend a lot of time on. This just doesn't make any sense.	2 3	some liberty in there. But also try to have something that's consistent, that you cover everything, because
2 3 4	choose to spend a lot of time on. This just doesn't make any sense.DR TORTEROLA: I mean, you said three pages. There are	2 3 4	some liberty in there. But also try to have something that's consistent, that you cover everything, because we'd like to have an input on everything.
2 3 4 5	choose to spend a lot of time on. This just doesn't make any sense.DR TORTEROLA: I mean, you said three pages. There are 24 questions. Three pages per question, that brings us closer to 85.	2 3 4 5	some liberty in there. But also try to have something that's consistent, that you cover everything, because we'd like to have an input on everything. PROFESSOR BOO: Some questions, for example, can be
2 3 4 5 6	choose to spend a lot of time on. This just doesn't make any sense.DR TORTEROLA: I mean, you said three pages. There are 24 questions. Three pages per question, that brings us closer to 85.THE PRESIDENT: Yes. The thing is, all of these questions	2 3 4 5 6	some liberty in there. But also try to have something that's consistent, that you cover everything, because we'd like to have an input on everything. PROFESSOR BOO: Some questions, for example, can be a yes/no.
2 3 4 5 6 7	choose to spend a lot of time on. This just doesn't make any sense.DR TORTEROLA: I mean, you said three pages. There are 24 questions. Three pages per question, that brings us closer to 85.THE PRESIDENT: Yes. The thing is, all of these questions are important to the Committee. If you choose not to	2 3 4 5 6 7	 some liberty in there. But also try to have something that's consistent, that you cover everything, because we'd like to have an input on everything. PROFESSOR BOO: Some questions, for example, can be a yes/no. MS MENAKER: Yes, exactly. You ask, for example, if there's any jurisprudence on X, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 choose to spend a lot of time on. This just doesn't make any sense. DR TORTEROLA: I mean, you said three pages. There are 24 questions. Three pages per question, that brings us closer to 85. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. The thing is, all of these questions are important to the Committee. If you choose not to answer an important question, it's your choice, but it's 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 some liberty in there. But also try to have something that's consistent, that you cover everything, because we'd like to have an input on everything. PROFESSOR BOO: Some questions, for example, can be a yes/no. MS MENAKER: Yes, exactly. You ask, for example, if there's any jurisprudence on X, and DR TORTEROLA: Do we have an agreement on the number of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 choose to spend a lot of time on. This just doesn't make any sense. DR TORTEROLA: I mean, you said three pages. There are 24 questions. Three pages per question, that brings us closer to 85. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. The thing is, all of these questions are important to the Committee. If you choose not to answer an important question, it's your choice, but it's not advisable. So 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 some liberty in there. But also try to have something that's consistent, that you cover everything, because we'd like to have an input on everything. PROFESSOR BOO: Some questions, for example, can be a yes/no. MS MENAKER: Yes, exactly. You ask, for example, if there's any jurisprudence on X, and DR TORTEROLA: Do we have an agreement on the number of pages or not?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 choose to spend a lot of time on. This just doesn't make any sense. DR TORTEROLA: I mean, you said three pages. There are 24 questions. Three pages per question, that brings us closer to 85. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. The thing is, all of these questions are important to the Committee. If you choose not to answer an important question, it's your choice, but it's not advisable. So DR TORTEROLA: Let's do 75 then, if that's a number that you 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 some liberty in there. But also try to have something that's consistent, that you cover everything, because we'd like to have an input on everything. PROFESSOR BOO: Some questions, for example, can be a yes/no. MS MENAKER: Yes, exactly. You ask, for example, if there's any jurisprudence on X, and DR TORTEROLA: Do we have an agreement on the number of pages or not? THE PRESIDENT: I think 75. Ms Menaker, is that acceptable?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 choose to spend a lot of time on. This just doesn't make any sense. DR TORTEROLA: I mean, you said three pages. There are 24 questions. Three pages per question, that brings us closer to 85. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. The thing is, all of these questions are important to the Committee. If you choose not to answer an important question, it's your choice, but it's not advisable. So DR TORTEROLA: Let's do 75 then, if that's a number that you can live with. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 some liberty in there. But also try to have something that's consistent, that you cover everything, because we'd like to have an input on everything. PROFESSOR BOO: Some questions, for example, can be a yes/no. MS MENAKER: Yes, exactly. You ask, for example, if there's any jurisprudence on X, and DR TORTEROLA: Do we have an agreement on the number of pages or not? THE PRESIDENT: I think 75. Ms Menaker, is that acceptable? If you want to make it shorter, you will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 choose to spend a lot of time on. This just doesn't make any sense. DR TORTEROLA: I mean, you said three pages. There are 24 questions. Three pages per question, that brings us closer to 85. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. The thing is, all of these questions are important to the Committee. If you choose not to answer an important question, it's your choice, but it's not advisable. So DR TORTEROLA: Let's do 75 then, if that's a number that you can live with. THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 some liberty in there. But also try to have something that's consistent, that you cover everything, because we'd like to have an input on everything. PROFESSOR BOO: Some questions, for example, can be a yes/no. MS MENAKER: Yes, exactly. You ask, for example, if there's any jurisprudence on X, and DR TORTEROLA: Do we have an agreement on the number of pages or not? THE PRESIDENT: I think 75. Ms Menaker, is that acceptable? If you want to make it shorter, you will MS MENAKER: 75 is fine.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 choose to spend a lot of time on. This just doesn't make any sense. DR TORTEROLA: I mean, you said three pages. There are 24 questions. Three pages per question, that brings us closer to 85. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. The thing is, all of these questions are important to the Committee. If you choose not to answer an important question, it's your choice, but it's not advisable. So DR TORTEROLA: Let's do 75 then, if that's a number that you can live with. THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker? MS MENAKER: I have two questions. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 some liberty in there. But also try to have something that's consistent, that you cover everything, because we'd like to have an input on everything. PROFESSOR BOO: Some questions, for example, can be a yes/no. MS MENAKER: Yes, exactly. You ask, for example, if there's any jurisprudence on X, and DR TORTEROLA: Do we have an agreement on the number of pages or not? THE PRESIDENT: I think 75. Ms Menaker, is that acceptable? If you want to make it shorter, you will MS MENAKER: 75 is fine. THE PRESIDENT: 75. Excellent.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 choose to spend a lot of time on. This just doesn't make any sense. DR TORTEROLA: I mean, you said three pages. There are 24 questions. Three pages per question, that brings us closer to 85. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. The thing is, all of these questions are important to the Committee. If you choose not to answer an important question, it's your choice, but it's not advisable. So DR TORTEROLA: Let's do 75 then, if that's a number that you can live with. THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker? MS MENAKER: I have two questions. First of all, I do prefer I think that it makes 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 some liberty in there. But also try to have something that's consistent, that you cover everything, because we'd like to have an input on everything. PROFESSOR BOO: Some questions, for example, can be a yes/no. MS MENAKER: Yes, exactly. You ask, for example, if there's any jurisprudence on X, and DR TORTEROLA: Do we have an agreement on the number of pages or not? THE PRESIDENT: I think 75. Ms Menaker, is that acceptable? If you want to make it shorter, you will MS MENAKER: 75 is fine. THE PRESIDENT: 75. Excellent. The font can't be smaller than Times New Roman 12,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 choose to spend a lot of time on. This just doesn't make any sense. DR TORTEROLA: I mean, you said three pages. There are 24 questions. Three pages per question, that brings us closer to 85. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. The thing is, all of these questions are important to the Committee. If you choose not to answer an important question, it's your choice, but it's not advisable. So DR TORTEROLA: Let's do 75 then, if that's a number that you can live with. THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker? MS MENAKER: I have two questions. First of all, I do prefer I think that it makes sense to do it per question, for the reasons that you've 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 some liberty in there. But also try to have something that's consistent, that you cover everything, because we'd like to have an input on everything. PROFESSOR BOO: Some questions, for example, can be a yes/no. MS MENAKER: Yes, exactly. You ask, for example, if there's any jurisprudence on X, and DR TORTEROLA: Do we have an agreement on the number of pages or not? THE PRESIDENT: I think 75. Ms Menaker, is that acceptable? If you want to make it shorter, you will MS MENAKER: 75 is fine. THE PRESIDENT: 75. Excellent. The font can't be smaller than Times New Roman 12, please, for my eyes' sake.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 choose to spend a lot of time on. This just doesn't make any sense. DR TORTEROLA: I mean, you said three pages. There are 24 questions. Three pages per question, that brings us closer to 85. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. The thing is, all of these questions are important to the Committee. If you choose not to answer an important question, it's your choice, but it's not advisable. So DR TORTEROLA: Let's do 75 then, if that's a number that you can live with. THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker? MS MENAKER: I have two questions. First of all, I do prefer I think that it makes sense to do it per question, for the reasons that you've expressed. Because if we just have a limit and it's 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 some liberty in there. But also try to have something that's consistent, that you cover everything, because we'd like to have an input on everything. PROFESSOR BOO: Some questions, for example, can be a yes/no. MS MENAKER: Yes, exactly. You ask, for example, if there's any jurisprudence on X, and DR TORTEROLA: Do we have an agreement on the number of pages or not? THE PRESIDENT: I think 75. Ms Menaker, is that acceptable? If you want to make it shorter, you will MS MENAKER: 75 is fine. THE PRESIDENT: 75. Excellent. The font can't be smaller than Times New Roman 12, please, for my eyes' sake. DR TORTEROLA: Understood.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 choose to spend a lot of time on. This just doesn't make any sense. DR TORTEROLA: I mean, you said three pages. There are 24 questions. Three pages per question, that brings us closer to 85. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. The thing is, all of these questions are important to the Committee. If you choose not to answer an important question, it's your choice, but it's not advisable. So DR TORTEROLA: Let's do 75 then, if that's a number that you can live with. THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker? MS MENAKER: I have two questions. First of all, I do prefer I think that it makes sense to do it per question, for the reasons that you've expressed. Because if we just have a limit and it's limited to the questions, and you've already said we're 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 some liberty in there. But also try to have something that's consistent, that you cover everything, because we'd like to have an input on everything. PROFESSOR BOO: Some questions, for example, can be a yes/no. MS MENAKER: Yes, exactly. You ask, for example, if there's any jurisprudence on X, and DR TORTEROLA: Do we have an agreement on the number of pages or not? THE PRESIDENT: I think 75. Ms Menaker, is that acceptable? If you want to make it shorter, you will MS MENAKER: 75 is fine. THE PRESIDENT: 75. Excellent. The font can't be smaller than Times New Roman 12, please, for my eyes' sake. DR TORTEROLA: Understood. THE PRESIDENT: The time: how much time do you need?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 choose to spend a lot of time on. This just doesn't make any sense. DR TORTEROLA: I mean, you said three pages. There are 24 questions. Three pages per question, that brings us closer to 85. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. The thing is, all of these questions are important to the Committee. If you choose not to answer an important question, it's your choice, but it's not advisable. So DR TORTEROLA: Let's do 75 then, if that's a number that you can live with. THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker? MS MENAKER: I have two questions. First of all, I do prefer I think that it makes sense to do it per question, for the reasons that you've expressed. Because if we just have a limit and it's limited to the questions, and you've already said we're not supposed to add extraneous things So that would 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 some liberty in there. But also try to have something that's consistent, that you cover everything, because we'd like to have an input on everything. PROFESSOR BOO: Some questions, for example, can be a yes/no. MS MENAKER: Yes, exactly. You ask, for example, if there's any jurisprudence on X, and DR TORTEROLA: Do we have an agreement on the number of pages or not? THE PRESIDENT: I think 75. Ms Menaker, is that acceptable? If you want to make it shorter, you will MS MENAKER: 75 is fine. THE PRESIDENT: 75. Excellent. The font can't be smaller than Times New Roman 12, please, for my eyes' sake. DR TORTEROLA: Understood. THE PRESIDENT: The time: how much time do you need? I don't know if we've agreed on the time to review the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 choose to spend a lot of time on. This just doesn't make any sense. DR TORTEROLA: I mean, you said three pages. There are 24 questions. Three pages per question, that brings us closer to 85. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. The thing is, all of these questions are important to the Committee. If you choose not to answer an important question, it's your choice, but it's not advisable. So DR TORTEROLA: Let's do 75 then, if that's a number that you can live with. THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker? MS MENAKER: I have two questions. First of all, I do prefer I think that it makes sense to do it per question, for the reasons that you've expressed. Because if we just have a limit and it's limited to the questions, and you've already said we're not supposed to add extraneous things So that would be my preference. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 some liberty in there. But also try to have something that's consistent, that you cover everything, because we'd like to have an input on everything. PROFESSOR BOO: Some questions, for example, can be a yes/no. MS MENAKER: Yes, exactly. You ask, for example, if there's any jurisprudence on X, and DR TORTEROLA: Do we have an agreement on the number of pages or not? THE PRESIDENT: I think 75. Ms Menaker, is that acceptable? If you want to make it shorter, you will MS MENAKER: 75 is fine. THE PRESIDENT: 75. Excellent. The font can't be smaller than Times New Roman 12, please, for my eyes' sake. DR TORTEROLA: Understood. THE PRESIDENT: The time: how much time do you need? I don't know if we've agreed on the time to review the transcript.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 choose to spend a lot of time on. This just doesn't make any sense. DR TORTEROLA: I mean, you said three pages. There are 24 questions. Three pages per question, that brings us closer to 85. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. The thing is, all of these questions are important to the Committee. If you choose not to answer an important question, it's your choice, but it's not advisable. So DR TORTEROLA: Let's do 75 then, if that's a number that you can live with. THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker? MS MENAKER: I have two questions. First of all, I do prefer I think that it makes sense to do it per question, for the reasons that you've expressed. Because if we just have a limit and it's limited to the questions, and you've already said we're not supposed to add extraneous things So that would be my preference. But I do have a question in that regard. Because 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	some liberty in there. But also try to have something that's consistent, that you cover everything, because we'd like to have an input on everything. PROFESSOR BOO: Some questions, for example, can be a yes/no. MS MENAKER: Yes, exactly. You ask, for example, if there's any jurisprudence on X, and DR TORTEROLA: Do we have an agreement on the number of pages or not? THE PRESIDENT: I think 75. Ms Menaker, is that acceptable? If you want to make it shorter, you will MS MENAKER: 75 is fine. THE PRESIDENT: 75. Excellent. THE PRESIDENT: 75. Excellent. The font can't be smaller than Times New Roman 12, please, for my eyes' sake. DR TORTEROLA: Understood. THE PRESIDENT: The time: how much time do you need? I don't know if we've agreed on the time to review the transcript. DR TORTEROLA: I think that the procedural order says
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 choose to spend a lot of time on. This just doesn't make any sense. DR TORTEROLA: I mean, you said three pages. There are 24 questions. Three pages per question, that brings us closer to 85. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. The thing is, all of these questions are important to the Committee. If you choose not to answer an important question, it's your choice, but it's not advisable. So DR TORTEROLA: Let's do 75 then, if that's a number that you can live with. THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker? MS MENAKER: I have two questions. First of all, I do prefer I think that it makes sense to do it per question, for the reasons that you've expressed. Because if we just have a limit and it's limited to the questions, and you've already said we're not supposed to add extraneous things So that would be my preference. But I do have a question in that regard. Because some of your questions, for example 15, you end by 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 some liberty in there. But also try to have something that's consistent, that you cover everything, because we'd like to have an input on everything. PROFESSOR BOO: Some questions, for example, can be a yes/no. MS MENAKER: Yes, exactly. You ask, for example, if there's any jurisprudence on X, and DR TORTEROLA: Do we have an agreement on the number of pages or not? THE PRESIDENT: I think 75. Ms Menaker, is that acceptable? If you want to make it shorter, you will MS MENAKER: 75 is fine. THE PRESIDENT: 75. Excellent. The font can't be smaller than Times New Roman 12, please, for my eyes' sake. DR TORTEROLA: Understood. THE PRESIDENT: The time: how much time do you need? I don't know if we've agreed on the time to review the transcript. DR TORTEROLA: I think that the procedural order says 20 days.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 choose to spend a lot of time on. This just doesn't make any sense. DR TORTEROLA: I mean, you said three pages. There are 24 questions. Three pages per question, that brings us closer to 85. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. The thing is, all of these questions are important to the Committee. If you choose not to answer an important question, it's your choice, but it's not advisable. So DR TORTEROLA: Let's do 75 then, if that's a number that you can live with. THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker? MS MENAKER: I have two questions. First of all, I do prefer I think that it makes sense to do it per question, for the reasons that you've expressed. Because if we just have a limit and it's limited to the questions, and you've already said we're not supposed to add extraneous things So that would be my preference. But I do have a question in that regard. Because some of your questions, for example 15, you end by saying: 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 some liberty in there. But also try to have something that's consistent, that you cover everything, because we'd like to have an input on everything. PROFESSOR BOO: Some questions, for example, can be a yes/no. MS MENAKER: Yes, exactly. You ask, for example, if there's any jurisprudence on X, and DR TORTEROLA: Do we have an agreement on the number of pages or not? THE PRESIDENT: I think 75. Ms Menaker, is that acceptable? If you want to make it shorter, you will MS MENAKER: 75 is fine. THE PRESIDENT: 75. Excellent. The font can't be smaller than Times New Roman 12, please, for my eyes' sake. DR TORTEROLA: Understood. THE PRESIDENT: The time: how much time do you need? I don't know if we've agreed on the time to review the transcript. DR TORTEROLA: I think that the procedural order says 20 days. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, I remember you had another hearing:
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 choose to spend a lot of time on. This just doesn't make any sense. DR TORTEROLA: I mean, you said three pages. There are 24 questions. Three pages per question, that brings us closer to 85. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. The thing is, all of these questions are important to the Committee. If you choose not to answer an important question, it's your choice, but it's not advisable. So DR TORTEROLA: Let's do 75 then, if that's a number that you can live with. THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker? MS MENAKER: I have two questions. First of all, I do prefer I think that it makes sense to do it per question, for the reasons that you've expressed. Because if we just have a limit and it's limited to the questions, and you've already said we're not supposed to add extraneous things So that would be my preference. But I do have a question in that regard. Because some of your questions, for example 15, you end by saying: "The Committee is clear on TECO's position, wants to 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 some liberty in there. But also try to have something that's consistent, that you cover everything, because we'd like to have an input on everything. PROFESSOR BOO: Some questions, for example, can be a yes/no. MS MENAKER: Yes, exactly. You ask, for example, if there's any jurisprudence on X, and DR TORTEROLA: Do we have an agreement on the number of pages or not? THE PRESIDENT: I think 75. Ms Menaker, is that acceptable? If you want to make it shorter, you will MS MENAKER: 75 is fine. THE PRESIDENT: 75. Excellent. The font can't be smaller than Times New Roman 12, please, for my eyes' sake. DR TORTEROLA: Understood. THE PRESIDENT: The time: how much time do you need? I don't know if we've agreed on the time to review the transcript. DR TORTEROLA: I think that the procedural order says 20 days. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, I remember you had another hearing: that's why we decided on 20 days. Is that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 choose to spend a lot of time on. This just doesn't make any sense. DR TORTEROLA: I mean, you said three pages. There are 24 questions. Three pages per question, that brings us closer to 85. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. The thing is, all of these questions are important to the Committee. If you choose not to answer an important question, it's your choice, but it's not advisable. So DR TORTEROLA: Let's do 75 then, if that's a number that you can live with. THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker? MS MENAKER: I have two questions. First of all, I do prefer I think that it makes sense to do it per question, for the reasons that you've expressed. Because if we just have a limit and it's limited to the questions, and you've already said we're not supposed to add extraneous things So that would be my preference. But I do have a question in that regard. Because some of your questions, for example 15, you end by saying: 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 some liberty in there. But also try to have something that's consistent, that you cover everything, because we'd like to have an input on everything. PROFESSOR BOO: Some questions, for example, can be a yes/no. MS MENAKER: Yes, exactly. You ask, for example, if there's any jurisprudence on X, and DR TORTEROLA: Do we have an agreement on the number of pages or not? THE PRESIDENT: I think 75. Ms Menaker, is that acceptable? If you want to make it shorter, you will MS MENAKER: 75 is fine. THE PRESIDENT: 75. Excellent. The font can't be smaller than Times New Roman 12, please, for my eyes' sake. DR TORTEROLA: Understood. THE PRESIDENT: The time: how much time do you need? I don't know if we've agreed on the time to review the transcript. DR TORTEROLA: I think that the procedural order says 20 days. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, I remember you had another hearing:
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 choose to spend a lot of time on. This just doesn't make any sense. DR TORTEROLA: I mean, you said three pages. There are 24 questions. Three pages per question, that brings us closer to 85. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. The thing is, all of these questions are important to the Committee. If you choose not to answer an important question, it's your choice, but it's not advisable. So DR TORTEROLA: Let's do 75 then, if that's a number that you can live with. THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker? MS MENAKER: I have two questions. First of all, I do prefer I think that it makes sense to do it per question, for the reasons that you've expressed. Because if we just have a limit and it's limited to the questions, and you've already said we're not supposed to add extraneous things So that would be my preference. But I do have a question in that regard. Because some of your questions, for example 15, you end by saying: "The Committee is clear on TECO's position, wants to 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 some liberty in there. But also try to have something that's consistent, that you cover everything, because we'd like to have an input on everything. PROFESSOR BOO: Some questions, for example, can be a yes/no. MS MENAKER: Yes, exactly. You ask, for example, if there's any jurisprudence on X, and DR TORTEROLA: Do we have an agreement on the number of pages or not? THE PRESIDENT: I think 75. Ms Menaker, is that acceptable? If you want to make it shorter, you will MS MENAKER: 75 is fine. THE PRESIDENT: 75. Excellent. The font can't be smaller than Times New Roman 12, please, for my eyes' sake. DR TORTEROLA: Understood. THE PRESIDENT: The time: how much time do you need? I don't know if we've agreed on the time to review the transcript. DR TORTEROLA: I think that the procedural order says 20 days. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, I remember you had another hearing: that's why we decided on 20 days. Is that

		1	
13:13 1	a hearing before. And we have a hearing with Ms Menaker	13:21 1	limited to the record, the arguments we've been making;
2	on 29th August. So we have a very	13.21 1	the other side will be on notice that those legal
3	THE PRESIDENT: It shows how successful you are!	2	authorities, if admitted, will be used. So I don't see
4	DR TORTEROLA: Yes, and how much we will need to work during	4	the necessity or advantage of having a reply, and
- 5	the summer as well.	4 5	certainly not setting out with the expectations that we
	THE PRESIDENT: I hear you. It's no different here.		
6		6	would have a reply now.
7	So it stays 20 days?	7	THE PRESIDENT: Why don't we set a limit also for these
8	DR TORTEROLA: We would like that, yes.	8	applications. We don't want them to arrive at the
9	THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker, 20 days? That's what was	9	eleventh hour.
10	agreed.	10	MS MENAKER: Yes, exactly.
11	DR TORTEROLA: For?	11	DR TORTEROLA: I am not concerned, as I said before, with
12	THE PRESIDENT: For the revision, to review the transcript.	12	the length of the legal authorities applications, if
13	And we've learnt how important that is. So please do	13	that is the issue. Some of the questions, it is the
14	check all the figures!	14	first time that we are confronting them, and we really
15	Now, the real important time period is: how much do	15	would like to have the possibility I don't think that
16	you need, after you have reviewed the transcript, to	16	it's a question of time, because 15 days will change
17	produce these answers to the questions? (Pause)	17	nothing, and it will provide security to both sides.
18	Dr Torterola.	18	I don't see what the problem is if we can submit
19	DR TORTEROLA: I would like to hear, if possible, from	19	a short say 30-page reply in the next 15 days
20	Ms Menaker first, if she can suggest a date. Maybe they	20	after the first submission has been submitted.
21	are as busy as we are. Otherwise I will go with my	21	(The members of the Committee confer)
22	proposal. But maybe if she would like to volunteer	22	THE PRESIDENT: The Committee does accept that there be
23	first.	23	replies: very short, very brief, very to the point. So
24	THE PRESIDENT: Would you like to volunteer first?	24	choose the points where you want to file a reply.
25	MS MENAKER: Sure.	25	Be sure that these are questions which really hadn't
	Page 105		Page 107
13:19 1	I did have one minor question. The table that you	13:23 1	been dealt with before. So this is not like endless
13:19 1 2	I did have one minor question. The table that you had asked for the cases and that was limited to the	13:23 1 2	been dealt with before. So this is not like endless rounds of submission. It must be a reply that has never
	had asked for the cases and that was limited to the record on the timeliness, we have been working on it.		rounds of submission. It must be a reply that has never been filed before because this is a question that just
2	had asked for the cases and that was limited to the	2	rounds of submission. It must be a reply that has never
2 3	had asked for the cases and that was limited to the record on the timeliness, we have been working on it.	2 3	rounds of submission. It must be a reply that has never been filed before because this is a question that just
2 3 4	had asked for the cases and that was limited to the record on the timeliness, we have been working on it. It was not in a condition to produce today. Would you	2 3 4	rounds of submission. It must be a reply that has never been filed before because this is a question that just popped up now in the questions of the Tribunal.
2 3 4 5	 had asked for the cases and that was limited to the record on the timeliness, we have been working on it. It was not in a condition to produce today. Would you like us to make that as an annex to this? THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. Yes, annex it. MS MENAKER: So we would propose, also based on just 	2 3 4 5	rounds of submission. It must be a reply that has never been filed before because this is a question that just popped up now in the questions of the Tribunal. So very short, 15 days, and 30 pages limit for both parties. MS MENAKER: Just one question. With the submissions,
2 3 4 5 6	 had asked for the cases and that was limited to the record on the timeliness, we have been working on it. It was not in a condition to produce today. Would you like us to make that as an annex to this? THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. Yes, annex it. MS MENAKER: So we would propose, also based on just schedules and such, Monday, October 3rd. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	rounds of submission. It must be a reply that has never been filed before because this is a question that just popped up now in the questions of the Tribunal. So very short, 15 days, and 30 pages limit for both parties.MS MENAKER: Just one question. With the submissions, especially with the 15 days, we file in both English and
2 3 4 5 6 7	 had asked for the cases and that was limited to the record on the timeliness, we have been working on it. It was not in a condition to produce today. Would you like us to make that as an annex to this? THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. Yes, annex it. MS MENAKER: So we would propose, also based on just 	2 3 4 5 6 7	 rounds of submission. It must be a reply that has never been filed before because this is a question that just popped up now in the questions of the Tribunal. So very short, 15 days, and 30 pages limit for both parties. MS MENAKER: Just one question. With the submissions, especially with the 15 days, we file in both English and Spanish; with that, I believe it's 10 business days for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 had asked for the cases and that was limited to the record on the timeliness, we have been working on it. It was not in a condition to produce today. Would you like us to make that as an annex to this? THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. Yes, annex it. MS MENAKER: So we would propose, also based on just schedules and such, Monday, October 3rd. DR TORTEROLA: One Monday after and we have an agreement. THE PRESIDENT: One more week? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 rounds of submission. It must be a reply that has never been filed before because this is a question that just popped up now in the questions of the Tribunal. So very short, 15 days, and 30 pages limit for both parties. MS MENAKER: Just one question. With the submissions, especially with the 15 days, we file in both English and Spanish; with that, I believe it's 10 business days for the translation. So that would not work for us, if they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 had asked for the cases and that was limited to the record on the timeliness, we have been working on it. It was not in a condition to produce today. Would you like us to make that as an annex to this? THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. Yes, annex it. MS MENAKER: So we would propose, also based on just schedules and such, Monday, October 3rd. DR TORTEROLA: One Monday after and we have an agreement. THE PRESIDENT: One more week? DR TORTEROLA: One more week, yes. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 rounds of submission. It must be a reply that has never been filed before because this is a question that just popped up now in the questions of the Tribunal. So very short, 15 days, and 30 pages limit for both parties. MS MENAKER: Just one question. With the submissions, especially with the 15 days, we file in both English and Spanish; with that, I believe it's 10 business days for the translation. So that would not work for us, if they were to file in Spanish and we were with that timing.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 had asked for the cases and that was limited to the record on the timeliness, we have been working on it. It was not in a condition to produce today. Would you like us to make that as an annex to this? THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. Yes, annex it. MS MENAKER: So we would propose, also based on just schedules and such, Monday, October 3rd. DR TORTEROLA: One Monday after and we have an agreement. THE PRESIDENT: One more week? DR TORTEROLA: One more week, yes. THE PRESIDENT: One more week: would that be acceptable? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 rounds of submission. It must be a reply that has never been filed before because this is a question that just popped up now in the questions of the Tribunal. So very short, 15 days, and 30 pages limit for both parties. MS MENAKER: Just one question. With the submissions, especially with the 15 days, we file in both English and Spanish; with that, I believe it's 10 business days for the translation. So that would not work for us, if they were to file in Spanish and we were with that timing. DR TORTEROLA: Let me consult with the authorities right
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 had asked for the cases and that was limited to the record on the timeliness, we have been working on it. It was not in a condition to produce today. Would you like us to make that as an annex to this? THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. Yes, annex it. MS MENAKER: So we would propose, also based on just schedules and such, Monday, October 3rd. DR TORTEROLA: One Monday after and we have an agreement. THE PRESIDENT: One more week? DR TORTEROLA: One more week, yes. THE PRESIDENT: One more week: would that be acceptable? MS MENAKER: That's the 10th? Okay. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 rounds of submission. It must be a reply that has never been filed before because this is a question that just popped up now in the questions of the Tribunal. So very short, 15 days, and 30 pages limit for both parties. MS MENAKER: Just one question. With the submissions, especially with the 15 days, we file in both English and Spanish; with that, I believe it's 10 business days for the translation. So that would not work for us, if they were to file in Spanish and we were with that timing. DR TORTEROLA: Let me consult with the authorities right now. We are going to do everything in order to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 had asked for the cases and that was limited to the record on the timeliness, we have been working on it. It was not in a condition to produce today. Would you like us to make that as an annex to this? THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. Yes, annex it. MS MENAKER: So we would propose, also based on just schedules and such, Monday, October 3rd. DR TORTEROLA: One Monday after and we have an agreement. THE PRESIDENT: One more week? DR TORTEROLA: One more week, yes. THE PRESIDENT: One more week: would that be acceptable? MS MENAKER: That's the 10th? Okay. THE PRESIDENT: 10th October? Excellent. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 rounds of submission. It must be a reply that has never been filed before because this is a question that just popped up now in the questions of the Tribunal. So very short, 15 days, and 30 pages limit for both parties. MS MENAKER: Just one question. With the submissions, especially with the 15 days, we file in both English and Spanish; with that, I believe it's 10 business days for the translation. So that would not work for us, if they were to file in Spanish and we were with that timing. DR TORTEROLA: Let me consult with the authorities right now. We are going to do everything in order to accommodate that request. (Pause)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 had asked for the cases and that was limited to the record on the timeliness, we have been working on it. It was not in a condition to produce today. Would you like us to make that as an annex to this? THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. Yes, annex it. MS MENAKER: So we would propose, also based on just schedules and such, Monday, October 3rd. DR TORTEROLA: One Monday after and we have an agreement. THE PRESIDENT: One more week? DR TORTEROLA: One more week, yes. THE PRESIDENT: One more week: would that be acceptable? MS MENAKER: That's the 10th? Okay. THE PRESIDENT: 10th October? Excellent. With this, I think we reach the yes, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 rounds of submission. It must be a reply that has never been filed before because this is a question that just popped up now in the questions of the Tribunal. So very short, 15 days, and 30 pages limit for both parties. MS MENAKER: Just one question. With the submissions, especially with the 15 days, we file in both English and Spanish; with that, I believe it's 10 business days for the translation. So that would not work for us, if they were to file in Spanish and we were with that timing. DR TORTEROLA: Let me consult with the authorities right now. We are going to do everything in order to accommodate that request. (Pause) THE PRESIDENT: I am just being told that 10th October is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 had asked for the cases and that was limited to the record on the timeliness, we have been working on it. It was not in a condition to produce today. Would you like us to make that as an annex to this? THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. Yes, annex it. MS MENAKER: So we would propose, also based on just schedules and such, Monday, October 3rd. DR TORTEROLA: One Monday after and we have an agreement. THE PRESIDENT: One more week? DR TORTEROLA: One more week, yes. THE PRESIDENT: One more week: would that be acceptable? MS MENAKER: That's the 10th? Okay. THE PRESIDENT: 10th October? Excellent. With this, I think we reach the yes, Mr Torterola? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 rounds of submission. It must be a reply that has never been filed before because this is a question that just popped up now in the questions of the Tribunal. So very short, 15 days, and 30 pages limit for both parties. MS MENAKER: Just one question. With the submissions, especially with the 15 days, we file in both English and Spanish; with that, I believe it's 10 business days for the translation. So that would not work for us, if they were to file in Spanish and we were with that timing. DR TORTEROLA: Let me consult with the authorities right now. We are going to do everything in order to accommodate that request. (Pause) THE PRESIDENT: I am just being told that 10th October is Columbus Day and, according to the rules, ICSID is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 had asked for the cases and that was limited to the record on the timeliness, we have been working on it. It was not in a condition to produce today. Would you like us to make that as an annex to this? THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. Yes, annex it. MS MENAKER: So we would propose, also based on just schedules and such, Monday, October 3rd. DR TORTEROLA: One Monday after and we have an agreement. THE PRESIDENT: One more week? DR TORTEROLA: One more week, yes. THE PRESIDENT: One more week: would that be acceptable? MS MENAKER: That's the 10th? Okay. THE PRESIDENT: 10th October? Excellent. With this, I think we reach the yes, Mr Torterola? DR TORTEROLA: Yes, Madam President. We had a request to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 rounds of submission. It must be a reply that has never been filed before because this is a question that just popped up now in the questions of the Tribunal. So very short, 15 days, and 30 pages limit for both parties. MS MENAKER: Just one question. With the submissions, especially with the 15 days, we file in both English and Spanish; with that, I believe it's 10 business days for the translation. So that would not work for us, if they were to file in Spanish and we were with that timing. DR TORTEROLA: Let me consult with the authorities right now. We are going to do everything in order to accommodate that request. (Pause) THE PRESIDENT: I am just being told that 10th October is Columbus Day and, according to the rules, ICSID is closed, and it should be then moved to the subsequent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 had asked for the cases and that was limited to the record on the timeliness, we have been working on it. It was not in a condition to produce today. Would you like us to make that as an annex to this? THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. Yes, annex it. MS MENAKER: So we would propose, also based on just schedules and such, Monday, October 3rd. DR TORTEROLA: One Monday after and we have an agreement. THE PRESIDENT: One more week? DR TORTEROLA: One more week, yes. THE PRESIDENT: One more week: would that be acceptable? MS MENAKER: That's the 10th? Okay. THE PRESIDENT: 10th October? Excellent. With this, I think we reach the yes, Mr Torterola? DR TORTEROLA: Yes, Madam President. We had a request to have a short second round. It can be 15 days after. As 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 rounds of submission. It must be a reply that has never been filed before because this is a question that just popped up now in the questions of the Tribunal. So very short, 15 days, and 30 pages limit for both parties. MS MENAKER: Just one question. With the submissions, especially with the 15 days, we file in both English and Spanish; with that, I believe it's 10 business days for the translation. So that would not work for us, if they were to file in Spanish and we were with that timing. DR TORTEROLA: Let me consult with the authorities right now. We are going to do everything in order to accommodate that request. (Pause) THE PRESIDENT: I am just being told that 10th October is Columbus Day and, according to the rules, ICSID is closed, and it should be then moved to the subsequent day which is not a bank holiday, which is 11th October.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 had asked for the cases and that was limited to the record on the timeliness, we have been working on it. It was not in a condition to produce today. Would you like us to make that as an annex to this? THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. Yes, annex it. MS MENAKER: So we would propose, also based on just schedules and such, Monday, October 3rd. DR TORTEROLA: One Monday after and we have an agreement. THE PRESIDENT: One more week? DR TORTEROLA: One more week, yes. THE PRESIDENT: One more week: would that be acceptable? MS MENAKER: That's the 10th? Okay. THE PRESIDENT: 10th October? Excellent. With this, I think we reach the yes, Mr Torterola? DR TORTEROLA: Yes, Madam President. We had a request to have a short second round. It can be 15 days after. As long as you wish, to the extent that we have, I mean, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 rounds of submission. It must be a reply that has never been filed before because this is a question that just popped up now in the questions of the Tribunal. So very short, 15 days, and 30 pages limit for both parties. MS MENAKER: Just one question. With the submissions, especially with the 15 days, we file in both English and Spanish; with that, I believe it's 10 business days for the translation. So that would not work for us, if they were to file in Spanish and we were with that timing. DR TORTEROLA: Let me consult with the authorities right now. We are going to do everything in order to accommodate that request. (Pause) THE PRESIDENT: I am just being told that 10th October is Columbus Day and, according to the rules, ICSID is closed, and it should be then moved to the subsequent day which is not a bank holiday, which is 11th October. Okay? How nice: you're going to be spending the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 had asked for the cases and that was limited to the record on the timeliness, we have been working on it. It was not in a condition to produce today. Would you like us to make that as an annex to this? THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. Yes, annex it. MS MENAKER: So we would propose, also based on just schedules and such, Monday, October 3rd. DR TORTEROLA: One Monday after and we have an agreement. THE PRESIDENT: One more week? DR TORTEROLA: One more week, yes. THE PRESIDENT: One more week: would that be acceptable? MS MENAKER: That's the 10th? Okay. THE PRESIDENT: 10th October? Excellent. With this, I think we reach the yes, Mr Torterola? DR TORTEROLA: Yes, Madam President. We had a request to have a short second round. It can be 15 days after. As long as you wish, to the extent that we have, I mean, the minimum space to write something meaningful and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 rounds of submission. It must be a reply that has never been filed before because this is a question that just popped up now in the questions of the Tribunal. So very short, 15 days, and 30 pages limit for both parties. MS MENAKER: Just one question. With the submissions, especially with the 15 days, we file in both English and Spanish; with that, I believe it's 10 business days for the translation. So that would not work for us, if they were to file in Spanish and we were with that timing. DR TORTEROLA: Let me consult with the authorities right now. We are going to do everything in order to accommodate that request. (Pause) THE PRESIDENT: I am just being told that 10th October is Columbus Day and, according to the rules, ICSID is closed, and it should be then moved to the subsequent day which is not a bank holiday, which is 11th October. Okay? How nice: you're going to be spending the extended!
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 had asked for the cases and that was limited to the record on the timeliness, we have been working on it. It was not in a condition to produce today. Would you like us to make that as an annex to this? THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. Yes, annex it. MS MENAKER: So we would propose, also based on just schedules and such, Monday, October 3rd. DR TORTEROLA: One Monday after and we have an agreement. THE PRESIDENT: One more week? DR TORTEROLA: One more week, yes. THE PRESIDENT: One more week: would that be acceptable? MS MENAKER: That's the 10th? Okay. THE PRESIDENT: 10th October? Excellent. With this, I think we reach the yes, Mr Torterola? DR TORTEROLA: Yes, Madam President. We had a request to have a short second round. It can be 15 days after. As long as you wish, to the extent that we have, I mean, the minimum space to write something meaningful and nothing else. Something like 15 days after. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 rounds of submission. It must be a reply that has never been filed before because this is a question that just popped up now in the questions of the Tribunal. So very short, 15 days, and 30 pages limit for both parties. MS MENAKER: Just one question. With the submissions, especially with the 15 days, we file in both English and Spanish; with that, I believe it's 10 business days for the translation. So that would not work for us, if they were to file in Spanish and we were with that timing. DR TORTEROLA: Let me consult with the authorities right now. We are going to do everything in order to accommodate that request. (Pause) THE PRESIDENT: I am just being told that 10th October is Columbus Day and, according to the rules, ICSID is closed, and it should be then moved to the subsequent day which is not a bank holiday, which is 11th October. Okay? How nice: you're going to be spending the extended! DR TORTEROLA: I had not realised that. But anyways.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 had asked for the cases and that was limited to the record on the timeliness, we have been working on it. It was not in a condition to produce today. Would you like us to make that as an annex to this? THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. Yes, annex it. MS MENAKER: So we would propose, also based on just schedules and such, Monday, October 3rd. DR TORTEROLA: One Monday after and we have an agreement. THE PRESIDENT: One more week? DR TORTEROLA: One more week, yes. THE PRESIDENT: One more week: would that be acceptable? MS MENAKER: That's the 10th? Okay. THE PRESIDENT: 10th October? Excellent. With this, I think we reach the yes, Mr Torterola? DR TORTEROLA: Yes, Madam President. We had a request to have a short second round. It can be 15 days after. As long as you wish, to the extent that we have, I mean, the minimum space to write something meaningful and nothing else. Something like 15 days after. THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 rounds of submission. It must be a reply that has never been filed before because this is a question that just popped up now in the questions of the Tribunal. So very short, 15 days, and 30 pages limit for both parties. MS MENAKER: Just one question. With the submissions, especially with the 15 days, we file in both English and Spanish; with that, I believe it's 10 business days for the translation. So that would not work for us, if they were to file in Spanish and we were with that timing. DR TORTEROLA: Let me consult with the authorities right now. We are going to do everything in order to accommodate that request. (Pause) THE PRESIDENT: I am just being told that 10th October is Columbus Day and, according to the rules, ICSID is closed, and it should be then moved to the subsequent day which is not a bank holiday, which is 11th October. Okay? How nice: you're going to be spending the extended! DR TORTEROLA: I had not realised that. But anyways. THE PRESIDENT: Regarding the translations.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 had asked for the cases and that was limited to the record on the timeliness, we have been working on it. It was not in a condition to produce today. Would you like us to make that as an annex to this? THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. Yes, annex it. MS MENAKER: So we would propose, also based on just schedules and such, Monday, October 3rd. DR TORTEROLA: One Monday after and we have an agreement. THE PRESIDENT: One more week? DR TORTEROLA: One more week, yes. THE PRESIDENT: One more week: would that be acceptable? MS MENAKER: That's the 10th? Okay. THE PRESIDENT: 10th October? Excellent. With this, I think we reach the yes, Mr Torterola? DR TORTEROLA: Yes, Madam President. We had a request to have a short second round. It can be 15 days after. As long as you wish, to the extent that we have, I mean, the minimum space to write something meaningful and nothing else. Something like 15 days after. THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker? MS MENAKER: I think that if the parties make the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 rounds of submission. It must be a reply that has never been filed before because this is a question that just popped up now in the questions of the Tribunal. So very short, 15 days, and 30 pages limit for both parties. MS MENAKER: Just one question. With the submissions, especially with the 15 days, we file in both English and Spanish; with that, I believe it's 10 business days for the translation. So that would not work for us, if they were to file in Spanish and we were with that timing. DR TORTEROLA: Let me consult with the authorities right now. We are going to do everything in order to accommodate that request. (Pause) THE PRESIDENT: I am just being told that 10th October is Columbus Day and, according to the rules, ICSID is closed, and it should be then moved to the subsequent day which is not a bank holiday, which is 11th October. Okay? How nice: you're going to be spending the extended! DR TORTEROLA: I had not realised that. But anyways. THE PRESIDENT: Regarding the translations. I don't know
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 had asked for the cases and that was limited to the record on the timeliness, we have been working on it. It was not in a condition to produce today. Would you like us to make that as an annex to this? THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. Yes, annex it. MS MENAKER: So we would propose, also based on just schedules and such, Monday, October 3rd. DR TORTEROLA: One Monday after and we have an agreement. THE PRESIDENT: One more week? DR TORTEROLA: One more week, yes. THE PRESIDENT: One more week: would that be acceptable? MS MENAKER: That's the 10th? Okay. THE PRESIDENT: 10th October? Excellent. With this, I think we reach the yes, Mr Torterola? DR TORTEROLA: Yes, Madam President. We had a request to have a short second round. It can be 15 days after. As long as you wish, to the extent that we have, I mean, the minimum space to write something meaningful and nothing else. Something like 15 days after. THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker? MS MENAKER: I think that if the parties make the application to put in the new legal authorities, if any, 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 rounds of submission. It must be a reply that has never been filed before because this is a question that just popped up now in the questions of the Tribunal. So very short, 15 days, and 30 pages limit for both parties. MS MENAKER: Just one question. With the submissions, especially with the 15 days, we file in both English and Spanish; with that, I believe it's 10 business days for the translation. So that would not work for us, if they were to file in Spanish and we were with that timing. DR TORTEROLA: Let me consult with the authorities right now. We are going to do everything in order to accommodate that request. (Pause) THE PRESIDENT: I am just being told that 10th October is Columbus Day and, according to the rules, ICSID is closed, and it should be then moved to the subsequent day which is not a bank holiday, which is 11th October. Okay? How nice: you're going to be spending the extended! DR TORTEROLA: I had not realised that. But anyways. THE PRESIDENT: Regarding the translations. I don't know what the proposal was, but we can submit in English.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 had asked for the cases and that was limited to the record on the timeliness, we have been working on it. It was not in a condition to produce today. Would you like us to make that as an annex to this? THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. Yes, annex it. MS MENAKER: So we would propose, also based on just schedules and such, Monday, October 3rd. DR TORTEROLA: One Monday after and we have an agreement. THE PRESIDENT: One more week? DR TORTEROLA: One more week, yes. THE PRESIDENT: One more week: would that be acceptable? MS MENAKER: That's the 10th? Okay. THE PRESIDENT: 10th October? Excellent. With this, I think we reach the yes, Mr Torterola? DR TORTEROLA: Yes, Madam President. We had a request to have a short second round. It can be 15 days after. As long as you wish, to the extent that we have, I mean, the minimum space to write something meaningful and nothing else. Something like 15 days after. THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker? MS MENAKER: I think that if the parties make the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 rounds of submission. It must be a reply that has never been filed before because this is a question that just popped up now in the questions of the Tribunal. So very short, 15 days, and 30 pages limit for both parties. MS MENAKER: Just one question. With the submissions, especially with the 15 days, we file in both English and Spanish; with that, I believe it's 10 business days for the translation. So that would not work for us, if they were to file in Spanish and we were with that timing. DR TORTEROLA: Let me consult with the authorities right now. We are going to do everything in order to accommodate that request. (Pause) THE PRESIDENT: I am just being told that 10th October is Columbus Day and, according to the rules, ICSID is closed, and it should be then moved to the subsequent day which is not a bank holiday, which is 11th October. Okay? How nice: you're going to be spending the extended! DR TORTEROLA: I had not realised that. But anyways. THE PRESIDENT: Regarding the translations. I don't know

13:25 1	translation. Translations need to be forthcoming,	13:28 1	MS MENAKER: Yes, and just the date? (Pause)
2	but	2	DR TORTEROLA: That is one week after you make the decision
3	THE PRESIDENT: Is it okay if these two rounds of answers	3	whether you are going to be accepting those legal
4	are submitted in English, and once the two have been	4	authorities or not.
5	submitted, then the translations are provided? Is that	5	THE PRESIDENT: I think we'll make just one decision.
6	acceptable?	6	Assuming they were accepted, what you would like to
7	DR TORTEROLA: It is acceptable to us, yes.	7	submit in reply, and then we'll see. Because otherwise
8	THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker, is that okay?	8	we'll be running
9	MS MENAKER: Yes.	9	DR TORTEROLA: What we are saying is that a week from the
10	THE PRESIDENT: Yes.	10	moment in which you make the decision on which are the
11	MS MENAKER: And since we won't be drafting simultaneously,	11	authorities that are being introduced. It's a proposal
12	how much after the second submission? Is it still the	12	just to have that. (Pause)
13	same rule that we've used?	13	THE PRESIDENT: So you make submissions for leave to
14	THE PRESIDENT: What do you do?	14	introduce responsive legal authorities a week later, and
15	MS MENAKER: Normally we have ten business days.	15	the Tribunal decides. If we decide not to have the main
16	THE PRESIDENT: Ten business days, and you simultaneously	16	legal authorities, of course the responsive or reply
17	file then the translations of both answers	17	would also fall away. Okay?
18	MS MENAKER: Correct, yes. The first one will already	18	MS MENAKER: Okay.
19	THE PRESIDENT: the first and the reply. Okay?	19	THE PRESIDENT: That way you don't keep us working around
20	DR TORTEROLA: That's correct for us, yes.	20	the clock on these decisions.
21	THE PRESIDENT: Very good.	21	DR TORTEROLA: It's fine with us. Thank you.
22	How much in advance do you want to set the cut-off	22	THE PRESIDENT: Good.
23	date to ask for leave to submit the new authorities?	23	(A discussion took place off the record)
24	(Pause)	24	THE PRESIDENT: So 27th October for the reply submission.
25	MS MENAKER: We would propose splitting it. So a month.	25	MS MENAKER: Madam President, can we expect that on the
	P 100		5
	Page 109		Page 111
13:27 1	Obviously each party would have to do the research to	13:31 1	legal authorities, you won't give us a date for them,
13:27 1 2	Obviously each party would have to do the research to identify. But the advantage would be that we would know		legal authorities, you won't give us a date for them, but we would learn fairly quickly, so we would adjust
	Obviously each party would have to do the research to identify. But the advantage would be that we would know one another's authorities, so we could take them into	13:31 1 2 3	but we would learn fairly quickly, so we would adjust
2	identify. But the advantage would be that we would know	2	but we would learn fairly quickly, so we would adjust our submission accordingly?
2 3	identify. But the advantage would be that we would know one another's authorities, so we could take them into	2 3	but we would learn fairly quickly, so we would adjust
2 3 4	identify. But the advantage would be that we would know one another's authorities, so we could take them into account in our answers if we chose to.	2 3 4 5	but we would learn fairly quickly, so we would adjust our submission accordingly? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I commit to preparing a draft decision
2 3 4 5	identify. But the advantage would be that we would know one another's authorities, so we could take them into account in our answers if we chose to.DR TORTEROLA: A month from now is going to be	2 3 4 5	but we would learn fairly quickly, so we would adjust our submission accordingly?THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I commit to preparing a draft decision early enough not to burden you.
2 3 4 5 6	identify. But the advantage would be that we would know one another's authorities, so we could take them into account in our answers if we chose to.DR TORTEROLA: A month from now is going to be August 29th	2 3 4 5 6	but we would learn fairly quickly, so we would adjust our submission accordingly?THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I commit to preparing a draft decision early enough not to burden you.DR TORTEROLA: We can chat with each other, if necessary, in
2 3 4 5 6 7	 identify. But the advantage would be that we would know one another's authorities, so we could take them into account in our answers if we chose to. DR TORTEROLA: A month from now is going to be August 29th THE PRESIDENT: No, no, a month before the deadline. So it would be 11th September. So we count backwards. So 	2 3 4 5 6 7	but we would learn fairly quickly, so we would adjust our submission accordingly?THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I commit to preparing a draft decision early enough not to burden you.DR TORTEROLA: We can chat with each other, if necessary, in order to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 identify. But the advantage would be that we would know one another's authorities, so we could take them into account in our answers if we chose to. DR TORTEROLA: A month from now is going to be August 29th THE PRESIDENT: No, no, a month before the deadline. So it 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 but we would learn fairly quickly, so we would adjust our submission accordingly? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I commit to preparing a draft decision early enough not to burden you. DR TORTEROLA: We can chat with each other, if necessary, in order to THE PRESIDENT: Chat with each other. If you think: yes, of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 identify. But the advantage would be that we would know one another's authorities, so we could take them into account in our answers if we chose to. DR TORTEROLA: A month from now is going to be August 29th THE PRESIDENT: No, no, a month before the deadline. So it would be 11th September. So we count backwards. So you've got a whole month. It's a month in advance of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 but we would learn fairly quickly, so we would adjust our submission accordingly? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I commit to preparing a draft decision early enough not to burden you. DR TORTEROLA: We can chat with each other, if necessary, in order to THE PRESIDENT: Chat with each other. If you think: yes, of course that's reasonable, and we also have in reply, so
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 identify. But the advantage would be that we would know one another's authorities, so we could take them into account in our answers if we chose to. DR TORTEROLA: A month from now is going to be August 29th THE PRESIDENT: No, no, a month before the deadline. So it would be 11th September. So we count backwards. So you've got a whole month. It's a month in advance of the deadline. I don't know if that's a Sunday. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 but we would learn fairly quickly, so we would adjust our submission accordingly? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I commit to preparing a draft decision early enough not to burden you. DR TORTEROLA: We can chat with each other, if necessary, in order to THE PRESIDENT: Chat with each other. If you think: yes, of course that's reasonable, and we also have in reply, so it's good please do have a collegial attitude here.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 identify. But the advantage would be that we would know one another's authorities, so we could take them into account in our answers if we chose to. DR TORTEROLA: A month from now is going to be August 29th THE PRESIDENT: No, no, a month before the deadline. So it would be 11th September. So we count backwards. So you've got a whole month. It's a month in advance of the deadline. I don't know if that's a Sunday. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, it's Sunday: it would be September 12th. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 but we would learn fairly quickly, so we would adjust our submission accordingly? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I commit to preparing a draft decision early enough not to burden you. DR TORTEROLA: We can chat with each other, if necessary, in order to THE PRESIDENT: Chat with each other. If you think: yes, of course that's reasonable, and we also have in reply, so it's good please do have a collegial attitude here. MS MENAKER: So in theory, if we agree, you have no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 identify. But the advantage would be that we would know one another's authorities, so we could take them into account in our answers if we chose to. DR TORTEROLA: A month from now is going to be August 29th THE PRESIDENT: No, no, a month before the deadline. So it would be 11th September. So we count backwards. So you've got a whole month. It's a month in advance of the deadline. I don't know if that's a Sunday. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, it's Sunday: it would be September 12th. THE PRESIDENT: Is that okay? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 but we would learn fairly quickly, so we would adjust our submission accordingly? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I commit to preparing a draft decision early enough not to burden you. DR TORTEROLA: We can chat with each other, if necessary, in order to THE PRESIDENT: Chat with each other. If you think: yes, of course that's reasonable, and we also have in reply, so it's good please do have a collegial attitude here. MS MENAKER: So in theory, if we agree, you have no objection to the inclusion?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 identify. But the advantage would be that we would know one another's authorities, so we could take them into account in our answers if we chose to. DR TORTEROLA: A month from now is going to be August 29th THE PRESIDENT: No, no, a month before the deadline. So it would be 11th September. So we count backwards. So you've got a whole month. It's a month in advance of the deadline. I don't know if that's a Sunday. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, it's Sunday: it would be September 12th. THE PRESIDENT: Is that okay? DR TORTEROLA: We agree September 12th. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 but we would learn fairly quickly, so we would adjust our submission accordingly? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I commit to preparing a draft decision early enough not to burden you. DR TORTEROLA: We can chat with each other, if necessary, in order to THE PRESIDENT: Chat with each other. If you think: yes, of course that's reasonable, and we also have in reply, so it's good please do have a collegial attitude here. MS MENAKER: So in theory, if we agree, you have no objection to the inclusion? THE PRESIDENT: If you agree, I don't think we will have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 identify. But the advantage would be that we would know one another's authorities, so we could take them into account in our answers if we chose to. DR TORTEROLA: A month from now is going to be August 29th THE PRESIDENT: No, no, a month before the deadline. So it would be 11th September. So we count backwards. So you've got a whole month. It's a month in advance of the deadline. I don't know if that's a Sunday. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, it's Sunday: it would be September 12th. THE PRESIDENT: Is that okay? DR TORTEROLA: We agree September 12th. The only thing that we would like to request here is 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 but we would learn fairly quickly, so we would adjust our submission accordingly? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I commit to preparing a draft decision early enough not to burden you. DR TORTEROLA: We can chat with each other, if necessary, in order to THE PRESIDENT: Chat with each other. If you think: yes, of course that's reasonable, and we also have in reply, so it's good please do have a collegial attitude here. MS MENAKER: So in theory, if we agree, you have no objection to the inclusion? THE PRESIDENT: If you agree, I don't think we will have an objection.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 identify. But the advantage would be that we would know one another's authorities, so we could take them into account in our answers if we chose to. DR TORTEROLA: A month from now is going to be August 29th THE PRESIDENT: No, no, a month before the deadline. So it would be 11th September. So we count backwards. So you've got a whole month. It's a month in advance of the deadline. I don't know if that's a Sunday. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, it's Sunday: it would be September 12th. THE PRESIDENT: Is that okay? DR TORTEROLA: We agree September 12th. The only thing that we would like to request here is that we don't know what authorities are going be 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 but we would learn fairly quickly, so we would adjust our submission accordingly? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I commit to preparing a draft decision early enough not to burden you. DR TORTEROLA: We can chat with each other, if necessary, in order to THE PRESIDENT: Chat with each other. If you think: yes, of course that's reasonable, and we also have in reply, so it's good please do have a collegial attitude here. MS MENAKER: So in theory, if we agree, you have no objection to the inclusion? THE PRESIDENT: If you agree, I don't think we will have an objection. MS MENAKER: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 identify. But the advantage would be that we would know one another's authorities, so we could take them into account in our answers if we chose to. DR TORTEROLA: A month from now is going to be August 29th THE PRESIDENT: No, no, a month before the deadline. So it would be 11th September. So we count backwards. So you've got a whole month. It's a month in advance of the deadline. I don't know if that's a Sunday. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, it's Sunday: it would be September 12th. THE PRESIDENT: Is that okay? DR TORTEROLA: We agree September 12th. The only thing that we would like to request here is that we don't know what authorities are going be introduced, and we will need to introduce, both sides, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 but we would learn fairly quickly, so we would adjust our submission accordingly? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I commit to preparing a draft decision early enough not to burden you. DR TORTEROLA: We can chat with each other, if necessary, in order to THE PRESIDENT: Chat with each other. If you think: yes, of course that's reasonable, and we also have in reply, so it's good please do have a collegial attitude here. MS MENAKER: So in theory, if we agree, you have no objection to the inclusion? THE PRESIDENT: If you agree, I don't think we will have an objection. MS MENAKER: Okay. THE PRESIDENT: Perhaps you will have a chat before and you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 identify. But the advantage would be that we would know one another's authorities, so we could take them into account in our answers if we chose to. DR TORTEROLA: A month from now is going to be August 29th THE PRESIDENT: No, no, a month before the deadline. So it would be 11th September. So we count backwards. So you've got a whole month. It's a month in advance of the deadline. I don't know if that's a Sunday. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, it's Sunday: it would be September 12th. THE PRESIDENT: Is that okay? DR TORTEROLA: We agree September 12th. The only thing that we would like to request here is that we don't know what authorities are going be introduced, and we will need to introduce, both sides, authorities that are responsive to the authorities that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 but we would learn fairly quickly, so we would adjust our submission accordingly? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I commit to preparing a draft decision early enough not to burden you. DR TORTEROLA: We can chat with each other, if necessary, in order to THE PRESIDENT: Chat with each other. If you think: yes, of course that's reasonable, and we also have in reply, so it's good please do have a collegial attitude here. MS MENAKER: So in theory, if we agree, you have no objection to the inclusion? THE PRESIDENT: If you agree, I don't think we will have an objection. MS MENAKER: Okay. THE PRESIDENT: Perhaps you will have a chat before and you say, "We have already agreed this, this and this, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 identify. But the advantage would be that we would know one another's authorities, so we could take them into account in our answers if we chose to. DR TORTEROLA: A month from now is going to be August 29th THE PRESIDENT: No, no, a month before the deadline. So it would be 11th September. So we count backwards. So you've got a whole month. It's a month in advance of the deadline. I don't know if that's a Sunday. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, it's Sunday: it would be September 12th. THE PRESIDENT: Is that okay? DR TORTEROLA: We agree September 12th. The only thing that we would like to request here is that we don't know what authorities are going be introduced, and we will need to introduce, both sides, authorities that are responsive to the authorities that have been introduced. So we suggest that a week after, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 but we would learn fairly quickly, so we would adjust our submission accordingly? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I commit to preparing a draft decision early enough not to burden you. DR TORTEROLA: We can chat with each other, if necessary, in order to THE PRESIDENT: Chat with each other. If you think: yes, of course that's reasonable, and we also have in reply, so it's good please do have a collegial attitude here. MS MENAKER: So in theory, if we agree, you have no objection to the inclusion? THE PRESIDENT: If you agree, I don't think we will have an objection. MS MENAKER: Okay. THE PRESIDENT: Perhaps you will have a chat before and you say, "We have already agreed this, this and this, and there will be this and this in reply", or whatever, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 identify. But the advantage would be that we would know one another's authorities, so we could take them into account in our answers if we chose to. DR TORTEROLA: A month from now is going to be August 29th THE PRESIDENT: No, no, a month before the deadline. So it would be 11th September. So we count backwards. So you've got a whole month. It's a month in advance of the deadline. I don't know if that's a Sunday. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, it's Sunday: it would be September 12th. THE PRESIDENT: Is that okay? DR TORTEROLA: We agree September 12th. The only thing that we would like to request here is that we don't know what authorities are going be introduced, and we will need to introduce, both sides, authorities that are responsive to the authorities that have been introduced. So we suggest that a week after, the parties are permitted to introduce any legal 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 but we would learn fairly quickly, so we would adjust our submission accordingly? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I commit to preparing a draft decision early enough not to burden you. DR TORTEROLA: We can chat with each other, if necessary, in order to THE PRESIDENT: Chat with each other. If you think: yes, of course that's reasonable, and we also have in reply, so it's good please do have a collegial attitude here. MS MENAKER: So in theory, if we agree, you have no objection to the inclusion? THE PRESIDENT: If you agree, I don't think we will have an objection. MS MENAKER: Okay. THE PRESIDENT: Perhaps you will have a chat before and you say, "We have already agreed this, this and this, and there will be this and this in reply", or whatever, and we don't even need to enforce these deadlines.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 identify. But the advantage would be that we would know one another's authorities, so we could take them into account in our answers if we chose to. DR TORTEROLA: A month from now is going to be August 29th THE PRESIDENT: No, no, a month before the deadline. So it would be 11th September. So we count backwards. So you've got a whole month. It's a month in advance of the deadline. I don't know if that's a Sunday. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, it's Sunday: it would be September 12th. THE PRESIDENT: Is that okay? DR TORTEROLA: We agree September 12th. The only thing that we would like to request here is that we don't know what authorities are going be introduced, and we will need to introduce, both sides, authorities that are responsive to the authorities that have been introduced. So we suggest that a week after, the parties are permitted to introduce any legal authorities in response to what has been introduced. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 but we would learn fairly quickly, so we would adjust our submission accordingly? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I commit to preparing a draft decision early enough not to burden you. DR TORTEROLA: We can chat with each other, if necessary, in order to THE PRESIDENT: Chat with each other. If you think: yes, of course that's reasonable, and we also have in reply, so it's good please do have a collegial attitude here. MS MENAKER: So in theory, if we agree, you have no objection to the inclusion? THE PRESIDENT: If you agree, I don't think we will have an objection. MS MENAKER: Okay. THE PRESIDENT: Perhaps you will have a chat before and you say, "We have already agreed this, this and this, and there will be this and this in reply", or whatever, and we don't even need to enforce these deadlines. Okay? Good.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 identify. But the advantage would be that we would know one another's authorities, so we could take them into account in our answers if we chose to. DR TORTEROLA: A month from now is going to be August 29th THE PRESIDENT: No, no, a month before the deadline. So it would be 11th September. So we count backwards. So you've got a whole month. It's a month in advance of the deadline. I don't know if that's a Sunday. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, it's Sunday: it would be September 12th. THE PRESIDENT: Is that okay? DR TORTEROLA: We agree September 12th. The only thing that we would like to request here is that we don't know what authorities are going be introduced, and we will need to introduce, both sides, authorities that are responsive to the authorities that have been introduced. So we suggest that a week after, the parties are permitted to introduce any legal authorities in response to what has been introduced. THE PRESIDENT: To ask for leave to submit? 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 but we would learn fairly quickly, so we would adjust our submission accordingly? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I commit to preparing a draft decision early enough not to burden you. DR TORTEROLA: We can chat with each other, if necessary, in order to THE PRESIDENT: Chat with each other. If you think: yes, of course that's reasonable, and we also have in reply, so it's good please do have a collegial attitude here. MS MENAKER: So in theory, if we agree, you have no objection to the inclusion? THE PRESIDENT: If you agree, I don't think we will have an objection. MS MENAKER: Okay. THE PRESIDENT: Perhaps you will have a chat before and you say, "We have already agreed this, this and this, and there will be this and this in reply", or whatever, and we don't even need to enforce these deadlines. Okay? Good. Any other point of order that you'd like to raise?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 identify. But the advantage would be that we would know one another's authorities, so we could take them into account in our answers if we chose to. DR TORTEROLA: A month from now is going to be August 29th THE PRESIDENT: No, no, a month before the deadline. So it would be 11th September. So we count backwards. So you've got a whole month. It's a month in advance of the deadline. I don't know if that's a Sunday. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, it's Sunday: it would be September 12th. THE PRESIDENT: Is that okay? DR TORTEROLA: We agree September 12th. The only thing that we would like to request here is that we don't know what authorities are going be introduced, and we will need to introduce, both sides, authorities that are responsive to the authorities that have been introduced. So we suggest that a week after, the parties are permitted to introduce any legal authorities in response to what has been introduced. THE PRESIDENT: To ask for leave to submit? DR TORTEROLA: Yes, for leave to submit, yes. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 but we would learn fairly quickly, so we would adjust our submission accordingly? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I commit to preparing a draft decision early enough not to burden you. DR TORTEROLA: We can chat with each other, if necessary, in order to THE PRESIDENT: Chat with each other. If you think: yes, of course that's reasonable, and we also have in reply, so it's good please do have a collegial attitude here. MS MENAKER: So in theory, if we agree, you have no objection to the inclusion? THE PRESIDENT: If you agree, I don't think we will have an objection. MS MENAKER: Okay. THE PRESIDENT: Perhaps you will have a chat before and you say, "We have already agreed this, this and this, and there will be this and this in reply", or whatever, and we don't even need to enforce these deadlines. Okay? Good. Any other point of order that you'd like to raise? Mr Torterola?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 identify. But the advantage would be that we would know one another's authorities, so we could take them into account in our answers if we chose to. DR TORTEROLA: A month from now is going to be August 29th THE PRESIDENT: No, no, a month before the deadline. So it would be 11th September. So we count backwards. So you've got a whole month. It's a month in advance of the deadline. I don't know if that's a Sunday. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, it's Sunday: it would be September 12th. THE PRESIDENT: Is that okay? DR TORTEROLA: We agree September 12th. The only thing that we would like to request here is that we don't know what authorities are going be introduced, and we will need to introduce, both sides, authorities that are responsive to the authorities that have been introduced. So we suggest that a week after, the parties are permitted to introduce any legal authorities in response to what has been introduced. THE PRESIDENT: To ask for leave to submit? DR TORTEROLA: Yes, for leave to submit, yes. THE PRESIDENT: Do you agree? That makes sense. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 but we would learn fairly quickly, so we would adjust our submission accordingly? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I commit to preparing a draft decision early enough not to burden you. DR TORTEROLA: We can chat with each other, if necessary, in order to THE PRESIDENT: Chat with each other. If you think: yes, of course that's reasonable, and we also have in reply, so it's good please do have a collegial attitude here. MS MENAKER: So in theory, if we agree, you have no objection to the inclusion? THE PRESIDENT: If you agree, I don't think we will have an objection. MS MENAKER: Okay. THE PRESIDENT: Perhaps you will have a chat before and you say, "We have already agreed this, this and this, and there will be this and this in reply", or whatever, and we don't even need to enforce these deadlines. Okay? Good. Any other point of order that you'd like to raise? Mr Torterola? DR TORTEROLA: No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 identify. But the advantage would be that we would know one another's authorities, so we could take them into account in our answers if we chose to. DR TORTEROLA: A month from now is going to be August 29th THE PRESIDENT: No, no, a month before the deadline. So it would be 11th September. So we count backwards. So you've got a whole month. It's a month in advance of the deadline. I don't know if that's a Sunday. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, it's Sunday: it would be September 12th. THE PRESIDENT: Is that okay? DR TORTEROLA: We agree September 12th. The only thing that we would like to request here is that we don't know what authorities are going be introduced, and we will need to introduce, both sides, authorities that are responsive to the authorities that have been introduced. So we suggest that a week after, the parties are permitted to introduce any legal authorities in response to what has been introduced. THE PRESIDENT: To ask for leave to submit? DR TORTEROLA: Yes, for leave to submit, yes. THE PRESIDENT: Do you agree? That makes sense. MS MENAKER: So responsive legal authorities one week later? 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 but we would learn fairly quickly, so we would adjust our submission accordingly? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I commit to preparing a draft decision early enough not to burden you. DR TORTEROLA: We can chat with each other, if necessary, in order to THE PRESIDENT: Chat with each other. If you think: yes, of course that's reasonable, and we also have in reply, so it's good please do have a collegial attitude here. MS MENAKER: So in theory, if we agree, you have no objection to the inclusion? THE PRESIDENT: If you agree, I don't think we will have an objection. MS MENAKER: Okay. THE PRESIDENT: Perhaps you will have a chat before and you say, "We have already agreed this, this and this, and there will be this and this in reply", or whatever, and we don't even need to enforce these deadlines. Okay? Good. Any other point of order that you'd like to raise? Mr Torterola? DR TORTEROLA: No. THE PRESIDENT: Okay, good.

13:33 1	MS MENAKER: None, thank you.	13:36	1	you came a long way too. I'm so sorry for not having
2	THE PRESIDENT: Good.	15.50	2	expressed that. So sorry. I do thank you also for
3	Anything? Anything? Good.		3	coming here and being present.
4	I do have a question for both parties, and I always		4	MS MENAKER: Thank you.
5	ask this question: at any point during these proceedings			THE PRESIDENT: So sorry. That was very insensitive.
			5	
6	has any party suffered any kind of violation of their		6	Sorry.
7	due process rights; and if so, when did it occur, and		7	Okay, that's it.
8	can this Committee do anything to cure the defect?		8	(1.36 pm)
9	Mr Torterola?		9	(The hearing concluded)
10	DR TORTEROLA: I'm not aware of any in what concerns to me.		10	
11	It has been a very good hearing in which very		11	
12	interesting topics have been discussed that are very		12	
13	important not only for the parties but also for the		13	
14	future of the ICSID system and its reliability.		14	
15	So I speak for myself; I think I speak for my		15	
16	client. If that's not the case, we are going to let you		16	
17	know very quickly. But I don't have any procedural		17	
18	issues that I could complain about. I think that you		18	
19	handled the hearing very elegantly and with a deep		19	
20	knowledge of the topics that we have discussed. So in		20	
21	my regard, it has been one of the best annulment		21	
22	hearings in which I have participated. So I have no		22	
23	complaints about it.		23	
24	THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Dr Torterola.		24	
25	Ms Menaker?		25	
20			25	
	Page 113			Page 115
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 having made the effort, those who are here and those who are connected over Zoom. Thank you. (In English) Sorry, costs submissions, of course. It's good that I've got an assistant here. Sorry, we cannot close the cost submissions. Do you want to talk it amongst yourselves and give us a DR TORTEROLA: That's fine. THE PRESIDENT: Yes? Ms Menaker, in the spirit of 			
22 23	MS MENAKER: Sure. Okay. THE PRESIDENT: Yes?			
24				
25				
	Page 114			

TECO Guatemala Holdings, LLC -v- Republic of Guatemala ICSID Case No. ARB/10/23

Friday. 29 July 2022

		1 1 10 7 00 15	5.4	1 21 20	10, 10, 51, 00, 50, 0
A	39:2 46:1 49:2	against 60:7 80:15	annexes 5:4	approaches 31:20	42:10 51:22 52:2
Abdala 32:11,20	68:23 82:13 84:4	89:5,20 91:13	annulled 30:7 45:8	appropriate 1:15 2:8	attention 13:24 16:22
33:17 35:21 36:10	88:16 96:14 97:5	agency 49:3	annulment 1:9,16 2:2	56:2 94:23 95:7	53:21 114:3
36:18 37:24 38:1	98:6	aggravating 19:8,14	6:20 20:4 53:21	approximate 74:16	attitude 112:10
41:20,23 45:16	add 9:8 15:24 45:14	aggregation 65:5	70:1 74:24 75:8,10	approximately 47:9	Attorney 2:16,17,18
46:13 51:21 52:8	61:11,12 65:12	ago 13:9 25:25 38:1	75:19 82:14 94:25	April 14:21,22	2:19,20,20,21,21
53:2 54:20 55:1,8	69:10 102:19	90:2 94:18	100:24 101:1	ARAGÓN 1:22	71:22 72:7 74:15
55:14 56:2,8 62:5	added 6:14 44:5 48:18	agree 15:5,7 19:5 33:8	113:21	arbitration 1:1,1 3:6	86:23 87:1
63:9 64:13,20 65:1	52:15	39:16 41:5,6 44:20	another 8:14 14:6	4:21 13:16 15:8,18	August 59:6,17 105:2
65:4,18 66:4	adding 44:6	64:11 70:5 85:16,22	22:25 37:21 38:9	16:2,4,8 21:21	110:6
Abdala's 35:19 46:16	addition 53:17	96:8,8,11,15,22,23	56:11 60:7 65:20	31:15,24 32:7,8	authorities 3:1,1
49:13 50:3 60:23	additional 20:13	97:24 110:13,23	104:23,25	33:16,18 34:25 35:7	93:19 94:9,24 95:3
64:16 69:1	50:20 95:3 96:16	112:11,13 114:21	another's 110:3	35:10,13,14,16	95:5,9,11,14,20
aberrant 16:16	address 40:13 52:9	agreed 44:23 48:14	answer 3:10 20:8 21:7	44:22 48:17 50:13	96:17 97:1 106:24
ability 75:22	58:10,14 65:16	55:1 66:4,5 97:18	24:24 28:15 37:13	50:17 55:7 57:5	107:3,12 108:12
able 21:8 24:18 42:11	66:24 71:15 72:3,15	104:19 105:10	38:17 53:13 54:8,10	58:17 59:9 69:1	109:23 110:3,15,17
about 2:13,25 4:6 6:10	73:6,9 100:6 103:24	112:17	58:7 70:8 71:6,10	80:14 81:13	110:17,20,24 111:4
11:5 12:13 13:22	addressed 54:12 64:6	agreement 39:24	72:17,20 77:10 78:2	arbitrations 80:5	111:11,14,16 112:1
16:24 30:22 33:1	64:10 77:8 82:7	104:9 106:9	83:1 91:11 94:10,19	81:21	authority 94:16 96:12
34:19 36:12,20	98:23 99:9,12 101:9	Ah 40:7	99:17,25 100:13,23	arbitrator 5:10,10,19	avail 14:17
39:12 40:18 41:24	103:7	aha 90:13	102:9 103:5,5,23	5:20 6:1,7 8:15,18	available 24:6 80:24
43:10 44:8 50:25	addresses 73:16	alert 60:5	answered 94:7	13:2,2,4,5,10 20:1	86:23 87:4
61:13,15 69:21 70:2	adjudicator 19:17	Alexandrov 31:3 52:6	answering 3:17 88:9	64:5 90:16	average 34:12 35:12
71:18 73:10,10	adjudicators 20:16	62:21 64:5 73:4	93:18 96:2 98:8	arbitrators 5:17 54:20	37:16 54:23
75:17 77:3 79:11	adjust 45:17 112:2	75:14 76:3 80:10,15	101:6	ARB/10/23 1:4	avoidance 97:2
80:1,2 81:24 82:5	adjusted 23:15,20	81:9 82:18 85:3,19	answers 4:8 3:14,23	area 98:20	award 21:23 22:14
82:20 84:2 88:17	adjustment 45:14	86:4 88:18,20 89:5	21:16 74:9 87:13,18	areas 98:16 99:15	25:6 26:20 27:14,21
90:5,11,25 92:22	48:22 54:15	89:11,20 90:6 91:16	87:23 88:3,7 97:25	103:20	28:1,23 29:25 30:5
93:10 98:7,17	adjustments 65:19	Alexandrov's 69:21	98:1,12,13 105:17	argue 80:10	30:7,13,15,16,18
100:13 113:18,23	administrative 1:16	allegation 73:23 74:6	109:3,17 110:4	argued 24:9 49:19	31:8 38:8,14 40:25
abreast 80:5	7:6 9:18 10:8	74:17 85:1	anticipated 2:9 25:2	arguing 8:14 36:11	60:10,18 61:14
absence 47:18	admission 63:9,10,16	alleged 33:22 61:14	48:20	46:8 79:3 81:14	66:19 67:9 68:7,22
absent 37:7 55:13,19	63:20 75:19	66:19 67:3,7 68:9	anticipating 76:8 98:7	argument 46:14 71:17	69:7 74:2 84:16,22
absolutely 23:19	admitted 97:11 107:3	74:19	anticipation 25:11	73:23 77:4 79:21	85:4 98:17 100:3
26:13 31:12 33:11	adopted 7:4,8 10:12	allegedly 80:25	anybody 84:13 91:2	81:3,5 86:7 90:1,12	awarded 30:11 58:2
36:5 62:9 97:12	11:25 12:2 13:6	alleging 75:3	anyone 2:17 16:19	90:12 92:4,6,7,11	awarding 31:9 68:14
accept 42:16 107:22	14:3 42:23 47:8	allot 70:6	anything 2:19 3:13,15	arguments 100:3	aware 13:11 34:21
acceptable 41:11,12	50:18 59:5	allow 13:15 74:22	10:11 26:9 46:20	107:1	61:4 79:23 83:19
104:11 106:12	adopting 45:9	77:23	50:4,8 63:19 65:12	arises 84:15	84:22 100:9 113:10
109:6,7	advance 109:22 110:9	allowed 94:13	68:5 69:10 74:9,10	arithmetical 23:12	away 54:12 94:22
accepted 16:18 21:12	advancement 9:15	already 24:9 27:4	75:3 92:19 113:3,3	36:8	111:17 114:25
111:6	10:7	29:10 50:10 65:8	113:8	around 10:17 42:9	
accepting 111:3	advantage 47:20	78:13,15 83:22	anyway 53:24	75:2 76:11 111:19	B
access 85:13 86:24	69:18 107:4 110:2	87:16,19,20 88:3,13	anyways 93:9 108:21	arrive 38:16 107:8	B 30:11,20
accommodate 108:14	advisable 102:10	91:21 102:18	anywhere 63:15	arrows 29:22	back 16:23 44:19
accord 10:25	Advisor 2:17,18	109:18 112:17	AO 1:12	article 4:25 5:7,8,9 8:3	48:18,25 49:8 50:19
accordance 81:22	Affairs 2:19	alright 53:25	apologise 23:19 88:11	8:23 9:23 10:5	55:14 68:8 87:16
accorded 5:23 14:9	affect 24:2	always 16:3 43:4	appear 52:12	16:25 17:2,12,14,15	90:8 93:9 99:24
according 61:2 80:12	affecting 22:9	64:17 96:22 113:4	APPEARANCES 2:1	17:17,19 18:1,2	100:4,22
83:16 85:1,17	affects 20:5 36:21	amend 77:19	appears 24:15 33:14	20:11,11 79:25	backwards 110:8
101:13 108:16	afraid 95:13	amendments 32:4	35:15 63:2	articles 81:8,8,18	back-and-forth 42:13
accordingly 112:3	after 3:3 7:8 30:16	among 99:12	applicable 9:3	aside 31:11	balance 52:19
account 19:20 110:4	53:4,6 61:16 76:6	amongst 114:16	application 17:15,16	asked 3:4 20:9 21:22	bank 108:18
accounted 65:8	81:19 84:22 85:3	amortisation 48:18	95:22 97:3,13	21:24 39:12 61:19	bar 65:23
accurate 37:13	92:2 105:16 106:9	amount 23:15 24:8	106:24	84:13 86:4 87:7	BARRERO 1:22
accusation 15:17	106:18,21 107:20	26:25 27:3 28:5,21	applications 96:13	91:8 94:12 106:2	bars 65:14
Act 15:8,19 16:2	109:12 110:18	29:4,7 34:1 35:12	107:8,12	asking 25:18,22 77:4	base 47:24
acted 5:19	111:2	61:9 101:5,8	applied 7:9 28:9,10	84:9 94:5	based 25:9 27:10
actual 31:23 32:24	afterwards 21:3	ample 100:5	29:16,17,21 31:17	aspect 76:9	37:11 38:24 48:5,20
33:1 34:9,14 36:8	again 5:6 7:21 8:21	analysis 26:16 31:16	apply 9:4,5 11:19 16:3	assets 30:23 48:21	55:17 63:13 68:6
36:21 37:20,22 43:4	17:20 18:1,3 19:8	34:8 35:9 68:5,6	30:8 37:22 101:13	assist 39:10	81:13 91:4 92:11
43:13 46:25 47:2,5	19:22 31:6 35:10	ANDREA 2:3	appointed 5:10	assistant 1:22 114:14	106:7
47:22 55:12,21	47:15 48:9 50:12	ANDRES 2:21	appointments 79:24	assumed 23:13 48:4	basically 2:23 22:19
56:17,23 57:2,25	55:6 56:21 58:18	and/or 94:11	apprised 82:22 84:18	67:21	26:21 38:11,12 51:5
58:16,21,22,24 59:8	59:3 65:15 73:15	ANGELO 2:15	86:12	Assuming 111:6	51:21 67:23 87:9
59:11,13 82:24 86:4	80:18 81:7,17 84:5	angle 58:12	approach 22:10 32:5	assumption 48:9	basis 28:7 29:1,9,15
86:13 88:25	84:11 89:9,24 91:20	ANNA 3:3	32:16 36:22 57:18	58:19	44:11 47:14 87:9
actually 25:9 34:18	94:21	annex 6:4 106:5,6	58:4 95:25	assumptions 37:19	89:21 90:20 95:23

Trevor McGowan

TECO Guatemala Holdings, LLC -v- Republic of Guatemala ICSID Case No. ARB/10/23

Friday. 29 July 2022

Bates 44:11,12 45:1,1	19:5 77:23 88:16	58:3,16,25 59:18,25	36:25 75:20 107:5	1:16 2:2	26:11,14 35:3 38:7
45:9 47:25 51:25	91:15 92:4 96:10	64:1 67:1,2	certainty 42:8 50:5	claimed 31:24	40:19 44:21 46:19
56:10 57:7	103:11 104:5	buyers 23:24	Chair 18:7 33:12	claims 22:24	51:15 53:21 58:13
became 14:13 45:5	borrow 31:7	~~~;	58:10	clarification 98:19	61:19,22 70:1 72:14
79:23 90:8	both 8:11 9:6,11,14	C	chairman 7:6 9:17	clarifies 74:24	72:23 73:9,16 74:24
become 13:11 83:19	31:22 33:8 39:15	calculate 23:13 28:1,6	10:8	clarify 83:1 88:6	75:8,10 82:14 84:3
before 1:11 1:7,8 3:9	53:5 54:16 61:20	28:23,25 29:8,14	Chair's 38:18	92:19,21	85:17,23 94:5,25
6:14 8:14 20:9,13	65:11 67:3,7 72:25	32:16 36:22 56:16	challenge 8:7 20:3	clause 76:2,6	95:6,23 96:3,23
25:24 26:2 27:10	73:14 96:10,16	57:18 58:17	79:18 80:2,13,15	clear 7:3 28:15 46:2	99:2 100:10,24
32:19 35:3 36:12	100:6 107:17 108:5	calculated 36:2 49:2	81:13 84:17 85:20	58:6 66:13 91:15	101:1 102:8,24
38:19 42:24 48:1	108:8 109:17	49:11,17,19 50:12	89:6,6 90:13,18	92:20 93:22 97:12	107:21,22 113:8
50:4,21,23 53:21	110:16 113:4	63:12	91:21 92:1,10	102:24 103:7,9	Committee's 28:15
59:13,15 67:10	bother 4:4	calculation 23:4,6,10	challenged 75:6 88:21	clearer 58:5	70:23
68:13,20 69:2 80:22	bottom 15:21	30:4 32:4 34:13,17	90:3 91:3	clearest 91:17	common 39:15 53:7
82:4 84:15,21,21	bound 30:8	35:21 36:8 38:15,16	challenges 75:14 76:4	clearly 19:11 26:5	community 12:3,4
90:25 95:12 96:6	bracket 76:6	46:9 49:14 50:12	76:14,25 78:22,24	85:15	83:11
97:11 105:1 107:11	bracketed 4:12 7:13	51:24,25 63:13	79:5 80:17 81:9,19	client 76:20 95:11	companies 31:21
108:1,3 110:7	7:13,16 9:7 17:8,9	calculations 33:13	81:23 82:6,18 89:4	113:16	37:17
112:16	brackets 13:7 14:2	35:23 46:15,16	89:20 90:19 91:1,13	clients 44:1	company 34:10 42:18
beforehand 106:25	16:24 17:1	call 4:23 13:13,20	challenging 80:10	clock 111:20	43:2,19,21 48:21
begin 1:8 41:18	Brattle 85:3,19 88:18	22:14 31:19,23	89:7	close 74:10 78:23 85:2	54:25 55:15,18
beginning 73:18	90:6	75:22 93:16	chance 96:18 100:4	85:19 114:15	56:11 62:24
begins 89:14	breach 10:5 16:25	called 13:23 42:25	change 19:3,5 45:7,10	closed 74:1 86:21 87:5	company's 43:17,17
behalf 4:1,4 4:8 7:1	17:2,12,15,16,18,22	44:4 45:3	57:3 58:18 60:1	108:17	56:9 57:1
being 2:19 4:11,14,15	18:5 25:6 44:24	came 14:9 75:13 81:5	107:16	closely 19:9 82:16	comparable 31:20,21
6:18 12:12 19:13	47:18,18 50:5 55:19	83:5,6 85:3,6,20	changed 8:8 35:17	closer 102:6	31:21 34:10,10
23:17 36:16 38:16	breached 44:24 45:8	90:11 91:20 99:22	60:1 62:18	closing 39:2	37:16,17
39:6 41:23 51:4	breaches 23:10	100:16 115:1	changes 4:11 24:1	CNEE 44:13,17 49:3	comparables 38:3
59:5 79:6 80:17	break 14:11 53:12,13	cancel 64:12	27:6 29:18 33:20	code 4:1,4 1:9,24 2:11	comparative 36:1
85:25 86:7 87:6,7	54:4 57:6 72:10,12 brief 7:2 8:2 26:10	candidate 5:11 6:7	34:2 36:10	4:6,8,16 5:1,4 6:19 7:1 8:24 9:5,6 10:5	compared 4:10
91:3 95:9,16 97:17 108:15 111:11	107:23	13:2,10	CHAPMAN 3:3 chart 36:14 39:4	10:11,15 11:11 17:1	Compass 31:25 32:3 32:15 33:3,21,23
115:3	briefed 93:21	capacities 8:11	64:24 65:22	17:13,16,17 99:10	36:7 51:2 64:22
believe 7:17 10:6	briefing 97:11 100:11	capex 48:11,12,14,20	chat 72:9 112:6,8,16	100:2	competence 18:2
11:16 18:17,23	briefly 94:4 103:2	capital 48:11,22 54:24 CARMINE 2:12	check 91:7 105:14	codified 14:14	completence 10.2 compilation 87:19
	orieny > 100.2				
37:12 49:6 56:12	briefs 63:21 94:8 98:8		chief 12:15	COLLA 3:3	-
37:12 49:6 56:12 57:9 60:8 72:16	briefs 63:21 94:8 98:8 98:12	carried 62:20	chief 12:15 choice 102:9	COLLA 3:3 colleague 2:14,21 11:5	compile 78:25 82:1
37:12 49:6 56:12 57:9 60:8 72:16 74:21 80:18 86:10		carried 62:20 case 1:4 2:3,4,4,5,5,6	chief 12:15 choice 102:9 CHONG 2:5	COLLA 3:3 colleague 2:14,21 11:5 99:5	-
57:9 60:8 72:16	98:12	carried 62:20 case 1:4 2:3,4,4,5,5,6 2:6 10:9 12:25 13:1	choice 102:9	colleague 2:14,21 11:5	compile 78:25 82:1 complain 113:18
57:9 60:8 72:16 74:21 80:18 86:10	98:12 bring 53:20 78:20	carried 62:20 case 1:4 2:3,4,4,5,5,6 2:6 10:9 12:25 13:1 16:2 23:1 26:7 31:5	choice 102:9 CHONG 2:5	colleague 2:14,21 11:5 99:5	compile 78:25 82:1 complain 113:18 complaints 113:23
57:9 60:8 72:16 74:21 80:18 86:10 86:15 91:22 100:10	98:12 bring 53:20 78:20 90:20 92:1	carried 62:20 case 1:4 2:3,4,4,5,5,6 2:6 10:9 12:25 13:1 16:2 23:1 26:7 31:5 54:21 59:21 62:13	choice 102:9 CHONG 2:5 choose 32:16 71:14	colleague 2:14,21 11:5 99:5 colleagues 94:1	compile 78:25 82:1 complain 113:18 complaints 113:23 complement 70:3
57:9 60:8 72:16 74:21 80:18 86:10 86:15 91:22 100:10 100:12 108:9 believes 85:18 belongs 33:15	98:12 bring 53:20 78:20 90:20 92:1 bringing 59:7 92:10	carried 62:20 case 1:4 2:3,4,4,5,5,6 2:6 10:9 12:25 13:1 16:2 23:1 26:7 31:5 54:21 59:21 62:13 73:10 75:21 79:11	choice 102:9 CHONG 2:5 choose 32:16 71:14 102:2,8 107:24	colleague 2:14,21 11:5 99:5 colleagues 94:1 collegial 112:10 Columbus 108:16 column 36:17,18	compile 78:25 82:1 complain 113:18 complaints 113:23 complement 70:3 complete 20:8 completed 20:19 completely 2:17 21:8
57:9 60:8 72:16 74:21 80:18 86:10 86:15 91:22 100:10 100:12 108:9 believes 85:18 belongs 33:15 besides 2:19 53:18	98:12 bring 53:20 78:20 90:20 92:1 bringing 59:7 92:10 brings 102:5 broad 16:16 17:6 broader 15:12	carried 62:20 case 1:4 2:3,4,4,5,5,6 2:6 10:9 12:25 13:1 16:2 23:1 26:7 31:5 54:21 59:21 62:13	choice 102:9 CHONG 2:5 choose 32:16 71:14 102:2,8 107:24 choosing 17:10 chose 24:17 110:4 chunk 70:11	colleague 2:14,21 11:5 99:5 colleagues 94:1 collegial 112:10 Columbus 108:16 column 36:17,18 combination 31:20	compile 78:25 82:1 complain 113:18 complaints 113:23 complement 70:3 complete 20:8 completed 20:19 completely 2:17 21:8 32:17 63:3
57:9 60:8 72:16 74:21 80:18 86:10 86:15 91:22 100:10 100:12 108:9 believes 85:18 belongs 33:15 besides 2:19 53:18 best 69:13 87:14 88:6	98:12 bring 53:20 78:20 90:20 92:1 bringing 59:7 92:10 brings 102:5 broad 16:16 17:6 broader 15:12 broken 4:14 66:11	carried 62:20 case 1:4 2:3,4,4,5,5,6 2:6 10:9 12:25 13:1 16:2 23:1 26:7 31:5 54:21 59:21 62:13 73:10 75:21 79:11 79:12,14 80:8,15	choice 102:9 CHONG 2:5 choose 32:16 71:14 102:2,8 107:24 choosing 17:10 chose 24:17 110:4 chunk 70:11 Cicoria 3:6	colleague 2:14,21 11:5 99:5 colleagues 94:1 collegial 112:10 Columbus 108:16 column 36:17,18 combination 31:20 come 76:7 82:19,25	compile 78:25 82:1 complain 113:18 complaints 113:23 complement 70:3 complete 20:8 completed 20:19 completely 2:17 21:8 32:17 63:3 Compliance 8:24
57:9 60:8 72:16 74:21 80:18 86:10 86:15 91:22 100:10 100:12 108:9 believes 85:18 belongs 33:15 besides 2:19 53:18 best 69:13 87:14 88:6 113:21	98:12 bring 53:20 78:20 90:20 92:1 bringing 59:7 92:10 brings 102:5 broad 16:16 17:6 broader 15:12 broken 4:14 66:11 BROOKE 2:6	carried 62:20 case 1:4 2:3,4,4,5,5,6 2:6 10:9 12:25 13:1 16:2 23:1 26:7 31:5 54:21 59:21 62:13 73:10 75:21 79:11 79:12,14 80:8,15 81:5 82:21 84:2,16	choice 102:9 CHONG 2:5 choose 32:16 71:14 102:2,8 107:24 choosing 17:10 chose 24:17 110:4 chunk 70:11 Cicoria 3:6 circumstance 17:24	colleague 2:14,21 11:5 99:5 colleagues 94:1 collegial 112:10 Columbus 108:16 column 36:17,18 combination 31:20 come 76:7 82:19,25 83:7 88:24 90:1	compile 78:25 82:1 complain 113:18 complaints 113:23 complement 70:3 complete 20:8 completed 20:19 completely 2:17 21:8 32:17 63:3 Compliance 8:24 complicated 37:19
57:9 60:8 72:16 74:21 80:18 86:10 86:15 91:22 100:10 100:12 108:9 believes 85:18 belongs 33:15 besides 2:19 53:18 best 69:13 87:14 88:6 113:21 BETHEL 2:15	98:12 bring 53:20 78:20 90:20 92:1 bringing 59:7 92:10 brings 102:5 broad 16:16 17:6 broader 15:12 broken 4:14 66:11 BROOKE 2:6 brought 58:22 59:10	carried 62:20 case 1:4 2:3,4,4,5,5,6 2:6 10:9 12:25 13:1 16:2 23:1 26:7 31:5 54:21 59:21 62:13 73:10 75:21 79:11 79:12,14 80:8,15 81:5 82:21 84:2,16 85:21 86:14 88:18	choice 102:9 CHONG 2:5 choose 32:16 71:14 102:2,8 107:24 choosing 17:10 chose 24:17 110:4 chunk 70:11 Cicoria 3:6 circumstance 17:24 19:11,14 42:21	colleague 2:14,21 11:5 99:5 colleagues 94:1 collegial 112:10 Columbus 108:16 column 36:17,18 combination 31:20 come 76:7 82:19,25 83:7 88:24 90:1 91:1	compile 78:25 82:1 complain 113:18 complaints 113:23 complement 70:3 complete 20:8 completed 20:19 completed 20:19 completely 2:17 21:8 32:17 63:3 Compliance 8:24 compliance 37:19 concede 56:2
57:9 60:8 72:16 74:21 80:18 86:10 86:15 91:22 100:10 100:12 108:9 believes 85:18 belongs 33:15 besides 2:19 53:18 best 69:13 87:14 88:6 113:21 BETHEL 2:15 better 103:11	98:12 bring 53:20 78:20 90:20 92:1 bringing 59:7 92:10 brings 102:5 broad 16:16 17:6 broader 15:12 broken 4:14 66:11 BROOKE 2:6 brought 58:22 59:10 78:24 79:4 81:16	carried 62:20 case 1:4 2:3,4,4,5,5,6 2:6 10:9 12:25 13:1 16:2 23:1 26:7 31:5 54:21 59:21 62:13 73:10 75:21 79:11 79:12,14 80:8,15 81:5 82:21 84:2,16 85:21 86:14 88:18 88:19 93:17 94:6 95:9 97:4 113:16 cases 5:18,22,22,24	choice 102:9 CHONG 2:5 choose 32:16 71:14 102:2,8 107:24 choosing 17:10 chose 24:17 110:4 chunk 70:11 Cicoria 3:6 circumstance 17:24 19:11,14 42:21 81:11	colleague 2:14,21 11:5 99:5 colleagues 94:1 collegial 112:10 Columbus 108:16 column 36:17,18 combination 31:20 come 76:7 82:19,25 83:7 88:24 90:1 91:1 comes 12:14 73:20	compile 78:25 82:1 complain 113:18 complaints 113:23 complement 70:3 complete 20:8 completed 20:19 completely 2:17 21:8 32:17 63:3 Compliance 8:24 complicated 37:19 concede 56:2 conceded 53:2 56:6
57:9 60:8 72:16 74:21 80:18 86:10 86:15 91:22 100:10 100:12 108:9 believes 85:18 belongs 33:15 besides 2:19 53:18 best 69:13 87:14 88:6 113:21 BETHEL 2:15 better 103:11 between 4:20 13:7	98:12 bring 53:20 78:20 90:20 92:1 bringing 59:7 92:10 brings 102:5 broad 16:16 17:6 broader 15:12 broken 4:14 66:11 BROOKE 2:6 brought 58:22 59:10 78:24 79:4 81:16 96:5	carried 62:20 case 1:4 2:3,4,4,5,5,6 2:6 10:9 12:25 13:1 16:2 23:1 26:7 31:5 54:21 59:21 62:13 73:10 75:21 79:11 79:12,14 80:8,15 81:5 82:21 84:2,16 85:21 86:14 88:18 88:19 93:17 94:6 95:9 97:4 113:16 cases 5:18,22,22,24 15:20 80:3 88:16	choice 102:9 CHONG 2:5 choose 32:16 71:14 102:2,8 107:24 choosing 17:10 chose 24:17 110:4 chunk 70:11 Cicoria 3:6 circumstance 17:24 19:11,14 42:21 81:11 circumstances 6:2,8	colleague 2:14,21 11:5 99:5 colleagues 94:1 collegial 112:10 Columbus 108:16 column 36:17,18 combination 31:20 come 76:7 82:19,25 83:7 88:24 90:1 91:1 comes 12:14 73:20 81:2 86:18 89:25	compile 78:25 82:1 complain 113:18 complaints 113:23 complement 70:3 complete 20:8 completed 20:19 completely 2:17 21:8 32:17 63:3 Compliance 8:24 complicated 37:19 concede 56:2 concede 53:2 56:6 concentrate 31:10
57:9 60:8 72:16 74:21 80:18 86:10 86:15 91:22 100:10 100:12 108:9 believes 85:18 belongs 33:15 besides 2:19 53:18 best 69:13 87:14 88:6 113:21 BETHEL 2:15 better 103:11 between 4:20 13:7 14:2 36:1 45:4 49:9	98:12 bring 53:20 78:20 90:20 92:1 bringing 59:7 92:10 brings 102:5 broad 16:16 17:6 broader 15:12 broken 4:14 66:11 BROOKE 2:6 brought 58:22 59:10 78:24 79:4 81:16 96:5 burden 18:12,14 19:5	carried 62:20 case 1:4 2:3,4,4,5,5,6 2:6 10:9 12:25 13:1 16:2 23:1 26:7 31:5 54:21 59:21 62:13 73:10 75:21 79:11 79:12,14 80:8,15 81:5 82:21 84:2,16 85:21 86:14 88:18 88:19 93:17 94:6 95:9 97:4 113:16 cases 5:18,22,22,24 15:20 80:3 88:16 90:25 91:7,9 96:1,3	choice 102:9 CHONG 2:5 choose 32:16 71:14 102:2,8 107:24 choosing 17:10 chose 24:17 110:4 chunk 70:11 Cicoria 3:6 circumstance 17:24 19:11,14 42:21 81:11 circumstances 6:2,8 7:22 12:25 13:1,12	colleague 2:14,21 11:5 99:5 colleagues 94:1 collegial 112:10 Columbus 108:16 column 36:17,18 combination 31:20 come 76:7 82:19,25 83:7 88:24 90:1 91:1 comes 12:14 73:20 81:2 86:18 89:25 92:6 99:4	compile 78:25 82:1 complain 113:18 complaints 113:23 complement 70:3 complete 20:8 completed 20:19 completely 2:17 21:8 32:17 63:3 Compliance 8:24 complicated 37:19 concede 56:2 conceded 53:2 56:6 concentrate 31:10 concentrating 32:25
57:9 60:8 72:16 74:21 80:18 86:10 86:15 91:22 100:10 100:12 108:9 believes 85:18 belongs 33:15 besides 2:19 53:18 best 69:13 87:14 88:6 113:21 BETHEL 2:15 bettre 103:11 between 4:20 13:7 14:2 36:1 45:4 49:9 52:21 62:17 65:3,6	98:12 bring 53:20 78:20 90:20 92:1 bringing 59:7 92:10 brings 102:5 broad 16:16 17:6 broader 15:12 broken 4:14 66:11 BROOKE 2:6 brought 58:22 59:10 78:24 79:4 81:16 96:5 burden 18:12,14 19:5 19:20 78:10,11,14	carried 62:20 case 1:4 2:3,4,4,5,5,6 2:6 10:9 12:25 13:1 16:2 23:1 26:7 31:5 54:21 59:21 62:13 73:10 75:21 79:11 79:12,14 80:8,15 81:5 82:21 84:2,16 85:21 86:14 88:18 88:19 93:17 94:6 95:9 97:4 113:16 cases 5:18,22,22,24 15:20 80:3 88:16 90:25 91:7,9 96:1,3 97:6 106:2	choice 102:9 CHONG 2:5 choose 32:16 71:14 102:2,8 107:24 choosing 17:10 chose 24:17 110:4 chunk 70:11 Cicoria 3:6 circumstance 17:24 19:11,14 42:21 81:11 circumstances 6:2,8 7:22 12:25 13:1,12 16:12 19:9,24 73:2	colleague 2:14,21 11:5 99:5 colleagues 94:1 collegial 112:10 Columbus 108:16 column 36:17,18 combination 31:20 come 76:7 82:19,25 83:7 88:24 90:1 91:1 comes 12:14 73:20 81:2 86:18 89:25 92:6 99:4 comfortable 73:12	compile 78:25 82:1 complain 113:18 complaints 113:23 complement 70:3 complete 20:8 completed 20:19 completely 2:17 21:8 32:17 63:3 Compliance 8:24 complicated 37:19 concede 56:2 concedet 53:2 56:6 concentrating 32:25 concept 18:4,16
57:9 60:8 72:16 74:21 80:18 86:10 86:15 91:22 100:10 100:12 108:9 believes 85:18 besides 2:19 53:18 best 69:13 87:14 88:6 113:21 BETHEL 2:15 better 103:11 between 4:20 13:7 14:2 36:1 45:4 49:9 52:21 62:17 65:3,6 85:2,19 88:18,20	98:12 bring 53:20 78:20 90:20 92:1 bringing 59:7 92:10 brings 102:5 broad 16:16 17:6 broader 15:12 broken 4:14 66:11 BROOKE 2:6 brought 58:22 59:10 78:24 79:4 81:16 96:5 burden 18:12,14 19:5 19:20 78:10,11,14 78:19 112:5	carried $62:20$ case $1:4$ $2:3,4,4,5,5,6$ 2:6 $10:9$ $12:25$ $13:116:2$ $23:1$ $26:7$ $31:554:21$ $59:21$ $62:1373:10$ $75:21$ $79:1179:12,14$ $80:8,1581:5$ $82:21$ $84:2,1685:21$ $86:14$ $88:1888:19$ $93:17$ $94:695:9$ $97:4$ $113:16cases 5:18,22,22,2415:20$ $80:3$ $88:1690:25$ $91:7,9$ $96:1,397:6$ $106:2cash 20:25 24:23 28:6$	choice 102:9 CHONG 2:5 choose 32:16 71:14 102:2,8 107:24 choosing 17:10 chose 24:17 110:4 chunk 70:11 Cicoria 3:6 circumstance 17:24 19:11,14 42:21 81:11 circumstances 6:2,8 7:22 12:25 13:1,12 16:12 19:9,24 73:2 81:14 83:9 89:10	colleague 2:14,21 11:5 99:5 colleagues 94:1 collegial 112:10 Columbus 108:16 column 36:17,18 combination 31:20 come 76:7 82:19,25 83:7 88:24 90:1 91:1 comes 12:14 73:20 81:2 86:18 89:25 92:6 99:4 comfortable 73:12 coming 43:11 50:19	compile 78:25 82:1 complain 113:18 complaints 113:23 complement 70:3 complete 20:8 completed 20:19 completely 2:17 21:8 32:17 63:3 Compliance 8:24 complicated 37:19 concede 56:2 concedet 53:2 56:6 concentrate 31:10 concentrating 32:25 concept 18:4,16 concern 5:23 11:15
57:9 60:8 72:16 74:21 80:18 86:10 86:15 91:22 100:10 100:12 108:9 believes 85:18 besides 2:19 53:18 best 69:13 87:14 88:6 113:21 BETHEL 2:15 better 103:11 between 4:20 13:7 14:2 36:1 45:4 49:9 52:21 62:17 65:3,6 85:2,19 88:18,20 91:16 93:3	98:12 bring 53:20 78:20 90:20 92:1 bringing 59:7 92:10 brings 102:5 broad 16:16 17:6 broader 15:12 broken 4:14 66:11 BROOKE 2:6 brought 58:22 59:10 78:24 79:4 81:16 96:5 burden 18:12,14 19:5 19:20 78:10,11,14 78:19 112:5 burden-shifting 19:4	carried $62:20$ case $1:4 2:3,4,4,5,5,6$ 2:6 10.9 12:25 13:1 16:2 23:1 26:7 31:5 54:21 59:21 62:13 73:10 75:21 79:11 79:12,14 80:8,15 81:5 82:21 84:2,16 85:21 86:14 88:18 88:19 93:17 94:6 95:9 97:4 113:16 cases $5:18,22,22,24$ 15:20 80:3 88:16 90:25 91:7,9 96:1,3 97:6 106:2 cash $20:25 24:23 28:6$ 28:24 29:7,13 31:10	choice 102:9 CHONG 2:5 choose 32:16 71:14 102:2,8 107:24 choosing 17:10 chose 24:17 110:4 chunk 70:11 Cicoria 3:6 circumstance 17:24 19:11,14 42:21 81:11 circumstances 6:2,8 7:22 12:25 13:1,12 16:12 19:9,24 73:2 81:14 83:9 89:10 citation 31:5 63:2	colleague 2:14,21 11:5 99:5 colleagues 94:1 collegial 112:10 Columbus 108:16 column 36:17,18 combination 31:20 come 76:7 82:19,25 83:7 88:24 90:1 91:1 comes 12:14 73:20 81:2 86:18 89:25 92:6 99:4 comfortable 73:12 coming 43:11 50:19 72:22 114:24 115:3	compile 78:25 82:1 complain 113:18 complaints 113:23 complement 70:3 complete 20:8 completed 20:19 completely 2:17 21:8 32:17 63:3 Compliance 8:24 complicated 37:19 concede 56:2 concent 53:2 56:6 concentrate 31:10 concentrating 32:25 concept 18:4,16 concern 5:23 11:15 12:3 71:13 94:17
57:9 60:8 72:16 74:21 80:18 86:10 86:15 91:22 100:10 100:12 108:9 believes 85:18 belongs 33:15 besides 2:19 53:18 best 69:13 87:14 88:6 113:21 BETHEL 2:15 better 103:11 between 4:20 13:7 14:2 36:1 45:4 49:9 52:21 62:17 65:3,6 85:2,19 88:18,20 91:16 93:3 beyond 7:21 46:17	98:12 bring 53:20 78:20 90:20 92:1 bringing 59:7 92:10 brings 102:5 broad 16:16 17:6 broader 15:12 broken 4:14 66:11 BROOKE 2:6 brought 58:22 59:10 78:24 79:4 81:16 96:5 burden 18:12,14 19:5 19:20 78:10,11,14 78:19 112:5 burden-shifting 19:4 20:1	carried $62:20$ case $1:4$ $2:3,4,4,5,5,6$ 2:6 $10:9$ $12:25$ $13:116:2$ $23:1$ $26:7$ $31:554:21$ $59:21$ $62:1373:10$ $75:21$ $79:1179:12,14$ $80:8,1581:5$ $82:21$ $84:2,1685:21$ $86:14$ $88:1888:19$ $93:17$ $94:695:9$ $97:4$ $113:16cases 5:18,22,22,2415:20$ $80:3$ $88:1690:25$ $91:7,9$ $96:1,397:6$ $106:2cash 20:25 24:23 28:628:24$ $29:7,13$ $31:1031:18,18,25$ $34:19$	choice 102:9 CHONG 2:5 choose 32:16 71:14 102:2,8 107:24 choosing 17:10 chose 24:17 110:4 chunk 70:11 Cicoria 3:6 circumstance 17:24 19:11,14 42:21 81:11 circumstances 6:2,8 7:22 12:25 13:1,12 16:12 19:9,24 73:2 81:14 83:9 89:10 citation 31:5 63:2 cite 68:8	colleague 2:14,21 11:5 99:5 colleagues 94:1 collegial 112:10 Columbus 108:16 column 36:17,18 combination 31:20 come 76:7 82:19,25 83:7 88:24 90:1 91:1 comes 12:14 73:20 81:2 86:18 89:25 92:6 99:4 comfortable 73:12 coming 43:11 50:19 72:22 114:24 115:3 comment 1:9,15,22	compile 78:25 82:1 complain 113:18 complaints 113:23 complement 70:3 complete 20:8 completed 20:19 completely 2:17 21:8 32:17 63:3 Compliance 8:24 compliance 8:24 compliance 37:19 concede 56:2 concent 31:10 concentrating 32:25 concept 18:4,16 concern 5:23 11:15 12:3 71:13 94:17 103:20
57:9 60:8 72:16 74:21 80:18 86:10 86:15 91:22 100:10 100:12 108:9 believes 85:18 belongs 33:15 besides 2:19 53:18 best 69:13 87:14 88:6 113:21 BETHEL 2:15 better 103:11 between 4:20 13:7 14:2 36:14 45:4 49:9 52:21 62:17 65:3,6 85:2,19 88:18,20 91:16 93:3 beyond 7:21 46:17 98:10	98:12 bring 53:20 78:20 90:20 92:1 bringing 59:7 92:10 brings 102:5 broad 16:16 17:6 broader 15:12 broken 4:14 66:11 BROOKE 2:6 brought 58:22 59:10 78:24 79:4 81:16 96:5 burden 18:12,14 19:5 19:20 78:10,11,14 78:19 112:5 burden-shifting 19:4 20:1 Burlington 79:8,10,22	carried $62:20$ case $1:4 2:3,4,4,5,5,6$ 2:6 10:9 12:25 13:1 16:2 23:1 26:7 31:5 54:21 59:21 62:13 73:10 75:21 79:11 79:12,14 80:8,15 81:5 82:21 84:2,16 85:21 86:14 88:18 88:19 93:17 94:6 95:9 97:4 113:16 cases $5:18,22,22,24$ 15:20 80:3 88:16 90:25 91:7,9 96:1,3 97:6 106:2 cash $20:25 24:23 28:6$ 28:24 29:7,13 31:10 31:18,18,25 34:19 34:20 35:1,2 37:4	choice 102:9 CHONG 2:5 choose 32:16 71:14 102:2,8 107:24 choosing 17:10 chose 24:17 110:4 Chunk 70:11 Cicoria 3:6 circumstance 17:24 19:11,14 42:21 81:11 circumstances 6:2,8 7:22 12:25 13:1,12 16:12 19:9,24 73:2 81:14 83:9 89:10 citation 31:5 63:2 cite 68:8 cites 61:9	colleague 2:14,21 11:5 99:5 colleagues 94:1 collegial 112:10 Columbus 108:16 column 36:17,18 combination 31:20 come 76:7 82:19,25 83:7 88:24 90:1 91:1 comes 12:14 73:20 81:2 86:18 89:25 92:6 99:4 comfortable 73:12 coming 43:11 50:19 72:22 114:24 115:3 comment 1:9,15,22 8:23 12:22 14:25	compile 78:25 82:1 complain 113:18 complaints 113:23 complement 70:3 complete 20:8 completed 20:19 completely 2:17 21:8 32:17 63:3 Compliance 8:24 complicated 37:19 concede 56:2 concedt 53:2 56:6 concentrate 31:10 concent 73:11:15 12:3 71:13 94:17 103:20 concerned 107:11
57:9 60:8 72:16 74:21 80:18 86:10 86:15 91:22 100:10 100:12 108:9 believes 85:18 beorgs 33:15 besides 2:19 53:18 best 69:13 87:14 88:6 113:21 BETHEL 2:15 better 103:11 between 4:20 13:7 14:2 36:1 45:4 49:9 52:21 62:17 65:3,6 85:2,19 88:18,20 91:16 93:3 beyond 7:21 46:17 98:10 bias 15:17 16:18	98:12 bring 53:20 78:20 90:20 92:1 bringing 59:7 92:10 brings 102:5 broad 16:16 17:6 broader 15:12 broken 4:14 66:11 BROOKE 2:6 brought 58:22 59:10 78:24 79:4 81:16 96:5 burden 18:12,14 19:5 19:20 78:10,11,14 78:19 112:5 burden-shifting 19:4 20:1 Burlington 79:8,10,22 business 5:12 42:6,7	carried $62:20$ case 1:4 2:3,4,4,5,5,6 2:6 10:9 12:25 13:1 16:2 23:1 26:7 31:5 54:21 59:21 62:13 73:10 75:21 79:11 79:12,14 80:8,15 81:5 82:21 84:2,16 85:21 86:14 88:18 88:19 93:17 94:6 95:9 97:4 113:16 cases 5:18,22,22,24 15:20 80:3 88:16 90:25 91:7,9 96:1,3 97:6 106:2 cash 20:25 24:23 28:6 28:24 29:7,13 31:10 31:18,18,25 34:19 34:20 35:1,2 37:4 42:1,6 43:15 45:22	choice 102:9 CHONG 2:5 choose 32:16 71:14 102:2,8 107:24 choosing 17:10 chose 24:17 110:4 chunk 70:11 Cicoria 3:6 circumstance 17:24 19:11,14 42:21 81:11 circumstances 6:2,8 7:22 12:25 13:1,12 16:12 19:9,24 73:2 81:14 83:9 89:10 citation 31:5 63:2 cite 68:8 cites 61:9 39:12	colleague 2:14,21 11:5 99:5 colleagues 94:1 collegial 112:10 Columbus 108:16 column 36:17,18 combination 31:20 come 76:7 82:19,25 83:7 88:24 90:1 91:1 comes 12:14 73:20 81:2 86:18 89:25 92:6 99:4 comfortable 73:12 coming 43:11 50:19 72:22 114:24 115:3 comment 1:9,15,22 8:23 12:22 14:25 41:18 61:13 64:21	compile 78:25 82:1 complain 113:18 complaints 113:23 complement 70:3 complete 20:19 completed 20:19 completely 2:17 21:8 32:17 63:3 Compliance 8:24 complicated 37:19 concede 56:2 concedet 53:2 56:6 concentrating 32:25 concept 18:4,16 concern 5:23 11:15 12:3 71:13 94:17 103:20 concerned 107:11 concerns 12:2,2,21
57:9 60:8 72:16 74:21 80:18 86:10 86:15 91:22 100:10 100:12 108:9 believes 85:18 besides 2:19 53:18 best 69:13 87:14 88:6 113:21 BETHEL 2:15 better 103:11 between 4:20 13:7 14:2 36:1 45:4 49:9 52:21 62:17 65:3,6 85:2,19 88:18,20 91:16 93:3 beyond 7:21 46:17 98:10 bias 15:17 16:18 bid 42:19	98:12 bring 53:20 78:20 90:20 92:1 bringing 59:7 92:10 brings 102:5 broad 16:16 17:6 broader 15:12 broken 4:14 66:11 BROOKE 2:6 brought 58:22 59:10 78:24 79:4 81:16 96:5 burden 18:12,14 19:5 19:20 78:10,11,14 78:19 112:5 burden-shifting 19:4 20:1 Burlington 79:8,10,22 business 5:12 42:6,7 42:12 108:9 109:15	carried $62:20$ case 1:4 2:3,4,4,5,5,6 2:6 10:9 12:25 13:1 16:2 23:1 26:7 31:5 54:21 59:21 62:13 73:10 75:21 79:11 79:12,14 80:8,15 81:5 82:21 84:2,16 85:21 86:14 88:18 88:19 93:17 94:6 95:9 97:4 113:16 cases 5:18,22,22,24 15:20 80:3 88:16 90:25 91:7,9 96:1,3 97:6 106:2 cash 20:25 24:23 28:6 28:24 29:7,13 31:10 31:18,18,25 34:19 34:20 35:1,2 37:4 42:1,6 43:15 45:22 48:10,23,24 49:11	choice 102:9 CHONG 2:5 choose 32:16 71:14 102:2,8 107:24 choosing 17:10 chose 24:17 110:4 chunk 70:11 Cicoria 3:6 circumstance 17:24 19:11,14 42:21 81:11 circumstances 6:2,8 7:22 12:25 13:1,12 16:12 19:9,24 73:2 81:14 83:9 89:10 citation 31:5 63:2 cite 68:8 cites 61:9 39:12 32:22 39:8	colleague 2:14,21 11:5 99:5 colleagues 94:1 collegial 112:10 Columbus 108:16 column 36:17,18 combination 31:20 come 76:7 82:19,25 83:7 88:24 90:1 91:1 comes 12:14 73:20 81:2 86:18 89:25 92:6 99:4 comfortable 73:12 coming 43:11 50:19 72:22 114:24 115:3 comment 1:9,15,22 8:23 12:22 14:25 41:18 61:13 64:21 70:18 82:10 87:9	compile 78:25 82:1 complain 113:18 complaints 113:23 complement 70:3 complete 20:8 completed 20:19 completely 2:17 21:8 32:17 63:3 Compliance 8:24 complicated 37:19 concede 56:2 conceded 53:2 56:6 concentrating 32:25 concept 18:4,16 concern 5:23 11:15 12:3 71:13 94:17 103:20 concerned 107:11 concerns 12:2,2,21 58:10 93:10 95:8
57:9 60:8 72:16 74:21 80:18 86:10 86:15 91:22 100:10 100:12 108:9 believes 85:18 besides 2:19 53:18 best 69:13 87:14 88:6 113:21 BETHEL 2:15 better 103:11 between 4:20 13:7 14:2 36:1 45:4 49:9 52:21 62:17 65:3,6 85:2,19 88:18,20 91:16 93:3 beyond 7:21 46:17 98:10 bias 15:17 16:18 bid 42:19 big 73:20 98:19	98:12 bring 53:20 78:20 90:20 92:1 bringing 59:7 92:10 brings 102:5 broad 16:16 17:6 broader 15:12 broken 4:14 66:11 BROOKE 2:6 brought 58:22 59:10 78:24 79:4 81:16 96:5 burden 18:12,14 19:5 19:20 78:10,11,14 78:19 112:5 burden-shifting 19:4 20:1 Burlington 79:8,10,22 business 5:12 42:6,7 42:12 108:9 109:15 109:16	carried $62:20$ case 1:4 2:3,4,4,5,5,6 2:6 10:9 12:25 13:1 16:2 23:1 26:7 31:5 54:21 59:21 62:13 73:10 75:21 79:11 79:12,14 80:8,15 81:5 82:21 84:2,16 85:21 86:14 88:18 88:19 93:17 94:6 95:9 97:4 113:16 cases 5:18,22,22,24 15:20 80:3 88:16 90:25 91:7,9 96:1,3 97:6 106:2 cash 20:25 24:23 28:6 28:24 29:7,13 31:10 31:18,18,25 34:19 34:20 35:1,2 37:4 42:1,6 43:15 45:22 48:10,23,24 49:11 49:14,17 51:4,7,12	choice 102:9 CHONG 2:5 choose 32:16 71:14 102:2,8 107:24 choosing 17:10 chose 24:17 110:4 chunk 70:11 Cicoria 3:6 circumstance 17:24 19:11,14 42:21 81:11 circumstances 6:2,8 7:22 12:25 13:1,12 16:12 19:9,24 73:2 81:14 83:9 89:10 citation 31:5 63:2 cite 68:8 cites 61:9 39:12 39:22 40:6 41:4,7	colleague 2:14,21 11:5 99:5 colleagues 94:1 collegial 112:10 Columbus 108:16 column 36:17,18 combination 31:20 come 76:7 82:19,25 83:7 88:24 90:1 91:1 comes 12:14 73:20 81:2 86:18 89:25 92:6 99:4 comfortable 73:12 coming 43:11 50:19 72:22 114:24 115:3 comment 1:9,15,22 8:23 12:22 14:25 41:18 61:13 64:21 70:18 82:10 87:9 100:4	compile 78:25 82:1 complain 113:18 complaints 113:23 complement 70:3 complete 20:8 completed 20:19 completely 2:17 21:8 32:17 63:3 Compliance 8:24 complicated 37:19 concede 56:2 conceded 53:2 56:6 concentrating 32:25 concept 18:4,16 concern 5:23 11:15 12:3 71:13 94:17 103:20 concerned 107:11 concerns 12:2,2,21 58:10 93:10 95:8 103:20 113:10
57:9 60:8 72:16 74:21 80:18 86:10 86:15 91:22 100:10 100:12 108:9 believes 85:18 besides 2:19 53:18 best 69:13 87:14 88:6 113:21 BETHEL 2:15 better 103:11 between 4:20 13:7 14:2 36:1 45:4 49:9 52:21 62:17 65:3,6 85:2,19 88:18,20 91:16 93:3 beyond 7:21 46:17 98:10 bias 15:17 16:18 bid 42:19	98:12 bring 53:20 78:20 90:20 92:1 bringing 59:7 92:10 brings 102:5 broad 16:16 17:6 broader 15:12 broken 4:14 66:11 BROOKE 2:6 brought 58:22 59:10 78:24 79:4 81:16 96:5 burden 18:12,14 19:5 19:20 78:10,11,14 78:19 112:5 burden-shifting 19:4 20:1 Burlington 79:8,10,22 business 5:12 42:6,7 42:12 108:9 109:15	carried $62:20$ case $1:4 2:3,4,4,5,5,6$ 2:6 10:9 12:25 13:1 16:2 23:1 26:7 31:5 54:21 59:21 62:13 73:10 75:21 79:11 79:12,14 80:8,15 81:5 82:21 84:2,16 85:21 86:14 88:18 88:19 93:17 94:6 95:9 97:4 113:16 cases $5:18,22,22,24$ 15:20 80:3 88:16 90:25 91:7,9 96:1,3 97:6 106:2 cash $20:25 24:23 28:6$ 28:24 29:7,13 31:10 31:18,18,25 34:19 34:20 35:1,2 37:4 42:1,6 43:15 45:22 48:10,23,24 49:11 49:14,17 51:4,7,12 51:14,18,18 54:18	choice 102:9 CHONG 2:5 choose 32:16 71:14 102:2,8 107:24 choosing 17:10 chose 24:17 110:4 chunk 70:11 Cicoria 3:6 circumstance 17:24 19:11,14 42:21 81:11 circumstances 6:2,8 7:22 12:25 13:1,12 16:12 19:9,24 73:2 81:14 83:9 89:10 citation 31:5 63:2 cite 68:8 cites 61:9 39:12 32:22 39:8	colleague 2:14,21 11:5 99:5 colleagues 94:1 collegial 112:10 Columbus 108:16 column 36:17,18 combination 31:20 come 76:7 82:19,25 83:7 88:24 90:1 91:1 comes 12:14 73:20 81:2 86:18 89:25 92:6 99:4 comfortable 73:12 coming 43:11 50:19 72:22 114:24 115:3 comment 1:9,15,22 8:23 12:22 14:25 41:18 61:13 64:21 70:18 82:10 87:9	compile 78:25 82:1 complain 113:18 complaints 113:23 complement 70:3 complete 20:8 completed 20:19 completely 2:17 21:8 32:17 63:3 Compliance 8:24 complicated 37:19 concede 56:2 conceded 53:2 56:6 concentrating 32:25 concept 18:4,16 concern 5:23 11:15 12:3 71:13 94:17 103:20 concerned 107:11 concerns 12:2,2,21 58:10 93:10 95:8
57:9 60:8 72:16 74:21 80:18 86:10 86:15 91:22 100:10 100:12 108:9 believes 85:18 beongs 33:15 besides 2:19 53:18 best 69:13 87:14 88:6 113:21 BETHEL 2:15 better 103:11 between 4:20 13:7 14:2 36:1 45:4 49:9 52:21 62:17 65:3,6 85:2,19 88:18,20 91:16 93:3 beyond 7:21 46:17 98:10 bias 15:17 16:18 bid 42:19 big 73:20 98:19 bigger 59:1	98:12 bring 53:20 78:20 90:20 92:1 bringing 59:7 92:10 brings 102:5 broad 16:16 17:6 broader 15:12 broken 4:14 66:11 BROOKE 2:6 brought 58:22 59:10 78:24 79:4 81:16 96:5 burden 18:12,14 19:5 19:20 78:10,11,14 78:19 112:5 burden-shifting 19:4 20:1 Burlington 79:8,10,22 business 5:12 42:6,7 42:12 108:9 109:15 109:16 businesses 42:9	carried $62:20$ case $1:4 2:3,4,4,5,5,6$ 2:6 10:9 12:25 13:1 16:2 23:1 26:7 31:5 54:21 59:21 62:13 73:10 75:21 79:11 79:12,14 80:8,15 81:5 82:21 84:2,16 85:21 86:14 88:18 88:19 93:17 94:6 95:9 97:4 113:16 cases $5:18,22,22,24$ 15:20 80:3 88:16 90:25 91:7,9 96:1,3 97:6 106:2 cash $20:25 24:23 28:6$ 28:24 29:7,13 31:10 31:18,18,25 34:19 34:20 35:1,2 37:4 42:1,6 43:15 45:22 48:10,23,24 49:11 49:14,17 51:4,7,12 51:14,18,18 54:18 54:19,21 59:23,25	choice 102:9 CHONG 2:5 choose 32:16 71:14 102:2,8 107:24 choosing 17:10 chose 24:17 110:4 chunk 70:11 Cicoria 3:6 circumstance 17:24 19:11,14 42:21 81:11 circumstances 6:2,8 7:22 12:25 13:1,12 16:12 19:9,24 73:2 81:14 83:9 89:10 citation 31:5 63:2 cite 68:8 cites 61:9 39:12 39:22 40:6 41:4,7 38:22	colleague 2:14,21 11:5 99:5 colleagues 94:1 collegial 112:10 Columbus 108:16 column 36:17,18 combination 31:20 come 76:7 82:19,25 83:7 88:24 90:1 91:1 comes 12:14 73:20 81:2 86:18 89:25 92:6 99:4 comfortable 73:12 coming 43:11 50:19 72:22 114:24 115:3 comment 1:9,15,22 8:23 12:22 14:25 41:18 61:13 64:21 70:18 82:10 87:9 100:4 commented 4:13	compile 78:25 82:1 complain 113:18 complaints 113:23 complement 70:3 complete 20:8 completed 20:19 completely 2:17 21:8 32:17 63:3 Compliance 8:24 complicated 37:19 concede 56:2 concedt 53:2 56:6 concentrating 32:25 concept 18:4,16 concern 5:23 11:15 12:3 71:13 94:17 103:20 concerned 107:11 concerned 107:11 con
57:9 60:8 72:16 74:21 80:18 86:10 86:15 91:22 100:10 100:12 108:9 believes 85:18 beongs 33:15 besides 2:19 53:18 best 69:13 87:14 88:6 113:21 BETHEL 2:15 better 103:11 between 4:20 13:7 14:2 36:1 45:4 49:9 52:21 62:17 65:3,6 85:2,19 88:18,20 91:16 93:3 beyond 7:21 46:17 98:10 bias 15:17 16:18 bid 42:19 big 73:20 98:19 bigger 59:1 billion 33:24 34:1,5	98:12 bring 53:20 78:20 90:20 92:1 bringing 59:7 92:10 brings 102:5 broad 16:16 17:6 broader 15:12 broken 4:14 66:11 BROOKE 2:6 brought 58:22 59:10 78:24 79:4 81:16 96:5 burden 18:12,14 19:5 19:20 78:10,11,14 78:19 112:5 burden-shifting 19:4 20:1 Burlington 79:8,10,22 business 5:12 42:6,7 42:12 108:9 109:15 109:16 businesses 42:9 busy 105:21	carried $62:20$ case $1:4 2:3,4,4,5,5,6$ 2:6 10:9 12:25 13:1 16:2 23:1 26:7 31:5 54:21 59:21 62:13 73:10 75:21 79:11 79:12,14 80:8,15 81:5 82:21 84:2,16 85:21 86:14 88:18 88:19 93:17 94:6 95:9 97:4 113:16 cases $5:18,22,22,24$ 15:20 80:3 88:16 90:25 91:7,9 96:1,3 97:6 106:2 cash $20:25 24:23 28:6$ 28:24 29:7,13 31:10 31:18,18,25 34:19 34:20 35:1,2 37:4 42:1,6 43:15 45:22 48:10,23,24 49:11 49:14,17 51:4,7,12 51:14,18,18 54:18 54:19,21 59:23,25 62:2 63:14	choice 102:9 CHONG 2:5 choose 32:16 71:14 102:2,8 107:24 choosing 17:10 chose 24:17 110:4 chunk 70:11 Cicoria 3:6 circumstance 17:24 19:11,14 42:21 81:11 circumstances 6:2,8 7:22 12:25 13:1,12 16:12 19:9,24 73:2 81:14 83:9 89:10 citation 31:5 63:2 cite 68:8 cites 61:9 39:12 32:22 39:8 39:22 40:6 41:4,7 38:22 citing 24:15 81:7	colleague 2:14,21 11:5 99:5 colleagues 94:1 collegial 112:10 Columbus 108:16 column 36:17,18 combination 31:20 come 76:7 82:19,25 83:7 88:24 90:1 91:1 comes 12:14 73:20 81:2 86:18 89:25 92:6 99:4 comfortable 73:12 coming 43:11 50:19 72:22 114:24 115:3 comment 1:9,15,22 8:23 12:22 14:25 41:18 61:13 64:21 70:18 82:10 87:9 100:4 commented 4:13 commenting 52:24	compile 78:25 82:1 complain 113:18 complaints 113:23 complement 70:3 complete 20:8 completed 20:19 completely 2:17 21:8 32:17 63:3 Compliance 8:24 complicated 37:19 concede 56:2 concedt 53:2 56:6 concentrate 31:10 concentrating 32:25 concept 18:4,16 concern 5:23 11:15 12:3 71:13 94:17 103:20 concerned 107:11 concerned 107:11 concerns 12:2,2,21 58:10 93:10 95:8 103:20 113:10 114:2 concession 56:4 63:20
57:9 60:8 72:16 74:21 80:18 86:10 86:15 91:22 100:10 100:12 108:9 believes 85:18 belongs 33:15 besides 2:19 53:18 best 69:13 87:14 88:6 113:21 BETHEL 2:15 better 103:11 between 4:20 13:7 14:2 36:1 45:4 49:9 52:21 62:17 65:3,6 85:2,19 88:18,20 91:16 93:3 beyond 7:21 46:17 98:10 bias 15:17 16:18 bid 42:19 big 73:20 98:19 bigger 59:1 billion 33:24 34:1,5 bind 23:5	98:12 bring 53:20 78:20 90:20 92:1 bringing 59:7 92:10 brings 102:5 broad 16:16 17:6 broader 15:12 broken 4:14 66:11 BROOKE 2:6 brought 58:22 59:10 78:24 79:4 81:16 96:5 burden 18:12,14 19:5 19:20 78:10,11,14 78:19 112:5 burden-shifting 19:4 20:1 Burlington 79:8,10,22 business 5:12 42:6,7 42:12 108:9 109:15 109:16 businesses 42:9 busy 105:21 but-for 21:1 24:23	carried $62:20$ case $1:4 2:3,4,4,5,5,6$ 2:6 10:9 12:25 13:1 16:2 23:1 26:7 31:5 54:21 59:21 62:13 73:10 75:21 79:11 79:12,14 80:8,15 81:5 82:21 84:2,16 85:21 86:14 88:18 88:19 93:17 94:6 95:9 97:4 113:16 cases $5:18,22,22,24$ 15:20 80:3 88:16 90:25 91:7,9 96:1,3 97:6 106:2 cash $20:25 24:23 28:6$ 28:24 29:7,13 31:10 31:18,18,25 34:19 34:20 35:1,2 37:4 42:1,6 43:15 45:22 48:10,23,24 49:11 49:14,17 51:4,7,12 51:14,18,18 54:18 54:19,21 59:23,25 62:2 63:14 Cassation 12:17	choice 102:9 CHONG 2:5 choose 32:16 71:14 102:2,8 107:24 choosing 17:10 chose 24:17 110:4 chunk 70:11 Cicoria 3:6 circumstance 17:24 19:11,14 42:21 81:11 circumstances 6:2,8 7:22 12:25 13:1,12 16:12 19:9,24 73:2 81:14 83:9 89:10 citation 31:5 63:2 cite 68:8 cites 61:9 39:12 39:22 40:6 41:4,7 38:22 citing 24:15 81:7 claim 21:19 51:14	colleague 2:14,21 11:5 99:5 colleagues 94:1 collegial 112:10 Columbus 108:16 column 36:17,18 combination 31:20 come 76:7 82:19,25 83:7 88:24 90:1 91:1 comes 12:14 73:20 81:2 86:18 89:25 92:6 99:4 comfortable 73:12 coming 43:11 50:19 72:22 114:24 115:3 comment 1:9,15,22 8:23 12:22 14:25 41:18 61:13 64:21 70:18 82:10 87:9 100:4 commented 4:13 commenting 52:24 comments 7:2 9:8	compile 78:25 82:1 complain 113:18 complaints 113:23 complement 70:3 complete 20:8 completely 2:17 21:8 32:17 63:3 Compliance 8:24 complicated 37:19 concede 56:2 concedted 53:2 56:6 concentrate 31:10 concentrating 32:25 concept 18:4,16 concern 5:23 11:15 12:3 71:13 94:17 103:20 concerned 107:11 concerns 12:2,2,21 58:10 93:10 95:8 103:20 113:10 114:2 concession 56:4 63:20 conclude 68:2
57:9 60:8 72:16 74:21 80:18 86:10 86:15 91:22 100:10 100:12 108:9 believes 85:18 belongs 33:15 besides 2:19 53:18 best 69:13 87:14 88:6 113:21 BETHEL 2:15 better 103:11 between 4:20 13:7 14:2 36:1 45:4 49:9 52:21 62:17 65:3,6 85:2,19 88:18,20 91:16 93:3 beyond 7:21 46:17 98:10 bias 15:17 16:18 bid 42:19 big 73:20 98:19 bigger 59:1 billion 33:24 34:1,5 bind 23:5 binding 9:20	98:12 bring 53:20 78:20 90:20 92:1 bringing 59:7 92:10 brings 102:5 broad 16:16 17:6 broader 15:12 broken 4:14 66:11 BROOKE 2:6 brought 58:22 59:10 78:24 79:4 81:16 96:5 burden 18:12,14 19:5 19:20 78:10,11,14 78:19 112:5 burden-shifting 19:4 20:1 Burlington 79:8,10,22 business 5:12 42:6,7 42:12 108:9 109:15 109:16 businesses 42:9 busy 105:21 but-for 21:1 24:23 31:22 32:2,3,16,25	carried $62:20$ case $1:4 2:3,4,4,5,5,6$ 2:6 10:9 12:25 13:1 16:2 23:1 26:7 31:5 54:21 59:21 62:13 73:10 75:21 79:11 79:12,14 80:8,15 81:5 82:21 84:2,16 85:21 86:14 88:18 88:19 93:17 94:6 95:9 97:4 113:16 cases $5:18,22,22,24$ 15:20 80:3 88:16 90:25 91:7,9 96:1,3 97:6 106:2 cash $20:25 24:23 28:6$ 28:24 29:7,13 31:10 31:18,18,25 34:19 34:20 35:1,2 37:4 42:1,6 43:15 45:22 48:10,23,24 49:11 49:14,17 51:4,7,12 51:14,18,18 54:18 54:19,21 59:23,25 62:2 63:14 Cassation $12:17$ CASTEJÓN $2:17$	choice 102:9 CHONG 2:5 choose 32:16 71:14 102:2,8 107:24 choosing 17:10 chose 24:17 110:4 chunk 70:11 Cicoria 3:6 circumstance 17:24 19:11,14 42:21 81:11 circumstances 6:2,8 7:22 12:25 13:1,12 16:12 19:9,24 73:2 81:14 83:9 89:10 citation 31:5 63:2 cite 68:8 cites 61:9 32:22 39:8 39:22 40:6 41:4,7 38:22 citing 24:15 81:7 claim 21:19 51:14 Claimant 4:5 7:1	colleague 2:14,21 11:5 99:5 colleagues 94:1 collegial 112:10 Columbus 108:16 column 36:17,18 combination 31:20 come 76:7 82:19,25 83:7 88:24 90:1 91:1 comes 12:14 73:20 81:2 86:18 89:25 92:6 99:4 comfortable 73:12 coming 43:11 50:19 72:22 114:24 115:3 comment 1:9,15,22 8:23 12:22 14:25 41:18 61:13 64:21 70:18 82:10 87:9 100:4 commented 4:13 comments 7:2 9:8 11:13 20:20 36:12	compile 78:25 82:1 complain 113:18 complaints 113:23 complement 70:3 complete 20:8 completed 20:19 completely 2:17 21:8 32:17 63:3 Compliance 8:24 complicated 37:19 concede 56:2 concented 53:2 56:6 concentrate 31:10 concentrating 32:25 concept 18:4,16 concern 5:23 11:15 12:3 71:13 94:17 103:20 concerned 107:11 concerns 12:2,2,21 58:10 93:10 95:8 103:20 113:10 114:2 concession 56:4 63:20 conclude 68:2 conclude 67:23
57:9 60:8 72:16 74:21 80:18 86:10 86:15 91:22 100:10 100:12 108:9 believes 85:18 belongs 33:15 besides 2:19 53:18 best 69:13 87:14 88:6 113:21 BETHEL 2:15 better 103:11 between 4:20 13:7 14:2 36:14 45:4 49:9 52:21 62:17 65:3,6 85:2,19 88:18,20 91:16 93:3 beyond 7:21 46:17 98:10 bias 15:17 16:18 bid 42:19 big 73:20 98:19 bigger 59:1 billion 33:24 34:1,5 bind 23:5 binding 9:20 bios 89:17	98:12 bring 53:20 78:20 90:20 92:1 bringing 59:7 92:10 brings 102:5 broad 16:16 17:6 broader 15:12 broken 4:14 66:11 BROOKE 2:6 brought 58:22 59:10 78:24 79:4 81:16 96:5 burden 18:12,14 19:5 19:20 78:10,11,14 78:19 112:5 burden-shifting 19:4 20:1 Burlington 79:8,10,22 business 5:12 42:6,7 42:12 108:9 109:15 109:16 businesses 42:9 busy 105:21 but-for 21:1 24:23 31:22 32:2,3,16,25 32:25 33:1,2 34:8	carried 62:20 case 1:4 2:3,4,4,5,5,6 2:6 10:9 12:25 13:1 16:2 23:1 26:7 31:5 54:21 59:21 62:13 73:10 75:21 79:11 79:12,14 80:8,15 81:5 82:21 84:2,16 85:21 86:14 88:18 88:19 93:17 94:6 95:9 97:4 113:16 cases 5:18,22,22,24 15:20 80:3 88:16 90:25 91:7,9 96:1,3 97:6 106:2 cash 20:25 24:23 28:6 28:24 29:7,13 31:10 31:18,18,25 34:19 34:20 35:1,2 37:4 42:1,6 43:15 45:22 48:10,23,24 49:11 49:14,17 51:4,7,12 51:14,18,18 54:18 54:19,21 59:23,25 62:2 63:14 Casstion 12:17 CASTEJÓN 2:17 categorically 10:13	choice 102:9 CHONG 2:5 choose $32:16\ 71:14$ $102:2,8\ 107:24$ choosing 17:10 chose $24:17\ 110:4$ chunk 70:11 Cicoria 3:6 circumstance 17:24 $19:11,14\ 42:21$ 81:11 circumstances $6:2,8$ $7:22\ 12:25\ 13:1,12$ $16:12\ 19:9,24\ 73:2$ $81:14\ 83:9\ 89:10$ citation $31:5\ 63:2$ cite $68:8$ cites $61:9$ 39:12 $39:22\ 40:6\ 41:4,7$ $39:22\ citing\ 24:15\ 81:7$ claim $21:19\ 51:14$ Claimant $4:5\ 7:1$ $21:19\ 39:7\ 78:5,5$	colleague 2:14,21 11:5 99:5 colleagues 94:1 collegial 112:10 Columbus 108:16 column 36:17,18 combination 31:20 come 76:7 82:19,25 83:7 88:24 90:1 91:1 comes 12:14 73:20 81:2 86:18 89:25 92:6 99:4 comfortable 73:12 coming 43:11 50:19 72:22 114:24 115:3 comment 1:9,15,22 8:23 12:22 14:25 41:18 61:13 64:21 70:18 82:10 87:9 100:4 commented 4:13 comments 7:2 9:8 11:13 20:20 36:12 44:19,20 88:9,9	compile 78:25 82:1 complain 113:18 complaints 113:23 complement 70:3 complete 20:8 completed 20:19 completed 20:19 completely 2:17 21:8 32:17 63:3 Compliance 8:24 complicated 37:19 concede 56:2 concedt 33:2 56:6 concentrating 32:25 concept 18:4,16 concernt 5:23 11:15 12:3 71:13 94:17 103:20 concerned 107:11 concerns 12:2,2,21 58:10 93:10 95:8 103:20 113:10 114:2 concession 56:4 63:20 conclude 68:2 conclude 67:23 115:9
57:9 60:8 72:16 74:21 80:18 86:10 86:15 91:22 100:10 100:12 108:9 believes 85:18 belongs 33:15 besides 2:19 53:18 best 69:13 87:14 88:6 113:21 BETHEL 2:15 better 103:11 between 4:20 13:7 14:2 36:14 45:4 49:9 52:21 62:17 65:3,6 85:2,19 88:18,20 91:16 93:3 beyond 7:21 46:17 98:10 bias 15:17 16:18 bid 42:19 big 73:20 98:19 bigger 59:1 billion 33:24 34:1,5 bind 23:5 binding 9:20 bios 89:17 bit 37:19 71:13 74:3	98:12 bring 53:20 78:20 90:20 92:1 bringing 59:7 92:10 brings 102:5 broad 16:16 17:6 broader 15:12 broken 4:14 66:11 BROOKE 2:6 brought 58:22 59:10 78:24 79:4 81:16 96:5 burden 18:12,14 19:5 19:20 78:10,11,14 78:19 112:5 burden-shifting 19:4 20:1 Burlington 79:8,10,22 business 5:12 42:6,7 42:12 108:9 109:15 109:16 businesses 42:9 busy 105:21 but-for 21:1 24:23 31:22 32:2,3,16,25 32:25 33:1,2 34:8 34:14 35:8 36:22	carried 62:20 case 1:4 2:3,4,4,5,5,6 2:6 10:9 12:25 13:1 16:2 23:1 26:7 31:5 54:21 59:21 62:13 73:10 75:21 79:11 79:12,14 80:8,15 81:5 82:21 84:2,16 85:21 86:14 88:18 88:19 93:17 94:6 95:9 97:4 113:16 cases 5:18,22,22,24 15:20 80:3 88:16 90:25 91:7,9 96:1,3 97:6 106:2 cash 20:25 24:23 28:6 28:24 29:7,13 31:10 31:18,18,25 34:19 34:20 35:1,2 37:4 42:1,6 43:15 45:22 48:10,23,24 49:11 49:14,17 51:4,7,12 51:14,18,18 54:18 54:19,21 59:23,25 62:2 63:14 Casteorically 10:13 categorically 10:13	choice 102:9 CHONG 2:5 choose 32:16 71:14 102:2,8 107:24 choosing 17:10 chose 24:17 110:4 chunk 70:11 Cicoria 3:6 circumstance 17:24 19:11,14 42:21 81:11 circumstances 6:2,8 7:22 12:25 13:1,12 16:12 19:9,24 73:2 81:14 83:9 89:10 citation 31:5 63:2 cite 68:8 cites 61:9 39:12 39:22 40:6 41:4,7 38:22 citing 24:15 81:7 claim 21:19 51:14 Claimant 4:5 7:1 21:19 39:7 78:5,5 83:7	colleague 2:14,21 11:5 99:5 colleagues 94:1 collegial 112:10 Columbus 108:16 column 36:17,18 combination 31:20 come 76:7 82:19,25 83:7 88:24 90:1 91:1 comes 12:14 73:20 81:2 86:18 89:25 92:6 99:4 comfortable 73:12 coming 43:11 50:19 72:22 114:24 115:3 comment 1:9,15,22 8:23 12:22 14:25 41:18 61:13 64:21 70:18 82:10 87:9 100:4 commented 4:13 comments 7:2 9:8 11:13 20:20 36:12 44:19,20 88:9,9 commercial 31:7	compile 78:25 82:1 complain 113:18 complaints 113:23 complement 70:3 complete 20:8 completed 20:19 completed 20:19 completely 2:17 21:8 32:17 63:3 Compliance 8:24 complicated 37:19 concede 56:2 conceded 53:2 56:6 concentrating 32:25 concept 18:4,16 concern 5:23 11:15 12:3 71:13 94:17 103:20 concerned 107:11 concerns 12:2,2,21 58:10 93:10 95:8 103:20 113:10 114:2 concession 56:4 63:20 conclude 68:2 conclude 67:23 115:9 conclusion 30:14,20
57:9 60:8 72:16 74:21 80:18 86:10 86:15 91:22 100:10 100:12 108:9 believes 85:18 belongs 33:15 besides 2:19 53:18 best 69:13 87:14 88:6 113:21 BETHEL 2:15 better 103:11 between 4:20 13:7 14:2 36:1 45:4 49:9 52:21 62:17 65:3,6 85:2,19 88:18,20 91:16 93:3 beyond 7:21 46:17 98:10 bias 15:17 16:18 bid 42:19 big 73:20 98:19 big 73:19 71:13 74:3 bit 84:20 Blackaby 83:14,15,16 83:19	98:12 bring 53:20 78:20 90:20 92:1 bringing 59:7 92:10 brings 102:5 broad 16:16 17:6 broader 15:12 broken 4:14 66:11 BROOKE 2:6 brought 58:22 59:10 78:24 79:4 81:16 96:5 burden 18:12,14 19:5 19:20 78:10,11,14 78:19 112:5 burden-shifting 19:4 20:1 Burlington 79:8,10,22 business 5:12 42:6,7 42:12 108:9 109:15 109:16 businesses 42:9 busy 105:21 but-for 21:1 24:23 31:22 32:2,3,16,25 32:25 33:1,2 34:8 34:14 35:8 36:22 37:3,6,15,20,23 41:25 43:4,15 45:21 46:24 47:15 49:11	carried 62:20 case 1:4 2:3,4,4,5,5,6 2:6 10:9 12:25 13:1 16:2 23:1 26:7 31:5 54:21 59:21 62:13 73:10 75:21 79:11 79:12,14 80:8,15 81:5 82:21 84:2,16 85:21 86:14 88:18 88:19 93:17 94:6 95:9 97:4 113:16 cases 5:18,22,22,24 15:20 80:3 88:16 90:25 91:7,9 96:1,3 97:6 106:2 cash 20:25 24:23 28:6 28:24 29:7,13 31:10 31:18,18,25 34:19 34:20 35:1,2 37:4 42:1,6 43:15 45:22 48:10,23,24 49:11 49:14,17 51:4,7,12 51:14,18,18 54:18 54:19,21 59:23,25 62:2 63:14 Casstion 12:17 CASTEJÓN 2:17 categorically 10:13	choice 102:9 CHONG 2:5 choose 32:16 71:14 102:2,8 107:24 choosing 17:10 chose 24:17 110:4 chunk 70:11 Cicoria 3:6 circumstance 17:24 19:11,14 42:21 81:11 circumstances 6:2,8 7:22 12:25 13:1,12 16:12 19:9,24 73:2 81:14 83:9 89:10 citation 31:5 63:2 cite 68:8 cites 61:9 39:12 32:22 39:8 39:22 40:6 41:4,7 38:22 citing 24:15 81:7 claim 21:19 51:14 Claimant 4:5 7:1 21:19 39:7 78:5,5 83:7 Claimants 4:16 Claimant's 33:19 35:15 45:22 47:16	colleague 2:14,21 11:5 99:5 colleagues 94:1 collegial 112:10 Columbus 108:16 column 36:17,18 combination 31:20 come 76:7 82:19,25 83:7 88:24 90:1 91:1 comes 12:14 73:20 81:2 86:18 89:25 92:6 99:4 comfortable 73:12 coming 43:11 50:19 72:22 114:24 115:3 comment 1:9,15,22 8:23 12:22 14:25 41:18 61:13 64:21 70:18 82:10 87:9 100:4 commented 4:13 comments 7:2 9:8 11:13 20:20 36:12 44:19,20 88:9,9 commertal 31:7 commit 112:4 comittee 1:21,22 2:4 2:10 3:4,11 4:4 6:5	compile 78:25 82:1 complain 113:18 complaints 113:23 complement 70:3 complete 20:8 completed 20:19 completely 2:17 21:8 32:17 63:3 Compliance 8:24 complicated 37:19 concede 56:2 concedet 53:2 56:6 concentrate 31:10 concentrating 32:25 concept 18:4,16 concern 5:23 11:15 12:3 71:13 94:17 103:20 concerned 107:11 concerns 12:2,2,21 58:10 93:10 95:8 103:20 113:10 114:2 concession 56:4 63:20 conclude 68:2 conclude 67:23 115:9 conclusion 30:14,20 68:11,12,16 69:6 71:5 conclusions 28:13
57:9 60:8 72:16 74:21 80:18 86:10 86:15 91:22 100:10 100:12 108:9 believes 85:18 belongs 33:15 besides 2:19 53:18 best 69:13 87:14 88:6 113:21 BETHEL 2:15 better 103:11 between 4:20 13:7 14:2 36:1 45:4 49:9 52:21 62:17 65:3,6 85:2,19 88:18,20 91:16 93:3 beyond 7:21 46:17 98:10 bias 15:17 16:18 bid 42:19 big 73:20 98:19 bigger 59:1 billion 33:24 34:1,5 bind 23:5 binding 9:20 bios 89:17 bit 37:19 71:13 74:3 bits 84:20 Blackaby 83:14,15,16 83:19 blurry 74:3	98:12 bring 53:20 78:20 90:20 92:1 bringing 59:7 92:10 brings 102:5 broad 16:16 17:6 broader 15:12 broken 4:14 66:11 BROOKE 2:6 brought 58:22 59:10 78:24 79:4 81:16 96:5 burden 18:12,14 19:5 19:20 78:10,11,14 78:19 112:5 burden-shifting 19:4 20:1 Burlington 79:8,10,22 business 5:12 42:6,7 42:12 108:9 109:15 109:16 businesses 42:9 busy 105:21 but-for 21:1 24:23 31:22 32:2,3,16,25 32:25 33:1,2 34:8 34:14 35:8 36:22 37:3,6,15,20,23 41:25 43:4,15 45:21 46:24 47:15 49:11 55:11 56:17,18,19	carried 62:20 case 1:4 2:3,4,4,5,5,6 2:6 10:9 12:25 13:1 16:2 23:1 26:7 31:5 54:21 59:21 62:13 73:10 75:21 79:11 79:12,14 80:8,15 81:5 82:21 84:2,16 85:21 86:14 88:18 88:19 93:17 94:6 95:9 97:4 113:16 cases 5:18,22,22,24 15:20 80:3 88:16 90:25 91:7,9 96:1,3 97:6 106:2 cash 20:25 24:23 28:6 28:24 29:7,13 31:10 31:18,18,25 34:19 34:20 35:1,2 37:4 42:1,6 43:15 45:22 48:10,23,24 49:11 49:14,17 51:4,7,12 51:14,18,18 54:18 54:19,21 59:23,25 62:2 63:14 Cassation 12:17 cASTEJÓN 2:17 categorised 103:12 ceiling 49:6	choice 102:9 CHONG 2:5 choose 32:16 71:14 102:2,8 107:24 choosing 17:10 chose 24:17 110:4 chunk 70:11 Cicoria 3:6 circumstance 17:24 19:11,14 42:21 81:11 circumstances 6:2,8 7:22 12:25 13:1,12 16:12 19:9,24 73:2 81:14 83:9 89:10 citation 31:5 63:2 cite 68:8 cites 61:9 39:12 32:22 39:8 39:22 40:6 41:4,7 32:22 39:8 39:22 40:6 41:4,7 32:22 39:8 39:22 40:6 41:4,7 32:22 39:8 39:22 40:6 41:4,7 32:22 39:8 39:22 40:6 41:4,7 121:19 51:14 Claimant 4:5 7:1 21:19 39:7 78:5,5 83:7 Claimants 4:16 Claimant's 33:19 35:15 45:22 47:16 77:13 85:7 88:17	colleague 2:14,21 11:5 99:5 colleagues 94:1 collegial 112:10 Columbus 108:16 column 36:17,18 combination 31:20 come 76:7 82:19,25 83:7 88:24 90:1 91:1 comes 12:14 73:20 81:2 86:18 89:25 92:6 99:4 comfortable 73:12 coming 43:11 50:19 72:22 114:24 115:3 comment 1:9,15,22 8:23 12:22 14:25 41:18 61:13 64:21 70:18 82:10 87:9 100:4 commented 4:13 commenting 52:24 comments 7:2 9:8 11:13 20:20 36:12 44:19,20 88:9,9 commercial 31:7 commit 112:4 committee 1:21,22 2:4 2:10 3:4,11 4:4 6:5 6:20 9:18 16:1	compile 78:25 82:1 complain 113:18 complaints 113:23 completent 70:3 complete 20:8 completed 20:19 completely 2:17 21:8 32:17 63:3 Compliance 8:24 complicated 37:19 concede 56:2 concedet 53:2 56:6 concentrate 31:10 concentrating 32:25 concept 18:4,16 concern 5:23 11:15 12:3 71:13 94:17 103:20 concerned 107:11 concerns 12:2,2,21 58:10 93:10 95:8 103:20 113:10 114:2 concession 56:4 63:20 conclude 68:2 conclude 67:23 115:9 conclusion 30:14,20 68:11,12,16 69:6 71:5 conclusions 28:13 34:7,24 35:19 36:9
57:9 60:8 72:16 74:21 80:18 86:10 86:15 91:22 100:10 100:12 108:9 believes 85:18 belongs 33:15 besides 2:19 53:18 best 69:13 87:14 88:6 113:21 BETHEL 2:15 better 103:11 between 4:20 13:7 14:2 36:1 45:4 49:9 52:21 62:17 65:3,6 85:2,19 88:18,20 91:16 93:3 beyond 7:21 46:17 98:10 bias 15:17 16:18 bid 42:19 big 73:20 98:19 big 73:19 71:13 74:3 bit 84:20 Blackaby 83:14,15,16 83:19	98:12 bring 53:20 78:20 90:20 92:1 bringing 59:7 92:10 brings 102:5 broad 16:16 17:6 broader 15:12 broken 4:14 66:11 BROOKE 2:6 brought 58:22 59:10 78:24 79:4 81:16 96:5 burden 18:12,14 19:5 19:20 78:10,11,14 78:19 112:5 burden-shifting 19:4 20:1 Burlington 79:8,10,22 business 5:12 42:6,7 42:12 108:9 109:15 109:16 businesses 42:9 busy 105:21 but-for 21:1 24:23 31:22 32:2,3,16,25 32:25 33:1,2 34:8 34:14 35:8 36:22 37:3,6,15,20,23 41:25 43:4,15 45:21 46:24 47:15 49:11	carried 62:20 case 1:4 2:3,4,4,5,5,6 2:6 10:9 12:25 13:1 16:2 23:1 26:7 31:5 54:21 59:21 62:13 73:10 75:21 79:11 79:12,14 80:8,15 81:5 82:21 84:2,16 85:21 86:14 88:18 88:19 93:17 94:6 95:9 97:4 113:16 cases 5:18,22,22,24 15:20 80:3 88:16 90:25 91:7,9 96:1,3 97:6 106:2 cash 20:25 24:23 28:6 28:24 29:7,13 31:10 31:18,18,25 34:19 34:20 35:1,2 37:4 42:1,6 43:15 45:22 48:10,23,24 49:11 49:14,17 51:4,7,12 51:14,18,18 54:18 54:19,21 59:23,25 62:2 63:14 Cassation 12:17 cASTEJÓN 2:17 categorised 103:12 ceiling 49:6 Centre 1:2,5	choice 102:9 CHONG 2:5 choose 32:16 71:14 102:2,8 107:24 choosing 17:10 chose 24:17 110:4 chunk 70:11 Cicoria 3:6 circumstance 17:24 19:11,14 42:21 81:11 circumstances 6:2,8 7:22 12:25 13:1,12 16:12 19:9,24 73:2 81:14 83:9 89:10 citation 31:5 63:2 cite 68:8 cites 61:9 39:12 32:22 39:8 39:22 40:6 41:4,7 38:22 citing 24:15 81:7 claim 21:19 51:14 Claimant 4:5 7:1 21:19 39:7 78:5,5 83:7 Claimants 4:16 Claimant's 33:19 35:15 45:22 47:16	colleague 2:14,21 11:5 99:5 colleagues 94:1 collegial 112:10 Columbus 108:16 column 36:17,18 combination 31:20 come 76:7 82:19,25 83:7 88:24 90:1 91:1 comes 12:14 73:20 81:2 86:18 89:25 92:6 99:4 comfortable 73:12 coming 43:11 50:19 72:22 114:24 115:3 comment 1:9,15,22 8:23 12:22 14:25 41:18 61:13 64:21 70:18 82:10 87:9 100:4 commented 4:13 comments 7:2 9:8 11:13 20:20 36:12 44:19,20 88:9,9 commertal 31:7 commit 112:4 comittee 1:21,22 2:4 2:10 3:4,11 4:4 6:5	compile 78:25 82:1 complain 113:18 complaints 113:23 complement 70:3 complete 20:8 completed 20:19 completely 2:17 21:8 32:17 63:3 Compliance 8:24 complicated 37:19 concede 56:2 concedet 53:2 56:6 concentrate 31:10 concentrating 32:25 concept 18:4,16 concern 5:23 11:15 12:3 71:13 94:17 103:20 concerned 107:11 concerns 12:2,2,21 58:10 93:10 95:8 103:20 113:10 114:2 concession 56:4 63:20 conclude 68:2 conclude 67:23 115:9 conclusion 30:14,20 68:11,12,16 69:6 71:5 conclusions 28:13

Trevor McGowan

TECO Guatemala Holdings, LLC -v- Republic of Guatemala ICSID Case No. ARB/10/23

Friday. 29 July 2022

concurrent 8:10	61:25	45:23 46:5,16 49:13	114:21	devote 101:6	19:17 20:3 79:6
condition 106:4	contradistinction	50:16,20 53:1,3	deadlines 112:19	devoted 66:25	disqualifying 16:12
condition 100.4 conditions 24:1 27:6	10:21	54:11 60:23,24 61:4	deal 3:25 21:22 27:11	DIEGO 2:11,21	17:25 18:6 19:11,15
29:19	contrary 27:17 84:19	61:9 64:12 65:1,6		difference 23:9 51:17	19:23
			38:14 48:3,11 77:4		
conduct 4:1,4 1:9,24	convenience 79:9	66:14	77:5	52:21 58:1 60:10	disregard 80:24 90:23
2:11 4:6,8,16 5:5	Convention 11:19,20	crossed 4:13	dealing 7:24 11:12	64:14 65:3,6,8,8	90:24
6:19 7:1 99:10	11:22,25	crosses 74:21	38:15 95:2	91:19	distinct 32:4 33:2
114:3	convert 45:14	cross-examine 75:22	deals 11:6 67:9 77:18	differences 23:16,20	distinction 15:22
confer 107:21	Converting 52:15,17	CUEBAS 2:7	90:16	different 3:5,6 7:19	73:15
conferencing 53:4,7	convey 70:1	cumulative 60:24	dealt 4:16 53:1 63:18	8:3 15:12 18:24	distinctly 24:9
54:17 94:1	cooperation 114:20	66:11	63:25 87:14 95:16	21:21 22:10,25	distribute 2:2
confidential 5:22,23	copy 2:16,17	cumulatively 65:19	108:1	37:20 39:6 50:14	distributing 44:6
5:24 41:10	CORDIDO-FREYT	cure 113:8	debate 19:7	53:25 54:23 55:2	distribution 23:25
confidentiality 39:24	1:21	currency 45:19	debated 55:23	58:12 63:3,6,11	44:5
confirm 8:18 14:4	corporate 48:7	current 20:15	debt 34:18 35:13	66:10,12 68:7,16	distributor 43:25
37:5 57:6,16,17	correct 10:24 20:20	currently 8:25 94:10	51:16	70:2,11,12 77:7,11	44:16 52:16
58:15,20	36:21 37:1 59:20	customary 11:23	DECA 32:2 48:13	77:13 82:13 88:23	distributors 43:25
conflict 17:24 20:11	109:18,20	customer 47:24	55:3	90:21,21,22 103:12	divide 101:4
conflicts 8:12	corrections 35:22	customers 44:2	decide 24:11 95:1,23	103:13 105:6	divulged 83:18
confronting 107:14	correspond 86:15	cut 47:8 59:23 74:11	101:25 103:13	differential 45:4	document 1:23 20:20
connected 2:22 114:12	corroborated 75:4	cut-off 109:22	111:15	differently 63:12	40:14 75:4,23
connecting 1:5	cost 43:17,18 47:13	CVs 89:17	decided 23:3 45:7	67:19	documentary 75:18
connection 6:11 11:8	54:24 58:4 114:15	C-1145 48:13	57:24 104:24	difficult 36:24,25 37:9	doing 59:25 67:16
11:13 12:10,22	114:21		decides 44:21 95:6	41:1	68:3 73:13 90:9
13:14 20:20	Costa 31:3,4,5	D	111:15	diligence 18:1	domain 80:22 87:3
consensus 7:5 8:1	costs 23:25 46:24,25		deciding 8:15	DIMITRIOS 3:10	88:19,24,25 91:25
consequence 80:13	47:3,5,12,14,21,22	damage 34:24	decision 20:13 68:18	direct 72:5,8 73:24	domestic 16:4
88:14	48:3 51:20 55:10,11	damages 21:19 22:2,9	96:9 111:2,5,10	79:5 93:20	done 11:14 42:14
consequences 58:12	55:12,13,15,21,22	22:21,22 23:5,7,13	112:4	directions 66:9	45:20 59:9 85:12
conservative 48:8	55:25 56:15,23 57:1	24:8 25:3 27:19	decisions 10:19 19:17	Director 2:23	doses 70:22
consider 61:7 68:20	57:2,8,19 58:16,21	28:2,8,24 29:1,9,15	67:12 111:20	disagree 78:18	double-check 40:5
92:8 96:13 97:10	58:22,25 59:6,8,11	30:4 31:24 35:16	deck 24:18 26:17	disclose 5:11 6:7 13:2	56:12,14
consideration 7:5	59:13 60:1 114:13	36:2,16 43:5,11	decreased 47:9	13:4,5,5 15:13	double-hatting 4:17
consideration 7.5	cost-cutting 47:10,19	45:5,22 46:9 47:16	deem 46:20	18:20,21 19:10	4:19 89:21 90:5
considered 61:4 67:25	Council 7:6 10:9	50:13 51:13 56:17	deemed 73:1 76:5,13	20:12,14	4.19 89.21 90.5 91:4
68:13 83:17	counsel 2:18 9:11,14	58:2 60:25 66:16	77:3,5,12,17 78:21	disclosed 18:10,15	doubt 12:9 13:13 97:2
considers 58:13 68:16	9:24 31:4 85:8	67:12,13 68:15,23	81:24 82:23 83:12	89:15,17	doubts 6:8,11,11 13:3
consistent 104:3	counsels 9:22	69:6	91:5	disclosure 7:11,20,21	13:4 73:2 81:1
consolidated 4:12	count 110:8	DANIEL 3:2	deeming 78:1	8:6 12:23 13:3,17	DOUG 1:12
constitute 22:14	couple 69:17 71:3	data 23:3,12 24:6 27:1	deep 113:19	18:13,13 19:1,1,22	down 4:14 9:24 16:23
constructive 80:8	94:18 97:7	27:10 28:3,9 29:3,5	defect 113:8	83:11 89:18	30:1 58:22 66:1
construed 58:3	course 1:10 7:7 22:21	29:16,20	defence 78:15	discount 48:25 49:1,1	84:23 99:18
		date 47:3 48:6,25		49:10 51:5.12	
consult 95:11 108:12	33:4 35:2 36:14	55:14 59:3,4,11	define 5:2		Dr 3:6 4:3,17 1:13,15
consultant 44:12,17	37:21 38:7 43:16	74:16,20 75:2,12	definitions 17:14,15	discounted 49:8	1:25 2:13 4:4,9 11:3
consultation 44:16	50:3 51:17 66:24	77:14 78:3 80:19	definitive 58:7	discounting 62:5	13:25 14:15,21,23
consumers 43:23	70:23 71:14 73:13	88:19,21 105:20	del 72:18	discretion 19:19	20:8,19,21 32:11
contained 9:16 67:8	73:19 76:3 80:9	109:23 111:1 112:1	delegates 7:17	discuss 1:17	35:19,21 36:10
99:1	82:3 90:24 111:16	dated 20:10,17	delve 64:6	discussed 8:2 12:12	37:24 41:20,23
content 40:4 41:14	112:9 114:6,13,24	dates 74:16 75:13	demand 54:16 65:24	34:11,15 35:14	45:16 46:13,16
93:14	114:25	76:16 82:1	demonstrate 2:5 78:5	41:21 46:10 51:4	49:13 50:3 51:21
contention 43:8	court 3:5 12:16,16	DAVID 2:7,15	demonstrates 87:25	55:16 61:6 64:9	52:6,8 53:2,16,25
contest 16:19	15:11,11 114:7,9	day 1:8 1:3 60:21	demonstration 22:16	66:3 70:12 74:14	54:20 55:1,8,14
context 6:21	courts 15:10	75:20 94:24 108:16	depends 18:9	83:9 100:15 113:12	56:2,8 60:23 62:5
continue 9:5 36:4	cover 30:25 99:14	108:18	deployed 95:5	113:20	62:21 63:9 64:5,16
46:21 79:15,21	104:3	days 38:1 71:3 94:18	depository 40:15	discussing 11:12 15:5	65:1,4,18 66:4
97:16	covered 98:17	104:22,24 105:7,9	depreciation 48:18	16:23 17:20 18:3	69:16 70:10,17,20
continues 59:24	covers 98:15,18	106:18,21 107:16	describing 7:16	discussion 4:19 7:15	72:6 74:14,22 75:16
continuing 13:18	crap 102:1	107:19 108:5,8,9	detail 33:12 54:14	7:18 8:21 17:4 18:8	76:3,18,23 77:7
contracted 23:22	CRISTÍAN 2:18	109:15,16	determination 20:6	34:19 36:15 41:13	78:3,10 79:11 80:10
contradict 28:17	critical 98:14	DCF 31:20 32:1,4,5	27:7 29:19	41:23 51:6 62:11,19	80:15 81:9 82:11,18
contradicted 22:15	criticised 32:21	32:12,16,17,18,21	determinations 23:1	64:2,7,19 66:4	83:25 84:7,10,12
69:5	criticising 88:12	32:22 33:2,5,6 34:4	determine 8:19 22:20	111:23	85:3,7,19,24 88:8
contradiction 26:5	criticism 38:6 49:17	34:8 35:8,21 36:20	25:8 26:24 27:1,2	dispute 1:5 49:9	88:15 89:5,11,20
29:22,24 66:19	49:21 53:6 55:6	37:16 38:4,24 39:9	27:18 28:3,4,7,20	disputed 48:16	90:6 92:22,25 93:6
contradictions 21:22	62:2,6 63:16	39:12 40:3 41:19,25	29:1,3,4,5,6,9,15	Disputes 1:2	94:1,19 95:8,19
21:25 22:2,4,6,9	criticisms 32:5,13,18	42:16	determined 15:9 24:9	disputing 6:16	97:18,22 98:25 99:4
25:7,16 26:15 30:3	33:4,6,17,23,25	DE 1:21 2:21	determining 58:4	disqualification 9:2	100:18,24 101:17
36:13 61:14,21,23	34:6 35:19,24 37:24	deadline 110:7,10	DEVA 1:12	10:14,19 12:24 19:2	101:21 102:4,11

TECO Guatemala Holdings, LLC -v- Republic of Guatemala ICSID Case No. ARB/10/23

Friday. 29 July 2022

104:9,17,21,25	either 1:20 9:5 17:11	every 2:23 16:2 24:14	95:4	findings 3:7 22:9,18	forthcoming 109:1
105:4,8,11,18,19	95:5,22	everybody 1:3,7	explanations 20:2	26:23 27:22,25	forum 75:24
106:9,11,17 107:11	elaborate 15:25 94:11	Everyone 42:9	explicitly 23:2	28:19,22	forward 9:19,21,25
108:12,21,23 109:7	99:5	everything 2:19 4:12	exposing 16:20	fine 3:19 41:16 66:23	13:8 47:6,12,14,22
109:20 110:5,11,13	elasticity 52:8,10	4:13 24:17 26:7	express 56:3 70:1	70:25 71:17 74:19	47:23 56:24 59:10
110:22 111:2,9,21	54:16 64:11 65:24	40:22 65:2 99:14	expressed 71:13	76:4 97:9 104:13	84:17 85:21 86:7
112:6,23 113:10,24	electricity 23:21 43:20	104:3,4 108:13	102:17 115:2	111:21 114:18	91:1
114:18	43:22 44:3,6,14,15	evidence 22:20 27:5,6	expressing 85:15	finish 53:21 73:19	found 27:4 29:11
draft 4:1,4 1:23 2:11	elegantly 113:19	27:18 29:11,18	expressly 89:15	firm 48:23 49:18,20	40:12 90:17 91:8
4:8 6:4,4,19 7:1 8:1	element 45:19	38:19 68:13,17,20	extended 108:20	54:19	four 38:14 45:23 46:4
8:2,8,8,25 9:19	elements 51:4	73:24 74:6,7 75:17	extent 3:18 9:14,17	first 4:9 7:3,9 11:10	50:20,24,24 51:3
10:12 11:11,11,12	eleventh 107:9	75:18,19 76:15,17	98:10 103:21	21:11 22:14,18	60:5,23 64:4,8,8
14:1,14,16,20,23	Elizabeth 3:6	77:25 78:25 86:25	106:19	26:19 29:23 32:7	65:1,5,18
17:23 20:9 99:21	empty 25:24	96:24 97:1	extraneous 102:19	35:9,13 49:21 51:12	fourth 1:23 35:5 36:7
112:4	enabled 88:5	evident 23:9	eyes 6:13,16 7:12	54:7 62:2 63:17	46:3 51:2 52:4,15
drafting 100:14	end 23:24 40:17 47:5	evidently 30:12	12:11,13 104:16	70:3 75:19 76:6,7	68:24
109:11	54:10 59:4 94:24	exact 28:11 29:24		77:16,21 79:22	framed 77:23
drafts 4:10,10 7:3	98:2 102:22	exactly 13:21 26:5	F	82:12,15,19,23 83:1	frames 77:16
9:16 13:21,23,23	ended 86:19	50:25 70:14 76:24	FABIOLA 2:13	83:4,6 90:3 102:15	framework 44:14
14:10	endless 108:1	84:20 104:7 107:10	faced 75:14 76:3,14	105:20,23,24	free 3:24 20:25 48:23
draw 16:22	ends 35:11	examination 62:20	82:18	107:14,20 109:18	48:24 49:14 51:14
DR-CAFTA 23:11	Energy 2:7,7	64:3	62:18 facing 11:16	109:19	63:13
due 18:1 113:7 114:1	enforce 112:19	example 12:6 13:1	fact 8:16 10:3,13 18:8	firsthand 72:4	freedom 103:23
during 3:22 63:25	engage 46:13	23:21 57:8 69:19.20	18:12 23:9 39:22	fit 103:24	frequently 4:21
74:5,9 105:4 113:5	engaged 19:10 42:18	70:6,17 79:22 87:12		five 5:14,20 45:10	fresh 24:12
duty 18:1,20	44:12	102:22 103:1 104:5	42:7 63:10 65:21	48:6 70:15 72:10	Freshfields 79:24
	English 1:7 6:24 11:3	104:7	66:21 68:19 69:15 69:18 80:19,20	five/ten 70:11	83:20
E	15:1,2 20:23 53:16	examples 93:16 94:5	69:18 80:19,20 81:10,11 92:7,9	flexibility 99:6	Friday 1:8 1:1
each 3:3,17 28:12,16	72:9 84:7 92:22	101:10 103:6	factor 19:8 24:5 62:5	floor 1:9 11:4 21:13	from 4:7 3:7 5:9 9:10
· · · ·	93:4,4,5 108:8,24	exceeding 3:23		49:6	11:24 12:2,3,14
28:17 31:17 36:11	109:4 114:13	excellent 4:2 100:8	factors 67:18	FLORES 2:22	20:24 21:10 22:25
62:23 63:7,11,23	enough 89:16 90:23	104:14 106:14	facts 72:1,8 80:24 82:7	flow 31:18,25 62:2	23:9 24:15,23 25:17
64:8,13 65:24 69:25	92:9,20,25 112:5	114:5,9	85:2,18,20 89:10	flows 20:25 24:23 28:6	26:2,4,14 27:14,19
70:7,15,24 71:10	enterprise 35:11 62:3	except 66:8 101:25	factual 71:19	28:24 29:7,13 31:11	28:12 29:22 30:9,13
88:1 96:20 110:1	entire 41:1 95:16	excerpt 60:18	fail 18:20 19:1	31:19 34:19,20 35:1	30:14,19,20 31:6
112:6,8 114:20	entirely 68:7	exchange 30:22 54:18	fair 32:19 38:23	35:2 37:4 42:1,6	32:15 33:23 34:3,4
earlier 8:1 13:23 14:1	entirety 55:4,4 64:7	88:14	fairly 112:2	43:15 45:22 48:10	34:8 35:5,14,19
14:11 22:11 48:15	entitled 80:24	exclusively 67:8	fairness 32:22 39:8,22	48:23,24 49:11,14	36:6,7 41:20 43:15
59:3 71:13 96:5	entity 34:19 51:18	excuse 59:4 80:1	40:9,11,20 41:4	49:17 51:4,7,12,14	44:1 46:8,24,25
98:16 99:9 100:17	63:6,14	exercise 19:18 22:16	fall 49:6 111:17	51:18,18 54:18,19	47:5,8,12,25 51:1
early 1:5 112:5 earned 55:19	envisage 21:5	23:12	fallen 54:12 far 16:8 43:14 97:16	54:22 59:23,25	52:4 56:4,13 59:6
	equal 56:9	exist 6:3.14	114:25	63:14	59:10 60:25 62:21
earnings 48:1	equals 43:4	existed 22:21 26:24	FARHOD 2:13	focused 8:12 11:6	62:25 63:23 64:25
EBIT 48:1	equity 54:19 62:3,4	27:2,8 28:4,21 29:4		follow 18:7 41:19	68:1 69:16 72:19
Economy 2:22,24,24	63:6	29:6,20 40:2	federal 11:1 15:8,8,10	81:21 82:16 103:21	73:8 75:8 77:20
2:25,25	errors 52:11	existing 9:15 10:1,7,15	15:18,19 16:2	following 5:13 84:24	80:19 84:14 87:22
Ecuador 79:8,10,22	escapes 46:3	16:14 87:17	feel 3:23,24 4:3 72:20	follows 62:12	87:22,23 89:4,14,25
79:23	especially 99:15 108:8	expanded 23:22	73:10,12 103:22	follow-up 56:15 71:7	105:19 110:5 111:9
EC4M 1:6 EEGSA 23:24 24:2	espouse 68:9	expect 25:1,14 94:8	feelings 72:15 feels 72:23	font 104:15	114:10
	essence 8:9	111:25	FELIPE 1:22	footnote 30:17 60:9,21	front 20:10
34:18 43:25 44:13	essentially 54:12	expectation 3:20	FELIPE 1:22 FERNÁNDEZ 3:9	61:5,8	full 3:21 8:4,6 24:14
47:10 51:6,13,16	establish 10:4 17:3,11	expectations 107:5		forecast 43:12,18	26:1,6,16 30:23
55:19 EECSA's 24:2 46:25	18:9 37:3,10 43:15	expected 24:2 98:21	few 7:2 71:10	45:12 46:24 47:24	fully 17:7 50:17 89:13
EEGSA's 24:3 46:25	55:18 62:23 63:7	103:4	fewer 23:24	48:13,14 56:25 59:7	further 11:24 40:21
47:4,9,14,24 48:5	established 16:9 25:8	expenditures 48:12	figures 105:14	forecasted 47:1 55:11	63:22 66:16 96:13
48:10 49:1,2,7	26:20 63:8	expenses 48:19	file 96:6,7 107:24	56:10	100:11
55:12 56:23	establishes 20:14	expert 5:21 31:4 36:2	108:8,11 109:17	forecasting 59:10	future 42:1,3,4,6 43:3
effect 9:20 33:17	Estado 72:18	44:21 53:4 89:21,22	filed 1:23 80:13 108:3	foregone 71:5	43:6 113:14
45:20 52:8 60:9	Esteno 3:6	90:21,21,22 91:4,6	filing 97:25 98:3	Foreign 2:23,23	
effective 48:4,5	estimation 38:23	experts 5:17 20:16	final 33:25 44:7 45:1	foresight 42:25 43:2,5	G
effects 52:10	etc 23:16,20	33:19 48:16 49:9	62:16	43:10	
efficient 55:17 70:23	even 7:8,10 30:2 40:5	54:16 63:22 66:7	finally 8:23 48:22	forget 32:25	gain 6:1
effort 66:23 72:22	55:2 80:23 81:4,23	89:5 90:16	financial 5:11	forgot 61:8	gap 58:25
114:11	89:23 90:10,23	explain 2:14,21 19:13	find 5:7 28:11,22 29:2	form 8:25 58:11	GAR 80:3,16 81:7,18
efforts 6:1 13:11	91:20,20 92:8 93:15	20:2 76:15 95:21	29:10,12,18 37:21	former 12:15	87:1
egotistically 95:16	100:16 103:11	explained 55:10 85:4	69:22 86:17 87:23	formulation 21:18	gate 96:21
eight 103:16	112:19	explained 55:10 85:4 explains 33:16 65:3	88:3 90:15	forth 11:8 44:19 67:22	gave 48:23 80:16
Eiser 80:9,9 84:2,15	ever 19:25	explanation 93:23	finding 27:5,9 29:11	67:25 68:4,22	general 2:16 70:2 71:1
84:19 86:11 90:19	UVCI 17.2J	CAPIAHAUUH 95:25	30:18 31:2	01.23 00.4,22	71:22 72:7,18 74:15
					1

Trevor McGowan

TECO Guatemala Holdings, LLC -v- Republic of Guatemala ICSID Case No. ARB/10/23

Friday. 29 July 2022

87:1	64:2,15,22 99:7,8	78:13,15 88:3 100:4	immediately 99:4	87:3,4,6 89:16,19	85:21
generally 16:18	100:1	hearing 1:9 1:4 21:5	impact 27:7 29:19	90:4,8,25 91:25	irrelevant 26:24 28:20
General's 2:17,18,19	gotten 91:11	22:5,12 34:16 41:22	33:21,25 36:8 53:4	94:20 95:17	46:19 79:11
2:20,20,21,21 86:23	governed 11:1 15:13	43:9 46:15 50:9,11	60:8,24 63:12 66:11	initial 100:22	irrespective 9:6
generated 43:22	grant 95:7	52:5,25 53:22 54:11	impacts 61:2	initially 45:16	issue 2:22 4:19 6:5
generation 43:24	graphic 21:24	56:4 63:25 66:3,13	impartial 6:9 18:25	input 104:4	8:12,14,15 15:14
generators 44:3	gravely 91:22	69:1 71:14 72:22	19:3	insensitive 115:5	17:24 30:3,5 38:19
Georgina 1:24	grey 65:22	75:20,20,21 104:23	impartiality 4:23 5:1	insisted 41:24	61:24,24 71:15
GEORGIOS 3:10	ground 12:24 39:15	104:25 105:1,1	5:3 6:12 8:13 10:4	insistence 42:1	73:16 76:2,6 77:17
gets 40:19	53:8 70:19	113:11,19 114:3	12:8,11 13:14 17:3	insisting 42:14	83:12 90:6 93:21
getting 33:13	grounds 10:14	115:11,19 114.5	17:11,18 18:9 73:3	instance 10:17 16:4	94:23 95:10 96:16
0 0	0	hearings 113:22	73:3 81:2,16		
GIGLIO 3:2	Group 8:17 90:6	0	-	26:3 32:23 54:7	100:1,2 107:13
give 1:8 2:17 6:8 11:4	growth 47:24	help 13:25 71:8	impermissible 24:11	55:25 79:8 93:15	issued 74:2 84:16
15:16 21:13 25:19	GST 2:10,11,11,12,12	helped 88:6	implemented 59:14	94:12 97:5	issues 1:8 4:15 8:19
37:13 51:8 69:16	2:13,13,14,14,15,15	helpful 65:11 71:4	important 6:20 32:14	instantaneously 91:8	21:23 44:21 50:14
70:7,24 73:6 81:1	Guatemala 1:16,18	hence 43:4	41:20 53:20 72:25	instead 41:7 42:23	50:15,16 52:20 60:6
88:21 99:6 101:5,8	2:16 1:5 9:13 21:13	herself 20:1	102:8,9 105:13,15	45:2 47:4 51:23	99:10,11 113:18
112:1 114:16	38:1 44:24 45:2	hide 75:7	113:13	52:1	item 20:14
given 13:7 20:4 39:23	48:8 53:20 57:4	higher 47:16,16	impose 98:22 104:1	instruct 75:10	iv 52:17,20
56:21 64:20 73:2,8	61:8,11,18 67:2,5,6	highlighted 60:21	impossible 41:25 42:2	instrument 29:12	IVANIA 3:9
86:9 88:19 89:17	67:7 69:20 71:14	him 20:1 61:2 91:9	50:4,8	insufficient 16:11	IVANNIA 2:25
98:21	72:14 73:5,22,22	hired 42:18	improper 46:21	26:23 27:2 28:20	
giving 3:21	75:13 76:7,12,14	historical 22:24 23:1	inadequate 23:3	29:3 68:14	J
go 16:23 21:3,8,18	77:14 78:4,19 81:24	23:13,14,23 26:23	Inc 2:7,7	Integration 2:22	J 2:3
22:10 25:13 28:11	82:19,20,21 83:5,6	27:1,25 28:3,7,19	inclined 101:17	integrity 18:2	JANIO 2:22
28:14 30:19 31:13	83:18,19,23 86:12	28:22,25 29:3,5,8	include 5:21 93:25	intend 2:18	JAVIER 2:7
33:16 34:2,23 35:4	87:6 94:17 95:15	29:14 31:19 32:1	99:8	intended 3:24 77:5	Jones 1:12 9:11 10:21
37:14 44:19 52:17	114:10,25	35:3 45:5 48:5	included 6:15,19	101:13	11:9 12:15 15:7,14
57:23 60:15 64:22	Guatemala's 62:1	51:24 52:11 56:17	13:22 61:5 70:16	interaction 65:20	15:23 16:13 77:2,16
69:24 83:25 96:19	72:17 73:1 77:17	57:19,23 58:17,24	including 6:16	interest 8:22 16:1,13	
98:10 99:24 100:22	80:8 102:25	59:6 67:12	inclusion 112:12	20:12 30:3,11,16,24	87:11 88:12,15
103:12 105:21	guidance 100:25	HOLDINGS 1:16	income 44:8,11 45:11	31:9,11 36:13,15	92:13,16 95:2,8,18
goes 11:24 34:13	guideline 14:7	holds 31:8 43:3	48:4	48:2 66:17	95:20 98:11 101:4
44:20 67:1 114:6	Guidelines 10:16	holiday 108:18	inconsistencies 66:18	interested 9:22 16:7	101:16,18,24
going 2:1,2 3:16 5:5,8	guilty 92:13	holistic 88:2	66:19 93:3 98:18	16:19 22:5 33:13	JOSÉ 2:15
11:7 13:25 14:8,10	Guinea 30:19	honest 19:18 21:8	99:11,16 100:2	interesting 5:7 113:12	judge 12:16
14:17,25 21:6 22:2	Gulland 1:24	hope 25:15	incorporated 45:18	interests 6:2 13:12	judged 83:15
	GUIANU 1.24 GUZMÁN 2:25	hour 107:9	increase 1:14 23:18	intern 3:10	judicata 67:9,12 68:2
25:13,19 26:13,17	GÓMEZ 2:16 71:23		increasing 45:21,21		68:8
35:18 53:11 55:13	GOMEZ 2:16 /1:23	hours 1:13 53:12	8	international 1:2,5	JULIO 2:20
64:23 71:25 72:1,3		69:12,14 103:18	incurred 55:13	2:19 11:23 12:3,16	July 1:8 1:1 80:12
75:5 76:1 78:7 80:3	<u> </u>	housekeeping 1:8	independence 4:24,25	16:8	jurisdictions 16:15
89:12 94:14,25	half 53:11 71:25	hypothetical 55:15,25	5:3 6:10,12 8:13	interpretation 25:23	
101:22 108:13,19			40 4 40 5 40 40 44	101.10	jurisprudence 10:22
110:5,15 111:3	101:25	56:9,11,25	10:4 12:7,10 13:14	101:13	Jurisprudence 10:22 15:15,15,19 16:3,5
		56:9,11,25 hypothetically 82:21	17:3,12,17 73:4	Interpreted 1:4 4:9	•
113:16	101:25	56:9,11,25	17:3,12,17 73:4 81:2,16	Interpreted 1:4 4:9 6:23 11:7 13:19	15:15,15,19 16:3,5 16:16 93:17 94:6,14 104:8
113:16 gone 87:15	101:25 halfway 52:14	56:9,11,25 hypothetically 82:21 92:8	17:3,12,17 73:4 81:2,16 independent 18:25	Interpreted 1:4 4:9 6:23 11:7 13:19 20:8,18 71:21,23	15:15,15,19 16:3,5 16:16 93:17 94:6,14 104:8
113:16 gone 87:15 GONZÁLEZ 2:14,16	101:25 halfway 52:14 half-hour 25:3,20	56:9,11,25 hypothetically 82:21	17:3,12,17 73:4 81:2,16 independent 18:25 19:3 24:3	Interpreted 1:4 4:9 6:23 11:7 13:19 20:8,18 71:21,23 82:12 84:12,24	15:15,15,19 16:3,5 16:16 93:17 94:6,14
113:16 gone 87:15 GONZÁLEZ 2:14,16 71:23	101:25 halfway 52:14 half-hour 25:3,20 hand 4:18	56:9,11,25 hypothetically 82:21 92:8	17:3,12,17 73:4 81:2,16 independent 18:25 19:3 24:3 independently 12:1	Interpreted 1:4 4:9 6:23 11:7 13:19 20:8,18 71:21,23 82:12 84:12,24 114:8	15:15,15,19 16:3,5 16:16 93:17 94:6,14 104:8 just 2:11,16 3:1,8 7:2
113:16 gone 87:15 GONZÁLEZ 2:14,16 71:23 good 1:3,11,18,21	101:25 halfway 52:14 half-hour 25:3,20 hand 4:18 handed 84:22 handled 113:19	56:9,11,25 hypothetically 82:21 92:8	17:3,12,17 73:4 81:2,16 independent 18:25 19:3 24:3 independently 12:1 index 45:16	Interpreted 1:4 4:9 6:23 11:7 13:19 20:8,18 71:21,23 82:12 84:12,24 114:8 interpreter 3:2,3,3	15:15,15,19 16:3,5 16:16 93:17 94:6,14 104:8 just 2:11,16 3:1,8 7:2 7:10,19 9:8,23 10:1 16:20,22 17:5,7,14
113:16 gone 87:15 GONZÁLEZ 2:14,16 71:23 good 1:3,11,18,21 20:23 33:7 41:17	101:25 halfway 52:14 half-hour 25:3,20 hand 4:18 handed 84:22	56:9,11,25 hypothetically 82:21 92:8 <u>I</u> IA 80:4,16 81:8	17:3,12,17 73:4 81:2,16 independent 18:25 19:3 24:3 independently 12:1 index 45:16 indicate 5:1 13:1	Interpreted 1:4 4:9 6:23 11:7 13:19 20:8,18 71:21,23 82:12 84:12,24 114:8 interpreter 3:2,3,3 interpreters 3:1 114:6	15:15,15,19 16:3,5 16:16 93:17 94:6,14 104:8 just 2:11,16 3:1,8 7:2 7:10,19 9:8,23 10:1
113:16 gone 87:15 GONZÁLEZ 2:14,16 71:23 good 1:3,11,18,21	101:25 halfway 52:14 half-hour 25:3,20 hand 4:18 handed 84:22 handled 113:19 hands 61:22 70:23 75:10 94:25	56:9,11,25 hypothetically 82:21 92:8 <u>I</u> IA 80:4,16 81:8 IBA 10:16	17:3,12,17 73:4 81:2,16 independent 18:25 19:3 24:3 independently 12:1 index 45:16 indicate 5:1 13:1 indicated 13:17	Interpreted 1:4 4:9 6:23 11:7 13:19 20:8,18 71:21,23 82:12 84:12,24 114:8 interpreter 3:2,3,3 interpreters 3:1 114:6 114:8	15:15,15,19 16:3,5 16:16 93:17 94:6,14 104:8 just 2:11,16 3:1,8 7:2 7:10,19 9:8,23 10:1 16:20,22 17:5,7,14 18:7 20:8 24:20,25
113:16 gone 87:15 GONZÁLEZ 2:14,16 71:23 good 1:3,11,18,21 20:23 33:7 41:17	101:25 halfway 52:14 half-hour 25:3,20 hand 4:18 handed 84:22 handled 113:19 hands 61:22 70:23 75:10 94:25 happen 79:14 96:18	56:9,11,25 hypothetically 82:21 92:8 <u>I</u> IA 80:4,16 81:8 IBA 10:16 ICSID 3:9,10 7:6 10:8 13:17 108:16	17:3,12,17 73:4 81:2,16 independent 18:25 19:3 24:3 independently 12:1 index 45:16 indicate 5:1 13:1	Interpreted 1:4 4:9 6:23 11:7 13:19 20:8,18 71:21,23 82:12 84:12,24 114:8 interpreter 3:2,3,3 interpreters 3:1 114:6 114:8 interrupting 25:25	15:15,15,19 16:3,5 16:16 93:17 94:6,14 104:8 just 2:11,16 3:1,8 7:2 7:10,19 9:8,23 10:1 16:20,22 17:5,7,14 18:7 20:8 24:20,25 25:2,11,18,21,22,24 25:25 26:2 29:22
113:16 gone 87:15 GONZÁLEZ 2:14,16 71:23 good 1:3,11,18,21 20:23 33:7 41:17 53:16 54:2 59:18	101:25 halfway 52:14 half-hour 25:3,20 hand 4:18 handed 84:22 handled 113:19 hands 61:22 70:23 75:10 94:25 happen 79:14 96:18 happened 54:25 79:12	56:9,11,25 hypothetically 82:21 92:8 I IA 80:4,16 81:8 IBA 10:16 ICSID 3:9,10 7:6 10:8 13:17 108:16 113:14	17:3,12,17 73:4 81:2,16 independent 18:25 19:3 24:3 independently 12:1 index 45:16 indicate 5:1 13:1 indicated 13:17	Interpreted 1:4 4:9 6:23 11:7 13:19 20:8,18 71:21,23 82:12 84:12,24 114:8 interpreter 3:2,3,3 interpreters 3:1 114:6 114:8	15:15,15,19 16:3,5 16:16 93:17 94:6,14 104:8 just 2:11,16 3:1,8 7:2 7:10,19 9:8,23 10:1 16:20,22 17:5,7,14 18:7 20:8 24:20,25 25:2,11,18,21,22,24 25:25 26:2 29:22 30:1 32:4,11,12
113:16 gone 87:15 GONZÁLEZ 2:14,16 71:23 good 1:3,11,18,21 20:23 33:7 41:17 53:16 54:2 59:18 62:10 69:10 87:12	101:25 halfway 52:14 half-hour 25:3,20 hand 4:18 handed 84:22 handled 113:19 hands 61:22 70:23 75:10 94:25 happen 79:14 96:18 happened 54:25 79:12 happy 73:11 77:19	56:9,11,25 hypothetically 82:21 92:8 IA 80:4,16 81:8 IBA 10:16 ICSID 3:9,10 7:6 10:8 13:17 108:16 113:14 idea 53:16 70:4	17:3,12,17 73:4 81:2,16 independent 18:25 19:3 24:3 independently 12:1 index 45:16 indicate 5:1 13:1 indicated 13:17 indicative 81:15 individual 3:3 5:19 63:5	Interpreted 1:4 4:9 6:23 11:7 13:19 20:8,18 71:21,23 82:12 84:12,24 114:8 interpreter 3:2,3,3 interpreters 3:1 114:6 114:8 interrupting 25:25	$\begin{array}{c} 15:15,15,19 \ 16:3,5\\ 16:16 \ 93:17 \ 94:6,14\\ 104:8\\ \textbf{just}\ 2:11,16 \ 3:1,8 \ 7:2\\ 7:10,19 \ 9:8,23 \ 10:1\\ 16:20,22 \ 17:5,7,14\\ 18:7 \ 20:8 \ 24:20,25\\ 25:2,11,18,21,22,24\\ 25:25 \ 26:2 \ 29:22\\ 30:1 \ 32:4,11,12\\ 33:3,4,14 \ 34:22\\ \end{array}$
113:16 gone 87:15 GONZÁLEZ 2:14,16 71:23 good 1:3,11,18,21 20:23 33:7 41:17 53:16 54:2 59:18 62:10 69:10 87:12 97:23 100:21	101:25 halfway 52:14 half-hour 25:3,20 hand 4:18 handed 84:22 handled 113:19 hands 61:22 70:23 75:10 94:25 happen 79:14 96:18 happened 54:25 79:12 happy 73:11 77:19 hard 114:7	56:9,11,25 hypothetically 82:21 92:8 I IA 80:4,16 81:8 IBA 10:16 ICSID 3:9,10 7:6 10:8 13:17 108:16 113:14 idea 53:16 70:4 101:12	17:3,12,17 73:4 81:2,16 independent 18:25 19:3 24:3 independently 12:1 index 45:16 indicate 5:1 13:1 indicated 13:17 indicative 81:15 individual 3:3 5:19	Interpreted 1:4 4:9 6:23 11:7 13:19 20:8,18 71:21,23 82:12 84:12,24 114:8 interpreter 3:2,3,3 interpreters 3:1 114:6 114:8 interrupting 25:25 interruption 26:2 46:7	15:15,15,19 16:3,5 16:16 93:17 94:6,14 104:8 just 2:11,16 3:1,8 7:2 7:10,19 9:8,23 10:1 16:20,22 17:5,7,14 18:7 20:8 24:20,25 25:2,11,18,21,22,24 25:25 26:2 29:22 30:1 32:4,11,12 33:3,4,14 34:22 35:14 37:18 39:5,21
113:16 gone 87:15 GONZÁLEZ 2:14,16 71:23 good 1:3,111,18,21 20:23 33:7 41:17 53:16 54:2 59:18 62:10 69:10 87:12 97:23 100:21 109:21 111:22	101:25 halfway 52:14 half-hour 25:3,20 hand 4:18 handed 84:22 handled 113:19 hands 61:22 70:23 75:10 94:25 happen 79:14 96:18 happened 54:25 79:12 happy 73:11 77:19 hard 114:7 having 41:8 97:11	56:9,11,25 hypothetically 82:21 92:8 I IA 80:4,16 81:8 IBA 10:16 ICSID 3:9,10 7:6 10:8 13:17 108:16 113:14 idea 53:16 70:4 101:12 identified 9:14 21:23	17:3,12,17 73:4 81:2,16 independent 18:25 19:3 24:3 independently 12:1 index 45:16 indicate 5:1 13:1 indicated 13:17 indicative 81:15 individual 3:3 5:19 63:5	Interpreted 1:4 4:9 6:23 11:7 13:19 20:8,18 71:21,23 82:12 84:12,24 114:8 interpreter 3:2,3,3 interpreters 3:1 114:6 114:8 interrupting 25:25 interruption 26:2 46:7 introduce 93:19 94:16	$\begin{array}{c} 15:15,15,19\ 16:3,5\\ 16:16\ 93:17\ 94:6,14\\ 104:8\\ \textbf{just}\ 2:11,16\ 3:1,8\ 7:2\\ 7:10,19\ 9:8,23\ 10:1\\ 16:20,22\ 17:5,7,14\\ 18:7\ 20:8\ 24:20,25\\ 25:2,11,18,21,22,24\\ 25:25\ 26:2\ 29:22\\ 30:1\ 32:4,11,12\\ 33:3,4,14\ 34:22\\ 35:14\ 37:18\ 39:5,21\\ 39:25\ 40:8\ 41:15,18\\ \end{array}$
113:16 gone 87:15 GONZÁLEZ 2:14,16 71:23 good 1:3,11,18,21 20:23 33:7 41:17 53:16 54:2 59:18 62:10 69:10 87:12 97:23 100:21 109:21 111:22 112:10,20,24 113:2	101:25 halfway 52:14 half-hour 25:3,20 hand 4:18 handed 84:22 handled 113:19 hands 61:22 70:23 75:10 94:25 happen 79:14 96:18 happened 54:25 79:12 happy 73:11 77:19 hard 114:7 having 41:8 97:11 107:4 114:11 115:1	56:9,11,25 hypothetically 82:21 92:8 I IA 80:4,16 81:8 IBA 10:16 ICSID 3:9,10 7:6 10:8 13:17 108:16 113:14 idea 53:16 70:4 101:12 identified 9:14 21:23 33:23 35:23 96:3	17:3,12,17 73:4 81:2,16 independent 18:25 19:3 24:3 independently 12:1 index 45:16 indicate 5:1 13:1 indicative 13:17 indicative 81:15 individual 3:3 5:19 63:5 individually 65:25	Interpreted 1:4 4:9 6:23 11:7 13:19 20:8,18 71:21,23 82:12 84:12,24 114:8 interpreter 3:2,3,3 interpreters 3:1 114:6 114:8 interrupting 25:25 interruption 26:2 46:7 introduce 93:19 94:16 110:16,19 111:14	$\begin{array}{c} 15:15,15,19\ 16:3,5\\ 16:16\ 93:17\ 94:6,14\\ 104:8\\ \textbf{just}\ 2:11,16\ 3:1,8\ 7:2\\ 7:10,19\ 9:8,23\ 10:1\\ 16:20,22\ 17:5,7,14\\ 18:7\ 20:8\ 24:20,25\\ 25:2,11,18,21,22,24\\ 25:25\ 26:2\ 29:22\\ 30:1\ 32:4,11,12\\ 33:3,4,14\ 34:22\\ 35:14\ 37:18\ 39:5,21\\ 39:25\ 40:8\ 41:15,18\\ 42:15\ 46:10,11\ 48:2 \end{array}$
113:16 gone 87:15 GONZÁLEZ 2:14,16 71:23 good 1:3,11,18,21 20:23 33:7 41:17 53:16 54:2 59:18 62:10 69:10 87:12 97:23 100:21 109:21 111:22 112:10,20,24 113:2 113:3,11 114:14	101:25 halfway 52:14 half-hour 25:3,20 hand 4:18 handed 84:22 handled 113:19 hands 61:22 70:23 75:10 94:25 happen 79:14 96:18 happened 54:25 79:12 happy 73:11 77:19 hard 114:7 having 41:8 97:11 107:4 114:11 115:1 head 2:19 39:13 46:3	56:9,11,25 hypothetically 82:21 92:8 I IA 80:4,16 81:8 IBA 10:16 ICSID 3:9,10 7:6 10:8 13:17 108:16 113:14 idea 53:16 70:4 101:12 identified 9:14 21:23 33:23 35:23 96:3 identifies 67:7	17:3,12,17 73:4 81:2,16 independent 18:25 19:3 24:3 independently 12:1 index 45:16 indicate 5:1 13:1 indicated 13:17 indicative 81:15 individual 3:3 5:19 63:5 individually 65:25 66:8	Interpreted 1:4 4:9 6:23 11:7 13:19 20:8,18 71:21,23 82:12 84:12,24 114:8 interpreter 3:2,3,3 interpreters 3:1 114:6 114:8 interrupting 25:25 interruption 26:2 46:7 introduce 93:19 94:16 110:16,19 111:14 introduced 58:23 95:9	$\begin{array}{c} 15:15,15,19\ 16:3,5\\ 16:16\ 93:17\ 94:6,14\\ 104:8\\ \textbf{just}\ 2:11,16\ 3:1,8\ 7:2\\ 7:10,19\ 9:8,23\ 10:1\\ 16:20,22\ 17:5,7,14\\ 18:7\ 20:8\ 24:20,25\\ 25:2,11,18,21,22,24\\ 25:25\ 26:2\ 29:22\\ 30:1\ 32:4,11,12\\ 33:3,4,14\ 34:22\\ 35:14\ 37:18\ 39:5,21\\ 39:25\ 40:8\ 41:15,18\\ 42:15\ 46:10,11\ 48:2\\ 53:10,23\ 54:1\ 56:24 \end{array}$
113:16 gone 87:15 GONZÁLEZ 2:14,16 71:23 good 1:3,11,18,21 20:23 33:7 41:17 53:16 54:2 59:18 62:10 69:10 87:12 97:23 100:21 109:21 111:22 112:10,20,24 113:2 113:3,11 114:14 Gosis 2:11 4:9,11,14 2:14,23 21:14,17	101:25 halfway 52:14 half-hour 25:3,20 hand 4:18 handed 84:22 handled 113:19 hands 61:22 70:23 75:10 94:25 happen 79:14 96:18 happened 54:25 79:12 happy 73:11 77:19 hard 114:7 having 41:8 97:11 107:4 114:11 115:1 head 2:19 39:13 46:3 69:17	56:9,11,25 hypothetically 82:21 92:8 I IA 80:4,16 81:8 IBA 10:16 ICSID 3:9,10 7:6 10:8 13:17 108:16 113:14 idea 53:16 70:4 101:12 identified 9:14 21:23 33:23 35:23 96:3 identifies 67:7 identifies 3:4 41:7 67:3	17:3,12,17 73:4 81:2,16 independent 18:25 19:3 24:3 independently 12:1 index 45:16 indicate 5:1 13:1 indicated 13:17 indicative 81:15 individual 3:3 5:19 63:5 individually 65:25 66:8 individuals 5:13 Industry 86:3	Interpreted 1:4 4:9 6:23 11:7 13:19 20:8,18 71:21,23 82:12 84:12,24 114:8 interpreter 3:2,3,3 interpreters 3:1 114:6 114:8 interrupting 25:25 interruption 26:2 46:7 introduce 93:19 94:16 110:16,19 111:14 introduced 58:23 95:9 110:16,18,20 111:11	$\begin{array}{c} 15:15,15,19\ 16:3,5\\ 16:16\ 93:17\ 94:6,14\\ 104:8\\ \textbf{just}\ 2:11,16\ 3:1,8\ 7:2\\ 7:10,19\ 9:8,23\ 10:1\\ 16:20,22\ 17:5,7,14\\ 18:7\ 20:8\ 24:20,25\\ 25:2,11,18,21,22,24\\ 25:25\ 26:2\ 29:22\\ 30:1\ 32:4,11,12\\ 33:3,4,14\ 34:22\\ 35:14\ 37:18\ 39:5,21\\ 39:25\ 40:8\ 41:15,18\\ 42:15\ 46:10,11\ 48:2\\ 53:10,23\ 54:1\ 56:24\\ 57:15\ 58:15,21\ 59:9\end{array}$
113:16 gone 87:15 GONZÁLEZ 2:14,16 71:23 good 1:3,11,18,21 20:23 33:7 41:17 53:16 54:2 59:18 62:10 69:10 87:12 97:23 100:21 109:21 111:22 112:10,20,24 113:2 113:3,11 114:14 Gosis 2:11 4:9,11,14 2:14,23 21:14,17 22:7 23:19 24:25	101:25 halfway 52:14 half-hour 25:3,20 hand 4:18 handed 84:22 handled 113:19 hands 61:22 70:23 75:10 94:25 happen 79:14 96:18 happened 54:25 79:12 happy 73:11 77:19 hard 114:7 having 41:8 97:11 107:4 114:11 115:1 head 2:19 39:13 46:3 69:17 hear 21:4 24:11 52:24	56:9,11,25 hypothetically 82:21 92:8 I IA 80:4,16 81:8 IBA 10:16 ICSID 3:9,10 7:6 10:8 13:17 108:16 113:14 idea 53:16 70:4 101:12 identified 9:14 21:23 33:23 35:23 96:3 identifies 67:7 identify 3:4 41:7 67:3 71:9 77:24 96:1	17:3,12,17 73:4 81:2,16 independent 18:25 19:3 24:3 independently 12:1 index 45:16 indicate 5:1 13:1 indicated 13:17 indicative 81:15 individual 3:3 5:19 63:5 individually 65:25 66:8 individually 65:25 66:8 individually 5:13 Industry 86:3 inevitably 23:14	Interpreted 1:4 4:9 6:23 11:7 13:19 20:8,18 71:21,23 82:12 84:12,24 114:8 interpreter 3:2,3,3 interpreters 3:1 114:6 114:8 interrupting 25:25 interruption 26:2 46:7 introduce 93:19 94:16 110:16,19 111:14 introduced 58:23 95:9 110:16,18,20	$\begin{array}{c} 15:15,15,19\ 16:3,5\\ 16:16\ 93:17\ 94:6,14\\ 104:8\\ \textbf{just}\ 2:11,16\ 3:1,8\ 7:2\\ 7:10,19\ 9:8,23\ 10:1\\ 16:20,22\ 17:5,7,14\\ 18:7\ 20:8\ 24:20,25\\ 25:2,11,18,21,22,24\\ 25:25\ 26:2\ 29:22\\ 30:1\ 32:4,11,12\\ 33:3,4,14\ 34:22\\ 35:14\ 37:18\ 39:5,21\\ 39:25\ 40:8\ 41:15,18\\ 42:15\ 46:10,11\ 48:2\\ 53:10,23\ 54:1\ 56:24\\ 57:15\ 58:15,21\ 59:9\\ 59:23\ 60:18\ 61:12\\ \end{array}$
113:16 gone 87:15 GONZÁLEZ 2:14,16 71:23 good 1:3,11,18,21 20:23 33:7 41:17 53:16 54:2 59:18 62:10 69:10 87:12 97:23 100:21 109:21 111:22 112:10,20,24 113:2 113:3,11 114:14 Gosis 2:11 4:9,11,14 2:14,23 21:14,17 22:7 23:19 24:25 25:23 26:9,13 31:10	101:25 halfway 52:14 half-hour 25:3,20 hand 4:18 handed 84:22 handled 113:19 hands 61:22 70:23 75:10 94:25 happen 79:14 96:18 happened 54:25 79:12 happy 73:11 77:19 hard 114:7 having 41:8 97:11 107:4 114:11 115:1 head 2:19 39:13 46:3 69:17 hear 21:4 24:11 52:24 53:5 61:15 69:12	56:9,11,25 hypothetically 82:21 92:8 I IA 80:4,16 81:8 IBA 10:16 ICSID 3:9,10 7:6 10:8 13:17 108:16 113:14 idea 53:16 70:4 101:12 identified 9:14 21:23 33:23 35:23 96:3 identifies 67:7 identify 3:4 41:7 67:3 71:9 77:24 96:1 110:2	17:3,12,17 73:4 81:2,16 independent 18:25 19:3 24:3 independently 12:1 index 45:16 indicate 5:1 13:1 indicated 13:17 indicative 81:15 individual 3:3 5:19 63:5 individually 65:25 66:8 individuals 5:13 Industry 86:3 inevitably 23:14 inflation 45:14,17,19	Interpreted 1:4 4:9 6:23 11:7 13:19 20:8,18 71:21,23 82:12 84:12,24 114:8 interpreter 3:2,3,3 interpreters 3:1 114:6 114:8 interrupting 25:25 interruption 26:2 46:7 introduce 93:19 94:16 110:16,19 111:14 introduced 58:23 95:9 110:16,18,20 111:11 introducing 76:15 invest 31:9	$\begin{array}{c} 15:15,15,19\ 16:3,5\\ 16:16\ 93:17\ 94:6,14\\ 104:8\\ \textbf{just}\ 2:11,16\ 3:1,8\ 7:2\\ 7:10,19\ 9:8,23\ 10:1\\ 16:20,22\ 17:5,7,14\\ 18:7\ 20:8\ 24:20,25\\ 25:25\ 26:2\ 29:22\\ 30:1\ 32:4,11,12\\ 33:3,4,14\ 34:22\\ 35:14\ 37:18\ 39:5,21\\ 39:25\ 40:8\ 41:15,18\\ 42:15\ 46:10,11\ 48:2\\ 53:10,23\ 54:1\ 56:24\\ 57:15\ 58:15,21\ 59:9\\ 59:23\ 60:18\ 61:12\\ 61:17,19\ 65:13,13\\ \end{array}$
113:16 gone 87:15 GONZÁLEZ 2:14,16 71:23 good 1:3,11,18,21 20:23 33:7 41:17 53:16 54:2 59:18 62:10 69:10 87:12 97:23 100:21 109:21 111:22 112:10,20,24 113:2 113:3,11 114:14 Gosis 2:11 4:9,11,14 2:14,23 21:14,17 22:7 23:19 24:25 25:23 26:9,13 31:10 31:12 32:6,20 33:6	101:25 halfway 52:14 half-hour 25:3,20 hand 4:18 handed 84:22 handled 113:19 hands 61:22 70:23 75:10 94:25 happen 79:14 96:18 happened 54:25 79:12 happy 73:11 77:19 hard 114:7 having 41:8 97:11 107:4 114:11 115:1 head 2:19 39:13 46:3 69:17 hear 21:4 24:11 52:24 53:5 61:15 69:12 71:8,16 72:22 73:11	56:9,11,25 hypothetically 82:21 92:8 IA 80:4,16 81:8 IBA 10:16 ICSID 3:9,10 7:6 10:8 13:17 108:16 113:14 idea 53:16 70:4 101:12 identified 9:14 21:23 33:23 35:23 96:3 identifies 67:7 identify 3:4 41:7 67:3 71:9 77:24 96:1 110:2 identifying 21:24	17:3,12,17 73:4 81:2,16 independent 18:25 19:3 24:3 independently 12:1 index 45:16 indicate 5:1 13:1 indicated 13:17 indicative 81:15 individual 3:3 5:19 63:5 individually 65:25 66:8 individuals 5:13 Industry 86:3 inevitably 23:14 inflation 45:14,17,19 47:23 54:15 64:11	Interpreted 1:4 4:9 6:23 11:7 13:19 20:8,18 71:21,23 82:12 84:12,24 114:8 interpreter 3:2,3,3 interpreters 3:1 114:6 114:8 interrupting 25:25 interrupting 25:25 interruption 26:2 46:7 introduce 93:19 94:16 110:16,19 111:14 introduced 58:23 95:9 110:16,18,20 111:11 introducing 76:15 invest 31:9 investment 1:2 30:9	$\begin{array}{c} 15:15,15,19\ 16:3,5\\ 16:16\ 93:17\ 94:6,14\\ 104:8\\ \textbf{just}\ 2:11,16\ 3:1,8\ 7:2\\ 7:10,19\ 9:8,23\ 10:1\\ 16:20,22\ 17:5,7,14\\ 18:7\ 20:8\ 24:20,25\\ 25:25\ 26:2\ 29:22\\ 30:1\ 32:4,11,12\\ 33:3,4,14\ 34:22\\ 35:14\ 37:18\ 39:5,21\\ 39:25\ 40:8\ 41:15,18\\ 42:15\ 46:10,11\ 48:2\\ 53:10,23\ 54:1\ 56:24\\ 57:15\ 58:15,21\ 59:9\\ 59:23\ 60:18\ 61:12\\ 61:17,19\ 65:13,13\\ 65:15\ 66:21\ 69:6,16\\ \end{array}$
113:16 gone 87:15 GONZÁLEZ 2:14,16 71:23 good 1:3,11,18,21 20:23 33:7 41:17 53:16 54:2 59:18 62:10 69:10 87:12 97:23 100:21 109:21 111:22 112:10,20,24 113:2 113:3,11 114:14 Gosis 2:11 4:9,11,14 2:14,23 21:14,17 22:7 23:19 24:25 25:23 26:9,13 31:10 31:12 32:6,20 33:6 33:9,11 34:22 36:5	101:25 halfway 52:14 half-hour 25:3,20 hand 4:18 handed 84:22 handled 113:19 hands 61:22 70:23 75:10 94:25 happen 79:14 96:18 happened 54:25 79:12 happy 73:11 77:19 hard 114:7 having 41:8 97:11 107:4 114:11 115:1 head 2:19 39:13 46:3 69:17 hear 21:4 24:11 52:24 53:5 61:15 69:12 71:8,16 72:22 73:11 73:12,21 74:7 76:14	56:9,11,25 hypothetically 82:21 92:8 I IA 80:4,16 81:8 IBA 10:16 ICSID 3:9,10 7:6 10:8 13:17 108:16 113:14 idea 53:16 70:4 101:12 identified 9:14 21:23 33:23 35:23 96:3 identifies 67:7 identify 3:4 41:7 67:3 71:9 77:24 96:1 110:2 identifying 21:24 IDRC 1:5	17:3,12,17 73:4 81:2,16 independent 18:25 19:3 24:3 independently 12:1 index 45:16 indicate 5:1 13:1 indicated 13:17 indicative 81:15 individual 3:3 5:19 63:5 individually 65:25 66:8 individuals 5:13 Industry 86:3 inevitably 23:14 inflation 45:14,17,19 47:23 54:15 64:11 65:24	Interpreted 1:4 4:9 6:23 11:7 13:19 20:8,18 71:21,23 82:12 84:12,24 114:8 interpreter 3:2,3,3 interpreters 3:1 114:6 114:8 interrupting 25:25 interrupting 25:25 interruption 26:2 46:7 introduce 93:19 94:16 110:16,19 111:14 introduced 58:23 95:9 110:16,18,20 111:11 introducing 76:15 invest 31:9 investment 1:2 30:9 30:25	$\begin{array}{c} 15:15,15,19\ 16:3,5\\ 16:16\ 93:17\ 94:6,14\\ 104:8\\ \textbf{just}\ 2:11,16\ 3:1,8\ 7:2\\ 7:10,19\ 9:8,23\ 10:1\\ 16:20,22\ 17:5,7,14\\ 18:7\ 20:8\ 24:20,25\\ 25:2,11,18,21,22,24\\ 25:25\ 26:2\ 29:22\\ 30:1\ 32:4,11,12\\ 33:3,4,14\ 34:22\\ 35:14\ 37:18\ 39:5,21\\ 39:25\ 40:8\ 41:15,18\\ 42:15\ 46:10,11\ 48:2\\ 53:10,23\ 54:1\ 56:24\\ 57:15\ 58:15,21\ 59:9\\ 59:23\ 60:18\ 61:12\\ 61:17,19\ 65:13,13\\ 65:15\ 66:21\ 69:6,16\\ 71:12\ 73:18\ 74:14\\ \end{array}$
113:16 gone 87:15 GONZÁLEZ 2:14,16 71:23 good 1:3,11,18,21 20:23 33:7 41:17 53:16 54:2 59:18 62:10 69:10 87:12 97:23 100:21 109:21 111:22 112:10,20,24 113:2 113:3,11 114:14 Gosis 2:11 4:9,11,14 2:14,23 21:14,17 22:7 23:19 24:25 25:23 26:9,13 31:10 31:12 32:6,20 33:6 33:9,11 34:22 36:5 36:25 37:14,24 38:6	101:25 halfway 52:14 half-hour 25:3,20 hand 4:18 handed 84:22 handled 113:19 hands 61:22 70:23 75:10 94:25 happen 79:14 96:18 happened 54:25 79:12 happy 73:11 77:19 hard 114:7 having 41:8 97:11 107:4 114:11 115:1 head 2:19 39:13 46:3 69:17 hear 21:4 24:11 52:24 53:5 61:15 69:12 71:8,16 72:22 73:11 73:12,21 74:7 76:14 76:18,24 78:9 93:24	56:9,11,25 hypothetically 82:21 92:8 I IA 80:4,16 81:8 IBA 10:16 ICSID 3:9,10 7:6 10:8 13:17 108:16 113:14 idea 53:16 70:4 101:12 identified 9:14 21:23 33:23 35:23 96:3 identifies 67:7 identify 3:4 41:7 67:3 71:9 77:24 96:1 110:2 identifying 21:24 IDRC 1:5 IGNACIO 2:10	17:3,12,17 73:4 81:2,16 independent 18:25 19:3 24:3 independently 12:1 index 45:16 indicate 5:1 13:1 indicative 81:15 individual 3:3 5:19 63:5 individually 65:25 66:8 individuals 5:13 Industry 86:3 inevitably 23:14 inflation 45:14,17,19 47:23 54:15 64:11 65:24 inform 86:8 87:7	Interpreted 1:4 4:9 6:23 11:7 13:19 20:8,18 71:21,23 82:12 84:12,24 114:8 interpreter 3:2,3,3 interpreters 3:1 114:6 114:8 interrupting 25:25 interruption 26:2 46:7 introduce 93:19 94:16 110:16,19 111:14 introduced 58:23 95:9 110:16,18,20 111:11 introducing 76:15 invest 31:9 investment 1:2 30:9 30:25 investments 31:9	$\begin{array}{c} 15:15,15,19\ 16:3,5\\ 16:16\ 93:17\ 94:6,14\\ 104:8\\ \textbf{just}\ 2:11,16\ 3:1,8\ 7:2\\ 7:10,19\ 9:8,23\ 10:1\\ 16:20,22\ 17:5,7,14\\ 18:7\ 20:8\ 24:20,25\\ 25:2,11,18,21,22,24\\ 25:25\ 26:2\ 29:22\\ 30:1\ 32:4,11,12\\ 33:3,4,14\ 34:22\\ 35:14\ 37:18\ 39:5,21\\ 39:25\ 40:8\ 41:15,18\\ 42:15\ 46:10,11\ 48:2\\ 53:10,23\ 54:1\ 56:24\\ 57:15\ 58:15,21\ 59:9\\ 59:23\ 60:18\ 61:12\\ 61:17,19\ 65:13,13\\ 65:15\ 66:21\ 69:6,16\\ 71:12\ 73:18\ 74:14\\ 75:24\ 83:1,4,25\\ \end{array}$
113:16 gone 87:15 GONZÁLEZ 2:14,16 71:23 good 1:3,11,18,21 20:23 33:7 41:17 53:16 54:2 59:18 62:10 69:10 87:12 97:23 100:21 109:21 111:22 112:10,20,24 113:2 113:3,11 114:14 Gosis 2:11 4:9,11,14 2:14,23 21:14,17 22:7 23:19 24:25 25:23 26:9,13 31:10 31:12 32:6,20 33:6 33:9,11 34:22 36:5 36:25 37:14,24 38:6 38:11,25 39:2,6,17	101:25 halfway 52:14 half-hour 25:3,20 hand 4:18 handed 84:22 handled 113:19 hands 61:22 70:23 75:10 94:25 happen 79:14 96:18 happened 54:25 79:12 happy 73:11 77:19 hard 114:7 having 41:8 97:11 107:4 114:11 115:1 head 2:19 39:13 46:3 69:17 hear 21:4 24:11 52:24 53:5 61:15 69:12 71:8,16 72:22 73:11 73:12,21 74:7 76:14 76:18,24 78:9 93:24 94:2 96:7 102:25	56:9,11,25 hypothetically 82:21 92:8 I IA 80:4,16 81:8 IBA 10:16 ICSID 3:9,10 7:6 10:8 13:17 108:16 113:14 idea 53:16 70:4 101:12 identified 9:14 21:23 33:23 35:23 96:3 identifies 67:7 identify 3:4 41:7 67:3 71:9 77:24 96:1 110:2 identifying 21:24 IDRC 1:5 IGNACIO 2:10 ii 3:2: 51:21 52:20	17:3,12,17 73:4 81:2,16 independent 18:25 19:3 24:3 independently 12:1 index 45:16 indicate 5:1 13:1 indicated 13:17 indicative 81:15 individual 3:3 5:19 63:5 individually 65:25 66:8 individuals 5:13 Industry 86:3 inevitably 23:14 inflation 45:14,17,19 47:23 54:15 64:11 65:24 inform 86:8 87:7 information 19:22	Interpreted 1:4 4:9 6:23 11:7 13:19 20:8,18 71:21,23 82:12 84:12,24 114:8 interpreter 3:2,3,3 interpreters 3:1 114:6 114:8 interrupting 25:25 interruption 26:2 46:7 introduce 93:19 94:16 110:16,19 111:14 introduced 58:23 95:9 110:16,18,20 111:11 introducing 76:15 invest 31:9 investment 1:2 30:9 30:25 investment 31:9 investor-state 80:3,5	$\begin{array}{c} 15:15,15,19\ 16:3,5\\ 16:16\ 93:17\ 94:6,14\\ 104:8\\ \textbf{just}\ 2:11,16\ 3:1,8\ 7:2\\ 7:10,19\ 9:8,23\ 10:1\\ 16:20,22\ 17:5,7,14\\ 18:7\ 20:8\ 24:20,25\\ 25:2,11,18,21,22,24\\ 25:25\ 26:2\ 29:22\\ 30:1\ 32:4,11,12\\ 33:3,4,14\ 34:22\\ 35:14\ 37:18\ 39:5,21\\ 39:25\ 40:8\ 41:15,18\\ 42:15\ 46:10,11\ 48:2\\ 53:10,23\ 54:1\ 56:24\\ 57:15\ 58:15,21\ 59:9\\ 59:23\ 60:18\ 61:12\\ 61:17,19\ 65:13,13\\ 65:15\ 66:21\ 69:6,16\\ 71:12\ 73:18\ 74:14\\ 75:24\ 83:1,4,25\\ 84:5,19\ 85:8\ 87:11\\ \end{array}$
113:16 gone 87:15 GONZÁLEZ 2:14,16 71:23 good 1:3,11,18,21 20:23 33:7 41:17 53:16 54:2 59:18 62:10 69:10 87:12 97:23 100:21 109:21 111:22 112:10,20,24 113:2 113:3,11 114:14 Gosis 2:11 4:9,11,14 2:14,23 21:14,17 22:7 23:19 24:25 25:23 26:9,13 31:10 31:12 32:6,20 33:6 33:9,11 34:22 36:5 36:25 37:14,24 38:6 38:11,25 39:2,6,17 40:12,25 46:6 50:23	101:25 halfway 52:14 half-hour 25:3,20 hand 4:18 handed 84:22 handled 113:19 hands 61:22 70:23 75:10 94:25 happen 79:14 96:18 happened 54:25 79:12 happy 73:11 77:19 hard 114:7 having 41:8 97:11 107:4 114:11 115:1 head 2:19 39:13 46:3 69:17 hear 21:4 24:11 52:24 53:5 61:15 69:12 71:8,16 72:22 73:11 73:12,21 74:7 76:14 76:18,24 78:9 93:24 94:2 96:7 102:25 105:6,19	56:9,11,25 hypothetically 82:21 92:8 IA 80:4,16 81:8 IBA 10:16 ICSID 3:9,10 7:6 10:8 13:17 108:16 113:14 idea 53:16 70:4 101:12 identified 9:14 21:23 33:23 35:23 96:3 identifies 67:7 identify 3:4 41:7 67:3 71:9 77:24 96:1 110:2 identifying 21:24 IDRC 1:5 IGNACIO 2:10 ii 32:2 51:21 52:20 55:3	17:3,12,17 73:4 81:2,16 independent 18:25 19:3 24:3 independently 12:1 index 45:16 indicate 5:1 13:1 indicated 13:17 indicative 81:15 individual 3:3 5:19 63:5 individually 65:25 66:8 individuals 5:13 Industry 86:3 inevitably 23:14 inflation 45:14,17,19 47:23 54:15 64:11 65:24 inform 86:8 87:7 information 19:22 41:10 78:23 79:18	Interpreted 1:4 4:9 6:23 11:7 13:19 20:8,18 71:21,23 82:12 84:12,24 114:8 interpreter 3:2,3,3 interpreters 3:1 114:6 114:8 interrupting 25:25 interruption 26:2 46:7 introduce 93:19 94:16 110:16,19 111:14 introduced 58:23 95:9 110:16,18,20 111:11 introducing 76:15 invest 31:9 investment 1:2 30:9 30:25 investments 31:9 investments 31:9 investments 31:9 investments 31:9	$\begin{array}{c} 15:15,15,19\ 16:3,5\\ 16:16\ 93:17\ 94:6,14\\ 104:8\\ \textbf{just}\ 2:11,16\ 3:1,8\ 7:2\\ 7:10,19\ 9:8,23\ 10:1\\ 16:20,22\ 17:5,7,14\\ 18:7\ 20:8\ 24:20,25\\ 25:2,11,18,21,22,24\\ 25:25\ 26:2\ 29:22\\ 30:1\ 32:4,11,12\\ 33:3,4,14\ 34:22\\ 35:14\ 37:18\ 39:5,21\\ 39:25\ 40:8\ 41:15,18\\ 42:15\ 46:10,11\ 48:2\\ 53:10,23\ 54:1\ 56:24\\ 57:15\ 58:15,21\ 59:9\\ 59:23\ 60:18\ 61:12\\ 61:17,19\ 65:13,13\\ 65:15\ 66:21\ 69:6,16\\ 71:12\ 73:18\ 74:14\\ 75:24\ 83:1,4,25\\ 84:5,19\ 85:8\ 87:11\\ 87:11\ 88:5,8\ 89:12\\ \end{array}$
113:16 gone 87:15 GONZÁLEZ 2:14,16 71:23 good 1:3,11,18,21 20:23 33:7 41:17 53:16 54:2 59:18 62:10 69:10 87:12 97:23 100:21 109:21 111:22 112:10,20,24 113:2 113:3,11 114:14 Gosis 2:11 4:9,11,14 2:14,23 21:14,17 22:7 23:19 24:25 25:23 26:9,13 31:10 31:12 32:6,20 33:6 33:9,11 34:22 36:5 36:25 37:14,24 38:6 38:11,25 39:2,6,17 40:12,25 46:6 50:23 51:9,11 52:23 58:6	$\begin{array}{c} 101:25\\ \textbf{halfway}\ 52:14\\ \textbf{half-hour}\ 25:3,20\\ \textbf{hand}\ 4:18\\ \textbf{handed}\ 84:22\\ \textbf{handled}\ 113:19\\ \textbf{hands}\ 61:22\ 70:23\\ 75:10\ 94:25\\ \textbf{happen}\ 79:14\ 96:18\\ \textbf{happened}\ 54:25\ 79:12\\ \textbf{happy}\ 73:11\ 77:19\\ \textbf{hard}\ 114:7\\ \textbf{having}\ 41:8\ 97:11\\ 107:4\ 114:11\ 115:1\\ \textbf{head}\ 2:19\ 39:13\ 46:3\\ 69:17\\ \textbf{hear}\ 21:4\ 24:11\ 52:24\\ 53:5\ 61:15\ 69:12\\ 71:8,16\ 72:22\ 73:11\\ 73:12,21\ 74:7\ 76:14\\ 76:18,24\ 78:9\ 93:24\\ 94:2\ 96:7\ 102:25\\ 105:6,19\\ \textbf{heard}\ 42:24\ 46:20\\ \end{array}$	56:9,11,25 hypothetically 82:21 92:8 IA 80:4,16 81:8 IBA 10:16 ICSID 3:9,10 7:6 10:8 13:17 108:16 113:14 idea 53:16 70:4 101:12 identified 9:14 21:23 33:23 35:23 96:3 identifies 67:7 identify 3:4 41:7 67:3 71:9 77:24 96:1 110:2 identifying 21:24 IDRC 1:5 IGNACIO 2:10 ii 3:22 51:21 52:20 55:3 iii 5:16 13:21 20:14	$\begin{array}{c} 17:3,12,17\ 73:4\\ 81:2,16\\ \textbf{independent}\ 18:25\\ 19:3\ 24:3\\ \textbf{independently}\ 12:1\\ \textbf{index}\ 45:16\\ \textbf{indicate}\ 5:1\ 13:1\\ \textbf{indicate}\ 5:1\ 13:1\\ \textbf{indicate}\ 81:15\\ \textbf{indicate}\ 81:15\\ \textbf{individual}\ 3:3\ 5:19\\ 63:5\\ \textbf{individual}\ 65:25\\ 66:8\\ \textbf{individuals}\ 5:13\\ \textbf{Industry}\ 86:3\\ \textbf{inevitably}\ 23:14\\ \textbf{inflation}\ 45:14,17,19\\ 47:23\ 54:15\ 64:11\\ 65:24\\ \textbf{inform}\ 86:8\ 87:7\\ \textbf{information}\ 19:22\\ 41:10\ 78:23\ 79:18\\ 80:2\ 84:14,18\ 85:8\\ \end{array}$	Interpreted 1:4 4:9 6:23 11:7 13:19 20:8,18 71:21,23 82:12 84:12,24 114:8 interpreter 3:2,3,3 interpreters 3:1 114:6 114:8 interrupting 25:25 interruption 26:2 46:7 introduce 93:19 94:16 110:16,19 111:14 introduced 58:23 95:9 110:16,18,20 111:11 introducing 76:15 invest 31:9 investment 1:2 30:9 30:25 investments 31:9 investments 31:9 investment 31:9	$\begin{array}{c} 15:15,15,19\ 16:3,5\\ 16:16\ 93:17\ 94:6,14\\ 104:8\\ \textbf{just}\ 2:11,16\ 3:1,8\ 7:2\\ 7:10,19\ 9:8,23\ 10:1\\ 16:20,22\ 17:5,7,14\\ 18:7\ 20:8\ 24:20,25\\ 25:2,11,18,21,22,24\\ 25:25\ 26:2\ 29:22\\ 30:1\ 32:4,11,12\\ 33:3,4,14\ 34:22\\ 35:14\ 37:18\ 39:5,21\\ 39:25\ 40:8\ 41:15,18\\ 42:15\ 46:10,11\ 48:2\\ 53:10,23\ 54:1\ 56:24\\ 57:15\ 58:15,21\ 59:9\\ 59:23\ 60:18\ 61:12\\ 61:17,19\ 65:13,13\\ 65:15\ 66:21\ 69:6,16\\ 71:12\ 73:18\ 74:14\\ 75:24\ 83:1,4,25\\ 84:5,19\ 85:8\ 87:11\\ 87:11\ 88:5,8\ 89:12\\ 94:4\ 97:2,9,12\ 98:2\\ \end{array}$
113:16 gone 87:15 GONZÁLEZ 2:14,16 71:23 good 1:3,11,18,21 20:23 33:7 41:17 53:16 54:2 59:18 62:10 69:10 87:12 97:23 100:21 109:21 111:22 112:10,20,24 113:2 113:3,11 114:14 Gosis 2:11 4:9,11,14 2:14,23 21:14,17 22:7 23:19 24:25 25:23 26:9,13 31:10 31:12 32:6,20 33:6 33:9,11 34:22 36:5 36:25 37:14,24 38:6 38:11,25 39:2,6,17 40:12,25 46:6 50:23 51:9,11 52:23 58:6 58:9 61:19 62:7,9	$\begin{array}{c} 101:25\\ \textbf{halfway}\ 52:14\\ \textbf{half-hour}\ 25:3,20\\ \textbf{hand}\ 4:18\\ \textbf{handed}\ 84:22\\ \textbf{handled}\ 113:19\\ \textbf{hands}\ 61:22\ 70:23\\ 75:10\ 94:25\\ \textbf{happen}\ 79:14\ 96:18\\ \textbf{happened}\ 54:25\ 79:12\\ \textbf{happy}\ 73:11\ 77:19\\ \textbf{hard}\ 114:7\\ \textbf{having}\ 41:8\ 97:11\\ 107:4\ 114:11\ 115:1\\ \textbf{head}\ 2:19\ 39:13\ 46:3\\ 69:17\\ \textbf{hear}\ 21:4\ 24:11\ 52:24\\ 53:5\ 61:15\ 69:12\\ 71:8,16\ 72:22\ 73:11\\ 73:12,21\ 74:7\ 76:14\\ 76:18,24\ 78:9\ 93:24\\ 94:2\ 96:7\ 102:25\\ 105:6,19\\ \textbf{heard}\ 42:24\ 46:20\\ 54:13\ 61:20,21\\ \end{array}$	56:9,11,25 hypothetically 82:21 92:8 IA 80:4,16 81:8 IBA 10:16 ICSID 3:9,10 7:6 10:8 13:17 108:16 113:14 idea 53:16 70:4 101:12 identified 9:14 21:23 33:23 35:23 96:3 identifies 67:7 identify 3:4 41:7 67:3 71:9 77:24 96:1 110:2 identifying 21:24 IDRC 1:5 IGNACIO 2:10 ii 3:2: 51:21 52:20 55:3 iii 5:16 13:21 20:14 52:20	$\begin{array}{c} 17:3,12,17\ 73:4\\ 81:2,16\\ \textbf{independent}\ 18:25\\ 19:3\ 24:3\\ \textbf{independently}\ 12:1\\ \textbf{index}\ 45:16\\ \textbf{indicate}\ 5:1\ 13:1\\ \textbf{indicate}\ 5:1\ 13:1\\ \textbf{indicated}\ 13:17\\ \textbf{indicate}\ 81:15\\ \textbf{individual}\ 3:3\ 5:19\\ 63:5\\ \textbf{individualy}\ 65:25\\ 66:8\\ \textbf{individualy}\ 5:13\\ \textbf{Industry}\ 86:3\\ \textbf{inevitably}\ 23:14\\ \textbf{inflation}\ 45:14,17,19\\ 47:23\ 54:15\ 64:11\\ 65:24\\ \textbf{inform}\ 86:8\ 87:7\\ \textbf{information}\ 19:22\\ 41:10\ 78:23\ 79:18\\ 80:2\ 84:14,18\ 85:8\\ 85:13\ 86:2,5,9,12\\ \end{array}$	Interpreted 1:4 4:9 6:23 11:7 13:19 20:8,18 71:21,23 82:12 84:12,24 114:8 interpreter 3:2,3,3 interpreters 3:1 114:6 114:8 interrupting 25:25 interruption 26:2 46:7 introduce 93:19 94:16 110:16,19 111:14 introduced 58:23 95:9 110:16,18,20 111:11 introducing 76:15 invest 31:9 investment 1:2 30:9 30:25 investments 31:9 investor-state 80:3,5 81:21 involved 4:21 12:4 80:4	$\begin{array}{c} 15:15,15,19\ 16:3,5\\ 16:16\ 93:17\ 94:6,14\\ 104:8\\ \textbf{just}\ 2:11,16\ 3:1,8\ 7:2\\ 7:10,19\ 9:8,23\ 10:1\\ 16:20,22\ 17:5,7,14\\ 18:7\ 20:8\ 24:20,25\\ 25:2,11,18,21,22,24\\ 25:25\ 26:2\ 29:22\\ 30:1\ 32:4,11,12\\ 33:3,4,14\ 34:22\\ 35:14\ 37:18\ 39:5,21\\ 39:25\ 40:8\ 41:15,18\\ 42:15\ 46:10,11\ 48:2\\ 53:10,23\ 54:1\ 56:24\\ 57:15\ 58:15,21\ 59:9\\ 59:23\ 60:18\ 61:12\\ 61:17,19\ 65:13,13\\ 65:15\ 66:21\ 69:6,16\\ 71:12\ 73:18\ 74:14\\ 75:24\ 83:1,4,25\\ 84:5,19\ 85:8\ 87:11\\ 87:11\ 88:5,8\ 89:12\\ 94:4\ 97:2,9,12\ 98:2\\ 99:5\ 102:2,17\\ \end{array}$
113:16 gone 87:15 GONZÁLEZ 2:14,16 71:23 good 1:3,11,18,21 20:23 33:7 41:17 53:16 54:2 59:18 62:10 69:10 87:12 97:23 100:21 109:21 111:22 112:10,20,24 113:2 113:3,11 114:14 Gosis 2:11 4:9,11,14 2:14,23 21:14,17 22:7 23:19 24:25 25:23 26:9,13 31:10 31:12 32:6,20 33:6 33:9,11 34:22 36:5 36:25 37:14,24 38:6 38:11,25 39:2,6,17 40:12,25 46:6 50:23 51:9,11 52:23 58:6	$\begin{array}{c} 101:25\\ \textbf{halfway}\ 52:14\\ \textbf{half-hour}\ 25:3,20\\ \textbf{hand}\ 4:18\\ \textbf{handed}\ 84:22\\ \textbf{handled}\ 113:19\\ \textbf{hands}\ 61:22\ 70:23\\ 75:10\ 94:25\\ \textbf{happen}\ 79:14\ 96:18\\ \textbf{happened}\ 54:25\ 79:12\\ \textbf{happy}\ 73:11\ 77:19\\ \textbf{hard}\ 114:7\\ \textbf{having}\ 41:8\ 97:11\\ 107:4\ 114:11\ 115:1\\ \textbf{head}\ 2:19\ 39:13\ 46:3\\ 69:17\\ \textbf{hear}\ 21:4\ 24:11\ 52:24\\ 53:5\ 61:15\ 69:12\\ 71:8,16\ 72:22\ 73:11\\ 73:12,21\ 74:7\ 76:14\\ 76:18,24\ 78:9\ 93:24\\ 94:2\ 96:7\ 102:25\\ 105:6,19\\ \textbf{heard}\ 42:24\ 46:20\\ \end{array}$	56:9,11,25 hypothetically 82:21 92:8 IA 80:4,16 81:8 IBA 10:16 ICSID 3:9,10 7:6 10:8 13:17 108:16 113:14 idea 53:16 70:4 101:12 identified 9:14 21:23 33:23 35:23 96:3 identifies 67:7 identify 3:4 41:7 67:3 71:9 77:24 96:1 110:2 identifying 21:24 IDRC 1:5 IGNACIO 2:10 ii 3:22 51:21 52:20 55:3 iii 5:16 13:21 20:14	$\begin{array}{c} 17:3,12,17\ 73:4\\ 81:2,16\\ \textbf{independent}\ 18:25\\ 19:3\ 24:3\\ \textbf{independently}\ 12:1\\ \textbf{index}\ 45:16\\ \textbf{indicate}\ 5:1\ 13:1\\ \textbf{indicate}\ 5:1\ 13:1\\ \textbf{indicate}\ 81:15\\ \textbf{indicate}\ 81:15\\ \textbf{individual}\ 3:3\ 5:19\\ 63:5\\ \textbf{individual}\ 65:25\\ 66:8\\ \textbf{individuals}\ 5:13\\ \textbf{Industry}\ 86:3\\ \textbf{inevitably}\ 23:14\\ \textbf{inflation}\ 45:14,17,19\\ 47:23\ 54:15\ 64:11\\ 65:24\\ \textbf{inform}\ 86:8\ 87:7\\ \textbf{information}\ 19:22\\ 41:10\ 78:23\ 79:18\\ 80:2\ 84:14,18\ 85:8\\ \end{array}$	Interpreted 1:4 4:9 6:23 11:7 13:19 20:8,18 71:21,23 82:12 84:12,24 114:8 interpreter 3:2,3,3 interpreters 3:1 114:6 114:8 interrupting 25:25 interruption 26:2 46:7 introduce 93:19 94:16 110:16,19 111:14 introduced 58:23 95:9 110:16,18,20 111:11 introducing 76:15 invest 31:9 investment 1:2 30:9 30:25 investments 31:9 investments 31:9 investment 31:9	$\begin{array}{c} 15:15,15,19\ 16:3,5\\ 16:16\ 93:17\ 94:6,14\\ 104:8\\ \textbf{just}\ 2:11,16\ 3:1,8\ 7:2\\ 7:10,19\ 9:8,23\ 10:1\\ 16:20,22\ 17:5,7,14\\ 18:7\ 20:8\ 24:20,25\\ 25:2,11,18,21,22,24\\ 25:25\ 26:2\ 29:22\\ 30:1\ 32:4,11,12\\ 33:3,4,14\ 34:22\\ 35:14\ 37:18\ 39:5,21\\ 39:25\ 40:8\ 41:15,18\\ 42:15\ 46:10,11\ 48:2\\ 53:10,23\ 54:1\ 56:24\\ 57:15\ 58:15,21\ 59:9\\ 59:23\ 60:18\ 61:12\\ 61:17,19\ 65:13,13\\ 65:15\ 66:21\ 69:6,16\\ 71:12\ 73:18\ 74:14\\ 75:24\ 83:1,4,25\\ 84:5,19\ 85:8\ 87:11\\ 87:11\ 88:5,8\ 89:12\\ 94:4\ 97:2,9,12\ 98:2\\ \end{array}$

Trevor McGowan

TECO Guatemala Holdings, LLC -v- Republic of Guatemala ICSID Case No. ARB/10/23

Friday. 29 July 2022

108:2151111.51.21 IRCROWSTI 1:21 IBIE 14.22.23 315 27:18 28:14.72.11 III 11:15.18.25 108:11 1:21 III 1:21 44:15 1:52 22:32 29:14.52.31:52 29:15.23 31:53 109:21.11:15.18.25 109:21 1:21 3:25 3:21 IIII 3:21 3:25 3:25 3:25 3:25 3:25 30:15 3:25 3:25 3:15.22.31:35 IIII 2:11:15.18.25 100:21 1:25 4:25 1:21 IIII 3:21 1:25 1:25 1:25 1:25 3:25 3:15 3:22.31:15 4:35 3:12.41 IIII 3:14 4:25 1:31 1:25 1:35 1:35 1:25 3:12.41 100:23 1:25 2:25 2:35 1:36 :24 3:35 1:26 2:27 1:25 2:25 2:35 1:36 :24 3:35 1:26 2:37 1:26 :35 1:26 1:21 1:36 3:35 1:24 1:36 1:37 1:36 1:						
justifishe 6:0 L 10:24 11:12;12:23 11:02.41 11:12:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:	108:7,15 111:1,5,12	KUROWSKI 1:21	like 1:4,22 2:21 3:15	27:18 28:1,4,7,21	matter 1:1 4:18 11:12	107:10 108:7 109:8
justifishe 6:0 L 10:24 11:12;12:23 11:02.41 11:12:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:			-		11:18 42:6 89:22	109:9,11,15,18,25
justife 656 inet 7:25 \$11 (10-4) 217.11 47207.5312 215.13 457.567.192.4 inst 6:47.55 7:192.4 inst 7:47.55 7:192.4 inst 7:47 7:135 7:192.4 inst 7:47 7:147 7:105 7		L				
justify 18:21 22:23 (73:11 189) 53:13 547:56:24 67:13 68:14.23 38:13 87:16 11:52 11:14.10,22 K Lane 16 61:15 65:12 09:10 05:82:35:14.22 05:82:35:14.22 38:13 177:187 187:4 Kazmmerk 21:11 Images 21:14 78:85:21 88:12 28:55:31:42 29:25:34:32:24 38:13 177:187 38:40:13 32:42:33:44,147 19:63:82:12 29:55:31:44 19:13 20:10.11; 10:33 38:40:13 28:37:64 38:40:13 28:37:64 38:40:13 28:37:64 38:40:13 28:37:64 38:40:13 28:37:64 38:40:13 28:37:64 38:40:13 28:37:64 38:40:13 38:40:13 28:37:64 38:40:13	3		-	<i>'</i>	,	
jnctapong (h):0 it:0 57:3:58:39:24.4 losses 23:1.4 24:3 may 4:23:516 6.27 15:4 K Lack 6:10 69:12 70:15 72:15 28:57.00:22:5 29:3 13:17:187.7 13:17:187.7 13:17:187.7 3:24:47:23:451.61.0 19:0 28:12 67:20 92:18 08:11.9 29:35.81:19 21:3 22:11 46.6 13:13 17:187.7 13:17:187.7<			-	-		
Image Insteps (1) Insteps (2) Insteps (2) <thinsteps (2)<="" th=""> <thinsteps (2)<="" th=""> <thin< td=""><td>• •</td><td></td><td></td><td>-</td><td></td><td></td></thin<></thinsteps></thinsteps>	• •			-		
K Immer 16 69:12 70:15 72:15 28:7,20:22:25 29:3 13:13 177 18.7 mentoned 26:35:20 35:24 34:7,34 21:35 53:124 19:0 28:12 67:20 29:5,84 31:19 29:13 35:5 51:24 38:41:13 177 18.7 35:24 34:7,34 21:35 53:20 38:84 10:14 34:25 98:13 55:51:24 98:13 83:25 19:14 88:17 18:7 13:35 51:14 88:17 18:7 13:35:51:14 88:17 18:7 13:35:51:14 88:17 18:7 13:35:51:14 88:17 18:7 13:35:51:14 88:17 18:7 99:25	Juxtaposing 10.10	-		-		
Karemarck 2:1:11 Impunge 4:11 4:2 78.6 82:12 83:12 29:5.8,14 3:19 19:13 20:10.13,17 38.8 40:13 32423 314,44 518,20 36.9,7.19,37.14 19:6.3 20:10.13,17 38.8 40:13 38.8 40:13 44:12 44:15 122 54.8 63:23 54:16,25 58.17 322.13 51:14 59:2 63.57,114 59:2 63.57,114 59:2 63.57,114 59:2 63.57,114 59:2 63.57,114 59:2 63.57,114 59:2 63.57,114 59:2 63.57,114 59:2 63.57,114 59:2 63.57,114 59:2 63.57,114 59:2 63.57,114 59:2 63.57,114 59:2 63.57,114 59:2 63.57,114 59:2 63.57,114 59:2 63.57,114 method 289 29:16 59:2 63.57,114 59:2 63.57,114 59:2 63.57,114 59:2 63.57,114 59:2 63.57,114 59:2 63.57,114 59:2 63.57,114 59:2 63.57,114 59:2 63.57,114 59:2 63.57,114 59:2 63.57,114 59:2 63.57,114 59:2 63.57,114 59:2 63.57,114 59:2 79:19,215 59:2 79:19,215 59:2 79:19,215 59:2 79:19,215 59:2 79:19,215 59:2 79:19,215 59:2 79:19,215 59:2 79:19,215 59:2 79:19,215 59:2 79:19,215 59:2 79:19,215 59:2 79:19,215 59:2 79:19,215 59:2 79:19,215 59:2 79:19,215 <				-		
2422 318;14;17 19:0:58:12 0:20 92:18 93:18 95:11 32:1 35:3 1:24 21:3 23:1 46:64 MERCEDES 1:21 33:23 43:7.24 3:25 33:23 43:7.24 3:25 33:25 3:55.24 92:18 93:18 95:11 32:1 35:3 1:24 91:3 23:1 46:61 92:18 93:18 95:11 34:14 45:18 0:23 38:14 10:13 42:25 5:37 98:23 91:26 10:51 91:16 10:18 10:38 10:84 10:22 10:18 10:38 10:14 10:22 10:18 10:38 10:14 10:22 10:12 0:15 0:11 10:18 10:18 10:12 10:12 10:18 10:18 10:12 10:12 10:18 10:18 10:18 10:12 10:18 10:18 10:12 10:12 10:18 10:18 10:18 10:12 10:18 10:18 10:12 10:18 10:18 10:12 10:18 10:18 10:12 10:18 10:18 10:12 10:18 10:18 10:12 10:18 10:18 10:12 10:18 10:18 10:12 10:18 10:18 10:12 10:18 10:18 10:12 10:18 10:18 10:12 10:18 10:18 10:12 10:18 10:18 10:12 10:18 10:18 10:12 10:18 10:18 10:18 10:12 10:18 10:18 10:18 10:12 10:18 10:18 10:18 10:12 10:18 10:18 10:18 10:12 10:18 10:18 10:18 10:18 10:18 10:18 10:18 1						
332.43(2) 332.5 952.5 974 (982.9) 951.7 952.6 35.7 114 merely 92.5 431.44 511.82 381.1 401.3 43.25 101.81 103.8 10.44 101.25 16.5 19.16 962.0 97.19.01 962.0 97.19.10 962.0 97.10 962.0 97.10 962.0 97.10 97.12 97.2 81.10 97.12 97.2 81.10 97.12 97.2 81.10 97.12 97.1	Kaczmarek 21:11					
366,07,199,37,14 Bars 811,23,345,35,46 982,312,399,5 101,810,38,1044 101,810,38,1044 101,810,38,1044 101,810,38,1044 101,810,38,1044 101,810,38,1044 101,22,102,22,4 101,22,102,22,4 101,22,102,22,4 101,22,102,22,4 101,22,102,22,4 101,22,102,22,4 101,22,102,22,4 101,22,102,24 101,22,102,24 101,22,102,24 101,22,102,24 101,22,102,24 101,22,102,24 101,22,102,24 101,22,102,24 101,22,102,24 101,22,102,24 101,22,102,24 101,22,102,24 101,22,102,24 101,22,102,24 101,22,102,24 101,22,102,24 101,21,022,24 101,21,022,24 101,21,022,24 101,21,022,24 101,21,022,24 101,21,022,24 101,21,022,24 101,21,022,24 101,21,022,24 101,21,022,24 101,21,022,24 101,21,022,24 101,21,022,24 101,21,022,24 101,21,022,24 101,21,022,24 101,21,022,24 101,21,022,24 101,21,22,24,12,13,24 101,21,22,24,12,13,24 101,21,22,24,12,13,24 101,21,22,24,12,13,24 101,21,22,24,12,13,24 101,21,22,24,12,13,24 101,21,22,24,12,14,12,	24:23 31:4,14,17					
43:14 4218.20 38:11 40:13 42:25 101:18 1028 1044 101:1023 16:51 91:0 96:20 97:10131 method 38:15 52:2 55:11 56:24 65:42 27 12: 75:20 10558,19:22.32 100:33 10:22 42:8 44: 29:315 40:20 46:15 6:16:66:11 70:25 71: 98:15 59:25 10:16: 10: 10: 10: 10: 10: 10: 10: 10: 10: 10					-	
	36:9,17,19 37:14	last 8:11,23 34:5 35:6	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
$\begin{array}{c} 522 5511 56.24 \\ 6420 8520 8820 88.12 \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$	43:14 45:18,20	38:11 40:13 43:25				
64:62 08:30 89:812 91:16 Inter: 14:12:40:14:617 11:16 108:12:321:01:4 11:16 108:94:13 98:17 11:61 651:66:10.70:10 70:25:719:82:15 100:22:19:15:80 100:22:19:15:80 100:22:19:15:80 100:22:19:15:80 100:22:19:15:80 100:22:19:15:80 100:22:19:15:80 100:22:19:15:80 100:19:10:10:10:10 100:19:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:	46:12 48:1 51:22	54:8 63:23 64:16,25				
sps23 pii 26, 10, 13 33:24 110:24 11:14 11:221 Lowe 64:5 702:57 19:215 57:25 28:18 Marcmarks 25:10 11:14 11:221 Luke f 8:8 LULIAN 21:9 method 28:02 29:16 20:22 31:16 39:67. 33:25 36:13.18:1 latter 4:12 mitted 9:88 99:14 LUISA 2:22 McGowan 1:23 method 28:02 29:16 33:25 36:14:12:0 p3:17 94:6 limited 9:88 99:14 21:14 32:11 37:1 18:18 25:12 8:13 66:10,10 67:17.19 Karka 2:24 7:26 LAWRENCE 1:13 limited 9:88 99:14 21:14 32:11 37:1 99:12 10:12 10:24 77:17 37:27 9:2 83:14 93:27 94:15 66:10,10 67:17.19 95:29 91:10:10:21 95:19 10:21 10:24 95:19 10:21 10:24 71:77 37:27 9:2 83:14 93:27 94:15 10:31 91 00:19 95:29 91:10:10:10:44 95:19 25:13 10:10:21 00:24 95:19 10:21 10:21 10:24 11:11:125 10:31 91 00:19 95:29 91:10:10:11 10:31 91 00:19 95:19 12:12 30:12:10:10:12 10:31 91 00:19 95:19 12:12 30:12:10:10:12 10:31 91 00:19 95:19 12:12 30:12:10:10:11 10:10:11 4:12:10:10:11 10:10:11 4:12:10:10:11 10:10:11 4:12:11:10:10:10:10:11 10:11:11:10:11:10:10:11 10:11:11:10:11:10:10:10:11 10:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:1	52:2 55:11 56:24	65:4,22 71:2 75:20	106:5,21 107:15	101:3 102:2	40:20 60:15 65:13	
space space <tp< td=""><td>64:20 88:20 89:8,12</td><td>later 14:12 40:1 45:17</td><td>108:1,25 110:14</td><td>lots 94:13 98:17</td><td>65:16 66:11 70:10</td><td>methodology 56:22</td></tp<>	64:20 88:20 89:8,12	later 14:12 40:1 45:17	108:1,25 110:14	lots 94:13 98:17	65:16 66:11 70:10	methodology 56:22
91:6 111:14 likely 6:8 lower 47:13.15 LiCKN 2:22 methods 28:9 29:16 31:25 32:13.18.21 latter 41:12 linit 83:10 174 98:1 WEX 2:23 mean 15:25 16:1 mean 15:25 16:1 mean 15:25 16:1 mean 15:25 16:1 might 16:15 23:22:23 35:26 34:31 23:55 linit 20 98:20 linit 20 98:22 madm 2:4 14:24:17:1 36:36:23 47:15 66:10.10 67:17,19 Kartha 2:24 72:6 LAWRENCE 11:3 linit 20 98:22 linit 25:10:17 mean 15:25 16:1 mean 15:23 12:2:47:02 71:73:27 92:2 83:18:32:10:12:10 67:12:14 72:11 37:1 79:12 10:12:10 67:12:14 70:22 11:47:12 71:73:27 79:2 83:18:10:12 mean 15:10:10:17:10 67:12:14 70:22 11:47:12 87:16 52:19:22 32:22:10 87:16 52:19:22 32:22:10 87:16 52:19:22:32:22:10 87:16 52:19:22:32:22:10 87:16 52:19:22:32:23:10:13:32:10:16:11 mean 30:23 mean 30:23 mean 30:23 mean 30:23 16:16 14:10:20 16:12:14:22:15:10:10 16:14:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:	-		111:6 112:21	Lowe 64:5	70:25 71:9 82:15	57:2 58:18
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			likely 6:8	lower 47:13,15	105:20,22	methods 28:9 29:16
matrix inter inter <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>LILIAN 2:19</td><td>LUISA 2:22</td><td>McGowan 1:23</td><td>29:21 31:16 39:6,7</td></t<>			LILIAN 2:19	LUISA 2:22	McGowan 1:23	29:21 31:16 39:6,7
33:56:34:312:35:5 Inv: 107:15 11:11:21 Performance of the performance						
352:34:6:14:50:18 11:22:15:41:13:6.4 10:41:107:7108:5 M.2.4 M.2.4 M.2.4 6:10:10:67:17:19 Karba 22:47:26 LAWRENCE 1:13 Imitation 98:22 Imitation 98:22 Imitation 98:22 11:13:17:19 9:12:13:12:15:17:81:0 9:23:11:15:17:81:0 9:23:11:10:22 11:13:14:92:57:92:27:14:37:12:92:27:14:37:12 9:13:10:12:10:24 9:13:10:12:10:24 11:13:10:62:10:71:10:31:10:32:14:37:12:92:12:10:12:4 9:13:10:12:10:24 9:13:10:12:10:24 9:13:10:12:10:24 9:13:10:12:10:24 9:13:10:12:10:24 9:13:10:12:10:24 9:13:10:12:10:24 9:13:10:12:10:24 9:10:10:10:12:12:10:12 11:13:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:				M		
Sis: 8 822 Sis: 8 823 Sis: 8						0
Kurin 2:24 47:6 LAWRENCE 1:13 Initiatel 98:8 99:14 21:14 32:11 37:11 91:10:12 10:24 71:27 32 79:2 KASS 2:15 Kand 2:31:4 33:25 Kass 2:15 Kass 2:15 71:12 10:24 71:12 10:24 71:12 10:24 Kartine Exits Jean 7:325 74:20 Jinited 98:8 99:14 Jinited 98:8 99:14 Jinited 98:16 10:12 Jinited 98:12						
International state International state Inc. 1 (2) Inc. 1 (2) <thinc. (2)<="" 1="" th=""></thinc.>						
KATTHENDE kerpLink learn 112:2limits 17:1971:24 73:15 16:17103:19 106:1995:29:11 03:11kerp80:51 11:19learn 173:25 74:20lime 15:12 34:17 44:1lime 15:12 34:17 44:1lime 15:12 34:17 44:1lime 35:12 35:12 34:17 44:1lime 35:12 35:12 34:17 44:14 45:2046:2 35:7 57:2253:19 74:18 65:5limking 89:19lima 36:41:11:4lime 35:12 60:12measures 37:7 47:11minimu 106:2011:3limk 11:13lime 11:13lime 11:13lime 11:13lime 11:12 52:22 8:65minimu 106:2011:3limk 11:13lime 11:13lime 11:13lime 11:13lime 11:12 32:22 4:2211:3limk 11:13lime 11:13lime 11:13lime 11:12 3:22 4:2511:3limk 11:13lime 11:13lime 11:13lime 11:12 3:22 4:2511:13limk 11:13lime 11:13lime 11:13lime 11:12 2:22 1:1311:13limk 11:14lime 11:15members 2:14:44:12liminu 86:38:7611:13limk 11:15lime 11:15lime 11:12lime 11:1511:14:12limk 11:12limk 11:15limk 11:1511:14:12limk 11:12limk 11:15limk 11:1511:14:12limk 11:12limk 11:15						
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$						· ·
		-				
Image 12, 15, 15, 16 Image 12, 15, 15, 16 Image 13, 15, 15, 16 Image 14, 16, 16, 11, 14, 11, 15, 15 Image 14, 16, 16, 16, 16, 16, 16, 16, 16, 16, 16					8	
	-		-			· · ·
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		·				
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $						
Diss 0:10 10:10 Disk 11:19 5:3 Lise 11:24 Disk 11:9 88:10 89:4.20 measures 37:7 47:11 MINE 30:19 KIT 2:5 95:7.20,21 96:24 litter 71:13 91:18 niminum 106:20 niminum 106:20 Rewer 71:18 77:25 19:23 10:02,12 litter 71:13 91:18 niminum 106:20 niminum 106:20 80:25 83:15,24 878 111:13 litter 71:13 91:18 niminum 106:20 media 86:3 87:6 media 86:3 87:6 Minister 22:2,22 know 12:19 13:20,25 legal 5:20 8:19 71:7 LLP 2:3,4,4,5,5,6,6.10 maintaine 3:19 memory 64:74:3 minute 36:3 38:9 51:8 22:3 26:11 33:12 90:11,11 (29:26:7 2:14,14,15,15 make 3:24 61:7:2 memory 64:74:3 minute 36:3 38:9 51:8 40:17,18 41:66 92:11 93:19 94:9,16 long 3:16 10:17 12:6 36:3 37:15 38:21 minute 36:3 38:9 51:8 minute 36:3 38:9 51:8 68:19,21 69:21 long 3:16 10:17 12:6 36:3 37:15 38:21 memory 64:74:3 minute 36:3 38:9 51:8 74:21 87:13 76:7 long 3:16 10:17 12:6 36:3 37:15 38:21 s2:11 37:5 minute 36:3 38:22 8:19 8:10:11:10:12 long 3:16 10:17 12:6 36:3 37:15 38:32 minut						
K112:5 Knew C12:15						
Inter Display 10:21, 22 Inter The Triageneration of triageneratina of triageneration of triageneratina of triageneration of tria		leave 25:24 31:11 95:3				
Bits of this 11:11:12 Bits of this 5:4111:15 media 86:3 87:6 Ministry 2:23,24,25 91:25 left 36:17 69:14 LLP 2:3,44,5,5,5,6,10 ministry 2:21 memorial 83:23 minor 106:1 147, 8,9,20 21:10 73:17 76:6 83:11 2:11,11,12,2:6,7 local 45:19 liaitaine 45:22:11 memorial 83:23 minor 106:1 42:23,3,517,432.6 94:24 95:4,9,13,20 local 45:19 lia:11 14:25 18:13 memorial 83:23 minute 36:3 87:6 minute 3		95:7,20,21 96:24				
Bits Bits <th< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<>						
know 12:19 13:20,25 legal 5:20 8:19 71:17 LLP 2:3,4,4,5,5,6,6,10 maintained 5:22 107:21 minor 106:1 14:7,8,9,20 21:10 73:17 76:6 83:11 2:11,11,12,12,13,13 majoriti 2:21 majoriti 2:21 minor 106:1 22:3 26:11 33:12 90:1,11,12 92:6,7 2:14,14,15,15 make 3:24 6:17:2 memory 46:474:3 minute 36:3 38:9 51:8 41:2,16,18 1:19,20 96:12,16 97:1 logic 103:21 18:25 19:1 25:3 4:12,16,18 1:19,20 53:23 70:7,11,15,24 58:3,6 61:6 64:19 106:24 107:2,12 long 3:16 10:17 12:6 36:3 37:15 38:9 7:2 10:6,24 15:24 Misen 10:9 90:21 72:17 73:18,18,25 111:16 11:2:1 111:51 95:12 90:23 97:3 37:12 39:10,14,20 mistake 52: 74:2,18 75:13 76:7 length 4:21 98:1 71:21 101:3 106:19 69:13 90:18 93:22 25:11,17 32:11 37:5 Mistake 33:22 76:11 77:28 22:19 less 71:1 103:14 longet 94:13,15 99:24 102:3 10:32:5 mistake 75:2 mistake 75:2 90:10 91:3 96:9,21 37:5,12 56:12,14 101:1,11 4:10,18 111:25,10,13 49:16,24 50:2,7,11 33:2,5 4:120 42:25 101:15 13:17 93:2	80:25 83:15,24 87:8			main 5:4 111:15		
RithRithRith2:11,11,12,12,13,13malignitymemorial83:23minus83:22minus83:22minus83:22minus83:22minus83:22minus83:22minus83:22minus83:22minus83:22minus83:22minus83:23minus83:23minus83:23minus83:23minus83:23minus83:23minus83:23minus83:23minus83:23minus83:2551:8minus83:2551:8minus83:2551:8minus83:2551:8minus83:2551:8minus83:2551:8minus83:2551:8minus83:2551:8minus83:2551:8minus83:2551:8minus83:2551:8minus83:2551:8minus83:2551:8minus83:2551:8minus83:2551:8minus83:2551:8minus83:2551:8minus83:2551:111:111:211:1 <td>91:25</td> <td>left 36:17 69:14</td> <td></td> <td>maintain 28:19</td> <td></td> <td></td>	91:25	left 36:17 69:14		maintain 28:19		
12:3: 26: 11 3:10 11:11 12: 92:6,7 2:14,14,15,15 make 3:24 6:17:2 memory 46:4 74:3 minute 36:3 38:9 51:8 40:17,18 41:6,6 92:11 93:19 94:9,16 10:21 13:11 14:25 18:13 Menaker 2:3 4:6.10 minute 36:3 38:9 51:8 42:2,3,5,17 43:2,6 94:24 95:4,9,13,20 96:12,16 97:1 10:321 18:55 19:1 25:3 41:21,618 11:9,20 53:23 70:7,11,15,24 58:3,6 61:6 64:19 106:24 107:2,12 10:9,214 11:3,14 16:9 24:16 40:1 16:9 24:16 40:1 16:9 24:16 40:1 16:9 24:16 40:1 16:9 24:16 40:1 16:9 24:16 40:1 16:9 24:16 40:1 16:9 24:16 40:1 16:9 24:16 40:1 16:9 22:2 71:10 72:10 Mistake 5:2 mistakes 86:6 91:22 74:2,18 75:13 76:7 length 41:21 98:1 71:21 101:3 106:19 69:13 90:18 93:22 25:11,17 32:11 37:5 Mistakes 33:22 mistaker 86:6 91:22 76:18 18,19,19,20 107:12 longest 94:13,15 99:24 10:2:3 10:3:23 39:21 40:4,8 41:12 77:20 76:21 77:25 82:19 37:5,12 56:12,14 longest 94:13,15 99:24 10:2:3 10:2:5 53:10,15 54:6,7,10 50:19 55:17 59:22 60:1 90:10 91:3 96:9,21 37:5,12 56:12,14 10:11 14:14:10:4:19 10:11:14:14:10:1 11:12:106:12 <	know 12:19 13:20,25	legal 5:20 8:19 71:17		maintained 56:22		
Link Link Disk Link Disk Link Disk Link Disk Link Menaker 2:3 4:6.10 minutes 25:25 53:14 40:17,18 41:6,6 92:11 93:19 94:9,16 logit 103:21 13:11 14:25 18:13 4:12,16,18 1:19,20 53:23 70:7,11,15,24 43:12 44:12 56:13 96:12,16 97:1 log 3:16 10:17 12:6 log 3:16 10:17 12:6 27:59 29:11 32:17 72:41.63 4:16:62 71:10 72:10 68:19,21 69:21 110:19,24 111:3,14 16:9 24:16 40:1 41:1 42:19 55:16,24 15:25 17:7 18:17,19 mistake 5:2 76:18,18,19,19,20 107:12 115:1 96:13 90:18 93:22 23:11,17 32:11 32:1 77:20 mistake 33:22 76:14,14 58 7:8 11:17 69:27 37:19 15:18,19,20 104:12 106:5.23 11:18 4:25 4:62 model 32:12,17,18 90:10 91:3 96:9,21 37:5,12 56:12,14 10:11,11 14:10,18 111:2,5,10,13 49:16,24 50:2,7,11 33:2,5 41:20 42:25 101:14 104:19 61:17 69:22 73:19 15:18,19,20 19:24 24:18 32:21 model 32:12,17,18 108:23,25 110:2,10 79:15 91:6,6,23 37:2,10 41:14 43:16 111:2,5,10,13 49:16,24 50:2,7,11 33:2,5 41:20 42:25 1010:1	14:7,8,9,20 21:10	73:17 76:6 83:11		majority 2:21		
411,13,17,13,21,17,432,6 94:24,95:4,9,13,20 logic 103:21 18:25 19:12 25:3 4:12,16,18 1:19,20 53:23 70:7,11,15,24 43:12 44:12 56:13 96:12,16 97:1 longic 103:21 18:25 19:12 25:3 2:4,15 3:14 4:1 6:24 71:10 72:10 58:3,6 61:6 64:19 106:24 107:2,12 logic 103:21 logic 103:21 18:25 19:12 25:3 2:4,15 3:14 4:16 224 71:10 72:10 76:18,18,19,167 length 41:21 98:1 11:16 112:1 41:13 60:19 66:20 63:10,13 68:11,18 18:25 19:6 24:20 mistake 5:2 mistake 5:2 76:18,18,19,19,20 107:12 longest 94:13,15 99:24 102:3 103:25 37:12 39:10,14,20 mistake 86:6 91:22 101:14 104:19 61:17 69:22 73:19 loss 5:6,81,6 6:20 104:12 106:5,23 41:18 4:25 4:6:22 model 32:12,17,18 101:14 104:19 61:17 69:22 73:19 19:24 24:18 32:21 19:24 24:18 32:21 19:24 24:18 32:21 10:11,11 14:10,18 11:22,10:13 49:16,24 50:2,7,11 33:2,5 41:20 42:25 100:12,11 104:104 108:12 113:16 13:19,42 0:61:1 makes 37:16 43:7 53:10,15 54:67,10 50:19 55:17 59:22 06:1 101:14 104:19 61:17 69:22 73:19 10:21 21:10:14 144:16 11:12,11 44:16 11:12,	22:3 26:11 33:12			make 3:24 6:1 7:2		
Harton 10 Point 10 London 1:6 Infinition 11 Point 16	40:17,18 41:6,6	92:11 93:19 94:9,16		13:11 14:25 18:13		
38:3.6 61:6 64:19 106:24 107:2,12 long 3:16 10:17 12:6 36:3 37:15 38:9 7:2 10:6,24 15:24 Misen 10:9 90:21 68:19,21 69:21 110:19,24 111:3,14 110:19,24 111:3,14 11:6 12:1 16:9 24:16 40:1 41:1 42:19 55:16,24 15:25 17:7 18:17,19 mistake 5:2 74:2,18 75:13 76:7 length 1:21 98:1 71:21 101:3 106:19 63:10,13 68:11,18 18:23 19:6 24:20 mistake 86:6 91:22 76:18,18,19,19,20 107:12 115:1 95:22 96:23 97:3 37:12 39:10,14.20 mistake 86:6 91:22 76:21 77:25 82:19 less 71:1 103:14 longest 94:13,15 99:24 102:3 103:25 39:21 40:4,8 41:12 77:20 90:10 91:3 96:9,21 37:5,12 56:12,14 10:11,11 14:10,18 111:2,5,10,13 49:16,24 50:2,7,11 33:2,5 41:20 42:25 100:15 13:17 93:24 94:2 97:24 37:2,10 41:14 43:16 111:2,5,10,13 49:16,24 50:2,7,11 33:2,5 41:20 42:25 100:15 13:17 93:24 92:97:24 37:2,10 41:14 43:16 101:2,1 10:16 101:2,1 10:16 102:15 56:3,1,18,20 57:9 60:1 71:21,51,81 78:4,19 71:20 60:14 89:10 90:8,14,14 107:1 70:21,2 73:15 models 25:17 57:11,14,17,20 models 25:17 57:21,59:2,5	42:2,3,5,17 43:2,6	94:24 95:4,9,13,20	8	18:25 19:1 25:3		
36:30:01 69:21 10:12:19:24:11:3:14 16:9 24:16 40:1 41:13:19:35:16;24 15:25 17:7 18:17,19 mistake 5:2 72:17 73:18,18,25 111:16 112:1 41:13:00:19 66:20 63:10,13 68:11,18 18:23 19:6 24:20 mistake 86:6 91:22 74:2,18 75:13 76:7 length 41:21 98:1 71:21 101:3 106:19 69:13 90:18 93:22 37:12 39:10,14,20 mistake 33:22 mistake 5:2 mistake 5:2 mistake 33:22 mistake 33:22 mistake 5:2 mistake 5:2 mistake 5:2 mistake 33:22 mistake 33:22 mistake 5:2 mistake	43:12 44:12 56:13	96:12,16 97:1		27:5,9 29:11 32:17		
301.11.101.111141:13 60:19 66:2041:13 60:19 66:2041:13 60:19 66:2041:13 10:13 68:11,1818:23 19:6 24:20mistaken 86:6 91:2274:2,18 75:13 76:7length 41:21 98:171:21 101:3 106:1995:22 96:23 97:337:12 39:10,14,2037:51 23:10,14,2076:21 77:25 82:19less 71:1 103:14longest 94:13,1599:24 102:3 103:2539:21 40:4,8 41:1277:2090:10 91:3 96:9,2137:5,12 56:12,14lott1,11 14:10,18111:2,5,10,1349:16,24 50:2,7,1133:2,5 41:20 42:25101:14 104:1961:17 69:22 73:1919:24 24:18 32:2137:2,10 41:14 43:16111:2,5,10,1349:16,24 50:2,7,1133:2,5 41:20 42:25101:14 104:1979:15 89:15 91:6,2319:24 24:18 32:2137:2,10 41:14 43:16111:2,5,10,1349:16,24 50:2,7,1150:19 55:17 59:22100:12,21 113:1619:24 24:18 32:2137:2,10 41:14 43:16110:2357:11,14,17,2050:19 55:17 59:22knowledge 6:2 14:16108:12 113:1657:21 58:20 65:1636:12 62:13 79:1659:20 60:3 61:1270:21,22 73:1577:12,15,18 78:4,1978:9 83:21,2591:6,9 94:22making 2:9 33:1858:15,21 59:2,15,1759:10 00:8,14,1477:12,15,18 78:4,19100:12,22 102:11looked 3:1 12:2547:12 60:742:9,9 80:2279:15,20,22 83:4,880:11,17 81:17 82:6Lexecon 31:2539:10,0114 40:16 44:9MARIO 2:2091:18 92:5,15 93:1380:11,17 81:17 82:6liberty 103:24 104:207:16 67:16 87:18 92:1077:22 00:11 10:5,780:21,25 81:24liberty 103:24 104:206:16 67:16 87:18 92:1077:22 09:19<	58:3,6 61:6 64:19	106:24 107:2,12	long 3:16 10:17 12:6	36:3 37:15 38:9	7:2 10:6,24 15:24	Misen 10:9 90:21
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	68:19,21 69:21			41:1 42:19 55:16,24		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				-		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $, ,		71:21 101:3 106:19			
76:21 77:25 82:19 83:5,6,7,14,15 87:8 90:10 91:3 96:9,21less 71:1 103:14 108:23,25 110:2,10longest 94:13,15 100k 5:6,8,16 6:20 101:11,11 14:10,1899:24 102:3 103:25 104:12 106:5,2339:21 40:4,8 41:12 41:18 45:25 46:22 41:18 45:25 46:22 49:16,24 50:2,7,1177:20 model 32:12,17,18 33:2,5 41:20 42:25101:14 104:19 108:23,25 110:2,1061:17 69:22 73:19 93:24 94:2 97:2410:11,11 14:10,18 115:18,19,20 16:11 93:24 94:2 97:2410:11,11 44:10,18 15:18,19,20 16:11 93:24 94:2 97:2410:11,11 44:10,18 110:2349:16,24 50:2,7,11 56:3,12,18,20 57:933:2,5 41:20 42:25 50:19 55:17 59:22 60:1knowledge 6:2 14:16 72:4 73:1,1 74:20108:12 113:16 108:12 113:1643:19 47:2 55:20,21 43:19 47:2 55:20,21 19:24 24:18 32:21 37:2,10 41:14 43:16making 2:9 33:18 36:12 62:13 79:1658:15,21 59:2,15,17 59:20 60:3 61:12 model 82:5model 82:2 60:176:5,13,16 77:3,6 76:5,13,16 77:3,672:10 76:11,11,24 78:22 79:17 80:1,878:9 83:21,25 100:12,22 102:1191:6,9 94:22 47:12 60:7 47:12 60:7 47:12 60:7 47:12 60:7 42:9,9 80:22making 2:9 33:18 39:10,11 40:16 44:9 		8	115:1		37:12 39:10,14,20	misunderstanding
Name			longest 94:13,15		39:21 40:4,8 41:12	
90:10 91:3 96:9,2137:5,12 56:12,1410:11,11 14:10,18111:2,5,10,1349:16,24 50:2,7,1133:2,5 41:20 42:25101:14 104:1961:17 69:22 73:1919:24 24:18 32:2191:18 102:1553:10,15 54:6,7,1050:19 55:17 59:22108:23,25 110:2,1079:15 89:15 91:6,2319:24 24:18 32:2191:18 102:1555:3,12,18,20 57:960:1110:15 113:1793:24 94:2 97:2437:2,10 41:14 43:16110:2357:11,14,17,20models 22:2knowledge 6: 21 4:16108:12 113:1643:19 47:2 55:20,2110:2358:15,21 59:2,15,17models 22:272:4 73:1,1 74:2012'' 55:21 75:23 60:1457:21 58:20 65:1636:12 62:13 79:1659:20 60:3 61:12modelfiel 8:572:4 73:1,1 74:2072:10 76:11,11,2491:6,9 94:22maifest 81:174:11,17 75:17111:1078:22 79:17 80:1,8100:12,22 10:11looked 3:1 12:25maifest 81:174:11,17 75:17111:1078:22 79:17 80:1,8100:12,22 10:211looked 3:1 12:25maifest 81:174:11,17 75:17111:1088:25 89:24 113:20Lexecon 31:25looking 7:11,22 19:18MARIA 2:2284:19 88:10 89:3monetary 52:16,1888:25 89:24 113:20Lexecon's 33:2139:10,11 40:16 44:9MARIO 2:2091:18 92:5,15 93:13months 71:25 103:1780:21,25 81:24liberty 103:24 104:267:16 87:18 92:1027:6 29:1993:14 94:4 97:2,9110:9,980:21,25 81:24liberty 103:24 104:2looks 44:18material 18:15,2298:24 101:8 102:13moths 71:25 103:1780:12 625liberty 103:24 104:2 <td></td> <td></td> <td>look 5:6,8,16 6:20</td> <td></td> <td>41:18 45:25 46:22</td> <td>model 32:12,17,18</td>			look 5:6,8,16 6:20		41:18 45:25 46:22	model 32:12,17,18
Join J 104 104:19Join 2022 73:1915:18,19,20 16:11Integrining108:23,25 110:2,1079:15 89:15 91:6,2319:24 24:18 32:2191:18 102:1553:10,15 54:6,7,1050:19 55:17 59:22100:15 113:1793:24 94:2 97:2437:2,10 41:14 43:16110:2357:11,14,17,20models 22:2knowledge 6:2 14:16108:12 113:1643:19 47:2 55:20,21making 2:9 33:1858:15,21 59:2,15,17models 22:272:4 73:1,1 74:20let's 52:17 57:23 60:1457:21 58:20 65:1636:12 62:13 79:1659:20 60:3 61:12MODOS 2:676:5,13,16 77:3,672:10 76:11,11,2489:10 90:8,14,14107:170:21,22 73:15models 29:577:12,15,18 78:4,1978:9 83:21,2591:6,9 94:22mainfest 81:174:11,17 75:17111:1078:22 79:17 80:1,8100:12,22 102:11looked 3:1 12:25mainfest 81:176:24 77:1 78:16,17Monday 106:8,980:11,17 81:17 82:6level 33:12 70:1947:12 60:742:9,9 80:2279:15,20,22 83:4,8monetary 52:16,1882:24,24 83:12Lexecon 31:25looking 7:11,22 19:18MARIA 2:2291:18 92:5,15 93:13month 109:25 110:5,780:21,25 81:24liberty 103:24 104:267:16 87:18 92:1027:6 29:1997:15,20 92:6,14,19month 109:25 103:1780:21,25 81:24liberty 103:24 104:2loos 22:20,22,24 23:4market 23:21 24:198:24 101:8 102:13morte 1:11,13 11:683:14 91:20 92:1life 48:21loos 22:20,22,24 23:4material 18:15,22102:14 104:7,11,1313:15 20:7,23 23:233:10light 25:21 67:16 85:3 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>49:16,24 50:2,7,11</td><td>33:2,5 41:20 42:25</td></t<>					49:16,24 50:2,7,11	33:2,5 41:20 42:25
108:12 10:14108:12 10:15108:12 10:1519:24 24:18 32:2119:18 102:1556:3,12,18,20 57:960:1108:12 113:1793:24 94:2 97:2437:2,10 41:14 43:16110:2357:11,14,17,20models 22:2knowledge 6:2 14:16108:12 113:1643:19 47:2 55:20,21making 2:9 33:1858:15,21 59:2,15,17models 22:272:4 73:1,1 74:20let's 52:17 57:23 60:1457:21 58:20 65:1636:12 62:13 79:1659:20 60:3 61:12models 25:576:5,13,16 77:3,672:10 76:11,11,2489:10 90:8,14,14107:170:21,22 73:15moment 13:9 85:577:12,15,18 78:4,1978:9 83:21,2591:6,9 94:22manifest 81:174:11,17 75:17111:1078:22 79:17 80:1,8100:12,22 102:11looked 3:1 12:25manifest 81:176:24 77:1 78:16,17Monday 106:8,980:11,17 81:17 82:6level 33:12 70:1947:12 60:742:9,9 80:2297:15,20,22 83:4,8monetary 52:16,1882:24,24 83:12looking 7:11,22 19:18MARIA 2:2284:19 88:10 89:3monetary 52:16,1880:21,25 81:24liberty 103:24 104:267:16 87:18 92:1097:15,20 98:6,14,19months 71:25 103:1780:21,25 81:24liberty 103:24 104:267:16 87:18 92:1027:6 29:1997:15,20 98:6,14,19moths 71:25 103:1783:14 91:20 92:1lies 26:5looks 44:18material 18:15,2298:24 101:8 102:13morths 71:25 103:1783:14 91:20 92:1lies 26:5looks 44:18105:12 66:1098:24 101:8 102:13morths 71:25 103:1783:10light 25:21 67:16 85:323:6 24:8 25:9<			15:18,19,20 16:11		53:10,15 54:6,7,10	50:19 55:17 59:22
110:12,12:10:12,13:16 10:12:07:10,12:07:10,12:07:10,12:07:10,12:07:10,11:10,12:07:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:						
Initial form1990 (12) (12) (12) (12) (12) (12) (12) (12)						
Rifewick (2): 14:10First (2): 14:10First (2): 53:1659:20: 60:3: 61:12MODOS 2:672:4 77:12, 15, 1672:10 76:11, 11, 12489:10: 90:8, 14, 14107:170:21, 22: 73:15moment 13:9: 85:577:12, 15, 1878:9: 83:21, 2591:6, 9: 94:22manifest 81:174:11, 17 75:17moment 13:9: 85:578:22 79:17 80:1, 8100:12, 22: 102:11looked 3:1: 12:25manifest 81:176:24: 77:1: 78:16, 17Monday 106:8,980:11, 17 81:17 82:6level 33:12 70:1947:12: 60:742:9,9: 80:2279:15, 20, 22: 83:4,8moment 13:9: 85:582:24, 24: 83:12Lexecon 31:25looking 7:11, 22: 19:18MARIA 2:2284:19: 88:10: 89:3mometary 52:16, 1888:25 89:24 113:20Lexecon's 33:2139:10, 11:40:16: 44:991:18: 92:5, 15: 93:13month 109:25: 110:5, 780:21, 25 81:24liberty 103:24: 104:267:16: 87:18: 92:1027:6: 29:1997:15, 20: 98:6, 14, 1983:14: 91:20: 92:1lies 26:5looks 44:18material 18:15, 22102:14: 104:7, 11, 1383:10life 48:21loss 22:20, 22, 24: 23:4material 18: 15, 22102:14: 104:7, 11, 1313:15: 20:7, 23: 23: 23: 23: 105: 1, 9, 20, 25: 106:726: 44: 28: 56: 13:10light 25:21: 67:16: 85:323: 62: 82: 59: 923: 25						
76:5,13,16 77:3,6 72:10 76:11,11,24 89:10 90:8,14,14 107:1 70:21,22 73:15 moment 13:9 85:5 77:12,15,18 78:4,19 78:9 83:21,25 91:6,9 94:22 manifest 81:1 74:11,17 75:17 111:10 78:22 79:17 80:1,8 100:12,22 102:11 looked 3:1 12:25 manifest 81:1 76:24 77:1 78:16,17 Monday 106:8,9 80:11,17 81:17 82:6 level 33:12 70:19 47:12 60:7 42:9,9 80:22 79:15,20,22 83:4,8 moment 13:9 85:5 82:24,24 83:12 Lexecon 31:25 looking 7:1,22 19:18 MARIA 2:22 84:19 88:10 89:3 money 44:1 88:25 89:24 113:20 Lexecon's 33:21 39:10,11 40:16 44:9 MARIO 2:20 91:18 92:5,15 93:13 month 109:25 110:5,7 80:21,25 81:24 liberty 103:24 104:2 67:16 87:18 92:10 27:6 29:19 97:15,20 98:6,14,19 month 71:25 103:17 80:14 91:20 92:1 lise 26:5 looks 44:18 material 18:15,22 102:14 104:7,11,13 13:15 20:7,23 23:23 3:10 light 25:21 67:16 85:3 23:6 24:8 25:9 23:25 105:1,9,20,25 106:7 26:4 42:8 56:1					· · · ·	
10:11:1111:1211:1277:12,15,18 78:4,1978:9 83:21,2591:6,9 94:22maifest 81:174:11,17 75:17111:1078:22 79:17 80:1,8100:12,22 102:11looked 3:1 12:25maifest 81:176:24 77:1 78:16,17Monday 106:8,980:11,17 81:17 82:6level 33:12 70:1947:12 60:742:9,9 80:2279:15,20,22 83:4,8monetary 52:16,1888:25 89:24 113:20Lexecon 31:25looking 7:11,22 19:18MARIA 2:2284:19 88:10 89:3monetary 52:16,1888:25 89:24 113:20Lexecon's 33:2139:10,11 40:16 44:9MARIO 2:2091:18 92:5,15 93:13month 109:25 110:5,780:21,25 81:24liberty 103:24 104:267:16 87:18 92:1027:6 29:1997:15,20 98:6,14,19month 71:25 103:1783:14 91:20 92:1lies 26:5looks 44:18match 43:1398:24 101:8 102:13more 1:11,13 11:6KONTOGIANNISlife 48:21loss 22:20,22,24 23:4material 18:15,22102:14 104:7,11,1313:15 20:7,23 23:233:10light 25:21 67:16 85:323:6 24:8 25:923:25105:1,9,20,25 106:726:4 42:8 56:1	-					
111:11:0:10:10:10:10:11:17 100:00:12:12 100:00:12:12 100:00:12:22:102:11 Inimited 01:11 76:24 77:1 78:16,17 Monday 106:8,9 80:11,17 80:1,8 100:12,22:102:11 47:12:60:7 42:9,9 80:22 79:15,20,22:83:4,8 monetary 52:16,18 82:24,24 83:12 Lexecon 31:25 looking 7:11,22:19:18 MARIA 2:22 84:19 88:10 89:3 monetary 52:16,18 88:25 89:24 113:20 Lexecon's 33:21 39:10,11 40:16 44:9 MARIO 2:20 91:18 92:5,15 93:13 month 109:25 110:5,7 80:21,25 81:24 liberty 103:24 104:2 67:16 87:18 92:10 27:6 29:19 97:15,20 98:6,14,19 months 71:25 103:17 83:14 91:20 92:1 lies 26:5 looks 44:18 material 18:15,22 98:24 101:8 102:13 more 1:11,13 11:6 KONTOGIANNIS light 25:21 67:16 85:3 23:6 24:8 25:9 23:25 105:1,9,20,25 106:7 26:4 42:8 56:1			, ,		<i>'</i>	
10:22 17:11 80:13,17 10:13:22 10:11 47:12 60:7 11:21 42:9,9 80:22 79:15,20,22 83:4.8 monetary 52:16,18 80:11,17 81:17 82:6 level 31:2 70:19 10:0king 7:11,22 19:18 42:9,9 80:22 79:15,20,22 83:4.8 monetary 52:16,18 82:24,24 83:12 Lexecon 31:25 looking 7:11,22 19:18 MARIA 2:22 91:18 92:5,15 93:13 monetary 52:10:5,7 known 73:5 76:25 LEÓN 2:21 46:11 55:12 66:10 market 23:21 24:1 93:14 94:4 97:2,9 110:9,9 80:21,25 81:24 liberty 103:24 104:2 67:16 87:18 92:10 27:6 29:19 97:15,20 98:6,14,19 months 71:25 103:17 83:14 91:20 92:1 lies 26:5 looks 44:18 material 18:15,22 102:14 104:7,11,13 13:15 20:7,23 23:23 3:10 light 25:21 67:16 85:3 23:6 24:8 25:9 23:25 105:1,9,20,25 106:7 26:4 42:8 56:1		-	-			
80:11,17 01:0 Ictic 9:11 7 01:0 Ictic	-				· · · · · ·	
8:25.89:24 113:20 Lexecon's 33:21 39:10.11 40:16 44:9 MARIO 2:20 91:18 92:5,15 93:13 month 109:25 110:5,7 known 73:5 76:25 LEÓN 2:21 46:11 55:12 66:10 market 23:21 24:1 93:14 94:4 97:2,9 110:9,9 80:21,25 81:24 liberty 103:24 104:2 67:16 87:18 92:10 27:6 29:19 97:15,20 98:6,14,19 month 57:125 103:17 83:14 91:20 92:1 lies 26:5 looks 44:18 match 43:13 98:24 101:8 102:13 more 1:11,13 11:6 KONTOGIANNIS light 25:21 67:16 85:3 23:6 24:8 25:9 23:25 105:1,9,20,25 106:7 26:4 42:8 56:1	-			-		
Intervention Interventinterventinterevention Intervention			8 ,			
Initial State Initial State <thinitial state<="" th=""> <thinitial state<="" t<="" td=""><td></td><td></td><td>· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·</td><td></td><td>-</td><td>,</td></thinitial></thinitial>			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		-	,
Bits 26:5 looks 44:18 match 43:13 98:24 101:8 102:13 more 1:11,13 11:6 KONTOGIANNIS life 48:21 loss 22:20,22,24 23:4 match 43:13 98:24 101:8 102:13 more 1:11,13 11:6 3:10 light 25:21 67:16 85:3 23:6 24:8 25:9 23:25 23:25 26:4 42:8 56:1					-	<i>'</i>
KONTOGIANNIS life 48:21 loss 22:20,22,24 23:4 material 18:15,22 102:14 104:7,11,13 13:15 20:7,23 23:23 3:10 light 25:21 67:16 85:3 23:6 24:8 25:9 23:25 105:1,9,20,25 106:7 26:4 42:8 56:1		e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e				
3:10 Interfact 40:21 23:6 24:8 25:9 23:25 105:1,9,20,25 106:7 26:4 42:8 56:1						
inglit 25.21 07.10 05.5						
KRISTEN 2:4 85:20 86:18 94:4 20:24 27:2,37,9,11 materials 40:15 100:13,22,25 70:22 71:1,4 77:10						
	KRISTEN 2:4	85:20 86:18 94:4	20.24 27:2,3,7,9,11	materials 40:15	100.13,22,23	/0.22 /1:1,4 //:10
	1					

Trevor McGowan

TECO Guatemala Holdings, LLC -v- Republic of Guatemala ICSID Case No. ARB/10/23

Friday. 29 July 2022

82:16 93:25 100:5	newly 55:8	offer 20:2 94:9	Operating 51:20	51:22 52:1 68:5,11	past 5:14,19 91:10
101:17 103:7,14	newsletter 79:25	office 2:17,17,18,18	opex 56:9 63:18,25	87:12 88:6	pasted 26:16
106:10,11,12	next 34:3,17 57:6	2:19,20,20,21,21	64:1	o'clock 21:9	Paternoster 1:6
MORI 2:12	104:25 107:19	72:7 86:23 87:1	opining 65:4		Pause 1:6 4:6 14:3
morning 1:3,6,11,17	NG 2:5	officials 73:8	opinion 39:23 40:9,11	Р	36:4 38:10 51:9
66:25 98:16	nice 108:19	often 10:18 11:6 20:2	41:5 75:5,5,6 85:23	PABLO 2:12	52:16 54:10 64:24
most 35:24 47:2,21	NICHOLSON 2:7	34:15	opportunity 3:18	pace 23:18	76:10 82:3 95:24
98:15	NICOLAS 2:14	Oh 32:8 50:10	14:17 20:4 22:3	page 60:22 64:23	105:17 108:14
move 9:20 33:10 56:24	Nods 39:13	okay 2:3 3:22 4:1 11:3	64:20 70:13,18		109:24 111:1,12
69:11	nominal 45:15 52:16	14:6,22 33:7 37:18	72:21 73:6,12,14	101:25	pays 43:22
moved 9:19 13:8	52:17	40:7,10 41:3,17	75:9 79:18 92:20	pages 51:2 98:2,3,4,7	penal 11:20
108:17	None 113:1	42:5 53:10 54:2	98:21 100:6	100:23 101:6,7,8,14	people 4:20 90:9
movement 9:25	non-cash 48:19	56:1,15 58:8 59:16	opposed 54:19	101:19,20,22,24	per 30:18 56:7 101:7
much 6:23 12:19	non-disclosure 10:3	60:2,17 62:17 63:18	opposite 66:9	102:4,5 103:16	101:16 102:5,16
14:24 18:9 20:18	10:13 15:16 16:10	64:10 67:5 76:17,22	option 8:4,5,6,7	104:1,10 108:5	101:10 102:5,10
22:7 30:2 52:23	16:17 17:21 18:4,8	82:11 83:25 84:12	options 8:3 9:6	Pakistan 80:14 81:6,9	perceived 19:13 56:5
53:3 54:17 88:8,15	18:21 19:7	90:9 92:4,15 93:6	oral 87:22	85:22 90:4	perfect 6:23 42:25
98:15 100:2 104:18	non-Member 11:19	93:12 97:15 98:24	orally 87:15	paragraph 9:23,25	43:2,5,10
				22:22 23:8,8 24:4	perfectly 34:21 97:9
105:4,15 109:12,22	normally 17:9 95:8,13	106:13 108:19	order 4:25 43:15	24:14 26:6 30:9,12	
multiple 7:24 8:3	109:15	109:3,8,19 110:12	56:24 73:13 94:10	30:18 38:22 52:14	performed 35:21
17:19,21	notably 7:20	111:17,18 112:15	96:14 104:21	60:13,14,18,19 84:4	perhaps 14:10 22:3
multiples 36:20,20,22	note 7:13 36:4,13 38:9	112:20,24 114:22	108:13 112:7,21	84:13,25 85:14,17	62:12 70:25 73:9
37:2	39:21 48:6 58:15	115:7	organisation 114:2	86:15	86:6 91:18 93:24
must 5:11 13:2,5	60:3	omitted 61:7	original 23:2 24:6,10	paragraphs 22:13	96:8 98:1 112:16
101:12 108:2	noted 7:11 10:24 38:7	once 7:21 73:25 86:12	27:4,10 28:9,25	26:4 27:13,20,23	period 23:23,25 31:1
myself 14:17 72:6	60:8	86:18 89:20 91:1	29:8,10,13,16 30:7	28:12 30:6 38:14	45:5,6 48:15 49:12
85:15 88:10 113:15	notes 7:15 8:16	96:18 109:4	31:15 32:8,19 33:15	41:1 67:8	52:11 58:1 97:25
MÉRIDA 2:20	nothing 3:10 35:16	one 2:8 3:11,17,17,20	33:18,18,24 34:25	paralegal 3:9	105:15
	62:18 63:15,20 67:2	6:5 8:16,17 11:6	35:14 44:22,23 45:7	parlance 35:3	periods 42:3
N	75:7 99:4 106:21	13:15,19 16:7 19:10	48:14 49:16 50:13	part 14:1 20:16 30:4	permissible 93:23
name 40:5	107:17	19:12 22:25 23:18	50:17 51:23 52:9	36:20 41:12 44:22	permitted 110:19
natural 88:13	notice 40:1 107:2	24:20 36:2,3 37:24	55:7 56:16 57:5,24	58:24 60:19 62:20	person 6:9 18:14
nature 11:16,21	noticed 93:1	37:25 39:21 42:11	58:17 59:9,22 67:11	67:9,15 76:12 77:2	71:25 90:3 95:13
Navigant 31:18 43:14	noting 60:10	42:12,16 45:23,24	67:17,18,24 68:3,4	77:16 78:2 83:3	personal 5:12 14:16
Navigant's 32:5	notion 69:4	46:9,17 47:2 51:8	68:12,14,20	85:10,11 99:9,21	petitum 63:23
nearly 56:22	nowhere 67:10 84:13	51:12,20 52:3,15	other 2:18 5:17 10:18	100:14	PETR 2:4
necessarily 23:11	number 4:20 50:14	53:10,11,19 54:15	11:8 13:21,23 15:5	participants 114:10	phases 3:6 21:21
necessary 15:1,3	54:22 65:20 66:8,9	55:6 56:1 60:7	18:6 24:5 36:2 37:2	participated 113:22	picked 56:13
22:20 23:4 25:8	86:20 87:16 96:1	61:17 62:12 63:4	37:11 42:9 46:9,12	particular 16:6,7	pile 102:1
27:18 53:24 75:4	101:17 102:11	65:7,13,20,25 66:1	46:18 48:17 49:23	40:14 41:22 42:7	place 45:9 87:21
112:6	104:9	66:1 69:25,25 71:11	53:18 60:3 62:13	54:15 56:14 79:2	111:23
necessity 41:14 107:4	numerous 89:5	72:17 76:2 77:8,11	64:13 65:7,21,25	81:11 82:5,6 96:15	places 93:17
need 2:16 8:19 15:20	NÁJERA 2:19	87:21 88:22 89:12	66:2,2 67:17,24,25	particularly 2:24 7:25	plainly 24:7
24:5 36:3 38:9		89:14 91:16 93:14	68:22 70:13,17	15:15 91:14 93:20	playing 70:19
	0	96:2 97:10 98:3,6	71:12 75:2 79:4,5	parties 2:9 3:2 6:17	please 3:24 23:17 36:4
39:25 42:21 64:6	object 2:5 3:16 45:16	101:10 102:1,1	79:17 85:9 87:2	-	46:21 53:5 65:15
72:9,24 94:9 96:13		103:6,6,8 106:1,9	90:9 92:23 93:17,24	7:12 19:7,10,12	74:11 78:16 97:7,24
103:23 104:18	74:11	106:10,11,12 108:7	96:7,20 97:19,21	21:5,10 31:17 33:8	99:7 103:21,25
105:4,16 109:1	objection 3:25 57:3	109:18 110:3,24	98:4,6 101:10 103:9	36:11 39:16 49:9,9	104:16 105:13
110:16 112:19	112:12,14	111:2,5 113:21	103:9 107:2 112:6,8	50:18 52:24 53:5,9	106:6 112:10
needed 49:6 83:17	obligation 5:25 7:12	ones 7:20 38:15 51:23	112:21 114:20	61:20 62:12 63:24	plus 52:20,20
95:21	10:15 11:24 13:18	only 3:19 4:18 10:8	others 7:17 53:8	69:12 70:24 71:8	pm 58:7 72:11,13
needs 100:11	13:18 17:22 18:24	16:13,14 23:12	otherwise 2:15 69:25	72:25 73:14 78:13	115:8
negative 65:23	18:25 20:12,14			78:15 85:12 86:3	
negligible 64:14	obligations 18:24	24:10 26:6 32:20	75:9 101:21 105:21	94:8 99:6 100:7,10	point 2:6 3:22 4:22
net 34:18 35:13 51:16	observations 21:20	36:21 37:3 38:13,15	111:7	106:23 108:6	5:16 13:10 24:12
52:19	obtain 30:23 76:16	47:23 52:12 54:21	out 4:13 41:1 49:3	110:19 113:4,13	29:25 33:7 34:22
netted 64:17 65:2	80:11	60:3 64:14 68:20	52:7,19 54:16 60:6	party 3:20 5:25 6:13	41:21 42:11,12,16
never 32:12 42:5,24	obtained 52:1 76:5,13	71:12 73:25 76:2	62:20 64:12,13,17	12:11,13 18:12	46:4 53:19 56:2
55:6 108:2	obviously 16:2 19:14	80:12 83:24 85:3,20	65:2 66:6,7,11,14	19:17 25:2 46:9,12	58:9 61:21 62:15,1
new 4:6 20:20 22:20	78:18,18 110:1	89:25 93:4,5 94:20	82:13 85:6 99:14	62:22 70:7,17 86:17	65:13 71:5 72:23,2
27:18 37:10 47:7,7	occur 4:18 113:7	98:12 99:14 110:14	107:5	88:1 91:23 93:24	73:7 74:5,7 78:15
49:14,20,24 50:1,19	occurred 50:6 88:14	113:13	outlying 16:15	95:5,22 96:8 97:10	79:16 82:12 83:2
57:3 75:17 76:15,17	occurs 18:11	onwards 2:25 24:16	over 23:22 48:5 54:14	101:10 103:8,9	91:3,19,21 92:18
80:19 81:10,11 92:7	October 30:10,16	31:13 35:18 52:13	71:2 72:22 86:13	110:1 113:6	93:10 107:23
	106:8,14 108:15,18	open 21:10 27:12	87:16 114:12,24	PASCUZZO 2:12	112:21 113:5
92:9 94:16 95:20		(0.10.17.0(.01	overall 70:7		pointed 7:23
92:9 94:16 93:20 96:4,15,21,24	111:24	68:10,17 96:21		passed 14:20 44:2	•
	111:24 off 59:11,23 60:7 83:1	opening 37:25 39:3	overlapping 91:7	passed 14:20 44:2 passes 43:22	points 15:24 107:24
96:4,15,21,24				-	•

Trevor McGowan

Page 7

TECO Guatemala Holdings, LLC -v- Republic of Guatemala ICSID Case No. ARB/10/23

Friday. 29 July 2022

		1	1		
65:13,16 66:21,25	1:21 2:3,4,11 3:13	91:5,24 92:3 95:10	72:16 73:13 97:7	questions 4:7,8 2:13	100:25 101:15
67:6	3:22 4:2 6:23 13:19	problems 76:9	99:17,25 100:23,24	2:20,24 3:11,17	112:9
Polášek 4:13,15 30:22	14:4,6,19,22,24	procedural 4:19 40:15	103:4,5 107:17	9:10 20:7,23,24	reasonableness 46:14
54:14 60:5 61:14	15:24 20:7,18,22	96:14 104:21	provided 9:3 68:6	21:3,6,9,16 26:11	reasonably 62:22
65:12 66:17	21:14 22:5 23:17	113:17	86:21 95:4 109:5	52:5 53:18 62:21	reasoning 60:19,20
PONCE 2:25	25:4,15 26:9 31:10	procedure 9:2 96:14	providing 75:2	64:4,4 66:16 69:11	68:21,23 100:3
POORVI 2:5	32:3,8,11,14,24	100:14	provision 7:21,23 8:24	69:15,24 70:8 77:8	reasons 96:6 102:16
popped 108:4	33:7,10 34:21 36:3	procedures 11:16	8:25 12:24 13:20	87:13,19,21,24 88:4	REA-25 64:22
portfolio 37:21	36:19 37:1,2,9,18	proceed 21:6	24:15 39:24	88:7 92:18,24 93:10	REA-29 51:3
portion 22:13 35:24	38:5,9,21 39:1,5,13	proceeded 68:1	provisions 7:19 12:19	93:15,18 94:5,7	REA-35 31:3
43:21 44:3 61:5	39:15,18,19 40:2,7	proceeding 35:4 49:16	public 19:22 34:10	96:2,11,19 97:22,25	recall 79:2 89:3
64:15	40:10,24 41:3,17	49:18,22,25 57:4	40:25 79:17 80:21	98:9,12,13 99:1,8	received 77:8 99:13
portions 26:4	45:23 46:2,20 49:13	74:1,5,18 85:10,11	85:5 87:3 88:19,24	99:10,13,15 100:12	receiving 11:13
posed 11:9 87:13	49:23 50:1,3,7,10	86:4,13,18	88:24 89:18 90:8,24	101:4,6,9,21,25	recent 47:2,21
position 10:1 16:14,20	50:22 51:8,10 52:22	proceedings 5:18	91:25	102:5,7,14,18,22	recently 1:23
69:13 71:24 77:13	52:24 53:11,23 54:2	20:17 49:15 113:5	publications 80:7	103:14,18 104:5	reciting 34:22
77:14 93:11 95:14	54:6,9 56:1,8,15,19	process 113:7 114:1	publicly 31:21 78:23	105:17 107:13,25	recollection 37:13
95:15 102:24 103:3	57:7,10,12,15,18,21	Procurador 72:18	80:24 86:22	108:4 114:4	record 3:2 10:1 26:1
positions 9:15	58:8,21 59:12,16,18	produce 105:17 106:4	published 79:25 80:3	quickly 79:7 93:11	69:2 77:24 78:25
possibility 83:13	60:2,11 61:10,17	produced 1:23	80:7 81:18 87:5	112:2 113:17	82:1 83:13 87:20
107:15	62:1,8,10,15,17,19	producer 45:15	PUENTE 2:21	Quinn 2:11 11:5	93:22 94:10,14,20
possible 9:13 21:2,24	63:18,25 64:10,19	production 75:23	pull 87:21	quite 17:6 24:22 25:1	95:17 97:12 100:19
37:18 51:8 63:19	65:9,10,15 66:15,23	professional 4:22 5:11	purchase 32:2 42:18	25:19 50:7	100:20,21 106:3
67:20,21 103:21	67:5 69:9 70:5,15	Professor 1:12,13	55:3	quotations 30:13	107:1 111:23
105:19	70:19,21 71:20,24	9:11 10:21 11:9	purchaser 63:11	quote 30:19	red 36:17
possibly 75:18 83:16	72:3,9,14 73:15,18	12:15 15:7,14,23	purpose 9:12 31:8	quoted 10:20	redact 40:22
post-hearing 63:21	75:12 76:11,21,24	16:13 18:7,18,20	purposes 38:2,17		redacted 39:23 40:19
98:8,11	77:3 78:9,13 79:15	19:5 77:2,16,23	pursuant 45:2 49:4	R	41:8
potential 23:24 72:5	79:21 82:9 83:22	79:24 87:11 88:12	put 2:20 3:3,8,18 11:8	raise 50:14 76:1 81:10	redactions 40:16
potentially 9:16 16:15 17:4	84:5,9,11,24 85:16 87:10 89:1 92:17,24	88:15,16 91:15 92:4 92:13,16 95:2,8,18	22:12 24:13 29:22 32:12 49:3 60:15	112:21	41:15 reduced 60:25 63:16
PowerPoint 1:25 3:15	93:5,12,24 94:17	95:20 96:10 98:11	77:12 79:8 84:17	raised 49:21 50:13,16	reduction 23:15 28:6
PPI 45:17	95:25 96:18 97:7,14	101:4,16,18,24	85:21 86:7 91:23	55:7,8 57:4,5 74:4	28:24 29:7,13 48:9
practice 11:7,21,24	97:16,19,21,23	103:11 104:5	96:16 99:1 106:24	raising 50:19 76:8	63:22
-				range 51:16 75:12	
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15	98:13,15,20 99:3,7 99:17 100:5,20	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2	puts 61:8 putting 88:1	98:2 100:23	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23
12:6,20,21	98:13,15,20 99:3,7	prohibition 8:5,6	puts 61:8	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15	98:13,15,20 99:3,7 99:17 100:5,20	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2	puts 61:8	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15 precise 38:6	98:13,15,20 99:3,7 99:17 100:5,20 101:2,9,20,23 102:7	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2 42:1 43:1 47:14	puts 61:8 putting 88:1 Q	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23 48:4,5,8 49:1,1,5,10	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23 reference 5:16 24:13
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15 precise 38:6 precisely 23:15 79:20 prefer 17:10 61:22 102:15	98:13,15,20 99:3,7 99:17 100:5,20 101:2,9,20,23 102:7 102:13 103:4,17	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2 42:1 43:1 47:14 50:4	puts 61:8 putting 88:1 quality 100:8	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23 48:4,5,8 49:1,1,5,10 51:5,13 72:3	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23 reference 5:16 24:13 30:17 39:8 40:21,23
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15 precise 38:6 precisely 23:15 79:20 prefer 17:10 61:22	98:13,15,20 99:3,7 99:17 100:5,20 101:2,9,20,23 102:7 102:13 103:4,17 104:11,14,18,23	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2 42:1 43:1 47:14 50:4 projected 21:1 47:6	puts 61:8 putting 88:1 quality 100:8 quantified 24:23	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23 48:4,5,8 49:1,1,5,10 51:5,13 72:3 rates 30:24,24 31:7	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23 reference 5:16 24:13 30:17 39:8 40:21,23 41:4 60:23 64:8,18
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15 precise 38:6 precisely 23:15 79:20 prefer 17:10 61:22 102:15 preference 102:20 premise 30:6,11,20,20	98:13,15,20 99:3,7 99:17 100:5,20 101:2,9,20,23 102:7 102:13 103:4,17 104:11,14,18,23 105:3,6,9,12,24	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2 42:1 43:1 47:14 50:4 projected 21:1 47:6 47:22 59:2 projecting 47:23 projection 31:18 32:1	puts 61:8 putting 88:1 quality 100:8	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23 48:4,5,8 49:1,1,5,10 51:5,13 72:3	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23 reference 5:16 24:13 30:17 39:8 40:21,23 41:4 60:23 64:8,18 references 68:24 69:2 81:7 86:20 referencing 41:15
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15 precise 38:6 precisely 23:15 79:20 prefer 17:10 61:22 102:15 preference 102:20 premise 30:6,11,20,20 82:4	98:13,15,20 99:3,7 99:17 100:5,20 101:2,9,20,23 102:7 102:13 103:4,17 104:11,14,18,23 105:3,6,9,12,24 106:6,10,12,14,17 106:22 107:7,22 108:15,22 109:3,8	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2 42:1 43:1 47:14 50:4 projected 21:1 47:6 47:22 59:2 projecting 47:23 projection 31:18 32:1 43:3	puts 61:8 putting 88:1 quality 100:8 quantified 24:23 quantum 38:20 68:6	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23 48:4,5,8 49:1,1,5,10 51:5,13 72:3 rates 30:24,24 31:7 rather 15:10 49:20	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23 reference 5:16 24:13 30:17 39:8 40:21,23 41:4 60:23 64:8,18 references 68:24 69:2 81:7 86:20 referencing 41:15 referring 15:14 56:11
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15 precise 38:6 precisely 23:15 79:20 prefer 17:10 61:22 102:15 preference 102:20 premise 30:6,11,20,20 82:4 premises 22:15 26:19	98:13,15,20 99:3,7 99:17 100:5,20 101:2,9,20,23 102:7 102:13 103:4,17 104:11,14,18,23 105:3,6,9,12,24 106:6,10,12,14,17 106:22 107:7,22 108:15,22 109:3,8 109:10,14,16,19,21	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2 42:1 43:1 47:14 50:4 projected 21:1 47:6 47:22 59:2 projecting 47:23 projection 31:18 32:1 43:3 projections 21:12 25:5	puts 61:8 putting 88:1 quality 100:8 quantified 24:23 quantum 38:20 68:6 89:22 90:16	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23 48:4,5,8 49:1,1,5,10 51:5,13 72:3 rates 30:24,24 31:7 rather 15:10 49:20 54:24 62:4 88:2	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23 reference 5:16 24:13 30:17 39:8 40:21,23 41:4 60:23 64:8,18 references 68:24 69:2 81:7 86:20 referencing 41:15 referring 15:14 56:11 85:24,25 100:1
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15 precise 38:6 precisely 23:15 79:20 prefer 17:10 61:22 102:15 preference 102:20 premise 30:6,11,20,20 82:4 premises 22:15 26:19 27:16,17 28:16,18	98:13,15,20 99:3,7 99:17 100:5,20 101:2,9,20,23 102:7 102:13 103:4,17 104:11,14,18,23 105:3,6,9,12,24 106:6,10,12,14,17 106:22 107:7,22 108:15,22 109:3,8 109:10,14,16,19,21 110:7,12,21,23,25	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2 42:1 43:1 47:14 50:4 projected 21:1 47:6 47:22 59:2 projecting 47:23 projection 31:18 32:1 43:3 projections 21:12 25:5 25:10 37:4 48:12,19	puts 61:8 putting 88:1 quality 100:8 quantified 24:23 quantum 38:20 68:6 89:22 90:16 question 2:6,24,25 3:3	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23 48:4,5,8 49:1,1,5,10 51:5,13 72:3 rates 30:24,24 31:7 rather 15:10 49:20 54:24 62:4 88:2 re 4:1,4,19 4:8 7:1	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23 reference 5:16 24:13 30:17 39:8 40:21,23 41:4 60:23 64:8,18 references 68:24 69:2 81:7 86:20 referencing 41:15 referring 15:14 56:11 85:24,25 100:1 refers 33:22 82:24
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15 precise 38:6 precisely 23:15 79:20 prefer 17:10 61:22 102:15 preference 102:20 premise 30:6,11,20,20 82:4 premises 22:15 26:19 27:16,17 28:16,18 29:23 67:3,7 68:5,9	98:13,15,20 99:3,7 99:17 100:5,20 101:2,9,20,23 102:7 102:13 103:4,17 104:11,14,18,23 105:3,6,9,12,24 106:6,10,12,14,17 106:22 107:7,22 108:15,22 109:3,8 109:10,14,16,19,21 110:7,12,21,23,25 111:5,13,19,22,24	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2 42:1 43:1 47:14 50:4 projected 21:1 47:6 47:22 59:2 projecting 47:23 projection 31:18 32:1 43:3 projections 21:12 25:5 25:10 37:4 48:12,19 48:20 52:12	puts 61:8 putting 88:1 Q quality 100:8 quantified 24:23 quantum 38:20 68:6 89:22 90:16 question 2:6;24;25 3:3 4:23 9:11 11:9 13:13,19 14:6 20:9 24:3,7;20;21 27:12	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23 48:4,5,8 49:1,1,5,10 51:5,13 72:3 rates 30:24,24 31:7 rather 15:10 49:20 54:24 62:4 88:2 re 4:1,4,19 4:8 7:1 reach 63:5 106:15 reaches 68:16 react 80:6 81:22	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23 reference 5:16 24:13 30:17 39:8 40:21,23 41:4 60:23 64:8,18 references 68:24 69:2 81:7 86:20 referencing 41:15 referring 15:14 56:11 85:24,25 100:1 refers 33:22 82:24 85:5
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15 precise 38:6 precisely 23:15 79:20 prefer 17:10 61:22 102:15 preference 102:20 premise 30:6,11,20,20 82:4 premises 22:15 26:19 27:16,17 28:16,18 29:23 67:3,7 68:5,9 69:4	$\begin{array}{c} 98{:}13{,}15{,}20{,}99{:}3{,}7\\ 99{:}17{,}100{:}5{,}20\\ 101{:}2{,}9{,}20{,}23{,}102{:}7\\ 102{:}13{,}103{:}4{,}17\\ 104{:}11{,}14{,}18{,}23\\ 105{:}3{,}6{,}9{,}12{,}24\\ 106{:}6{,}10{,}12{,}14{,}17\\ 106{:}22{,}107{:}7{,}22\\ 108{:}15{,}22{,}109{:}3{,}8\\ 109{:}10{,}14{,}16{,}19{,}21\\ 110{:}7{,}12{,}21{,}23{,}25\\ 111{:}5{,}13{,}19{,}22{,}24\\ 111{:}25{,}112{:}4{,}8{,}13\\ \end{array}$	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2 42:1 43:1 47:14 50:4 projected 21:1 47:6 47:22 59:2 projecting 47:23 projection 31:18 32:1 43:3 projections 21:12 25:5 25:10 37:4 48:12,19 48:20 52:12 prolific 90:15	puts 61:8 putting 88:1 quality 100:8 quantified 24:23 quantum 38:20 68:6 89:22 90:16 question 2:6,24,25 3:3 4:23 9:11 11:9 13:13,19 14:6 20:9 24:3,7,20,21 27:12 28:15 38:18,21	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23 48:4,5,8 49:1,1,5,10 51:5,13 72:3 rates 30:24,24 31:7 rather 15:10 49:20 54:24 62:4 88:2 re 4:1,4,19 4:8 7:1 reach 63:5 106:15 reaches 68:16 react 80:6 81:22 reacting 80:6	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23 reference 5:16 24:13 30:17 39:8 40:21,23 41:4 60:23 64:8,18 references 68:24 69:2 81:7 86:20 referencing 41:15 referring 15:14 56:11 85:24,25 100:1 refers 33:22 82:24 85:5 reflect 11:21 12:19,20
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15 precise 38:6 precisely 23:15 79:20 prefer 17:10 61:22 102:15 preference 102:20 premise 30:6,11,20,20 82:4 premises 22:15 26:19 27:16,17 28:16,18 29:23 67:3,7 68:5,9 69:4 prepare 53:12	98:13,15,20 99:3,7 99:17 100:5,20 101:2,9,20,23 102:7 102:13 103:4,17 104:11,14,18,23 105:3,6,9,12,24 106:6,10,12,14,17 106:22 107:7,22 108:15,22 109:3,8 109:10,14,16,19,21 110:7,12,21,23,25 111:5,13,19,22,24 111:25 112:4,8,13 112:16,24 113:2,24	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2 42:1 43:1 47:14 50:4 projected 21:1 47:6 47:22 59:2 projecting 47:23 projections 31:18 32:1 43:3 projections 21:12 25:5 25:10 37:4 48:12,19 48:20 52:12 prolific 90:15 prompt 96:9	puts 61:8 putting 88:1 Q quality 100:8 quantified 24:23 quantum 38:20 68:6 89:22 90:16 question 2:6;24,25 3:3 4:23 9:11 11:9 13:13,19 14:6 20:9 24:3,7;20;21 27:12	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23 48:4,5,8 49:1,1,5,10 51:5,13 72:3 rates 30:24,24 31:7 rather 15:10 49:20 54:24 62:4 88:2 re 4:1,4,19 4:8 7:1 reach 63:5 106:15 reaches 68:16 react 80:6 81:22	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23 reference 5:16 24:13 30:17 39:8 40:21,23 41:4 60:23 64:8,18 references 68:24 69:2 81:7 86:20 referencing 41:15 referring 15:14 56:11 85:24,25 100:1 refers 33:22 82:24 85:5 reflect 11:21 12:19,20 reflection 38:13
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15 precise 38:6 precisely 23:15 79:20 prefer 17:10 61:22 102:15 preference 102:20 premises 30:6,11,20,20 82:4 premises 22:15 26:19 27:16,17 28:16,18 29:23 67:3,7 68:5,9 69:4 prepare 53:12 prepared 1:25 3:13,14	98:13,15,20 99:3,7 99:17 100:5,20 101:2,9,20,23 102:7 102:13 103:4,17 104:11,14,18,23 105:3,6,9,12,24 106:6,10,12,14,17 106:22 107:7,22 108:15,22 109:3,8 109:10,14,16,19,21 110:7,12,21,23,25 111:5,13,19,22,24 111:25 112:4,8,13 112:16,24 113:2,24 114:5,19,23 115:5	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2 42:1 43:1 47:14 50:4 projected 21:1 47:6 47:22 59:2 projecting 47:23 projections 31:18 32:1 43:3 projections 21:12 25:5 25:10 37:4 48:12,19 48:20 52:12 prolific 90:15 prompt 96:9 promptly 78:20 94:12	puts 61:8 putting 88:1 quality 100:8 quantified 24:23 quantum 38:20 68:6 89:22 90:16 question 2:6,24,25 3:3 4:23 9:11 11:9 13:13,19 14:6 20:9 24:3,7,20,21 27:12 28:15 38:18,21 41:19 50:23 54:8 56:15 57:21 58:11	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23 48:4,5,8 49:1,1,5,10 51:5,13 72:3 rates 30:24,24 31:7 rather 15:10 49:20 54:24 62:4 88:2 re 4:1,4,19 4:8 7:1 reach 63:5 106:15 reactes 68:16 react 80:6 81:22 reacting 80:6 reaction 47:10 71:12 read 5:9 8:9 17:9	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23 reference 5:16 24:13 30:17 39:8 40:21,23 41:4 60:23 64:8,18 references 68:24 69:2 81:7 86:20 referencing 41:15 referring 15:14 56:11 85:24,25 100:1 refers 33:22 82:24 85:5 reflect 11:21 12:19,20 reflection 38:13 reflects 103:20
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15 precise 38:6 precisely 23:15 79:20 prefer 17:10 61:22 102:15 preference 102:20 premise 30:6,11,20,20 82:4 premises 22:15 26:19 27:16,17 28:16,18 29:23 67:3,7 68:5,9 69:4 prepare 53:12 prepared 1:25 3:13,14 3:15 24:24 66:18	98:13,15,20 99:3,7 99:17 100:5,20 101:2,9,20,23 102:7 102:13 103:4,17 104:11,14,18,23 105:3,6,9,12,24 106:6,10,12,14,17 106:22 107:7,22 108:15,22 109:3,8 109:10,14,16,19,21 110:7,12,21,23,25 111:5,13,19,22,24 111:25 112:4,8,13 112:16,24 113:2,24 114:5,19,23 115:5 President's 24:21	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2 42:1 43:1 47:14 50:4 projected 21:1 47:6 47:22 59:2 projecting 47:23 projection 31:18 32:1 43:3 projections 21:12 25:5 25:10 37:4 48:12,19 48:20 52:12 prolific 90:15 prompt 96:9 promptly 78:20 94:12 prof 24:5 78:10,11	puts 61:8 putting 88:1 Q quality 100:8 quantified 24:23 quantum 38:20 68:6 89:22 90:16 question 2:6,24,25 3:3 4:23 9:11 11:9 13:13,19 14:6 20:9 24:3,7,20,21 27:12 28:15 38:18,21 41:19 50:23 54:8 56:15 57:21 58:11 60:4 61:20 67:10,14	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23 48:4,5,8 49:1,1,5,10 51:5,13 72:3 rates 30:24,24 31:7 rather 15:10 49:20 54:24 62:4 88:2 re 4:1,4,19 4:8 7:1 reach 63:5 106:15 reaches 68:16 react 80:6 81:22 reacting 80:6 reaction 47:10 71:12 read 5:9 8:9 17:9 26:14 40:22 64:7	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23 reference 5:16 24:13 30:17 39:8 40:21,23 41:4 60:23 64:8,18 references 68:24 69:2 81:7 86:20 referencing 41:15 referring 15:14 56:11 85:24,25 100:1 refers 33:22 82:24 85:5 reflect 11:21 12:19,20 reflection 38:13 reflects 103:20 refrained 46:8
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15 precise 38:6 precisely 23:15 79:20 prefer 17:10 61:22 102:15 preference 102:20 premise 30:6,11,20,20 82:4 premises 22:15 26:19 27:16,17 28:16,18 29:23 67:37, 68:5,9 69:4 prepare 53:12 prepared 1:25 3:13,14 3:15 24:24 66:18 69:23,24 78:12	98:13,15,20 99:3,7 99:17 100:5,20 101:2,9,20,23 102:7 102:13 103:4,17 104:11,14,18,23 105:3,6,9,12,24 106:6,10,12,14,17 106:22 107:7,22 108:15,22 109:3,8 109:10,14,16,19,21 110:7,12,21,23,25 111:5,13,19,22,24 111:25 112:4,8,13 112:16,24 113:2,24 114:5,19,23 115:5 President's 24:21 press 79:7 90:13	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2 42:1 43:1 47:14 50:4 projected 21:1 47:6 47:22 59:2 projecting 47:23 projection 31:18 32:1 43:3 projections 21:12 25:5 25:10 37:4 48:12,19 48:20 52:12 prolific 90:15 prompt 96:9 promptly 78:20 94:12 proof 24:5 78:10,11 78:14	puts 61:8 putting 88:1 Q quality 100:8 quantified 24:23 quantum 38:20 68:6 89:22 90:16 question 2:6,24,25 3:3 4:23 9:11 11:9 13:13,19 14:6 20:9 24:3,7,20,21 27:12 28:15 38:18,21 41:19 50:23 54:8 56:15 57:21 58:11 60:4 61:20 67:10,14 67:15 69:20,22 71:7	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23 48:4,5,8 49:1,1,5,10 51:5,13 72:3 rates 30:24,24 31:7 rather 15:10 49:20 54:24 62:4 88:2 re 4:1,4,19 4:8 7:1 reach 63:5 106:15 reaches 68:16 react 80:6 81:22 reacting 80:6 reacting 80:6 reacting 47:10 71:12 read 5:9 8:9 17:9 26:14 40:22 64:7 84:2,5,12,20 94:2	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23 reference 5:16 24:13 30:17 39:8 40:21,23 41:4 60:23 64:8,18 references 68:24 69:2 81:7 86:20 referencing 41:15 referring 15:14 56:11 85:24,25 100:1 refers 33:22 82:24 85:5 reflect 11:21 12:19,20 reflection 38:13 reflects 103:20 refrained 46:8 refresh 37:12 46:4
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15 precise 38:6 precisely 23:15 79:20 prefer 17:10 61:22 102:15 preference 102:20 premise 30:6,11,20,20 82:4 premises 22:15 26:19 27:16,17 28:16,18 29:23 67:3,7 68:5,9 69:4 prepare 53:12 prepared 1:25 3:13,14 3:15 24:24 66:18 69:23,24 78:12 82:25 93:2	98:13,15,20 99:3,7 99:17 100:5,20 101:2,9,20,23 102:7 102:13 103:4,17 104:11,14,18,23 105:3,6,9,12,24 106:6,10,12,14,17 106:22 107:7,22 108:15,22 109:3,8 109:10,14,16,19,21 110:7,12,21,23,25 111:5,13,19,22,24 111:25 112:4,8,13 112:16,24 113:2,24 114:5,19,23 115:5 President's 24:21 press 79:7 90:13 pretty 98:15	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2 42:1 43:1 47:14 50:4 projected 21:1 47:6 47:22 59:2 projecting 47:23 projection 31:18 32:1 43:3 projections 21:12 25:5 25:10 37:4 48:12,19 48:20 52:12 prolific 90:15 prompt 96:9 promptly 78:20 94:12 proof 24:5 78:10,11 78:14 proper 74:8 75:24	puts 61:8 putting 88:1 quality 100:8 quantified 24:23 quantum 38:20 68:6 89:22 90:16 question 2:6,24,25 3:3 4:23 9:11 11:9 13:13,19 14:6 20:9 24:3,7,20,21 27:12 28:15 38:18,21 41:19 50:23 54:8 56:15 57:21 58:11 60:4 61:20 67:10,14 67:15 69:20,22 71:7 72:16 73:3 74:9,25	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23 48:4,5,8 49:1,1,5,10 51:5,13 72:3 rather 15:10 49:20 54:24 62:4 88:2 re 4:1,4,19 4:8 7:1 reach 63:5 106:15 reacts 80:6 81:22 reacting 80:6 reaction 47:10 71:12 read 5:9 8:9 17:9 26:14 40:22 64:7 84:2,5,12,20 94:2 100:9	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23 reference 5:16 24:13 30:17 39:8 40:21,23 41:4 60:23 64:8,18 references 68:24 69:2 81:7 86:20 referencing 41:15 referring 15:14 56:11 85:24,25 100:1 refers 33:22 82:24 85:5 reflect 11:21 12:19,20 reflection 38:13 reflects 103:20 refrained 46:8 refresh 37:12 46:4 refused 42:15
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15 precise 38:6 precisely 23:15 79:20 prefer 17:10 61:22 102:15 preference 102:20 premise 30:6,11,20,20 82:4 premises 22:15 26:19 27:16,17 28:16,18 29:23 67:3,7 68:5,9 69:4 prepare 53:12 prepared 1:25 3:13,14 3:15 24:24 66:18 69:23,24 78:12 82:25 93:2 prepares 44:17	98:13,15,20 99:3,7 99:17 100:5,20 101:2,9,20,23 102:7 102:13 103:4,17 104:11,14,18,23 105:3,6,9,12,24 106:6,10,12,14,17 106:22 107:7,22 108:15,22 109:3,8 109:10,14,16,19,21 110:7,12,21,23,25 111:5,13,19,22,24 111:25 112:4,8,13 112:16,24 113:2,24 114:5,19,23 115:5 President's 24:21 press 79:7 90:13 pretty 98:15 previous 20:15 47:8	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2 42:1 43:1 47:14 50:4 projected 21:1 47:6 47:22 59:2 projecting 47:23 projection 31:18 32:1 43:3 projections 21:12 25:5 25:10 37:4 48:12,19 48:20 52:12 prolific 90:15 prompt 96:9 prompt 96:9 prompt 96:9 prompt 978:20 94:12 proof 24:5 78:10,11 78:14 proper 74:8 75:24 100:23	puts 61:8 putting 88:1 Q quality 100:8 quantified 24:23 quantified 24:23 quantified 24:23 quantim 38:20 68:6 89:22 90:16 question 2:6,24,25 3:3 4:23 9:11 11:9 13:13,19 14:6 20:9 24:3,7,20,21 27:12 28:15 38:18,21 41:19 50:23 54:8 56:15 57:21 58:11 60:4 61:20 67:10,14 67:15 69:20,22 71:7 72:16 73:3 74:9,25 75:1,8,25 76:2,9,10	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23 48:4,5,8 49:1,1,5,10 51:5,13 72:3 rates 30:24,24 31:7 rather 15:10 49:20 54:24 62:4 88:2 re 4:1,4,19 4:8 7:1 reach 63:5 106:15 reactes 68:16 react 80:6 81:22 reacting 80:6 reaction 47:10 71:12 read 5:9 8:9 17:9 26:14 40:22 64:7 84:2,5,12,20 94:2 100:9 reading 52:14	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23 reference 5:16 24:13 30:17 39:8 40:21,23 41:4 60:23 64:8,18 references 68:24 69:2 81:7 86:20 referencing 41:15 referring 15:14 56:11 85:24,25 100:1 refers 33:22 82:24 85:5 reflect 11:21 12:19,20 reflection 38:13 reflects 103:20 refrained 46:8 refresh 37:12 46:4 refused 42:15 regard 19:4 102:21
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15 precise 38:6 precisely 23:15 79:20 prefer 17:10 61:22 102:15 preference 102:20 premise 30:6,11,20,20 82:4 premises 22:15 26:19 27:16,17 28:16,18 29:23 67:3,7 68:5,9 69:4 prepare 53:12 prepare 53:12 prepared 1:25 3:13,14 3:15 24:24 66:18 69:23,24 78:12 82:25 93:2 prepares 44:17 preparing 44:15 112:4	98:13,15,20 99:3,7 99:17 100:5,20 101:2,9,20,23 102:7 102:13 103:4,17 104:11,14,18,23 105:3,6,9,12,24 106:6,10,12,14,17 106:22 107:7,22 108:15,22 109:3,8 109:10,14,16,19,21 110:7,12,21,23,25 111:5,13,19,22,24 111:25 112:4,8,13 112:16,24 113:2,24 114:5,19,23 115:5 President's 24:21 press 79:7 90:13 pretiv 98:15 previous 20:15 47:8 pre-breach 47:21	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2 42:1 43:1 47:14 50:4 projected 21:1 47:6 47:22 59:2 projecting 47:23 projection 31:18 32:1 43:3 projections 21:12 25:5 25:10 37:4 48:12,19 48:20 52:12 prolific 90:15 prompt 96:9 promptly 78:20 94:12 proof 24:5 78:10,11 78:14 proper 74:8 75:24 100:23 properly 53:13	puts 61:8 putting 88:1 Q quality 100:8 quantified 24:23 quantum 38:20 68:6 89:22 90:16 question 2:6,24,25 3:3 4:23 9:11 11:9 13:13,19 14:6 20:9 24:3,7,20,21 27:12 28:15 38:18,21 41:19 50:23 54:8 56:15 57:21 58:11 60:4 61:20 67:10,14 67:15 69:20,22 71:7 72:16 73:3 74:9,25 75:1,8,25 76:2,9,10 76:11 77:2,7,9,11	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23 48:4,5,8 49:1,1,5,10 51:5,13 72:3 rates 30:24,24 31:7 rather 15:10 49:20 54:24 62:4 88:2 re 4:1,4,19 4:8 7:1 reach 63:5 106:15 reaches 68:16 react 80:6 81:22 reacting 80:6 reaction 47:10 71:12 read 5:9 8:9 17:9 26:14 40:22 64:7 84:2,5,12,20 94:2 100:9 reading 52:14 reads 10:2 23:18	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23 reference 5:16 24:13 30:17 39:8 40:21,23 41:4 60:23 64:8,18 references 68:24 69:2 81:7 86:20 referencing 41:15 referring 15:14 56:11 85:24,25 100:1 refers 33:22 82:24 85:5 reflect 11:21 12:19,20 reflection 38:13 reflects 103:20 refrained 46:8 refresh 37:12 46:4 refused 42:15 regard 19:4 102:21 113:21
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15 precise 38:6 precisely 23:15 79:20 prefer 17:10 61:22 102:15 preference 102:20 premise 30:6,11,20,20 82:4 premises 22:15 26:19 27:16,17 28:16,18 29:23 67:3,7 68:5,9 69:4 prepare 53:12 prepared 1:25 3:13,14 3:15 24:24 66:18 69:23,24 78:12 82:25 93:2 prepares 44:17 preparing 44:15 112:4 present 12:6 38:17	98:13,15,20 99:3,7 99:17 100:5,20 101:2,9,20,23 102:7 102:13 103:4,17 104:11,14,18,23 105:3,6,9,12,24 106:6,10,12,14,17 106:22 107:7,22 108:15,22 109:3,8 109:10,14,16,19,21 110:7,12,21,23,25 111:5,13,19,22,24 111:25 112:4,8,13 112:16,24 113:2,24 114:5,19,23 115:5 President's 24:21 press 79:7 90:13 pretty 98:15 previous 20:15 47:8 pre-breach 47:21 pre-measure 55:14	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2 42:1 43:1 47:14 50:4 projected 21:1 47:6 47:22 59:2 projecting 47:23 projection 31:18 32:1 43:3 projections 21:12 25:5 25:10 37:4 48:12,19 48:20 52:12 prolific 90:15 prompt 96:9 promptly 78:20 94:12 proof 24:5 78:10,11 78:14 proper 74:8 75:24 100:23 properly 53:13 proposal 105:22	puts 61:8 putting 88:1 Q quality 100:8 quantified 24:23 quantified 24:25 quantified 26:29,10 qcill 177:2,79,11 quantified 26:20 quantified 26:21 quantified 26:22 quantified 26:20	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23 48:4,5,8 49:1,1,5,10 51:5,13 72:3 rates 30:24,24 31:7 rather 15:10 49:20 54:24 62:4 88:2 re 4:1,4,19 4:8 7:1 reach 63:5 106:15 reaches 68:16 react 80:6 81:22 reacting 80:6 reaction 47:10 71:12 read 5:9 8:9 17:9 26:14 40:22 64:7 84:2,5,12,20 94:2 100:9 reading 52:14 reads 10:2 23:18 real 45:13 77:14 88:1	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23 reference 5:16 24:13 30:17 39:8 40:21,23 41:4 60:23 64:8,18 references 68:24 69:2 81:7 86:20 referencing 41:15 referring 15:14 56:11 85:24,25 100:1 refers 33:22 82:24 85:5 reflect 11:21 12:19,20 reflection 38:13 reflects 103:20 refrained 46:8 refresh 37:12 46:4 refused 42:15 regard 19:4 102:21 113:21 regarding 3:7 20:25
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15 precise 38:6 precisely 23:15 79:20 prefer 17:10 61:22 102:15 preference 102:20 premise 30:6,11,20,20 82:4 premises 22:15 26:19 27:16,17 28:16,18 29:23 67:3,7 68:5,9 69:4 prepare 53:12 prepared 1:25 3:13,14 3:15 24:24 66:18 69:23,24 78:12 82:25 93:2 prepares 44:17 preparing 44:15 112:4 present 12:6 38:17 52:12 115:3	98:13,15,20 99:3,7 99:17 100:5,20 101:2,9,20,23 102:7 102:13 103:4,17 104:11,14,18,23 105:3,6,9,12,24 106:6,10,12,14,17 106:22 107:7,22 108:15,22 109:3,8 109:10,14,16,19,21 110:7,12,21,23,25 111:5,13,19,22,24 111:25 112:4,8,13 112:16,24 113:2,24 114:5,19,23 115:5 President's 24:21 press 79:7 90:13 pretty 98:15 previous 20:15 47:8 pre-breach 47:21 pre-measure 55:14 pre-qualified 44:13,16	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2 42:1 43:1 47:14 50:4 projected 21:1 47:6 47:22 59:2 projecting 47:23 projection 31:18 32:1 43:3 projections 21:12 25:5 25:10 37:4 48:12,19 48:20 52:12 prolific 90:15 prompt 96:9 promptly 78:20 94:12 proof 24:5 78:10,11 78:14 proper 74:8 75:24 100:23 properly 53:13 proposal 105:22 108:24 111:11	puts 61:8 putting 88:1 Q quality 100:8 quantified 24:23 quantum 38:20 68:6 89:22 90:16 question 2:6,24,25 3:3 4:23 9:11 11:9 13:13,19 14:6 20:9 24:3,7,20,21 27:12 28:15 38:18,21 41:19 50:23 54:8 56:15 57:21 58:11 60:4 61:20 67:10,14 67:15 69:20,22 71:7 72:16 73:3 74:9,25 75:1,8,25 76:2,9,10 76:11 77:2,79,11 77:17,18,19,21,21 77:23 78:2,9 79:13	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23 48:4,5,8 49:1,1,5,10 51:5,13 72:3 rates 30:24,24 31:7 rather 15:10 49:20 54:24 62:4 88:2 re 4:1,4,19 4:8 7:1 reach 63:5 106:15 reaches 68:16 react 80:6 81:22 reacting 80:6 reaction 47:10 71:12 read 5:9 8:9 17:9 26:14 40:22 64:7 84:2,5,12,20 94:2 100:9 reading 52:14 reads 10:2 23:18 real 45:13 77:14 88:1 105:15	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23 reference 5:16 24:13 30:17 39:8 40:21,23 41:4 60:23 64:8,18 references 68:24 69:2 81:7 86:20 referencing 41:15 referring 15:14 56:11 85:24,25 100:1 refers 33:22 82:24 85:5 reflect 11:21 12:19,20 reflection 38:13 reflects 103:20 refrained 46:8 refresh 37:12 46:4 refused 42:15 regard 19:4 102:21 113:21 regarding 3:7 20:25 21:23 30:3 32:18
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15 precise 38:6 precisely 23:15 79:20 prefer 17:10 61:22 102:15 preference 102:20 premise 30:6,11,20,20 82:4 premises 22:15 26:19 27:16,17 28:16,18 29:23 67:3,7 68:5,9 69:4 prepare 53:12 prepared 1:25 3:13,14 3:15 24:24 66:18 69:23,24 78:12 82:25 93:2 prepares 44:17 preparing 44:15 112:4 present 12:6 38:17 52:12 115:3 presentation 2:1,7,9	98:13,15,20 99:3,7 99:17 100:5,20 101:2,9,20,23 102:7 102:13 103:4,17 104:11,14,18,23 105:3,6,9,12,24 106:6,10,12,14,17 106:22 107:7,22 108:15,22 109:3,8 109:10,14,16,19,21 110:7,12,21,23,25 111:5,13,19,22,24 111:25 112:4,8,13 112:16,24 113:2,24 114:5,19,23 115:5 President's 24:21 press 79:7 90:13 pretty 98:15 previous 20:15 47:8 pre-breach 47:21 pre-measure 55:14 pre-qualified 44:13,16 price 23:10,21 32:2	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2 42:1 43:1 47:14 50:4 projected 21:1 47:6 47:22 59:2 projecting 47:23 projection 31:18 32:1 43:3 projections 21:12 25:5 25:10 37:4 48:12,19 48:20 52:12 prolific 90:15 prompt 96:9 promptly 78:20 94:12 proof 24:5 78:10,11 78:14 proper 74:8 75:24 100:23 properly 53:13 proposal 105:22 108:24 111:11 proposals 9:20 79:6	puts 61:8 putting 88:1 Q quality 100:8 quantified 24:23 quantum 38:20 68:6 89:22 90:16 question 2:6,24,25 3:3 4:23 9:11 11:9 13:13,19 14:6 20:9 24:3,7,20,21 27:12 28:15 38:18,21 41:19 50:23 54:8 56:15 57:21 58:11 60:4 61:20 67:10,14 67:15 69:20,22 71:7 72:16 73:3 74:9,25 75:1,8,25 76:2,9,10 76:11 77:2,7,9,11 77:17,18,19,21,21 77:23 78:2,9 79:13 80:18 82:5,13,15,17	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23 48:4,5,8 49:1,1,5,10 51:5,13 72:3 rates 30:24,24 31:7 rather 15:10 49:20 54:24 62:4 88:2 re 4:1,4,19 4:8 7:1 reach 63:5 106:15 reaches 68:16 react 80:6 81:22 reacting 80:6 reaction 47:10 71:12 read 5:9 8:9 17:9 26:14 40:22 64:7 84:2,5,12,20 94:2 100:9 reading 52:14 reads 10:2 23:18 real 45:13 77:14 88:1 105:15 realised 108:21	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23 reference 5:16 24:13 30:17 39:8 40:21,23 41:4 60:23 64:8,18 references 68:24 69:2 81:7 86:20 referencing 41:15 referring 15:14 56:11 85:24,25 100:1 refers 33:22 82:24 85:5 reflect 11:21 12:19,20 reflection 38:13 reflects 103:20 refrained 46:8 refresh 37:12 46:4 refused 42:15 regard 19:4 102:21 113:21 regard 19:4 102:25 21:23 30:3 32:18 38:21 41:19 49:13
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15 precise 38:6 precisely 23:15 79:20 prefer 17:10 61:22 102:15 preference 102:20 premise 30:6,11,20,20 82:4 premises 22:15 26:19 27:16,17 28:16,18 29:23 67:37, 68:5,9 69:4 prepare 53:12 prepared 1:25 3:13,14 3:15 24:24 66:18 69:23,24 78:12 82:25 93:2 prepares 44:17 preparing 44:15 112:4 present 12:6 38:17 52:12 115:3 presentation 2:1,7,9 3:9,21 22:1 25:1,3	98:13,15,20 99:3,7 99:17 100:5,20 101:2,9,20,23 102:7 102:13 103:4,17 104:11,14,18,23 105:3,6,9,12,24 106:6,10,12,14,17 106:22 107:7,22 108:15,22 109:3,8 109:10,14,16,19,21 110:7,12,21,23,25 111:5,13,19,22,24 111:25 112:4,8,13 112:16,24 113:2,24 114:5,19,23 115:5 President's 24:21 press 79:7 90:13 pretty 98:15 previous 20:15 47:8 pre-breach 47:21 pre-breach 47:21 pre-measure 55:14 pre-qualified 44:13,16 price 23:10,21 32:2 38:23 45:16 63:7	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2 42:1 43:1 47:14 50:4 projected 21:1 47:6 47:22 59:2 projecting 47:23 projection 31:18 32:1 43:3 projections 21:12 25:5 25:10 37:4 48:12,19 48:20 52:12 prolific 90:15 prompt 96:9 promptly 78:20 94:12 proof 24:5 78:10,11 78:14 proper 74:8 75:24 100:23 properly 53:13 proposal 105:22 108:24 111:11 proposals 9:20 79:6 propose 106:7 109:25	puts 61:8 putting 88:1 Q quality 100:8 quantified 24:23 quantified 24:20 290:16 question 2:6,24,25 3:3 4:23 9:11 11:9 13:13,19 14:6 20:9 24:3,7,20,21 27:12 28:15 58:11 60:4 61:20 67:10,14 67:15 69:20,22 71:7 72:16 73:3 74:9,25 75:1,8,25 76:2,9,10 76:11 77:27,9,11 77:17,18,19,21,21 77:23 78:2,9 79:13 80:18 82:5,13,15,17 82:23,25 83:3,6	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23 48:4,5,8 49:1,1,5,10 51:5,13 72:3 rates 30:24,24 31:7 rather 15:10 49:20 54:24 62:4 88:2 re 4:1,4,19 4:8 7:1 reach 63:5 106:15 reaches 68:16 react 80:6 81:22 react 80:6 81:22 reading 80:6 reaction 47:10 71:12 read 5:9 8:9 17:9 26:14 40:22 64:7 84:2,5,12,20 94:2 100:9 reading 52:14 reads 10:2 23:18 real 45:13 77:14 88:1 105:15 realing 108:21 reality 14:13 59:19,19	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23 reference 5:16 24:13 30:17 39:8 40:21,23 41:4 60:23 64:8,18 references 68:24 69:2 81:7 86:20 referencing 41:15 referring 15:14 56:11 85:24,25 100:1 refers 33:22 82:24 85:5 reflect 11:21 12:19,20 reflection 38:13 reflects 103:20 refrained 46:8 refresh 37:12 46:4 refused 42:15 regard 19:4 102:21 113:21 regarding 3:7 20:25 21:23 30:3 32:18 38:21 41:19 49:13 62:2 63:18 66:18
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15 precise 38:6 precisely 23:15 79:20 prefer 17:10 61:22 102:15 preference 102:20 premise 30:6,11,20,20 82:4 premises 22:15 26:19 27:16,17 28:16,18 29:23 67:37 68:5,9 69:4 prepare 53:12 prepared 1:25 3:13,14 3:15 24:24 66:18 69:23,24 78:12 82:25 93:2 prepares 44:17 preparing 44:15 112:4 present 12:6 38:17 52:12 115:3 presentation 2:1,7,9 3:9,21 22:1 25:1,3 25:20 26:10 31:6	98:13,15,20 99:3,7 99:17 100:5,20 101:2,9,20,23 102:7 102:13 103:4,17 104:11,14,18,23 105:3,6,9,12,24 106:6,10,12,14,17 106:22 107:7,22 108:15,22 109:3,8 109:10,14,16,19,21 110:7,12,21,23,25 111:5,13,19,22,24 111:25 112:4,8,13 112:16,24 113:2,24 114:5,19,23 115:5 President's 24:21 press 79:7 90:13 pretty 98:15 previous 20:15 47:8 pre-breach 47:21 pre-measure 55:14 pre-qualified 44:13,16 price 23:10,21 32:2 38:23 45:16 63:7 primary 43:7	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2 42:1 43:1 47:14 50:4 projected 21:1 47:6 47:22 59:2 projecting 47:23 projection 31:18 32:1 43:3 projections 21:12 25:5 25:10 37:4 48:12,19 48:20 52:12 prolific 90:15 prompt 96:9 promptly 78:20 94:12 prof 24:5 78:10,11 78:14 proper 74:8 75:24 100:23 properly 53:13 proposal 105:22 108:24 111:11 proposals 9:20 79:6 propose 106:7 109:25 proposed 17:6	puts 61:8 putting 88:1 Q quality 100:8 quantified 24:23 quantified 24:25 quantified 24:27:27:27:12 quantified 26:20:27:17 quantified 56:20:20:27:17 quantified 76:20:20:27:17 quantified 76:20:20:27:17 quantified 76:20:20:27:17	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23 48:4,5,8 49:1,1,5,10 51:5,13 72:3 rates 30:24,24 31:7 rather 15:10 49:20 54:24 62:4 88:2 re 4:1,4,19 4:8 7:1 reach 63:5 106:15 reacts 80:6 81:22 reacting 80:6 reaction 47:10 71:12 read 5:9 8:9 17:9 26:14 40:22 64:7 84:2,5,12,20 94:2 100:9 reading 52:14 reads 10:2 23:18 real 45:13 77:14 88:1 105:15 realing 108:21 realing 14:13 59:19,19 really 8:12 14:8 15:20	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23 reference 5:16 24:13 30:17 39:8 40:21,23 41:4 60:23 64:8,18 references 68:24 69:2 81:7 86:20 referencing 41:15 referring 15:14 56:11 85:24,25 100:1 refers 33:22 82:24 85:5 reflect 11:21 12:19,20 reflection 38:13 reflects 103:20 refrained 46:8 refresh 37:12 46:4 refused 42:15 regard 19:4 102:21 113:21 regarding 3:7 20:25 21:23 30:3 32:18 38:21 41:19 49:13 62:2 63:18 66:18 87:20 99:20 108:22
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15 precise 38:6 precisely 23:15 79:20 prefer 17:10 61:22 102:15 preference 102:20 premise 30:6,11,20,20 82:4 premises 22:15 26:19 27:16,17 28:16,18 29:23 67:3,7 68:5,9 69:4 prepare 53:12 prepared 1:25 3:13,14 3:15 24:24 66:18 69:23,24 78:12 82:25 93:2 prepares 44:17 preparing 44:15 112:4 present 12:6 38:17 52:12 115:3 presentation 2:1,7,9 3:9,21 22:1 25:1,3 25:20 26:10 31:6 37:25 51:1 60:13	98:13,15,20 99:3,7 99:17 100:5,20 101:2,9,20,23 102:7 102:13 103:4,17 104:11,14,18,23 105:3,6,9,12,24 106:6,10,12,14,17 106:22 107:7,22 108:15,22 109:3,8 109:10,14,16,19,21 110:7,12,21,23,25 111:5,13,19,22,24 111:25 112:4,8,13 112:16,24 113:2,24 114:5,19,23 115:5 President's 24:21 press 79:7 90:13 pretty 98:15 previous 20:15 47:8 pre-breach 47:21 pre-measure 55:14 pre-qualified 44:13,16 price 23:10,21 32:2 38:23 45:16 63:7 primary 43:7 principle 12:22 13:6	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2 42:1 43:1 47:14 50:4 projected 21:1 47:6 47:22 59:2 projecting 47:23 projection 31:18 32:1 43:3 projections 21:12 25:5 25:10 37:4 48:12,19 48:20 52:12 prolific 90:15 prompt 96:9 promptly 78:20 94:12 proof 24:5 78:10,11 78:14 proper 74:8 75:24 100:23 properly 53:13 proposal 105:22 108:24 111:11 proposals 9:20 79:6 propose 106:7 109:25	puts 61:8 putting 88:1 Q quality 100:8 quantified 24:23 quantified 24:23 quantified 24:23 quantim 38:20 68:6 89:22 90:16 question 2:6,24,25 3:3 4:23 9:11 11:9 13:13,19 14:6 20:9 24:3,7,20,21 27:12 28:15 38:18,21 41:19 50:23 54:8 56:15 57:21 58:11 60:4 61:20 67:10,14 67:15 69:20,22 71:7 72:16 73:3 74:9,25 75:1,8,25 76:2,9,10 76:11 77:2,7,9,11 77:17,18,19,21,21 77:23 78:2,9 79:13 80:18 82:5,13,15,17 82:23,25 83:3,6 89:13 92:23,23 93:14,16,20 96:4,4	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23 48:4,5,8 49:1,1,5,10 51:5,13 72:3 rates 30:24,24 31:7 rather 15:10 49:20 54:24 62:4 88:2 re 4:1,4,19 4:8 7:1 reach 63:5 106:15 reacts 80:6 81:22 reacting 80:6 reaction 47:10 71:12 read 5:9 8:9 17:9 26:14 40:22 64:7 84:2,5,12,20 94:2 100:9 reading 52:14 reads 10:2 23:18 real 45:13 77:14 88:1 105:15 realised 108:21 reality 14:13 59:19,19 really 8:12 14:8 15:20 26:10 35:16 47:17	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23 reference 5:16 24:13 30:17 39:8 40:21,23 41:4 60:23 64:8,18 references 68:24 69:2 81:7 86:20 referencing 41:15 referring 15:14 56:11 85:24,25 100:1 refers 33:22 82:24 85:5 reflect 11:21 12:19,20 reflection 38:13 reflects 103:20 refrained 46:8 refresh 37:12 46:4 refused 42:15 regard 19:4 102:21 113:21 regarding 3:7 20:25 21:23 30:3 32:18 38:21 41:19 49:13 62:2 63:18 66:18 87:20 99:20 108:22 108:23
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15 precise 38:6 precisely 23:15 79:20 prefer 17:10 61:22 102:15 preference 102:20 premise 30:6,11,20,20 82:4 premises 22:15 26:19 27:16,17 28:16,18 29:23 67:3,7 68:5,9 69:4 prepare 53:12 prepared 1:25 3:13,14 3:15 24:24 66:18 69:23,24 78:12 82:25 93:2 prepares 44:17 preparing 44:15 112:4 present 12:6 38:17 52:12 115:3 presentation 2:1,7,9 3:9,21 22:1 25:1,3 25:20 26:10 31:6 37:25 51:1 60:13 63:2 84:7	98:13,15,20 99:3,7 99:17 100:5,20 101:2,9,20,23 102:7 102:13 103:4,17 104:11,14,18,23 105:3,6,9,12,24 106:6,10,12,14,17 106:22 107:7,22 108:15,22 109:3,8 109:10,14,16,19,21 110:7,12,21,23,25 111:5,13,19,22,24 111:25 112:4,8,13 112:16,24 113:2,24 114:5,19,23 115:5 President's 24:21 press 79:7 90:13 pretty 98:15 previous 20:15 47:8 pre-breach 47:21 pre-measure 55:14 pre-qualified 44:13,16 price 23:10,21 32:2 38:23 45:16 63:7 primary 43:7	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2 42:1 43:1 47:14 50:4 projected 21:1 47:6 47:22 59:2 projecting 47:23 projection 31:18 32:1 43:3 projections 21:12 25:5 25:10 37:4 48:12,19 48:20 52:12 prolific 90:15 prompt 96:9 prompt 96:9 prompt 978:20 94:12 proof 24:5 78:10,11 78:14 proper 74:8 75:24 100:23 properly 53:13 proposal 105:22 108:24 111:11 proposals 9:20 79:6 propose 106:7 109:25 proposed 17:6 proposing 8:9 98:11 98:12	puts 61:8 putting 88:1 Q quality 100:8 quantified 24:23 quantified 24:23 quantim 38:20 68:6 89:22 90:16 question 2:6,24,25 3:3 4:23 9:11 11:9 13:13,19 14:6 20:9 24:3,7,20,21 27:12 28:15 38:18,21 41:19 50:23 54:8 56:15 57:21 58:11 60:4 61:20 67:10,14 67:15 69:20,22 71:7 72:16 73:3 74:9,25 75:1,8,25 76:2,9,10 76:11 77:2,7,9,11 77:17,18,19,21,21 77:23 78:2,9 79:13 80:18 82:5,13,15,17 82:23,25 83:3,6 89:13 92:23,23 93:14,16,20 96:4,4 97:4,6,19,21 98:6	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23 48:4,5,8 49:1,1,5,10 51:5,13 72:3 rates 30:24,24 31:7 rather 15:10 49:20 54:24 62:4 88:2 re 4:1,4,19 4:8 7:1 reach 63:5 106:15 reactes 68:16 react 80:6 81:22 reacting 80:6 reaction 47:10 71:12 read 5:9 8:9 17:9 26:14 40:22 64:7 84:2,5,12,20 94:2 100:9 reading 52:14 reads 10:2 23:18 real 45:13 77:14 88:1 105:15 realised 108:21 reality 14:13 59:19,19 really 8:12 14:8 15:20 26:10 35:16 47:17 53:3 55:19 71:8	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23 reference 5:16 24:13 30:17 39:8 40:21,23 41:4 60:23 64:8,18 references 68:24 69:2 81:7 86:20 referencing 41:15 referring 15:14 56:11 85:24,25 100:1 refers 33:22 82:24 85:5 reflect 11:21 12:19,20 reflectin 38:13 reflects 103:20 refrained 46:8 refresh 37:12 46:4 refused 42:15 regard 19:4 102:21 113:21 regarding 3:7 20:25 21:23 30:3 32:18 38:21 41:19 49:13 62:2 63:18 66:18 87:20 99:20 108:22 108:23 Regularly 86:2
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15 precise 38:6 precisely 23:15 79:20 prefer 17:10 61:22 102:15 preference 102:20 premise 30:6,11,20,20 82:4 premises 22:15 26:19 27:16,17 28:16,18 29:23 67:3,7 68:5,9 69:4 prepare 53:12 prepare 1:25 3:13,14 3:15 24:24 66:18 69:23,24 78:12 82:25 93:2 prepares 44:17 preparing 44:15 112:4 present 12:6 38:17 52:12 115:3 presentation 2:1,7,9 3:9,21 22:1 25:1,3 25:20 26:10 31:6 37:25 51:1 60:13 63:2 84:7 presentations 3:2,8	98:13,15,20 99:3,7 99:17 100:5,20 101:2,9,20,23 102:7 102:13 103:4,17 104:11,14,18,23 105:3,6,9,12,24 106:6,10,12,14,17 106:22 107:7,22 108:15,22 109:3,8 109:10,14,16,19,21 110:7,12,21,23,25 111:5,13,19,22,24 111:25 112:4,8,13 112:16,24 113:2,24 114:5,19,23 115:5 President's 24:21 press 79:7 90:13 pretty 98:15 previous 20:15 47:8 pre-breach 47:21 pre-measure 55:14 pre-qualified 44:13,16 price 23:10,21 32:2 38:23 45:16 63:7 primary 43:7 principle 12:22 13:6 principles 11:22 12:5 12:5	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2 42:1 43:1 47:14 50:4 projected 21:1 47:6 47:22 59:2 projecting 47:23 projection 31:18 32:1 43:3 projections 21:12 25:5 25:10 37:4 48:12,19 48:20 52:12 prolific 90:15 prompt 96:9 promptly 78:20 94:12 proof 24:5 78:10,11 78:14 proper 74:8 75:24 100:23 properly 53:13 proposal 105:22 108:24 111:11 proposals 9:20 79:6 propose 106:7 109:25 propose 106:7 109:25 proposition 22:19	puts 61:8 putting 88:1 Q quality 100:8 quantified 24:23 quantum 38:20 68:6 89:22 90:16 question 2:6,24,25 3:3 4:23 9:11 11:9 13:13,19 14:6 20:9 24:3,7,20,21 27:12 28:15 38:18,21 41:19 50:23 54:8 56:15 57:21 58:11 60:4 61:20 67:10,14 67:15 69:20,22 71:7 72:16 73:3 74:9,25 75:1,8,25 76:2,9,10 76:11 77:2,7,9,11 77:17,18,19,21,21 77:23 78:2,9 79:13 80:18 82:5,13,15,17 82:23,25 83:3,6 89:13 92:23,23 93:14,16,20 96:4,4 97:4,6,19,21 98:6 99:20 100:22 101:7	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23 48:4,5,8 49:1,1,5,10 51:5,13 72:3 rates 30:24,24 31:7 rather 15:10 49:20 54:24 62:4 88:2 re 4:1,4,19 4:8 7:1 reach 63:5 106:15 reactes 68:16 react 80:6 81:22 reacting 80:6 reaction 47:10 71:12 read 5:9 8:9 17:9 26:14 40:22 64:7 84:2,5,12,20 94:2 100:9 reading 52:14 reads 10:2 23:18 real 45:13 77:14 88:1 105:15 realised 108:21 reality 14:13 59:19,19 really 8:12 14:8 15:20 26:10 35:16 47:17 53:3 55:19 71:8 90:10 95:10 100:7	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23 reference 5:16 24:13 30:17 39:8 40:21,23 41:4 60:23 64:8,18 references 68:24 69:2 81:7 86:20 referencing 41:15 referring 15:14 56:11 85:24,25 100:1 refers 33:22 82:24 85:5 reflect 11:21 12:19,20 reflectin 38:13 reflects 103:20 refrained 46:8 refresh 37:12 46:4 refused 42:15 regard 19:4 102:21 113:21 regarding 3:7 20:25 21:23 30:3 32:18 38:21 41:19 49:13 62:2 63:18 66:18 87:20 99:20 108:22 108:23 Regularly 86:2 regulated 42:8
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15 precise 38:6 precisely 23:15 79:20 prefer 17:10 61:22 102:15 preference 102:20 premise 30:6,11,20,20 82:4 premises 22:15 26:19 27:16,17 28:16,18 29:23 67:3,7 68:5,9 69:4 prepare 53:12 prepare 1:25 3:13,14 3:15 24:24 66:18 69:23,24 78:12 82:25 93:2 prepares 44:17 preparing 44:15 112:4 present 12:6 38:17 52:12 115:3 presentation 2:1,7,9 3:9,21 22:1 25:1,3 25:20 26:10 31:6 37:25 51:1 60:13 63:2 84:7 presentations 3:2,8 21:18 22:11 83:8	98:13,15,20 99:3,7 99:17 100:5,20 101:2,9,20,23 102:7 102:13 103:4,17 104:11,14,18,23 105:3,6,9,12,24 106:6,10,12,14,17 106:22 107:7,22 108:15,22 109:3,8 109:10,14,16,19,21 110:7,12,21,23,25 111:5,13,19,22,24 111:25 112:4,8,13 112:16,24 113:2,24 114:5,19,23 115:5 President's 24:21 press 79:7 90:13 pretiv 98:15 previous 20:15 47:8 pre-breach 47:21 pre-measure 55:14 pre-qualified 44:13,16 price 23:10,21 32:2 38:23 45:16 63:7 primary 43:7 principle 12:22 13:6 principles 11:22 12:5 12:5 primed 2:16	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2 42:1 43:1 47:14 50:4 projected 21:1 47:6 47:22 59:2 projecting 47:23 projection 31:18 32:1 43:3 projections 21:12 25:5 25:10 37:4 48:12,19 48:20 52:12 prolific 90:15 prompt 96:9 prompt 96:9 prompt 978:20 94:12 proof 24:5 78:10,11 78:14 proper 74:8 75:24 100:23 properly 53:13 proposal 105:22 108:24 111:11 proposals 9:20 79:6 propose 106:7 109:25 proposed 17:6 proposing 8:9 98:11 98:12	puts 61:8 putting 88:1 Q quality 100:8 quantified 24:23 quantum 38:20 68:6 89:22 90:16 question 2:6,24,25 3:3 4:23 9:11 11:9 13:13,19 14:6 20:9 24:3,7,20,21 27:12 28:15 38:18,21 41:19 50:23 54:8 56:15 57:21 58:11 60:4 61:20 67:10,14 67:15 69:20,22 71:7 72:16 73:3 74:9,25 75:1,8,25 76:2,9,10 76:11 77:2,7,9,11 77:17,18,19,21,21 77:23 78:2,9 79:13 80:18 82:5,13,15,17 82:23,25 83:3,6 89:13 92:23,23 93:14,16,20 96:4,4 97:4,6,19,21 98:6 99:20 100:22 101:7 101:16 102:5,9,16	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23 48:4,5,8 49:1,1,5,10 51:5,13 72:3 rates 30:24,24 31:7 rather 15:10 49:20 54:24 62:4 88:2 re 4:1,4,19 4:8 7:1 reach 63:5 106:15 reaches 68:16 react 80:6 81:22 reacting 80:6 reaction 47:10 71:12 read 5:9 8:9 17:9 26:14 40:22 64:7 84:2,5,12,20 94:2 100:9 reading 52:14 reads 10:2 23:18 real 45:13 77:14 88:1 105:15 realised 108:21 realised 10	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23 reference 5:16 24:13 30:17 39:8 40:21,23 41:4 60:23 64:8,18 references 68:24 69:2 81:7 86:20 referencing 41:15 referring 15:14 56:11 85:24,25 100:1 refras 33:22 82:24 85:5 reflect 11:21 12:19,20 reflection 38:13 reflects 103:20 refrained 46:8 refresh 37:12 46:4 refused 42:15 regard 19:4 102:21 113:21 regarding 3:7 20:25 21:23 30:3 32:18 38:21 41:19 49:13 62:2 63:18 66:18 87:20 99:20 108:22 108:23 Regularly 86:2 regulated 42:8 regulator 44:14,18
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15 precise 38:6 precisely 23:15 79:20 prefer 17:10 61:22 102:15 preference 102:20 premise 30:6,11,20,20 82:4 premises 22:15 26:19 27:16,17 28:16,18 29:23 67:3,7 68:5,9 69:4 prepare 53:12 prepared 1:25 3:13,14 3:15 24:24 66:18 69:23,24 78:12 82:25 93:2 prepares 44:17 preparing 44:15 112:4 present 12:6 38:17 52:12 115:3 presentation 2:1,7,9 3:9,21 22:1 25:1,3 25:20 26:10 31:6 37:25 51:1 60:13 63:2 84:7 presentations 3:2,8	98:13,15,20 99:3,7 99:17 100:5,20 101:2,9,20,23 102:7 102:13 103:4,17 104:11,14,18,23 105:3,6,9,12,24 106:6,10,12,14,17 106:22 107:7,22 108:15,22 109:3,8 109:10,14,16,19,21 110:7,12,21,23,25 111:5,13,19,22,24 111:25 112:4,8,13 112:16,24 113:2,24 114:5,19,23 115:5 President's 24:21 press 79:7 90:13 pretty 98:15 previous 20:15 47:8 pre-breach 47:21 pre-measure 55:14 pre-qualified 44:13,16 price 23:10,21 32:2 38:23 45:16 63:7 primary 43:7 principle 12:22 13:6 principles 11:22 12:5 12:5	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2 42:1 43:1 47:14 50:4 projected 21:1 47:6 47:22 59:2 projecting 47:23 projection 31:18 32:1 43:3 projections 21:12 25:5 25:10 37:4 48:12,19 48:20 52:12 prolific 90:15 prompt 96:9 promptly 78:20 94:12 proof 24:5 78:10,11 78:14 proper 74:8 75:24 100:23 properly 53:13 proposal 105:22 108:24 111:11 proposals 9:20 79:6 propose 106:7 109:25 propose 106:7 109:25 proposed 17:6 proposing 8:9 98:11 98:12 proposition 22:19 27:17 75:15 80:23	puts 61:8 putting 88:1 Q quality 100:8 quantified 24:23 quantum 38:20 68:6 89:22 90:16 question 2:6;24,25 3:3 4:23 9:11 11:9 13:13,19 14:6 20:9 24:3,7;20;21 27:12 28:15 38:18,21 41:19 50:23 54:8 56:15 57:21 58:11 60:4 61:20 67:10,14 67:15 69:20,22 71:7 72:16 73:3 74:9,25 75:1,8,25 76:2,9,10 76:11 77:2,7,9,11 77:17,18,19,21,21 77:23 78:2,9 79:13 80:18 82:5,13,15,17 82:23,25 83:3,6 89:13 92:23,23 93:14,16,20 96:4,4 97:4,6,19,21 98:6 99:20 100:22 101	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23 48:4,5,8 49:1,1,5,10 51:5,13 72:3 rates 30:24,24 31:7 rather 15:10 49:20 54:24 62:4 88:2 re 4:1,4,19 4:8 7:1 reach 63:5 106:15 reactes 68:16 react 80:6 81:22 reacting 80:6 reaction 47:10 71:12 read 5:9 8:9 17:9 26:14 40:22 64:7 84:2,5,12,20 94:2 100:9 reading 52:14 reading 52:14 reading 52:14 real 40:2 23:18 real 45:13 77:14 88:1 105:15 realised 108:21 realing 108:21 realing 11:12 real 59:19,19 realing 12:14:8 15:20 26:10 35:16 47:17 53:3 55:19 71:8 90:10 95:10 100:7 101:2,2 107:14,25 reason 38:6 47:6	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23 reference 5:16 24:13 30:17 39:8 40:21,23 41:4 60:23 64:8,18 references 68:24 69:2 81:7 86:20 referencing 41:15 referring 15:14 56:11 85:24,25 100:1 refers 33:22 82:24 85:5 reflect 11:21 12:19,20 reflectin 38:13 reflects 103:20 refrained 46:8 refresh 37:12 46:4 refused 42:15 regard 19:4 102:21 113:21 regarding 3:7 20:25 21:23 30:3 32:18 38:21 41:19 49:13 62:2 63:18 66:18 87:20 99:20 108:22 108:23 Regularly 86:2 regulated 42:8
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15 precise 38:6 precisely 23:15 79:20 prefer 17:10 61:22 102:15 preference 102:20 premise 30:6,11,20,20 82:4 premises 22:15 26:19 27:16,17 28:16,18 29:23 67:3,7 68:5,9 69:4 prepare 53:12 prepared 1:25 3:13,14 3:15 24:24 66:18 69:23,24 78:12 82:25 93:2 prepares 44:17 preparing 44:15 112:4 present 12:6 38:17 52:12 115:3 presentation 2:1,7,9 3:9,21 22:1 25:1,3 25:20 26:10 31:6 37:25 51:1 60:13 63:2 84:7 presentations 3:2,8 21:18 22:11 83:8 87:22	98:13,15,20 99:3,7 99:17 100:5,20 101:2,9,20,23 102:7 102:13 103:4,17 104:11,14,18,23 105:3,6,9,12,24 106:6,10,12,14,17 106:22 107:7,22 108:15,22 109:3,8 109:10,14,16,19,21 110:7,12,21,23,25 111:5,13,19,22,24 111:25 112:4,8,13 112:16,24 113:2,24 114:5,19,23 115:5 President's 24:21 press 79:7 90:13 pretty 98:15 previous 20:15 47:8 pre-qualified 44:13,16 price 23:10,21 32:2 38:23 45:16 63:7 primary 43:7 principle 12:22 13:6 principles 11:22 12:5 12:5 printed 2:16 prior 48:6 59:5	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2 42:1 43:1 47:14 50:4 projected 21:1 47:6 47:22 59:2 projecting 47:23 projection 31:18 32:1 43:3 projections 21:12 25:5 25:10 37:4 48:12,19 48:20 52:12 prolific 90:15 prompt 96:9 promptly 78:20 94:12 proof 24:5 78:10,11 78:14 proper 74:8 75:24 100:23 properly 53:13 proposal 105:22 108:24 111:11 proposal 9:20 79:6 propose 106:7 109:25 proposed 17:6 proposing 8:9 98:11 98:12 proposition 22:19 27:17 75:15 80:23 89:14	puts 61:8 putting 88:1 Q quality 100:8 quantified 24:23 quantified 24:25 sis:1 60:57:21 58:11 60:4 61:20 67:10,14 67:15 69:20,22 71:7 72:16 73:3 74:9,25 75:1,8,25 76:2,9,10 76:11 77:27,9,11 77:17,18,19,21,21 77:23 78:2,9 79:13 80:18 82:5,13,15,17 82:23,25 83:3,6 89:13 92:23,23 93:14,16,20 96:4,4 97:4,6,19,21 98:6 99:20 100:22 101:7	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23 48:4,5,8 49:1,1,5,10 51:5,13 72:3 rates 30:24,24 31:7 rather 15:10 49:20 54:24 62:4 88:2 re 4:1,4,19 4:8 7:1 reach 63:5 106:15 reaches 68:16 react 80:6 81:22 reacting 80:6 reaction 47:10 71:12 reading 52:14 reading 52:14 reading 52:14 reading 52:14 realing 108:21 realing 108:21 realing 108:21 realing 114:13 59:19,19 realing 45:19 71:8 90:10 95:10 100:7 101:2,2 107:14,25 reao 38:6 47:6 63:10 66:7 87:14	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23 reference 5:16 24:13 30:17 39:8 40:21,23 41:4 60:23 64:8,18 references 68:24 69:2 81:7 86:20 referencing 41:15 referring 15:14 56:11 85:24,25 100:1 refers 33:22 82:24 85:5 reflect 11:21 12:19,20 reflection 38:13 reflects 103:20 refrained 46:8 refresh 37:12 46:4 refused 42:15 regard 19:4 102:21 113:21 regard 19:4 102:21 113:22 regulated 42:8 regulated 42:8 regulator 44:14,18 regulator 49:3
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15 precise 38:6 precisely 23:15 79:20 prefer 17:10 61:22 102:15 preference 102:20 premise 30:6,11,20,20 82:4 premises 22:15 26:19 27:16,17 28:16,18 29:23 67:37 68:5,9 69:4 prepare 53:12 prepared 1:25 3:13,14 3:15 24:24 66:18 69:23,24 78:12 82:25 93:2 prepares 44:17 preparing 44:15 112:4 present 12:6 38:17 52:12 115:3 presentation 2:1,7,9 3:9,21 22:1 25:1,3 25:20 26:10 31:6 37:25 51:1 60:13 63:2 84:7 presentations 3:2,8 21:18 22:11 83:8 87:22 presented 5:18 15:6	98:13,15,20 99:3,7 99:17 100:5,20 101:2,9,20,23 102:7 102:13 103:4,17 104:11,14,18,23 105:3,6,9,12,24 106:6,10,12,14,17 106:22 107:7,22 108:15,22 109:3,8 109:10,14,16,19,21 110:7,12,21,23,25 111:5,13,19,22,24 111:25 112:4,8,13 112:16,24 113:2,24 114:5,19,23 115:5 President's 24:21 press 79:7 90:13 prety 98:15 previous 20:15 47:8 pre-breach 47:21 pre-breach 47:	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2 42:1 43:1 47:14 50:4 projected 21:1 47:6 47:22 59:2 projecting 47:23 projection 31:18 32:1 43:3 projections 21:12 25:5 25:10 37:4 48:12,19 48:20 52:12 prolific 90:15 prompt 96:9 promptly 78:20 94:12 proof 24:5 78:10,11 78:14 proper 74:8 75:24 100:23 properly 53:13 proposal 105:22 108:24 111:11 proposals 9:20 79:6 propose 106:7 109:25 proposed 17:6 proposing 8:9 98:11 98:12 proposition 22:19 27:17 75:15 80:23 89:14 protect 4:25	puts 61:8 putting 88:1 Q quality 100:8 quantified 24:23 quantified 24:25 sis:1 60:4 61:20 67:10,14 67:15 69:20,22 71:7 72:16 73:3 74:9,25 75:1,8,25 76:2,9,10 76:11 77:2,7,9,11 77:17,18,19,21,21 77:23 78:2,9 79:13 80:18 82:5,13,15,17 82:23,25 83:3,6 89:13 92:23,23 93:14,16,20 96:4,4 97:4,6,19,21 98:6 99:20 100:22 101:7 101:16 102:5,9,16 </td <td>98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23 48:4,5,8 49:1,1,5,10 51:5,13 72:3 rates 30:24,24 31:7 rather 15:10 49:20 54:24 62:4 88:2 re 4:1,4,19 4:8 7:1 reach 63:5 106:15 reacting 80:6 reacting 80:6 reacting 47:10 71:12 read 5:9 8:9 17:9 26:14 40:22 64:7 84:2,5,12,20 94:2 100:9 reading 52:14 reads 10:2 23:18 real 45:13 77:14 88:1 105:15 realing 108:21 reality 14:13 59:19,19 reality 14:2 14:8 15:20 26:10 35:16 47:17 53:3 55:19 71:8 90:10 95:10 100:7 101:2,2 107:14,25 reasonable 6:1,11</td> <td>refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23 reference 5:16 24:13 30:17 39:8 40:21,23 41:4 60:23 64:8,18 references 68:24 69:2 81:7 86:20 referencing 41:15 referring 15:14 56:11 85:24,25 100:1 refers 33:22 82:24 85:5 reflect 11:21 12:19,20 reflection 38:13 reflects 103:20 refrained 46:8 refresh 37:12 46:4 refused 42:15 regard 19:4 102:21 113:21 regarding 3:7 20:25 21:23 30:3 32:18 38:21 41:19 49:13 62:2 63:18 66:18 87:20 99:20 108:22 108:23 Regulator 44:14,18 regulator 49:3 reiterate 10:9 55:6</td>	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23 48:4,5,8 49:1,1,5,10 51:5,13 72:3 rates 30:24,24 31:7 rather 15:10 49:20 54:24 62:4 88:2 re 4:1,4,19 4:8 7:1 reach 63:5 106:15 reacting 80:6 reacting 80:6 reacting 47:10 71:12 read 5:9 8:9 17:9 26:14 40:22 64:7 84:2,5,12,20 94:2 100:9 reading 52:14 reads 10:2 23:18 real 45:13 77:14 88:1 105:15 realing 108:21 reality 14:13 59:19,19 reality 14:2 14:8 15:20 26:10 35:16 47:17 53:3 55:19 71:8 90:10 95:10 100:7 101:2,2 107:14,25 reasonable 6:1,11	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23 reference 5:16 24:13 30:17 39:8 40:21,23 41:4 60:23 64:8,18 references 68:24 69:2 81:7 86:20 referencing 41:15 referring 15:14 56:11 85:24,25 100:1 refers 33:22 82:24 85:5 reflect 11:21 12:19,20 reflection 38:13 reflects 103:20 refrained 46:8 refresh 37:12 46:4 refused 42:15 regard 19:4 102:21 113:21 regarding 3:7 20:25 21:23 30:3 32:18 38:21 41:19 49:13 62:2 63:18 66:18 87:20 99:20 108:22 108:23 Regulator 44:14,18 regulator 49:3 reiterate 10:9 55:6
12:6,20,21 preceding 9:16 27:15 precise 38:6 precisely 23:15 79:20 prefer 17:10 61:22 102:15 preference 102:20 premise 30:6,11,20,20 82:4 premises 22:15 26:19 27:16,17 28:16,18 29:23 67:37, 68:5,9 69:4 prepare 53:12 prepared 1:25 3:13,14 3:15 24:24 66:18 69:23,24 78:12 82:25 93:2 prepares 44:17 preparing 44:15 112:4 present 12:6 38:17 52:12 115:3 presentation 2:1,7,9 3:9,21 22:1 25:1,3 25:20 26:10 31:6 37:25 51:1 60:13 63:2 84:7 presentations 3:2,8 21:18 22:11 83:8 87:22 presented 5:18 15:6 60:24 67:1 68:25	98:13,15,20 99:3,7 99:17 100:5,20 101:2,9,20,23 102:7 102:13 103:4,17 104:11,14,18,23 105:3,6,9,12,24 106:6,10,12,14,17 106:22 107:7,22 108:15,22 109:3,8 109:10,14,16,19,21 110:7,12,21,23,25 111:5,13,19,22,24 111:25 112:4,8,13 112:16,24 113:2,24 114:5,19,23 115:5 President's 24:21 press 79:7 90:13 pretty 98:15 previous 20:15 47:8 pre-breach 47:21 pre-breach 47	prohibition 8:5,6 project 11:13 38:2 42:1 43:1 47:14 50:4 projected 21:1 47:6 47:22 59:2 projecting 47:23 projection 31:18 32:1 43:3 projections 21:12 25:5 25:10 37:4 48:12,19 48:20 52:12 prolific 90:15 prompt 96:9 promptly 78:20 94:12 proof 24:5 78:10,11 78:14 proper 74:8 75:24 100:23 properly 53:13 proposal 105:22 108:24 111:11 proposals 9:20 79:6 propose 106:7 109:25 proposed 17:6 proposing 8:9 98:11 98:12 profect 4:25 prove 78:3,19	puts 61:8 putting 88:1 Q quality 100:8 quantified 24:23 quantified 24:25 sis:1 60:57:21 58:11 60:4 61:20 67:10,14 67:15 69:20,22 71:7 72:16 73:3 74:9,25 75:1,8,25 76:2,9,10 76:11 77:27,9,11 77:17,18,19,21,21 77:23 78:2,9 79:13 80:18 82:5,13,15,17 82:23,25 83:3,6 89:13 92:23,23 93:14,16,20 96:4,4 97:4,6,19,21 98:6 99:20 100:22 101:7	98:2 100:23 rate 30:11 36:13,16,16 44:25 45:2 47:23 48:4,5,8 49:1,1,5,10 51:5,13 72:3 rates 30:24,24 31:7 rather 15:10 49:20 54:24 62:4 88:2 re 4:1,4,19 4:8 7:1 reach 63:5 106:15 reaches 68:16 react 80:6 81:22 reacting 80:6 reaction 47:10 71:12 reading 52:14 reading 52:14 reading 52:14 reading 52:14 realing 108:21 realing 108:21 realing 108:21 realing 114:13 59:19,19 realing 45:19 71:8 90:10 95:10 100:7 101:2,2 107:14,25 reao 38:6 47:6 63:10 66:7 87:14	refer 40:10,14,20 72:1 82:23 reference 5:16 24:13 30:17 39:8 40:21,23 41:4 60:23 64:8,18 references 68:24 69:2 81:7 86:20 referencing 41:15 referring 15:14 56:11 85:24,25 100:1 refers 33:22 82:24 85:5 reflect 11:21 12:19,20 reflection 38:13 reflects 103:20 refrained 46:8 refresh 37:12 46:4 refused 42:15 regard 19:4 102:21 113:21 regarding 3:7 20:25 21:23 30:3 32:18 38:21 41:19 49:13 62:2 63:18 66:18 87:20 99:20 108:22 108:23 Regularly 86:2 regulator 44:14,18 regulator 49:3 reiterate 10:9 55:6 reiterated 10:16

Trevor McGowan

Page 8

TECO Guatemala Holdings, LLC -v- Republic of Guatemala ICSID Case No. ARB/10/23

Friday. 29 July 2022

relating 88:20	74:10	89:1 90:2 91:17	scenario 21:1 34:9,9	series 35:22	single 24:18 26:8,17
relation 23:5	resigned 81:12	93:2 94:18,22 95:22	34:15 41:25 45:22	served 8:10	sits 10:21
relations 20:15	resolution 1:5 49:3,4	99:17 108:12	46:24 55:12 57:1,19	service 44:4	situation 4:17 69:22
relationship 4:20,22	respect 9:23 54:14,18	rights 113:7	58:3,16 64:1	set 22:14,15,18 24:16	74:23 77:15 78:4
5:12,12 80:21 85:2	55:10 67:13 75:25	right-hand 60:17	scheduled 2:7	26:19 27:16 29:23	83:17 84:15,20,21
85:19 88:17,23 89:7	85:23 89:5	65:22	schedules 106:8	29:24 30:2 37:10	86:9,11,17,18,19
89:11,15 90:5,7,17	respond 14:12,12	rise 6:8 15:16 73:2	scope 3:23 46:17	44:25 45:2 55:17	95:15
90:20,25 91:24	25:12 61:23 69:24	81:1	97:13 98:9	60:7 67:25 68:22	situations 93:16 94:6
relationships 6:3	74:15,25 75:9,11	risk 70:25	screen 60:15 79:9	107:7 109:22	101:11,12
13:12 20:15 85:6	76:19 78:6,7 93:11	risk-free 30:9,12,23	scroll 9:24	setting 68:4 107:5	six 26:21 103:15
relax 96:19	94:4,21 95:12	30:24,25 31:9	se 56:7	settled 33:7	skip 26:12 30:1 103:2
relevant 15:4 31:1	respondent 4:2 4:8	RITA 2:17	SEBASTIAN 2:6	Settlement 1:2	sleep 1:11 96:20
35:24 37:23 81:15	21:20 39:7 80:4	RODRÍGUEZ 2:18	second 4:15 7:10	seven 103:15	slide 2:5 3:19 5:7,8 6:4
96:1 97:6	81:20 86:1,2	roles 7:24 8:4,10	13:15 22:15,23	severe 47:10	7:10 9:12 22:8,10
reliability 113:14	Respondent's 48:16	17:19,21	26:19 27:16 29:23	share 6:5 62:24 65:15	25:18 26:3,22 27:15
relied 7:7 10:18	72:19	Roman 104:15	29:25 33:15 34:4	84:5,11	27:16,23 28:11,14
rely 80:7 86:2	Respondent/Applic	room 2:18 98:25	35:16 51:20 53:10	shareholder 49:20	28:17,17,18,18 30:1
relying 81:12 90:4	1:18 2:9	ROSALES 2:22	61:17 76:4,12 77:2	51:6,13,15,19 54:22	31:6,13,16 33:16
remain 18:24	responding 25:21	round 106:18	77:16,22 78:2,9	54:24 63:14	34:3,5,23 35:4,5,18
remained 45:9	74:19 88:9	rounds 108:2 109:3	81:10 83:3 99:22	shareholders 34:20	36:1 37:14 39:2
remark 3:19 17:7	response 2:6 50:23	routinely 75:13 76:3	106:18 109:12	55:3 63:5,8	51:1 52:3 60:12,16
remarked 7:6	60:4 77:4 79:5	76:13 82:18	Secretary 1:21	shareholder's 62:23	63:1 65:14 66:9
remedy 9:3	93:20 100:19	rule 13:20 16:8 24:7	section 13:7 68:3,7,8	SHARIPOV 2:13	79:4 82:2 84:8,10
remember 20:24	110:20	99:20 109:13	68:22 103:16	shift 18:12,14	86:1,20 89:3
51:15 52:4 62:20	responsive 2:20 71:1	ruled 67:19	sections 70:16 103:12	shifting 78:10,11	slides 2:1,7,22 3:3,21
104:23	96:4 110:17,24	rules 1:1 9:3 11:20,21	103:13,15	shifts 23:25	9:13 24:16,17,25
reminds 11:18	111:14,16	13:16 108:16	security 107:17	short 54:4 62:11 66:21	25:13,15 26:6,18
removal 9:2	rest 21:5 38:21 70:8	ruling 60:14	see 7:15,25 10:18	72:12 101:22	29:23,24 35:25
rendered 85:4	98:18	rulings 67:17	12:17 13:7 14:2	106:18 107:19,23	37:25 38:11,12
reparation 30:23	resubmission 22:13	running 111:8	16:6,25 17:5 18:3	108:5	46:11 87:23
repeat 78:17 79:23	22:18 23:5 26:20	runs 70:25 89:25	19:6,16 21:1 26:15	shorter 26:17 104:12	slightly 66:12
repeated 88:10	27:11,14,20,24 28:1		32:6,7,9,15 33:20	shortly 81:18	Slower 23:17
repeating 74:17 88:13	28:10,23 29:17 30:4	<u> </u>	34:4,17 35:8,18	show 2:1 17:18,23	small 46:6
repetition 92:14 101:3	30:8,13,15,15 31:8	s 34:18	36:6,7 40:19 43:8,9	18:14,22 26:4 29:24	smaller 70:22 104:15
replaced 41:3	32:6 35:4,6 38:8,12	sake 93:8 104:16	51:3 56:3 60:15	80:8 84:10	Smith 2:11 11:5 14:25
replies 107:23	41:21 49:15,18,21	sale 23:10,21	61:17 64:17 66:5	showed 4:17 31:2 39:3	15:3,8,18 16:21
reply 103:8 107:4,6,19	49:24 50:9,11 51:3	sales 54:23	67:19 69:22 75:1	60:5 64:15 79:4,6	72:6
107:24 108:2	52:5,25 55:9 57:4	same 8:15 18:4 23:6	81:6 86:20 90:19,21	showing 89:4	snippet 52:4 64:3
109:19 111:7,16,24 112:9,18	60:10,17 68:10,15	23:15 26:18 27:20	90:22 91:6 92:5	shows 12:2 58:12	snippets 3:7 27:14 35:19
report 33:15 34:4 35:5	68:17,19,25 69:2,5 74:1,5	28:9,21 29:2,12,16	93:15 96:25 103:24 107:3,18 111:7	60:13 77:25 80:2,14 105:3	sole 28:7 29:1,9,14
35:6 36:7 47:25	resubmitted 48:17	29:20 31:5 32:14	114:20	side 2:18 37:2 46:17	Sole 28.7 29.1,9,14 SolEs 81:12
51:2 64:17,23,25	result 34:6 40:17 52:1	35:9,12,13 36:14	seeing 36:15 46:17	46:23 60:17 65:22	some 2:1,13 3:14 4:22
65:4 68:25	52:20 81:13 85:21	56:22 58:12,20 59:4	65:21 66:10	70:13 77:10 88:17	6:18 7:16,16 9:14
reported 78:23 79:7	resulted 65:19	59:7,11,22 66:8	seems 53:1 74:25	98:4 107:2	10:20,22,23 12:5
80:16 81:6,20,25	resulting 34:12	73:13 80:7 84:6,15	95:25	sides 65:11 96:16	15:14,15 16:15 21:6
90:12	results 48:9	84:21 86:11 90:10	seen 33:19 37:3 100:8	107:17 110:16	24:5 25:19,24 33:17
Reporter 80:4,16 81:8	retain 44:4	92:13 109:13 sanction 9:3	select 21:6	Sigla 45:4	46:4 53:2,7 58:9
reporters 3:5 114:8,9	retrospectively 7:9	SANOJA 2:14	self-explanatory	significant 33:4 51:17	62:19 64:3 69:23
reports 3:7 26:18	return 49:5 62:3	SANUJA 2:14 SANTIZ 2:20	33:21	53:8 74:4	70:2,8 71:2 94:6
31:14 43:9 48:7	returns 30:24	SATIJA 2:5	sell 42:12	significantly 22:25	95:17 96:19 98:25
63:22 85:5	reveal 41:9	saw 7:20 34:6 54:13	semantics 41:5	23:22 47:13	98:25 99:6 101:9,10
representative 5:20	revenue 43:17 45:11	60:6 64:3 65:14	sense 16:16 41:2 43:7	SILVIA 3:3	101:12 102:22
representatives 69:19	45:12,13 46:23	saving 10:10 43:11	55:16,24 58:23	similar 3:13 8:20 30:2	103:23 104:2,5
Republic 1:18 2:16	revenues 43:18,19,20	46:18 47:17 50:8	102:3,16 110:23	58:19 81:14 94:17	107:13
request 21:17 75:8	47:9 48:2 55:20	51:21 54:21 62:14	sensible 95:25	Similarly 29:2	somebody 42:18
84:14 86:1 92:25	review 31:14 104:19	62:22 79:19 81:4	sensibly 87:15	simpler 30:2,5 32:6	somehow 25:5 46:3
106:17 108:14	105:12	82:14 84:25 85:7,18	sentence 76:4 77:16	96:10	53:2 62:5 64:12
110:14	reviewed 105:16	85:23 86:13 89:23	77:21,22	simplified 26:15	69:5 85:9 93:7
requested 85:9,10,11	revised 34:7,24 44:25	90:9 91:12,22 97:1	sentences 97:8	simply 6:5 35:23	someone 12:14 72:19
86:4 87:7	revision 105:12	102:23 111:9	separate 32:17 33:2	42:15 76:21 91:6	81:2,4 89:25 90:11
require 96:12	re-arguing 88:2	says 5:9 6:6 8:16	35:20 80:18	simultaneously	92:6,10 93:6,8
requirement 17:17	re-termed 35:2	13:10,15 15:11,16	separately 70:4 82:8	109:11,16	something 3:18 5:5
78:14	Rica 31:3,4,5	20:11 22:8,23 27:24	September 36:7 110:8	since 14:15 25:23	6:14 13:8 16:6
requires 77:10	right 12:22 17:1 19:6	31:17 33:22 36:20	110:11,13	26:14 42:24 52:11	30:21 31:1 39:11
res 67:9,12 68:2,8	19:19 36:18,18	40:8 52:9 73:22	September/October	66:23,25 98:6 99:20	40:12 41:6,8,8
research 110:1	56:20 57:20 59:22	82:13,14 84:4 85:14	89:2	99:21,23 100:13,14	42:24 50:22 55:8
resembling 63:19	61:9 65:23 79:19	103:8 104:21	seriatim 22:1	109:11	61:7,11,15 66:18

Trevor McGowan

TECO Guatemala Holdings, LLC -v- Republic of Guatemala ICSID Case No. ARB/10/23

Friday. 29 July 2022

	1				
69:21 73:10 74:20	83:4	suggesting 16:17 53:2	TCC 80:15 89:1,3	50:25 53:16,19,23	Torterola 2:10 4:3,17
76:20 78:20 80:6	statement 9:25 10:6	70:10 95:18,19	90:4	56:1 58:10,15,19	1:11,13,15,22,25
90:14 98:2,22	statements 61:13	suggestion 70:4,21	team 71:25 72:19 93:6	59:21 61:11 62:25	2:13 4:3,4,9 7:11
100:15,16 101:15	states 9:1 10:12,23,23	71:11	TECO 1:16 2:7,7 51:6	63:1 64:16,23,25	11:3 13:19,25 14:15
103:25 104:2	10:23,25 11:2,4,7	suggestions 21:10	51:13 53:1 61:20	69:17,20,25 70:12	14:21,23 20:8,19,21
106:20,21	11:19 12:4 15:9	32:5	67:6 73:4,6,8 76:12	70:22 71:5 74:3	53:16,25 69:16
					-
sometimes 19:6	79:4,17 80:4 81:20	summarise 62:12	77:4 78:9 84:9	76:12 78:3,11 79:3	70:10,17,20 72:6
somewhere 12:14	86:1,1,2,8	103:2	100:3 114:24	79:13 86:7 87:25	74:14,22 75:16
99:18	stating 10:15 79:23	summarised 27:22	TECO's 50:12 60:12	89:16 91:18,19 92:3	76:18,23 77:7 78:3
soon 78:22 81:4 92:2	statute 15:9	28:17,18	63:2 101:10 102:24	92:13,19 93:3 94:14	78:10 79:11,15
SOPHIA 3:3	stays 105:7	summary 26:21 27:13	tell 14:19 42:19 99:7	94:17 96:11,21 98:5	82:10,11 83:25 84:7
sorry 15:1 32:8,9,9,9	stenography 25:23	32:19 33:14 34:23	tells 61:3	98:15 99:18,23	84:10,12,25 85:7,24
36:4 39:10 40:10	stick 100:12	35:15 66:22	ten 53:14,23 109:15	100:5,15,20 101:21	88:8,15 92:22,25
46:1 50:10 57:11	still 7:4,14,17 9:7	summer 105:5	109:16	102:15 103:6	93:6 94:1,19 95:8
84:24 93:5 114:13	35:14 40:19,22 53:6	Sunday 110:10,11	tends 23:18	104:11,21 106:15	95:19 97:18,22
114:14 115:1,2,5,6	53:9 59:7,10,18	Superior 2:17,18	tenor 56:4	106:23 107:15	98:25 99:4 100:18
sought 36:16 95:3,5	62:16 109:12	supplemental 93:19	term 5:15 66:6 94:13	111:5 112:8,13	100:24 101:17,21
95:21		94:9		-	
	stood 53:6,9		terms 5:2 45:13,15	113:15,18	102:4,11 104:9,17
source 87:2	Stop 36:3	SUPPORT 3:8	52:16,18	thinking 114:25	104:21,25 105:4,8
sources 3:5 86:24 87:5	straightforward	supported 69:7 73:24	testimony 69:1 71:16	thinks 76:16 103:10	105:11,18,19 106:9
so-called 19:8,18	23:11	74:6	71:17 73:21 74:10	third 1:3 6:13 7:19	106:11,16,17
42:25 89:6	straitjacket 103:19,22	supposed 44:19 49:5	text 5:4 7:14,16 20:17	8:25 12:11,13 52:3	107:11 108:12,21
space 106:20	strict 98:22	73:5 102:19	24:14 26:6,16	52:3 62:22 64:22	108:23 109:7,20
Spain 80:11,11,16	strong 72:15 73:4	Supreme 15:11,11	texts 17:8,9	thorough 98:24	110:5,11,13,22
81:13 84:4,13,16,21	strongly 72:20	sure 14:3 22:5 51:9	thank 1:4,20 6:22,23	though 55:2	111:2,9,21 112:6,22
85:1,9,16,18	struck 41:1	53:11 61:12 73:4	14:24 15:23 20:18	thought 8:22 24:21	112:23 113:9,10,24
Spain's 85:1,23	structured 55:2	74:11 77:1 85:15	20:22 21:14 22:7	28:14 37:5 40:4	112.23 113.9,10,24
•					
Spanish 3:5 4:5 82:15	study 44:11,15,17,18	97:14 99:24 105:25	31:11 33:10 38:10	66:17 69:16 90:13	total 101:5,8
93:3,7 108:9,11	45:1,2,3,4,13 56:10	107:25 114:22	39:1,17,17,19,21	94:19	Trade 2:23,23
Spanish-English 3:2,3	56:13	surmise 19:21	41:18 46:22 51:11	thoughts 58:9 70:2,3	traded 31:21 37:16
3:3	sub 16:23	surprises 106:25	52:23 60:2 61:10	three 8:2,11 37:6 46:2	transaction 55:1 63:4
speak 10:7 11:5 22:19	subject 16:14 55:4	surrounding 85:2,18	65:9,10,10 66:15	49:23 65:1 96:3	63:11
27:17 58:11 113:15	83:10	survey 94:15	69:9 71:23 78:17	101:7 102:4,5 104:1	transactions 31:22
113:15 114:20	submission 9:22 63:23	sympathetic 72:23	82:9 87:10 88:5,8	through 21:3,9,18	34:11 37:10,11,17
speaking 4:5 59:20	101:11 107:20	system 113:14	88:14,15 92:17	22:16 25:13 30:23	37:22
87:15	108:2 109:12	systems 86:22	97:20 111:21 113:1	38:18 44:2 52:14	transcript 1:23 39:21
speaks 36:14	111:24 112:3	5 550115 00.22	113:24 114:1,2,6,7	57:23 59:20,24 64:7	39:25 40:18 46:10
-				-	
special 5:23	submissions 4:1,4 4:8	T	114:8,9,10,12,24	69:25 72:17 79:24	52:5,25 60:22 61:5
specific 3:11 5:14 7:23	7:1 10:20 24:12	table 33:14,21 34:3,23	115:2,4	83:19 85:20 96:19	62:25 63:15 66:5
8:14 22:12,13 24:22	87:17,22 96:24	35:7 106:1	their 4:23 6:11 44:4,8	100:9	94:2 99:19,24
39:8 71:4,7 75:1,7	100:7 101:2 103:18	tables 36:6	45:3 53:5 61:13	throughout 7:14	104:20 105:12,16
75:12 79:13 96:23	108:7 111:13	tacit 30:21	74:20 81:17 83:7	34:15 43:8 56:22	transition 89:12
100:13,18	114:13,15,21	tackle 103:14	101:11,13 113:6	58:19 114:3	translated 23:17 93:7
specifically 58:11	submit 2:10 96:24	take 2:16 14:11 25:1	themselves 10:25 12:9	till 92:5	translation 4:5 108:10
74:15 99:12 100:1	97:4 107:18 108:24		86:8	time 4:22 10:17 12:6	109:1
spend 102:2	108:25 109:23	25:13,19 32:14	theoretically 36:23	16:10 23:16,20	translations 108:22,23
spending 108:19	110:21,22 111:7	42:15 47:20 65:5	theory 37:18 68:18	25:19 28:22 29:2	109:1,5,17
	,	71:10 72:20 80:23			
spirit 114:19	submitted 70:9 87:12	89:12,24 94:15,22	112:11	40:13 48:17 49:7,8	transmission 43:24
splitting 109:25	107:20 109:4,5	96:9 110:3	thing 7:9 8:17 31:11	53:18 58:13 66:25	transparent 2:17,19
spot 26:8	subscribe 86:22	taken 3:6 15:11 27:19	40:2,14 56:1 60:3	74:8,18 78:24 81:10	Treaties 11:23
square 16:24 89:1	subscribed 87:1	28:13 34:2 35:5	63:4,7,17 95:16	83:9 89:25 91:3	treaty 9:4 44:24
STAFF 3:8	subscription-based	47:19,25 51:1 69:18	102:7 110:14	92:25 94:22 97:24	Trevor 1:23
stage 7:7	86:24 87:2	taking 19:20 20:16	things 4:14 5:1 6:21	102:2 104:18,18,19	tribunal 4:7,8 8:14
stance 42:15,23	subsequent 108:17	26:4 36:9 48:2	8:21 9:18,20 11:13	105:15 107:14,16	9:10 21:12,16 22:19
standard 12:8,9,10	substantial 4:11,15		11:14,15 12:1,4,12	timeliness 106:3	22:23 23:2,5 24:6
15:13 19:2	substantially 8:20	talk 12:13 88:17 96:20	54:1 63:3 64:6	times 7:15 104:15	24:10,11 25:6,8
standpoint 50:3	77:11	114:16	67:24 68:1 69:18	timing 108:11	26:20 27:4,10,11,24
-		talking 13:22 16:24		0	28:1,10,10,23,25
stands 8:25 40:25	successful 105:3	40:18 44:8 50:25	70:3 71:2,7 79:7	title 33:20 86:1,3	
start 22:3,8,16 31:13	suffered 113:6	71:18 75:17 82:5,20	82:13 93:1 96:22	today 2:2 46:10 51:1	29:8,10,14,16,17
34:7 35:8 76:11	suffice 27:25 28:22	92:22 98:7	98:17 99:1 102:19	77:10 82:25 106:4	30:8,15 31:7 32:19
started 46:25	sufficient 27:5 28:4	talks 6:10 43:9 77:2	think 2:8 5:5 6:19	today's 21:5	44:23 45:7 48:14
starting 2:24 22:1	29:6,11 68:17 97:3	TANIA 2:25	12:17,20 14:25 15:1	together 3:8 57:23	50:18 51:23 52:9
31:14 62:15	suggest 69:13 70:6	tariff 42:3,4 43:20	15:3,4 16:1,9 19:8	61:2 87:21 88:1	53:18 56:16 57:24
starts 33:23 34:4	74:23 94:21 103:11	47:7	19:23,25 20:5 21:8	told 14:15 58:21 85:11	59:22 60:4,14 61:3
74:10	105:20 110:18		24:13 25:12,17,20	85:25 108:15	61:7 62:21 67:5,11
state 11:1 15:13,15	suggested 2:15 35:22	tasked 44:15	26:10 36:23,25 37:3	top 69:17	67:15,18,23,24 68:3
16:4 69:19 97:5	45:18 56:8 88:16	tax 48:4,5,7	38:11 39:2,5,15	topics 70:2,11,12	68:4,11,13,14,15,15
		taxation 48:2			
stated 11:17 68:24	101:18	taxes 48:3	40:8 41:20 46:16	113:12,20	68:18,19,21 69:3
1					

TECO Guatemala Holdings, LLC -v- Republic of Guatemala ICSID Case No. ARB/10/23

Friday. 29 July 2022

71:15 84:14 87:13	27.2 6 10 28.16	113:12,17,19 115:5	56.25 57.1 58.2 22	X 91:10 104:8	11 28 54.2
	37:3,6,19 38:16		56:25 57:1 58:2,22		11.28 54:3
108:4 111:15	39:6,7 44:10 47:13	vice 2:22 66:1	59:12,14 60:6 61:6	XYZ 97:4	11.42 54:5
tribunals 38:19	48:12,15 51:23 55:5	VICTORIA 2:23	63:21,21 64:4,10		12 33:14 104:15
Tribunal's 38:13	56:23 57:7,12,18	Vicuña 79:24	72:1,8 74:1 75:25	Y	12th 110:11,13
60:20 67:11,17 69:6	58:4,24 59:3,4 62:4	Vienna 11:19,20,22	78:24 79:7,16 80:6	year 47:5 59:4	12.12 72:11
triggered 81:17	66:6 95:3 107:3	view 9:19 16:20 31:25	80:17 81:12,14,18	vears 5:14,20 8:11	12.22 72:13
triple-check 56:21	109:13	32:15 40:25 54:11	81:19,25 85:11,20	14:19 45:10 48:6	13 34:3 35:7 69:20
true 11:3,10	useful 9:12 48:21	55:23 69:14 87:12	90:4 92:8 97:2 99:8	80:22 90:1 91:10	134 27:20,23
try 19:12 40:10 104:2	user 44:7	96:10	99:12 103:17,18	yesterday 1:12,13	138 27:20,23 60:14,18
trying 19:21 47:17	uses 31:18,19,25	views 53:6,9 71:9 73:5	108:11,11 111:6	3:12 4:17 7:23 8:9	14 34:23
55:18	51:22	102:25	weren't 53:8		15 98:4 102:22 106:18
turn 54:13 76:11	using 45:15,17 47:21	VILLAGRÁN 2:22	we'll 39:25 41:14	20:24 21:17 25:4	106:21 107:16,19
two 1:13 17:8,9 18:23	47:23 48:25 54:23	VILLANÚA 1:12	58:20 71:6 102:1	28:15 30:22 31:2	108:5,8
-				38:18 39:3 54:13	
25:24,25 31:20 38:1	56:8,9,25 57:1	violation 113:6	111:5,7,8	60:5 64:15 77:9	18.2 61:1 65:3,7
38:14,19 45:4 52:18	97:10	volunteer 105:22,24	we're 3:16 7:22 15:4	79:3,3 99:13	18.6 52:21 62:14
53:19,25 63:3 64:12	usual 114:9		36:14 40:16,17	yesterday's 31:6	19 2:24
67:3,7 69:4,12,14	utility 42:8	W	41:15 46:10 50:25	yes/no 104:6	
71:24 82:13 99:8,13		WACC 49:1,2,4,7	55:18 61:21 71:16	Young 2:4 79:2	2
102:14 103:17,18	V	54:24 62:4	75:17 82:4,20 87:7	6	2 5:7 8:5 14:16,20,23
109:3,4	v 1:17 10:9 30:19 31:3	wait 92:2,5	91:12 94:14 98:7,12	Z	17:2,15 21:9 36:6
type 38:2 42:19	79:8,10,22 81:13	waive 62:5	102:18	zero 61:1	2(a)(iii) 13:22
Typically 47:2	VAD 44:4,9,10,15,17	walk 38:18	we've 10:19 11:11		2.00 58:7
v	44:18,25 45:2,3,6,9	want 2:5 16:22 33:3	34:15 46:10 53:11	Zoom 114:12	20 104:22,24 105:7,9
U	45:9,13,21 47:7,8		63:15 69:11,15		20 104:22,24 103:7,9 200 98:3,4
Ukraine 10:9		38:2 42:14 61:12,13	73:11 78:15 82:7	\$	
	47:25 51:25 52:17	63:17 70:24 73:21	88:3 104:19 105:13	\$1,479.3 34:14	2007 47:5,22 59:5,8,11
Ultimately 44:23	55:17 59:5	74:7 77:19 78:5	107:1 109:13	\$1.406 34:1,5	59:19
unable 84:16	VADs 45:4	80:23 92:20 95:17		\$1.451 33:24	2008 47:8 59:6,6,17,19
unacceptable 12:18	valuation 2:22 26:18	96:7,16 97:5,9,12	whatsoever 91:19	\$18.2 60:8 61:1	2008-2010 58:1
under 1:1 7:4,14,17	32:23 33:19,24 34:7	98:3 103:1,2,14,25	while 8:15 25:1 31:24	\$21 34:25 58:2	2010 24:24 30:10,16
8:21 16:3 30:12	37:15 38:22 39:9,9	104:12 107:8,24	39:11 46:6 53:8	\$21 34.23 38.2 \$222 35:1	43:15 46:24 47:4,12
35:8 44:14	40:21 41:4 47:3	109:22 114:16,20	55:17	\$222 33.1 \$26 61:1	52:13 59:7,8,10,23
underlying 7:22 16:12	48:6,25 51:22	wanted 3:19 4:9 11:10	White 2:3,4,4,5,5,6,6		2010-2013 20:25
17:24 20:5 21:19	valuations 3:5 32:22	24:22 25:4,7,24	44:11,12 45:1,1,9	\$3.7 65:25	44:10 45:6,11
32:22 80:20 82:7	value 14:8 21:19	26:7,15 50:22 55:14	47:25 51:25 56:10	\$3.8 66:1	2013 24:24 43:16
89:10 91:24	22:20,21,24 23:4,6	83:1 86:8 93:22	57:7	\$8 60:11	46:25 59:10
understand 10:22	24:2,8 25:9 26:24	wants 16:19 61:11	whole 62:24 102:1	\$8.2 65:20	2017 80:12 85:6,22
14:2 15:20 18:18,19	27:2,5,7,10,12,19	71:15 102:24	110:9	\$87 51:16	2017 00:12 05:0,22 2018 36:7
21:11 24:22 25:5	28:2,4,8,21,24 29:1	wash 64:12 66:7,14	widely 81:20,25		2010 30.7 2020 20:10,13,17
		-	WILSON 2:6	0	99:23
57:21 71:20 89:13	29:4,6,9,12,15,20	washed 52:7 54:16	wish 8:17 72:24 73:9	0.1 52:19 64:14	
92:4 95:19 97:8	31:22,23,23 32:2,3	66:6	93:25 103:5 106:19	012 02119 01111	2021 14:21,22
understanding 16:14	32:24 33:1,19 35:1	way 28:16 30:1,19	wished 9:8	1	2022 1:8 1:1
62:1	35:11,15 36:21	40:20 65:7 66:1,2	witness 5:21 71:16,17		21 4:8,9
understands 72:14,24	37:22 42:11 43:1	66:12,22 75:1 77:23	· · · · · ·	1 1:6 8:4 17:14 20:9	21st 30:10,16
understood 11:14	44:5,5 47:15 52:15	88:2 91:23 95:2	72:2,4,5 73:21,24	36:6 60:21 93:16	24 21:4,9 69:15,24
16:21 17:8 21:17	57:25 62:23,23 67:1	111:19 115:1	74:7,10 75:22	97:4,6	98:9 99:10,12,15
55:24 56:4 61:19	67:2,13 68:15,23	week 104:25 106:10	witnesses 72:8 75:22	1st 59:6,17	100:12 101:9,21
62:25 74:13,14 86:5	88:1	106:11,12 110:18	wondering 53:17	1,40[6 34:8	102:5
86:10,16 104:17	values 36:11	110:24 111:2,9,14	wording 17:10 18:4	1,406.7 34:6 35:9	251 64:16
unfair 47:20	vast 43:20	weighted 34:12 35:11	100:14	1,479.3 35:12	252 64:16
Unglaube 31:3	Vaughn 1:24	37:16 54:23	words 18:6 83:16	1.36 115:8	26.8 52:21 62:13 65:3
Unit 2:19	ventilated 50:17	welcome 1:7 103:6	work 77:10 105:4	1.5 65:23	65:6
United 10:23,23 11:2	verbatim 30:13,14,17	welcomed 96:22	108:10 114:7,9	10 5:8,9 9:23 72:16	27th 111:24
11:4.7	versa 66:1	well 1:14 3:22 4:13	working 8:17 19:12	75:25 82:17 108:9	29th 1:8 1:1 105:2
unless 99:4	version 1:23 14:1 40:9	10:20 11:12 12:2	48:22 103:17 106:3	10th 106:13,14 108:15	110:6
unnecessary 24:10			111:19	10% 34:13	110.0
	82:16 93:4,4,6	13:17 14:24 16:5,9	world 42:9	10/a)(vi) 99:20	
unredacted 40:8	99:22	20:22 31:18 42:5,20	worth 37:8		3
unrelated 80:13	versions 14:11	52:9 55:23 59:12	wouldn't 58:23 59:12	10.02 1:2	3 1:8 4:10,25 5:7,8 8:2
unsafe 24:7 27:9	very 1:5,15 6:23 14:24	79:16 81:24 82:12	87:5 91:15,20	10.06 4:7	8:6 9:12 10:5 13:10
until 81:2 84:22 90:11	14:24 16:9 19:9	83:25 100:9 105:5	-	10.12 6:25	14:1 16:25 17:5,12
uploaded 40:15	20:18,22 22:7 24:16	went 3:1 47:21	write 93:9 96:2 106:20	10.16 9:9	17:17
use 2:5 32:3 38:2,3	62:11 63:6 65:10	were 7:10 9:8 16:23	writing 2:10 21:7	10.37 21:15	3rd 106:8
51:25 55:15,24	66:20,21 72:25	16:24 17:20 20:25	65:17 70:4,9 71:6	100 63:1 101:19,20,23	3.7 52:18 65:7 66:1
56:16 57:13,14,15	74:15 75:1 77:7	23:3 25:5 26:3 30:7	87:14 88:7 100:7	101:24	3.8 52:18 65:7 66:2
58:16 69:14 79:17	78:23 79:13 81:18	35:21,22 37:2,12	written 10:20 99:18	100% 1:14 4:18 63:6	30 70:7,24 108:5
92:20 94:24	88:8,15 90:15 98:24	42:17 46:5 47:12	wrongly 84:3	104 27:20,22	30% 34:13
used 3:5 22:11 23:12	100:18 105:2	48:13 49:13,24 50:1	WUELMER 2:16	105 27:20,22	30-page 107:19
25:9 27:1 28:3,6,24	107:23,23,23 108:5	50:17,24 51:24 52:6		11 8:23 79:4	31% 48:8
29:3,5,7,13 36:22	109:21 113:11,11	54:13,20,22,23 55:2	X	11th 108:18 110:8	
27.5,5,7,15 50.22	107.21 113.11,11	51.15,20,22,25 55.2			33 22:8

Trevor McGowan

Page 11

TECO Guatemala Holdings, LLC -v- Republic of GuatemalaDay 3 -- Hearing on AnnulmentICSID Case No. ARB/10/23

Friday. 29 July 2022

35 22:10 24:25 25:13	80 27:13 64:23		
	80 27:13 04:23 81 23:8		
25:15,17 26:18			
28:17	82 4:17		
36 26:22 28:17	83 22:22 23:8		
37 27:16 28:11,18	84 24:4		
38 27:23 28:18	85 24:14 102:6		
38% 48:4	86 27:13		
39 28:14	89 4:18		
4	9		
4 4:1,3 4:10 6:4,4 8:3	9 4:7 51:2		
8:8 17:19 60:22	91 60:22		
4th 20:10,13,17	92 4:19		
40 24:16 26:3,6	96 38:22		
40% 47:9	99 60:12,16		
41 4:10			
5			
5 18:1 20:11 96:4			
50 4:11 26:3,6 84:4,25			
85:14,17 86:15			
101:14,22			
50% 47:8			
52 31:6			
52(1)(a) 101:11			
53 30:1			
54 4:12			
56 31:13			
562.4 34:14			
576.2 34:9			
58 31:16 37:14			
59 33:16			
6			
6 10:5 17:1,5,12 18:2			
6(2) 13:16			
60 4:13 34:3			
60% 34:13			
60/30/10 35:10			
61 4:14 34:23			
62 35:4			
63 35:5			
64 35:18			
65 4:15 35:25			
66 35:25			
67 35:25 51:1			
68 35:25 52:3			
69 36:1			
7			
7 4:4,6 9:23,25 16:23			
16:25 17:5 34:8			
60:22			
7BQ 1:6			
7-13 49:7			
72 38:12			
73 2:7 3:21 25:18			
38:12			
75 102:11 104:11,13			
104:14			
766 30:6			
767 30:6,9,12,18			
78 4:16			
8			
8 51:2 52:22			
8.8 49:7			
0.0 47./			