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(10.02 am)

THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, everybody, to the third day of this hearing. (Interpreted) I would like to thank those in Guatemala who are connecting very early in the morning. (Pause)
(In English) So welcome, everybody. Before we begin, are there any housekeeping issues? Before I give you the floor to comment on the code of conduct, of course.

Mr Torterola, good morning. Did you get more sleep than yesterday?
DR TORTEROLA: Yes, I got two more hours than yesterday.
THE PRESIDENT: Well, that is a $100 \%$ increase!
DR TORTEROLA: That's a very appropriate comment, yes.
No, we don't have any administrative matters to discuss this morning.
THE PRESIDENT: Good.
Ms Menaker?
MS MENAKER: We don't have any either, thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Good.

So, Mr Torterola, you would like to comment on the recently filed document, the fourth version of the draft Code of Conduct.

DR TORTEROLA: Yes. We have prepared a PowerPoint
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authorities, we went and just looked at the authorities in the record and in the presentations of the parties, and put them in slides after each individual question.

The Committee asked us to also identify the different sources for the valuations used in the different phases of the arbitration. We have taken snippets from the reports and the findings regarding those presentations and we just put them together in the presentation you have before you.

But there's nothing here which is not an answer to one of the specific questions by the Committee yesterday.
THE PRESIDENT: Have you prepared anything similar? MS MENAKER: We have not. We prepared some answers; we haven't prepared any PowerPoint or anything like that.

Like I said, I don't object: as long as we're going to be answering questions one by one and each of us have an opportunity, to the extent they put something on a slide, that is fine. But I only wanted to remark that it was certainly not our expectation that one party would be giving a presentation in full, with 73 slides. THE PRESIDENT: Okay. Well, if at any point during the answers you feel that this is exceeding the scope of what it is intended to be, please feel free to make the objection and we will deal with it.
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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
onwards, where there was a question about the

MS MENAKER: Okay. 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.

In Article 3, in order to protect the independence
and impartiality, they indicate these things. The Code has a mistake because they don't define the terms "independence" and "impartiality". They do so in the annexes, but not in the main text of the Code of Conduct. I think that's something that they're going to have to look at again.
(Slide 2) Article 3 I find interesting.
(Slide 3) But let us look at Article 10. I'm going to read Article 10 from here. It says that an arbitrator that has been appointed, or an arbitrator candidate, must disclose "any financial or professional or business relationship or personal relationship" that he or she may have with the following individuals "within the past five years". So there's a specific term there.

Then if you look at point (iii), reference is made to other arbitrators and to the experts that are presented in the proceedings; also cases in which that individual has acted as an arbitrator in the past five years, as an arbitrator, as a legal representative or as an expert witness. So this would include all the cases, the cases that are confidential and those that are not confidential, but special concern is accorded to those cases that are confidential.

There is also an obligation, not on the party but on
Page 5

10:12 1 Submissions re draft Code of Conduct on behalf of Claimant MS MENAKER: May I just make a few brief comments?

The first is, as is clear, these are drafts that have not been adopted yet; they are still under consideration. There is no consensus. So, as the chairman of the ICSID Administrative [Council] remarked, of course they can't be relied upon at this stage. And certainly even after -- if they are adopted, they can't be applied retrospectively. So that's the first thing.

The second is: even on the slide that we were just looking at, where Mr Torterola noted the disclosure obligation and it said "in the eyes of the ... parties", you will note that was bracketed. And there's bracketed text throughout, which means that it's still under discussion. And at times you will see there are notes describing why some text is bracketed, and what some of delegates believe and others, and that's still under discussion.
Third, there are different provisions -- you just saw the ones on disclosure, but there's also notably a provision -- once you get beyond disclosure, again, we're looking at the underlying circumstances, and there's a specific provision that I pointed to yesterday dealing with multiple roles.

And particularly on that, you can see a lack of
Page 7

10:11 1 the arbitrator, to make all reasonable efforts to gain
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.
(10.12 am)
consensus, because in the earlier draft which we 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 currently stands in draft form, the third provision

10:19 1
"Any disqualification and removal procedure or any sanction and remedy provided for in the applicable rules or treaty shall apply ..."

Either "to the Code" or "shall continue to apply irrespective of the Code", and those options are both still bracketed.

So those were just the comments I wished to add. ( 10.16 am )

Questions from THE TRIBUNAL
PROFESSOR JONES: May I ask both counsel a question. And for that purpose, it would be useful to have slide 3 of the Guatemala slides, if that's possible.

To some extent, as both counsel have identified, there is an advancement of existing positions potentially contained within this and preceding drafts. And to a certain extent, the chairman of the Administrative Committee has said that where things are moved forward by this draft, in his view, there is no binding effect of those proposals that move things forward.

I would be interested in counsels' submission in respect of paragraph 7 of Article 10, if we could just scroll down to that. What do counsel say as to whether paragraph 7 is a movement forward or merely a statement
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this is governed by state law, not federal law, in the
United States.
DR TORTEROLA: (In English) Okay. What is true or not in
the United States, I would like to give the floor to my
colleague Quinn Smith to speak about that, because he is
the one that deals more often and focused on the
practice in the United States. (Interpreted) I am going
to put forth other considerations in connection with the
question posed by Professor Jones.
First, I wanted to say that it is true that this is
a draft code. It is a draft. But as we've been
discussing in dealing with this matter, well, this draft
project is receiving comments in connection with things
that it is understood are the things to be done or
things that are related to the concern of those who are
facing procedures of this nature, and they believe that
this is what should be stated.
This reminds me of the matter of whether the
non-Member States of the Vienna Convention have to apply
the Vienna Convention. These are not rules of a penal
nature; these are rules that reflect practice. Many of
the principles of the Vienna Convention on the Law of
Treaties, these are customary international law, these
are practice. So the obligation goes further from
whether the Convention has been adopted or not.
Page 11

So independently of whether these things have been 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 looked at in the circumstances of the case. But the
circumstances of the case indicate, for example, that an arbitrator or arbitrator candidate must disclose. And if there are doubts as to the disclosure -- that is to say whether the arbitrator doubts whether to disclose or not to disclose -- the arbitrator must disclose.

This is a principle that has been adopted and we can see that this section is not given between brackets. So this is something that has moved forward, as we said a moment ago.
Point 3 says that, "A Candidate and an Arbitrator shall make [reasonable] ... efforts to become aware of such circumstances[, interests and relationships]" that may call into question the reasonable doubt in connection with impartiality and independence.

And one more second, if you'll allow me. It says here, and also in 6(2) of the Rules of Arbitration of ICSID, well, it is indicated there that the disclosure obligation is a continuing obligation.
THE PRESIDENT: (Interpreted) One question, Mr Torterola. This provision or this rule -- I don't know how to call it exactly -- at (iii), was this in the other drafts? I am talking about 2(a)(iii). Was this included in the other drafts, in earlier drafts? You have called our attention to this.
DR TORTEROLA: I'm going to ask for help. I don't know if
Page 13

```
```

    that's not necessary?(In English) Sorry, I think
    ```
```

    that's not necessary?(In English) Sorry, I think
    I should have said that in English.
    I should have said that in English.
    MR SMITH: I don't think it's necessary. We can get into US
MR SMITH: I don't think it's necessary. We can get into US
law, but I don't think it's relevant to what we're
law, but I don't think it's relevant to what we're
discussing. Other than I don't agree with what was
discussing. Other than I don't agree with what was
presented.
presented.
PROFESSOR JONES: You don't agree with what?
PROFESSOR JONES: You don't agree with what?
MR SMITH: Because the Federal Arbitration Act is a federal
MR SMITH: Because the Federal Arbitration Act is a federal
statute, and so it's not determined by what the states
statute, and so it's not determined by what the states
say, rather than the federal courts, and what the
say, rather than the federal courts, and what the
Supreme Court says. And the Supreme Court has taken
Supreme Court says. And the Supreme Court has taken
a different line, and so that's why it is a broader
a different line, and so that's why it is a broader
standard to disclose, and not governed by state law.
standard to disclose, and not governed by state law.
PROFESSOR JONES: The issue that I was referring to was some
PROFESSOR JONES: The issue that I was referring to was some
jurisprudence, some state jurisprudence particularly,
jurisprudence, some state jurisprudence particularly,
which says non-disclosure of itself will give rise to
which says non-disclosure of itself will give rise to
an accusation of bias.
an accusation of bias.
MR SMITH: Yes. And if we look at the Federal Arbitration
MR SMITH: Yes. And if we look at the Federal Arbitration
Act, we have to look at the federal jurisprudence to
Act, we have to look at the federal jurisprudence to
understand. So I need to look at those cases to really
understand. So I need to look at those cases to really
get to the bottom of it, but that would be the
get to the bottom of it, but that would be the
distinction.
distinction.
PROFESSOR JONES:Thank you.
PROFESSOR JONES:Thank you.
THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker, any points you'd like to add?
THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker, any points you'd like to add?
MS MENAKER: No. I mean, we can elaborate on it if it's of

```
```

MS MENAKER: No. I mean, we can elaborate on it if it's of

```
```
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this was part of version 3 or not, in the earlier draft. 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.

I think Mr Smith is going to make a comment, or
interest to the [Committee]. I do think that -- I mean, 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 was not. And you see that in 7, "a breach of article 3
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and 6 of the Code" is in brackets, right, which means that a breach of Article 2 therefore would in itself establish a lack of impartiality or independence.

So what is in discussion would potentially limit what you see in 7 to just 3 to 6 . So I would say that maybe it's not quite as broad as has been proposed. MS MENAKER: I'd just remark -- I may not have fully understood that. But there are two bracketed texts. When I read two bracketed texts, you're normally choosing which wording you prefer. So "does not in and of itself" either "establish a lack of impartiality or independence" or "a breach of article 3 to 6 of the Code".

Article 1 is just definitions: you can't have a breach of definitions. Article 2 is application of the code: you can't have a breach of application of the code. Article 3 is the requirement of independence and impartiality, so it can't show a breach of that.

Then Article 4 is the limits on multiple roles, which is what we were discussing. So again, a non-disclosure of your multiple roles in and of itself could not be a breach of that obligation; you would have to show, in this draft at least, that there was that underlying circumstance of an issue conflict that would be disqualifying.
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10:33 1
a disclosure. If you fail to make a disclosure, the standard for disqualification, whether you are independent or impartial, doesn't change, and there's no burden-shifting in that regard.
PROFESSOR BOO: The burden doesn't change, I agree. MS MENAKER: Right. So you will sometimes see language where parties debate whether the non-disclosure is a so-called "aggravating factor". And again, I think it's very closely linked to the circumstances. If you are engaged by one of the parties and you don't disclose that -- and it's clearly a disqualifying circumstance: you are working for one of the parties -- when you try to explain that, that may be perceived as being an aggravating circumstance because it's so obviously problematic and disqualifying.

However, that's why you also see in a lot of the disqualification decisions the party or the adjudicator looking at whether it was a so-called "honest exercise of discretion", right? So it's not that it's such a burden, but they're taking into account: why was -- or they're trying to surmise: why was this not made, the disclosure? And again, if it was public information, if they did not think it was disqualifying or problematic, and they look at those circumstances.

But I do not think that there was ever
Page 19

Then again, Article 5 is the duty of due diligence;
Article 6, integrity and competence.
So I see these as -- again, they're discussing the wording, but the concept is the same: the non-disclosure in and of itself is not a breach of -- or is not disqualifying, in other words.
PROFESSOR BOO: Chair, if I may just follow up on this discussion on the fact that non-disclosure of itself does not establish lack of impartiality; much depends on what was not disclosed.

Then it occurs to my mind: to whom then does the burden shift, by the fact that the party who should have made a disclosure did not make a disclosure? And therefore the burden should shift to that person to show that what was not disclosed is not material.

Is there such a concept?
MS MENAKER: I don't believe so.
PROFESSOR BOO: Do you understand what I mean? Because --
MS MENAKER: I understand.
PROFESSOR BOO: -- there is a duty to disclose. If you fail to disclose, then to justify a non-disclosure, you have to show that it is not material.
MS MENAKER: I don't believe so, because they are two
different obligations: the obligation to remain
independent and impartial, and the obligation to make
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projected in the but-for scenario. Could we see this now, if possible?

And afterwards we may go through the questions, because there's 24 of them, and we'd like to hear how the parties envisage the rest of today's hearing to proceed. Are we going to select some of the questions; would they like to answer them in writing? To be completely honest, I don't think we will be able to go through the 24 questions by 2 o'clock. But I don't know; I'm open to suggestions from the parties.

But first I'd like to understand how Kaczmarek did those projections and what the Tribunal accepted.

I give the floor to Guatemala.
MR GOSIS: Thank you, Madam President.
(10.37 am)

Answers to Tribunal questions
MR GOSIS: The request, as we understood it yesterday, was to go through the presentations on the formulation of value that was underlying the damages claim by Claimant and the observations that Respondent had at the different phases of the arbitration; and you have also asked us to deal with the contradictions we had identified regarding these issues in the Award. You asked us to be as graphic as possible in identifying these contradictions.

10:39 1
be the case that determinations of historical losses
made by the Original Tribunal which it explicitly
decided were inadequate to provide all the data
necessary for the calculation of the 'loss of value'
damages can [bind the Resubmission Tribunal] in relation
to the calculation of those same 'loss of value' damages."

Paragraph 83. Paragraph 81:
"The difference is evident from the fact that the calculation of the [sale price] 'but for' the breaches of the DR-CAFTA, is not necessarily a straightforward arithmetical exercise involving only data used to calculate the historical damages. It cannot be assumed that historical losses ... would inevitably lead to a reduction of precisely the same amount (adjusted for time differences, etc) ..."
THE PRESIDENT: Slower, please. You are being translated, and when one reads, it tends to increase the pace.
MR GOSIS: Absolutely. I apologise.
"... (adjusted for time differences, etc) in [the sale price]. For example, the market for electricity might have expanded or contracted significantly over the historical period, or there might have been more or fewer potential buyers of EEGSA by the end of the period, or material shifts in the costs of distribution.
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We had a seriatim presentation starting with those 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 significantly different from one another ... It cannot

Any such changes in the market conditions would be 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.

But as Mr Gosis just said, he has now 35 slides of

10:45 1
presentation; I expect this will take quite a while. It was just not what we had anticipated, that a party would make, say, a half-hour presentation on damages.
THE PRESIDENT: But I did ask yesterday, but I wanted to
understand whether these projections somehow were in breach of what the Tribunal had said in the Award. So I wanted to say: whether there are contradictions in what the Tribunal established was necessary to determine the loss of value and what they actually used based on Kaczmarek's projections.
MS MENAKER: If this is within your anticipation -- I just mean that for us to respond, I think that this will take -- if they're going to go through 35 slides, I expect --
THE PRESIDENT: I hope there's not 35 slides on contradictions.
MS MENAKER: I think there are. It's from 35 to -- that's why I was asking -- to slide 73 , and he just said it would take quite some time. So if he's going to give, say, a half-hour presentation, I think that we would be responding in kind, just in light of what the Committee had in mind. That's why I'm just asking now.
MR GOSIS: Since there's interpretation and stenography in two languages, I wanted just to leave some empty before interrupting two minutes ago, which I could have, just
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The data used to determine historical losses is insufficient to determine if loss of value existed, or its amount.

The Original Tribunal already found it had no evidence sufficient to make a finding of loss of value.

Evidence of any changes in market conditions could impact any determination of whether loss of value existed.

It would be unsafe to make a finding on loss of value based on the data before the Original Tribunal.

The Resubmission Tribunal would deal with loss of value as an open question.

This is a summary of paragraphs 80 to 86 of the Resubmission Award, which is from the snippets that we had in the preceding slide.
(Slide 37) The second set of premises, which are premises that speak to the contrary proposition, they now say: no new evidence is necessary to determine loss of value damages. And this is taken from paragraphs $104,105,138,134$ of the same Resubmission Award.

We have summarised the findings in this 104,105 , 134, [138] in slide 38. In these [paragraphs], the Resubmission Tribunal says:

Findings on historical losses suffice for the
Page 27
to have a full record of this.
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 its amount.

Resubmission Tribunal to calculate and award loss of 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 by the Original Tribunal to calculate historical losses
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is the sole basis to determine loss of value damages.
Similarly, you cannot find at the same time that the data used to determine historical losses is insufficient to determine if loss of value existed, or its amount, and that the data used to determine historical losses is sufficient to determine that loss of value existed, and its amount, or that the reduction in cash flows used by the Original Tribunal to calculate historical losses is the sole basis to determine loss of value damages.

You cannot find that the Original Tribunal already found it had no evidence sufficient to make a finding of loss of value, yet, in the same instrument, find also that the reduction in cash flows used by the Original Tribunal to calculate historical losses is the sole basis to determine loss of value damages, and that the same data and methods applied 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 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 Second Award on this point.

10:50 $\quad 1$
> made in the relevant period. And this is something -we showed it yesterday -- this is the finding in Unglaube v Costa Rica (REA-35), where Mr Alexandrov was counsel to Costa Rica, Mr Kaczmarek was the expert for Costa Rica in that same case, and we have the citation again from yesterday's presentation in slide 52 .

> So to borrow at commercial rates, as the Tribunal holds in the [Resubmission] Award that is the purpose of awarding interest, to invest in risk-free investments --
> THE PRESIDENT: Mr Gosis, could you concentrate on the cash flows and leave the interest thing aside. Thank you. MR GOSIS: Yes, absolutely.

> So if we go to slide 56 onwards, we start with the review of the reports by Mr Kaczmarek, starting with the original arbitration.

> Slide 58, we have his analysis of the methods applied by each of the parties. Mr Kaczmarek says: well, Navigant uses a cash flow projection for lost cash flows, what we call the historical losses, and uses a combination of DCF and two comparable approaches -comparable publicly traded companies, comparable transactions -- for both the but-for value and the actual value, which is what we call the loss of value damages claimed in the arbitration; while, in Mr Kaczmarek's view, Compass Lexecon uses a cash flow
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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 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 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
about the actual value. The but-for.
Was there a distinct and separate but-for DCF model by Compass, or was it just -- and I don't want to say "just"; I mean, it's significant of course -- criticisms on Kaczmarek's DCF model?
MR GOSIS: It was criticisms to Kaczmarek's DCF.
THE PRESIDENT: Okay, good. So that point is settled, so both parties agree.
MR GOSIS: Yes. So --
THE PRESIDENT: Move on. Thank you.
MR GOSIS: Absolutely.
I don't know what level of detail the Chair was interested in getting on these calculations. But we just took the summary that appears in table 12 of the second report -- this belongs to the [original] arbitration -- if you go to slide 59. This explains the effect of some of the criticisms that Mr Abdala was making in the [original] arbitration to the original value, as seen by Claimant's valuation experts.

So you see you have the changes -- the title of the table is self-explanatory: "Impact of Compass Lexecon's Alleged" -- it says "Mistakes": it refers to the criticisms identified by Compass. And it starts from an original valuation by Kaczmarek of $\$ 1.451$ billion, and the impact of those criticisms would lead to a final
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10:57 1
cash flows and $\$ 222$ million for lost value. And lost cash flows is, of course, what has been re-termed in parlance before this Committee as "historical losses".

Now we go to the resubmission proceeding: slide 62, slide 63. This is taken from Kaczmarek's fourth report, which is the last report in the resubmission arbitration, table 13.

You see we start -- the but-for under the DCF analysis is the same $1,406.7$ that we had in the first arbitration. Then we have again 60/30/10. And that ends up with the enterprise value of the weighted average $1,479.3$, the same amount that we had in the first arbitration. And the same net debt that we had just discussed from the [original] arbitration still appears in the summary of Claimant's loss of value damages in the second arbitration. So nothing really has changed there.

We see then, going to slide 64 onwards, we have snippets from Dr Abdala's conclusions and criticisms to Mr Kaczmarek. As we mentioned, there was no separate DCF calculation performed by [Dr] Abdala, but there were a series of corrections that were suggested to Mr Kaczmarek's calculations. We have simply identified the most relevant portion of those criticisms in slides 65, 66, 67, 68.
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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 [original] arbitration. That's $\$ 21$ million for lost
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2 THE PRESIDENT: I can look at the other side: were multiples used to establish the but-for? I think I've only seen cash flows projections, that was all.
MS MENAKER: Let me confirm, because I thought ... whether he used all three methodologies for the but-for or not -- which you could do, because absent the measures, what would it be worth --
THE PRESIDENT: It's difficult because how do you do it? You establish a new set of transactions and you look for other transactions based on ...
MS MENAKER: I believe there were ... Let me refresh our recollection so I can give you the accurate answer.
MR GOSIS: If we go to slide 58 this is what Mr Kaczmarek said he did. He does make -- for the but-for valuation, he makes a weighted average of DCF comparable traded companies, comparable transactions.
THE PRESIDENT: Okay. In theory, it's possible. It's just a bit complicated, because the assumptions he used are not that different in the but-for and the actual. But of course you could find another portfolio of transactions that don't apply to the actual value but would be relevant for the but-for.
MR GOSIS: Which is why [Dr] Abdala -- one of the criticisms we had in one of the slides for the opening presentation
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11:05 1 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 estimation that it was a fair price or whatever, was that based on a DCF?
MR GOSIS: Yes, it was.
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THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.
MR GOSIS: We actually had a slide, I think, in our closing yesterday -- we showed it also in opening -- where there was a chart with the --
THE PRESIDENT: I think you did. I was just --
MR GOSIS: -- with the different methods being used by the Claimant and methods used by the Respondent, and there was a specific reference that the fairness valuation was a DCF valuation.
MS MENAKER: I'm sorry, would it assist -- I was looking for something, but while they're looking. So they did do a DCF there in -- you're asked about the $\square$ ?
THE PRESIDENT: (Nods head).
MS MENAKER: Yes, they did.
THE PRESIDENT: Yes, I think that's common ground: both parties agree.
MR GOSIS: That's so, thank you. Thank you,
Madam President.
THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.

## Ms Menaker.

MS MENAKER: Thank you. Just one note for the transcript: that is the fact that there's the fairness opinion, we have redacted that, given the confidentiality provision in the agreement itself. So with the transcript we'll just need to do that; which we
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can do later, as long as we have notice.
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 --
MR GOSIS: The Award as it stands now in the public view has

Page 40

```
know. You agree on something that we all know what it
```

6 know. You agree on something that we all know what it
7 is, but it doesn't identify So instead of
8 having something redacted, we have something that's
9 meaningful to us and that doesn't reveal any
10 confidential information.
Would that be acceptable?
MS MENAKER: That's acceptable for us. And the latter part,
as long as -- if we do get into a discussion of the
content, then we'll look at the necessity for
redactions. But if we're just referencing it, yes,
that's fine.
THE PRESIDENT: Is that okay? Yes? Good.
MS MENAKER: Thank you. So just to begin with a comment to
follow up on your question regarding the lack of a DCF
model from Dr Abdala, which I do think is an important
point and was discussed at length in the resubmission
hearing in particular.
There was a discussion where Dr Abdala is being
questioned about that, and he insisted that it would be
impossible to do a DCF in the but-for scenario and to
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11:09 $1 \quad$ project future cash flows. And his insistence was: it 2 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".

So that was his stance. And instead he adopted something that I've never heard of before or since, which is called the so-called "perfect foresight model".
entire paragraphs struck out, and it's difficult to make
sense of it.
THE PRESIDENT: Would it be okay if we replaced any reference to this valuation as "the fairness opinion" or -- you agree on the semantics. I don't having something redacted, we have something that's meaningful to us and that doesn't reveal any confidential information.

Would that be acceptable?
MS MENAKER: That's acceptable for us. And the latter part, as long as -- if we do get into a discussion of the content, then we'll look at the necessity for redactions. But if we're just referencing it, yes, that's fine.
THE PRESIDENT: Is that okay? Yes? Good.
MS MENAKER: Thank you. So just to begin with a comment to follow up on your question regarding the lack of a DCF model from Dr Abdala, which I do think is an important point and was discussed at length in the resubmission hearing in particular.

There was a discussion where Dr Abdala is being impossible to do a DCF in the but-for scenario and to
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11:10 1

Which means you can project -- you can value the company -- you have perfect foresight, so you know what the future holds, and that is your projection. Which means your but-for always equals your actual, and hence no damages. Because you had perfect foresight, you would know in the future.

It makes no sense. But that was his primary contention. And you will see that throughout his reports and you will see it at the hearing: he talks about the "perfect foresight". And that's where he kept coming and saying: there would be no damages, because if you do forecast, you would know what it would be and it would match the actual.

So as far as what Navigant, what Mr Kaczmarek did, in order to establish the but-for cash flows from 2010 to 2013, he had to of course look at what was the company's revenue and what was the company's cost, or to forecast the revenues and the cost.

When you look at the revenues of the company, the revenues are in the electricity tariff. The vast portion of that is a pass-through because the company pays for the electricity that's generated and passes it on to the consumers.

You have the generation, the transmission and the distributors. EEGSA was a distributor, so the last in
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line. They get the money from the clients, the 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 VAD should have been set at the rate in that revised
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11:17 1 income, that was the revenue for 2010-2013. So he did not have to forecast that revenue.

The revenue in the VAD study is in real terms, so he had to add an inflation adjustment to convert it to nominal terms, and he did that by using the producer price index. Dr Abdala initially did not object to using the PPI to adjust for inflation. Later he suggested that Mr Kaczmarek should have incorporated a local currency inflation element. But had Mr Kaczmarek done that, it would have had the effect of increasing the VAD, and thus increasing the but-for scenario cash flows and Claimant's damages.
THE PRESIDENT: Was that one of the four criticisms? Is that one of them?
MS MENAKER: No, because it would have -- or was it,
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11:15 1 actually? I'm sorry.
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 2013. So he started from EEGSA's actual costs and
forecasted.
Typically, one would look at the most recent actual costs, which would have been as of the valuation date, 2010. He did not do that. He instead took EEGSA's actual costs from the end of the year in 2007 and projected those forward. The reason he did that was because the new tariff or the new VAD that had been adopted in 2008 was cut by $50 \%$ from the previous VAD and had decreased EEGSA's revenues by approximately $40 \%$. In reaction to that, EEGSA took severe cost-cutting measures.

So when you looked from 2010 forward, the costs were significantly lower. If he had used that as the cost basis to project forward, EEGSA's costs would have been lower, which again would mean that the but-for value would be higher, Claimant's damages would be higher, when really what you're trying to do is you're saying: but for the breach, in the absence of the breach, we would not have taken those cost-cutting measures.

So we did not take, like, an unfair advantage by using those most recent costs. We went to pre-breach, 2007, took those actual costs, projected them forward; projecting them forward only using an inflation rate and the forecast for the growth in EEGSA's customer base, which also was taken from the Bates White VAD report.
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Mr Kaczmarek then had the EBIT, earnings before 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 discount them back to the valuation date using the

11:23 1

THE PRESIDENT: Were [Dr] Abdala's criticisms regarding the calculation of the free cash flows new in the resubmission proceedings?
MS MENAKER: Yes. In the original proceeding there was no criticism that the cash flows had been calculated to the firm. It was in the resubmission proceeding that he argued that they should have been calculated to the shareholder rather than to the firm. So that was a new criticism that was first raised in the resubmission proceeding.
THE PRESIDENT: And the other three?
MS MENAKER: They were all new for the resubmission proceeding.
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It's slide 67 of our presentation today, taken from pages 8 and 9 of the fourth Compass report in the resubmission (REA-29). You will see there are four elements being discussed. There is (i), "Cash flows and discount rate". And basically, you have here the discussion. TECO was a shareholder of EEGSA, and so the cash flows should be --
THE PRESIDENT: Give me one minute, if possible. MR GOSIS: Sure. (Pause)
THE PRESIDENT: Yes.
MR GOSIS: Thank you.
So the first one is the "Cash flows and discount rate". TECO was a shareholder to EEGSA, so any damages it could claim should be free cash flows to the shareholder. The Committee will remember there was a net debt in the range of $\$ 87$ million at EEGSA. So of course that is a significant difference if you measure cash flows to the entity or cash flows to the shareholder.
The second one is "Operating Costs", you have in (ii) here. Basically here what Dr Abdala is saying is the valuation by Mr Kaczmarek uses its own assumptions instead of the ones that the Original Tribunal had used for calculation of the historical losses. If you were to use the Bates White VAD calculation, this is the
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10 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 I think this is exactly what we're talking about here.
THE PRESIDENT: They were new?
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.
result it should have obtained, instead of the own 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.
THE PRESIDENT: Then we did hear the parties commenting on the transcript of the resubmission hearing on how these
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criticisms have been dealt with. It seems that TECO was suggesting that somehow [Dr] Abdala conceded that some of the criticisms didn't really have that much of an impact, after the expert conferencing.

Can we please hear both parties: what are their views on whether all the criticism still stood after the conferencing or whether there was some kind of common ground that they weren't that significant, while others still stood? What are the parties' views?
MS MENAKER: Just one second, if that's okay.
THE PRESIDENT: Sure. We've been going for one and a half hours: would you like to break, and then you can prepare the answer properly? Would you like to break for ten minutes?
MS MENAKER: Yes.
DR TORTEROLA: (In English) That's a good idea, I think. And in addition to that, I was wondering whether we will have time for other questions by the Tribunal, besides this point. I think that there are at least one or two for Guatemala that would be important to bring to the attention of the Annulment Committee before we finish the hearing.
THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Just ten minutes, and I think that's necessary anyway to --
DR TORTEROLA: No, it's alright. These are two different
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11:43 1

Dr Abdala agreed that that was not how the transaction was structured; that even though there were different shareholders in DECA II, the purchase was for the entirety and it was subject to the entirety, and so that was used.

Again, I reiterate that that criticism was never one that was raised in the original arbitration, so was something that was newly raised by Dr Abdala in the resubmission.

With respect to the costs, there, as I explained, Mr Kaczmarek had forecasted the costs in the but-for scenario looking at EEGSA's actual costs, what it would have incurred in costs absent the measures and going back to the pre-measure date, whereas Dr Abdala wanted to use the costs of a hypothetical company. Which then was discussed, as that would not make sense because, while you set the VAD based on a model efficient company, if what we're trying to establish is: what would EEGSA really have earned absent the breach, you should look at what its revenues would have been but what it costs would have been, and you look at actual costs.

And that was debated as well and, in our view, understood that it would make no sense to use hypothetical costs in that instance.
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11:28 1 things. I'm just --
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 than the company, which is not what happened here? And

THE PRESIDENT: Okay. One thing is what you think more 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 forecast. They were not using the hypothetical
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company's costs in the but-for scenario, they were using
the actual costs. And because our methodology didn't
change -- and like I said, this was a new objection
raised by Guatemala in the resubmission proceeding that
they had not raised in the original arbitration.
But I can also confirm that at our next break --
THE PRESIDENT: But they could have used the Bates White costs, for example, in the but-for?
MS MENAKER: I don't believe so.
THE PRESIDENT: That they could or that they did?
MS MENAKER: I'm sorry?
THE PRESIDENT: That they could have used it or that they did use it?
MS MENAKER: Did not use it.
THE PRESIDENT: They did not use it. If you can just confirm --
MS MENAKER: But I will confirm that.
THE PRESIDENT: -- what approach they used to calculate the costs in the but-for scenario of the historical loss.
MS MENAKER: Right.
THE PRESIDENT: Do you understand the question? You look at me kind of ...

Let's go through this together. So the historical loss that was decided by the Original Tribunal, they also had to do a but-for and an actual value. And the
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11:48 1 difference for the period 2008-2010, that was the
2 damages awarded, and those were the $\$ 21$ million. I'd
3 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.
HE 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 also for the historical part to have used the actual costs in the but-for, because then the gap would have
been bigger.
MS MENAKER: But they could have -- they may have projected it again as of an earlier date. Because we used -- it's the same date, excuse me. We used the end of the year 2007, which is prior to the VAD being adopted in August 1st 2008. So for historical costs from 2008 to 2010, you could still do that same forecast, bringing the 2007 actual costs up to 2010 , which is what he would have done in the original arbitration. And then he just brought it forward from 2010 to 2013, still forecasting off that same date, the 2007 actual costs.
THE PRESIDENT: Well, if those were -- but those wouldn't
be -- it would be the actual costs before the measures were implemented?
MS MENAKER: It is before the measures.
THE PRESIDENT: Okay. Yes, I get it. I get it.
MS MENAKER: Because the measures is August 1st 2008.
THE PRESIDENT: Good. So it would still be a but-for,
because it was a reality in 2007, not a reality in 2008.
MS MENAKER: Correct. And as I'm speaking through it, I think that has to have been the case, because the model was the same, right? So in the Original Tribunal, you had the cash flows: they just cut it off at 2010 and then it continues through. And it's not like the methodologies for doing those but-for cash flows for
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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 cumulative impact of those criticisms as he presented them was that the damages would be reduced from
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$\$ 26$ million to $\$ 18.2$ million. Not zero; 18.2. That's all the impacts together, according to him.

So what this tells you is that the Tribunal was aware of these criticisms and considered them, because it included a footnote to that portion of the transcript where those were discussed. So we know that this is not something that the Tribunal omitted, did not consider; "forgot", as Guatemala puts it. We have a footnote right there which cites those criticisms and the amount.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.
I think Guatemala wants to add something?
MS MENAKER: Sure. I just will ask if they want to add, or did you want us to comment on their statements about the alleged contradictions in the Award? Mr Polášek had something to say about that. Would you like to hear that now or after?
THE PRESIDENT: One second. Let me just see what Guatemala --
MR GOSIS: No, it is just: we understood the Committee asked a question of both of the parties. You heard TECO on this point; you heard us on the contradictions. We're in the hands of the Committee whether you would prefer that they respond to the contradictions and then us on this issue, or us on this issue and then them on the contradictions.

11:55
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11:54 1 THE PRESIDENT: Is it Guatemala's understanding that the
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?" That's what I think I understood from the transcript.

MR GOSIS: So we have it -- it's, I think, slide 100 of TECO's opening presentation where this citation appears. So these are two completely different things. It's one thing to say whether the transaction would be with the individual shareholders, which may or may not reach $100 \%$ of the equity in the entity, and a very different thing to establish how the price to each of those shareholders is established.

There's no admission by Dr Abdala -- not that there's any reason to make an admission -- that the fact that the purchaser was different, that each transaction was calculated differently, would have any impact on whether you would make the calculation based on free cash flows to the shareholder or the entity. There's nothing in this transcript or anywhere else we've heard with an admission that this criticism should be reduced. That's the first thing we want to say.
THE PRESIDENT: Okay. Regarding the opex, was that dealt with at all? Was there anything resembling a possible admission, concession, or nothing of the kind?
MR GOSIS: No, there were no post-hearing briefs, there were no further reports by the experts. There's no reduction from the petitum in the last submission by each of the parties and --
THE PRESIDENT: But was opex dealt with during the hearing,
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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)
This is from -- I think it's the last report by

Dr Abdala. There's four criticisms but there's three lines, because everything is netted out. And that explains the difference between 26.8 and 18.2.

What Dr Abdala was opining in the last report is that when you take the aggregation of all of these four criticisms, that justifies the difference between 26.8 and 18.2: it's 3.7 one way, 3.8 on the other. That difference is already accounted for in the difference.

Thank you, Madam President.
THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Thank you. That was very helpful, both sides.

Would you like to add anything, Mr Polášek?
MR POLÁŠEK: Just maybe one point, and that is what we just saw on the slide, the bars.
THE PRESIDENT: Could you please just share that again.
MR POLÁŠEK: Maybe we can look into it and address it in writing.

But what Dr Abdala did is he had his four adjustments and those cumulatively resulted in the $\$ 8.2$ million number, in interaction with one another. So the fact that we are seeing the "Other" on the right-hand side as -- in this chart that's the last grey bar on the right, negative 1.5 . So those would be the elasticity of demand and inflation. And each of those individually, one was $\$ 3.7$ million up, the other was
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12:02 1

It goes to the but-for value as it was presented by
Guatemala, nothing else. The but-for value.
They identify two alleged premises. Both of those --

THE PRESIDENT: Okay, "they" is Guatemala, not the Tribunal? MR POLÁŠEK: They, Guatemala, not TECO.

Guatemala identifies two alleged premises. Both of those, all of those paragraphs are contained exclusively in the part of the Award that deals with res judicata, nowhere else. And the question that was before the Tribunal there is whether the Original Tribunal's decisions on the historical damages are res judicata with respect to the loss of value damages. That was the question.

As part of that question, what the Tribunal was doing there is it was looking at whether, in light of the Original Tribunal's rulings, there might be other factors that, if the Original Tribunal had had those, it might have ruled differently. So that's why you see this language in there: whether it is possible, whether it might be possible, that it cannot be assumed, and so forth.

So basically the Tribunal concluded that: yes, there might have been other things that the Original Tribunal could have considered, and it set forth what those other
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12:01 $1 \quad \$ 3.8$ million down, or vice versa. One was 3.7 one way, 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.
MR POLÁŠEK: Yes, since time was devoted to it this morning!

12:04 $\quad 1$
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things could have been, and then it proceeded from that 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 report, which was presented in the resubmission
arbitration, to Abdala's testimony at the hearing; there
are references to the record before the Resubmission
Tribunal.
So this notion that there are these two premises that somehow are contradicted by the Resubmission Tribunal's conclusion on damages, it's just not supported, it's not in the Award. That's all I have to say on this.
THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.
Is there anything else you'd like to add? Good.
So with this, we move on to the questions. We've got two hours, and I'd like to hear the parties' position on what they suggest, how we could make best use of these two hours that are left, in view of the fact that we've got 24 questions.
DR TORTEROLA: I give you just kind of a thought from the top of my head. I think that there are a couple of things that can be taken advantage of the fact that we have, for example, the state representatives here: for example, how Guatemala -- I think it's question 13 or something -- got to know about Mr Alexandrov's situation. Let me see if I can find the question.

And also I have some -- I mean, we are prepared to respond to the 24 questions, we are prepared to go through each of them one by one. But otherwise, I think
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12:09 1
less responsive, because it will be more general and a reiteration of some things you've heard over the last couple of days.

So it might be more helpful if there are specific -I mean, at this point I think it's a foregone conclusion we'll have to answer in writing. So if there are specific things that you might have a follow-up question to, or that it would really help to hear the parties' views on now, maybe if you would identify them and then we would each take a few minutes to answer that. That would be one suggestion.

Then the only other reaction that I had is just a little bit of concern that I had expressed earlier in the hearing that of course Guatemala may choose whomever it wants to address the Tribunal, that's not the issue, but we're not here to hear witness testimony. So if it's legal argument, fine, but not witness testimony. When he was talking about what they knew, that's factual.
THE PRESIDENT: I understand.
(Interpreted) How long have you been the Attorney General?
MR GÓMEZ GONZÁLEZ: (Interpreted) Thank you, Madam President. I have been in this position for two and a half months. So a person in our team was going to
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that we can express, convey to the Annulment Committee some general thoughts about the different topics, kind of the first thoughts, and we can complement things separately in writing. That's an idea, a suggestion.
THE PRESIDENT: Would you agree?
Would you then suggest, for example, that we allot 30 minutes to each party and they give us an overall answer to some of the questions, and the rest would be submitted in writing? Is that ...?
DR TORTEROLA: Maybe what I was suggesting is five/ten minutes for different topics -- we have a chunk of different topics that can be discussed, I think -and provide an opportunity for the other side. Yes, exactly.
THE PRESIDENT: So would you say like five minutes for each of the sections that are included?
DR TORTEROLA: For example. And to provide the other party an opportunity to comment on it.
THE PRESIDENT: So there's a level playing ground here.
DR TORTEROLA: Yes.
THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker, what would be your suggestion?
MS MENAKER: I think in smaller doses might be more efficient. I'm in the Committee's hands, of course. If you want to give the parties 30 minutes each, that's fine. But that runs the risk it will be maybe, perhaps,
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refer to the facts; it's not that we were going to have a witness.
THE PRESIDENT: But at any rate, whoever is going to address
this does not have firsthand knowledge as a witness, as a potential direct witness.
DR TORTEROLA: Mr Smith, myself and Ms Karla Liquez, the members of the Office of the Attorney General, all of them were direct witnesses of the facts.
THE PRESIDENT: (In English) We need to have a chat, yes. Let's break for five minutes.
( 12.12 pm )
(A short break)
( 12.22 pm )
THE PRESIDENT: The Committee understands that Guatemala has
strong feelings that it would like to address
question 10, I believe it would be, and provide
an answer through one of Guatemala's -- I don't know if it would be the Procurador General del Estado or it would be someone else from Respondent's team who would answer. They feel strongly that we should take this opportunity now that we have them here, they have made the effort of coming over to the hearing, to hear them on this point. And the Committee feels sympathetic and understands that need and that wish.

This is a very important point to both parties,
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Guatemala's knowledge or deemed knowledge of circumstances which might have given rise to doubts as to the impartiality question, the impartiality and independence of Mr Alexandrov. I'm sure TECO has strong views too on when Guatemala was supposed to have known. So we will give the opportunity to TECO to also address this point.

And given that we have got officials from TECO here, perhaps they wish to address the Committee too and say something about how they feel about this case. We are happy to hear them too, now that we've got the opportunity to hear them -- if they feel comfortable doing it, of course -- in order to provide the same opportunity to both parties.
MS MENAKER: Madam President, the distinction is -- again, we don't have an issue with who addresses the Committee on the legal --
THE PRESIDENT: I know, I know. This is just the beginning. Let me finish. Of course.

But -- and there comes a big "but" -- the "but" is that we don't want to hear witness testimony. We have heard Guatemala, what Guatemala says, and it's an allegation, it's an argument that has not been supported with direct witness evidence: that they did not know, and that they only learnt once the
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12:25 1
the question is very specific, and I don't see a way around [other] than providing a date for that. And I'm not alleging anything. And I can also say that this can be corroborated with a document if it's necessary, and if the opinion, my opinion -- what I am going to say, not opinion -- is challenged.

We have nothing to hide. There is a specific question from the Annulment Committee, and we request the opportunity to respond. Otherwise we are in the hands of the Annulment Committee: you instruct us how to respond to it.
THE PRESIDENT: So you have a specific date or range of dates in which Guatemala came to know of the "routinely faced challenges" of Mr Alexandrov; is that your proposition?
DR TORTEROLA: Yes.
MS MENAKER: That is new evidence. We're talking about documentary evidence. We cannot possibly have the admission of such evidence at -- first, in an annulment hearing, certainly not at the hearing and the last day of the hearing. We would have, in that case, the ability to call witnesses, to cross-examine the witness, to ask for document production. That's not what this is -- it's just not the proper forum for that.

I would say with respect to question 10 -- we were
Page 75

12:24 1 resubmission proceeding, at least they were closed.
I don't know whether the Award was issued or whatever; that's a bit blurry in my memory. But I think they said that they could not have raised it at any significant point during the resubmission proceeding.

That is an allegation not supported by evidence and we do not want to hear witness evidence on that point. This is not the proper time to do that.

So if anything during the answers to this question starts resembling anything close to witness testimony, I'm sure -- Ms Menaker, please object, and we will cut it there.

Is that understood?
DR TORTEROLA: It is understood. I just discussed it with the Attorney General. I will respond very specifically on the date, or approximate dates, and that's it.
MS MENAKER: If they are repeating an allegation that they did not know at the time of the proceeding -- that is what they have alleged -- that is fine. Responding with a date of when they learnt something or their knowledge, that is where I believe it crosses the line.
DR TORTEROLA: If you'll allow me.
So if that is the situation, then I would suggest that the Annulment Committee clarifies how we should respond to the question. Because it seems to me that
going to raise it when we got to that -- we did have an issue with that question, only one clause in it. Of course, when you say, "Dr Alexandrov 'routinely faced challenges'" -- the second sentence, fine with us: when are they deemed to have obtained knowledge, that is a legal issue. But the first clause, after the bracket,
"when did Guatemala first come to know of this?", that
is what I was anticipating raising with you when we got
to that question, that we had problems with that aspect of the question. (Pause)
THE PRESIDENT: Let's turn the question around. Let's start by the second part: when does TECO think that Guatemala was deemed to have obtained knowledge of the "routinely faced challenges"? And then we will hear Guatemala explain to us, without introducing new evidence, why it thinks on those dates it did not obtain knowledge.

Okay? No new evidence.
DR TORTEROLA: I don't know, I have to hear -- I don't know how to respond that I don't know -- that I know something that I don't know, or that my client --
THE PRESIDENT: Or you can say simply, "We did not know". Okay?
DR TORTEROLA: That's it.
THE PRESIDENT: Let's hear then, Ms Menaker, when exactly it should have known of these challenges.

Page 76

3 PROFESSOR BOO: The question is framed in a way to allow you
MS MENAKER: Sure.
ROFESSOR JONES: The second part of the question talks about deemed knowledge. That is what the President is asking TECO to deal with. Your argument in response is intended to deal with when you say you should be deemed to have had knowledge or not.
DR TORTEROLA: That is a very different question than the one that is addressed in the questions that we received yesterday. And if that is the question, I will not answer that today. That requires more work on our side.

The question is substantially different, the one that has been put to us. It's not the deemed knowledge; that is Claimant's position. We have a different position: when is the real date that Guatemala got knowledge of the situation?
PROFESSOR JONES: The first sentence frames the second part of the question: the issue of Guatemala's deemed knowledge. That is all that question deals with.

If you want us to amend the question, we are happy to do so. If there's misunderstanding from that -- that first sentence is not the question. The question is in the second sentence. to identify for us where in the record, where in the evidence shows when you knew or when you did not know.

12:33 1
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for you.
But in particular, you might recall when Ms Young was arguing yesterday -- or I think it was yesterday -on slide 11 she showed that other states brought challenges and it was in direct response to other disqualification proposals being made, which showed that these things were reported in the press quickly.

For instance, in Burlington v Ecuador -- and we put this on the screen for your convenience. You have Burlington v Ecuador. And there --
DR TORTEROLA: But that case is irrelevant. It's not about this case. I mean, when is that, that happened? I think that the question is very specific: when did that happen in our case?
THE PRESIDENT: Mr Torterola, let Ms Menaker continue. The point that you were making is: well, this was public knowledge, and other states did use the opportunity that they got this information to challenge; right? Is that what you're saying?
MS MENAKER: Precisely, yes.
THE PRESIDENT: Then continue. It's an argument. MS MENAKER: The first example was Burlington v Ecuador, where Ecuador is stating that it became aware of repeat appointments of Professor Vicuña by Freshfields through an article that was published in a newsletter.
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12:32 $\quad 1$ If you don't, then the deeming will kick in, and then
2 you have to answer the second part of the question.

DR TORTEROLA: We think that who has to prove the date at which Guatemala got knowledge of this situation is Claimant. So if Claimant doesn't want to demonstrate that and they would like us not to respond to that, we are not going to respond to that. But we should not be --
THE PRESIDENT: Let's hear TECO on the second question.
DR TORTEROLA: -- shifting the burden of proof. I mean,
I think that we are shifting the burden of proof, and we are not prepared to do that here.
THE PRESIDENT: We already heard the parties on who has the
burden of proof, whether this is a requirement or defence; we've already heard the parties on that point.

So, Ms Menaker, please.
MS MENAKER: Thank you. And I won't repeat that, but obviously we disagree. Obviously we don't have the burden to prove when Guatemala had knowledge; they have to bring something promptly.

So as to when they should be deemed to have knowledge of these challenges, it's as soon as that information was publicly reported, which was very close in time to when those challenges were brought. And we have that evidence in the record and we will compile it

12:34 $\quad 1$

Excuse me, so this is not about knowledge of a challenge but it shows that information about what was going on in investor-state cases is published in GAR, in IA Reporter, that respondent states that are involved in investor-state arbitrations keep abreast of and they react. So there they were reacting to something that was published in the same publications that we rely on to show Guatemala's constructive knowledge in this case.

Then you have Eiser. And Eiser of course is where they are challenging Dr Alexandrov. They argue -- and this is Spain. So when did Spain obtain knowledge, according to them? They say it is only in July 2017, as a consequence of a challenge filed in an unrelated arbitration involving Pakistan. So that shows that the challenge against Dr Alexandrov in the TCC case was reported in GAR and IA Reporter, and that gave Spain knowledge that these challenges were being made.

Now, again, I believe it's a separate question as to whether that is a new fact from the date when you would measure, because it's not the underlying fact, which is the relationship, which was known and in the public domain many years before that.

But even if you want to take the proposition that you are entitled to disregard publicly available facts that you knew or should have known of that allegedly
give rise to justifiable doubts as to a manifest lack of independence or impartiality, until someone else comes up with an argument that they do -- I mean, that's what they are saying here. But even then, as soon as someone else came up with that argument -- in this case, Pakistan -- it was reported, and you can see here that the references they are citing are to, again, GAR articles, IA Reporter articles.

Then when Pakistan challenges Dr Alexandrov for the second time and they raise the new fact -- and this is a new fact in this particular circumstance: what they were relying on was that he had resigned in the SolEs v Spain arbitration as a result of a challenge based on similar circumstances, and were arguing that that was relevant, that that was indicative of his lack of independence and impartiality. And they brought that -again, they said their knowledge was triggered by the GAR articles, and those were published very shortly after those challenges were made.

So these are widely reported. Respondent states in investor-state arbitrations follow this, and then they react in accordance to it.

So even if you took the challenges, when should Guatemala be deemed to have known about them? Well, when they were widely reported. And we have all of Page 81

12:39 1
to answer. So I just wanted to first off clarify that point.

Then the second part of the question is what Ms Menaker has just stated. And first off, that's not when Guatemala came to know of this. It has, in the first question, to do with what Guatemala came to know or did not come to know of. And the Claimant in their presentations -- and Ms Menaker said that that was discussed at the time, as to whether these circumstances should have been or should not have been subject to disclosure within the legal community.

So the issue of deemed knowledge -- and I'd like this to be on the record -- and the possibility that Mr Blackaby might have known -- and we don't know what Mr Blackaby knew or did not know, or how he judged that. So according to Ms Menaker's words, possibly Mr Blackaby considered that that was not a situation that needed to be divulged to Guatemala. But what I can say is that Guatemala did not become aware of it through Mr Blackaby or Freshfields.

So let's now --
THE PRESIDENT: That is in what they've already said and what is in the memorial. Because they said Guatemala only knew of this later; that they said.
DR TORTEROLA: Okay. Well, let's go on to what's just been
Page 83 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 the question, and that's what we had come today prepared
said.
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 you, Mr Torterola. Paragraph 50, you're saying that

Page 82
Page 84
according to Spain -- and this is Spain's allegation -the facts surrounding the close relationship between Dr Alexandrov and Brattle only came to light after the award was rendered, and then it explained when that moment was. And it refers to the public reports of the relationships that came out in 2017.
DR TORTEROLA: What I'm saying is that the Claimant's counsel has just said that this information was requested by Spain, and that somehow or other, when it was requested -- as part of the proceeding. And when it was requested as part of the proceeding, we were told what could have been done by the parties that have access to that information, but didn't. But that's not what it says here in paragraph 50 .
I'm not sure if I'm expressing myself clearly.
THE PRESIDENT: Would you agree that Spain, in paragraph 50 -- this is according to what the committee believes Spain is saying: that the facts surrounding the close relationship between Dr Alexandrov and Brattle were facts that only came to light through the challenge that was put forward as a result of a case involving Pakistan in 2017. Do you agree that that's what the committee is saying with respect to Spain's opinion?
DR TORTEROLA: But that's not what I'm referring to. What I'm referring to is that we are being told -- and the
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12:45 1 slide title states that respondent states request 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 of information. There's no evidence at all to say that

12:47 $\quad 1$
the Attorney General office subscribed to the GAR or any other subscription-based source of information.

Had that information been in the public domain, then that information would have been available. But if it's closed sources, then it wouldn't have been published in the media in Guatemala. And information was being requested here. But here we're being asked to inform you of what we knew of and what we did not know of, and basically that is the basis of my comment.
THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.
PROFESSOR JONES: Can I just say that what you've just submitted is a good example of why, in my own view, the answers to the questions the Tribunal has posed would best be dealt with in writing, for this reason: that you have -- sensibly, because you're speaking orally -- gone back over a number of matters that are already within your existing submissions.

What we are looking for in the answers to the questions is a compilation of what has already been said and what is already in the record regarding these questions, so that we can pull together in one place -from the submissions, from the oral presentations here, from the slides -- where we can find the answers to these questions.

I think it demonstrates, at least for me, why there
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will be real value in each party putting together in
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 domain, not actual knowledge.
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12:54 1

Mr Kaczmarek. It's just going to take one transition. I fully understand the question.

But if one begins from the proposition that that relationship is not, let us say, expressly disclosed, we think there is enough information there that it was disclosed, given the CVs and the bios. But then you have that disclosure, then you have the public information linking them.
Once the challenges are made against Dr Alexandrov on the basis of double-hatting with an expert, with a quantum expert, it does not matter that it is not Mr Kaczmarek. Because then, even if they're saying -and again, you have to take the leap that your knowledge only runs from the time that someone else comes up with
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Once all these challenges come forward, it doesn't matter that it's not with Mr Kaczmarek, because anybody would know at that point in time: he's being challenged based on double-hatting with an expert.

If you deemed that to be problematic, you would simply look and see: who's our expert? Kaczmarek. Let me check: do they have any overlapping cases? You would have instantaneously found -- or you would have asked him. You would have said, "Look, do you have any cases with Mr Kaczmarek in the past X years?" And then you would have gotten your answer.

So that's why we're saying it doesn't matter that these challenges aren't against Mr Kaczmarek particularly.
PROFESSOR BOO: Yes, but wouldn't it be a clear line if there is one between Mr Kaczmarek and Mr Alexandrov? That would be the clearest line, right?
MS MENAKER: Perhaps. I think it makes little to no difference whatsoever. I think that at this point -- if you even came again to say he wouldn't have even known at the point of the challenge, you're already -I believe it's gravely mistaken. Because you're saying that a party -- let me put it this way: it's the underlying relationship that's problematic. If that information is in the public domain, if you knew or
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12:52 $1 \quad$ a legal argument that you could have come up with years 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 information before about the cases and the relationship.
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should have known, then you have to bring a challenge 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?
THE PRESIDENT: All questions now.
DR TORTEROLA: For that, we will request enough time.
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I mean, we have noticed things here and there. I would
12:59 1
inconsistencies in between -- I think there is a Spanish version and an English version? No, only English?
THE PRESIDENT: Only in English. I'm so sorry.
DR TORTEROLA: Okay. Someone has in my team a version in Spanish somehow; it might have been translated for the sake of someone.

Anyways, we will write back to you if we have concerns about the questions. At this point I'm not in a position to quickly respond.
THE PRESIDENT: Okay.
Ms Menaker?
MS MENAKER: I have one question. It's not on the content.
But I see that a lot of questions -- for instance, even question 1 -- you call for examples of situations or case law; in other places ask you for jurisprudence.

In answering these questions, we would like to introduce supplemental legal authorities if it's in direct response to your question. Particularly if the issue hasn't been briefed, they may not be on the record. So I wanted to make clear that that was your explanation and that is permissible.
THE PRESIDENT: Let us hear the other party, because perhaps they too wish to include more.
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to decide.
PROFESSOR JONES: Might a way of dealing with this be for leave to be sought for additional authorities to be used and an explanation provided as to why those legal authorities are sought to be deployed, and either party can do that, and then the [Committee] decides whether to grant leave or not? Would that be appropriate?
DR TORTEROLA: Normally, Professor Jones, I have no concerns
with legal authorities being introduced. In this case this issue has been that problematic that I really would like to consult with the authorities, with my client, before I can respond.

Normally, in my person, I'm not afraid of the legal authorities. But this cannot be my position; it has to be the position of Guatemala, in a situation in which the entire thing is being dealt so egotistically that we don't want some information to be in the record.
PROFESSOR JONES: All I am suggesting is --
DR TORTEROLA: I understand what you're suggesting.
PROFESSOR JONES: -- no new legal authorities without leave,
and leave has to be sought to explain why it is needed.
Then either party has the right to make an application, and the [Committee] will decide on the basis of that. (Pause)
THE PRESIDENT: It seems like a sensible approach. If you

$$
\text { Page } 95
$$ and ...

MS MENAKER: I can briefly just respond that in light of the questions where the Committee is asking for examples or case law or situations or jurisprudence, some of these are questions that have not been answered in the parties' briefs, and we would then expect that we would need to offer supplemental legal authorities that are not currently on the record in order to answer those and/or to elaborate.

You asked, for instance: for "promptly", what has been the longest term allowed? We have lots of jurisprudence on the record, but I think if we're going to take a survey to say the longest, it might be that we introduce a new legal authority.
THE PRESIDENT: I think Guatemala had a similar concern a couple of days ago, right?
DR TORTEROLA: Yes. And the answer was: no, we thought that it was only the information that was in the record.

So what I suggest is that, again, I will not respond to that right away; I will take my time. I will look into this issue and whether it would be appropriate to use legal authorities or not. At the end of the day, it's going to be in the hands of the Annulment Committee
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identify a number of cases that are relevant for answering one of the questions, you write to the Committee and say, "We have identified three cases that are responsive to question 5 , and this is a new question and it had not been brought up earlier and this is why we could not file it before, and these are the reasons why we want to file it now". And we will hear the other party: perhaps they agree or they do not agree, we don't know. And then we will take a prompt decision.
PROFESSOR BOO: In my view, it would be simpler if both of you can agree on which questions that you will think you require legal authority, and that's it, so that there won't be further need for us to consider applications. This procedure is actually in our procedural order, so it's not new. So if you can agree on which particular issue there both sides want to put in additional legal authorities, then so be it.
THE PRESIDENT: It may happen that once you have a chance to go through the questions, and you relax and you get some sleep, then you may talk to each other and say, "What do 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 Committee. If you don't agree, then you make specific submissions to us for leave to submit new evidence, and we will see what we do.
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2 MS MENAKER: Just for the avoidance of doubt, if we were to
Legal authorities, I'm saying, not evidence. make that [application], is it sufficient to say, "We would like to submit XYZ case for question 1 ", for instance, or do you want us to actually state why those cases are relevant to question 1 ?
THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please do provide a couple of sentences, so that we understand --

MS MENAKER: That's perfectly fine. I just don't want to -because then one party may consider then you to be using that and briefing before having that admitted to the record. I just want to be absolutely clear what is the scope of the application.
THE PRESIDENT: I'm sure we will all be reasonable.
MS MENAKER: Okay.
THE PRESIDENT: We have been so far, and we will continue being reasonable.
DR TORTEROLA: Agreed.
THE PRESIDENT: Any other question?
MS MENAKER: No, thank you.
THE PRESIDENT: Any other question?
DR TORTEROLA: We don't have questions.
THE PRESIDENT: No. Good.
So let us then, please, agree on a reasonable time period for the filing of these answers to the questions,
things that might not be contained in the questions put by the Committee.
THE PRESIDENT: Such as?
DR TORTEROLA: Nothing that comes immediately, unless my colleague would like to elaborate on that. But just to give the parties the flexibility to have some --
THE PRESIDENT: Tell us now, please. Mr Gosis? MR GOSIS: If we were to include the two questions which we addressed earlier which are not part of the 24 questions, the issues of the Code of Conduct, the issues of the inconsistencies, which are not specifically addressed in these 24 but were among the two questions we received yesterday, that would probably cover everything out. If this is only limited to these 24 questions, those are areas, especially the inconsistencies and the --
THE PRESIDENT: But you did provide an answer, right? I think I've written it down somewhere that you said -or it should be in the transcript if I haven't.

My question was regarding Rule 10(a)(vi): since when was this part of the draft? And you said: since the second version. But then you came and said: this was since -- I think you said 2020, but I'm not ... I should go back to the transcript to make sure. But you did provide an answer.
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13:03 $\quad 1$ and perhaps also a limit to the length of these answers; 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 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.
MS MENAKER: It was very thorough, so it's okay.
DR TORTEROLA: We would like to have some room for some
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THE PRESIDENT: I mean, the submissions are really, really long and there's a lot of repetition in them.
PROFESSOR JONES: We have to divide it up by questions, don't we? We can't give you a limit to the total amount of pages you will devote to answering all the questions. So why don't we say three pages per question?
MS MENAKER: Then we could give a total amount of pages! THE PRESIDENT: There are 24 questions: some are addressed to one party, some to the other. TECO's examples on situations of 52(1)(a), it's their submission and they must have some idea of to what situations this is intended to apply, according to their interpretation.

So I don't know. Would you say 50 pages, would that be something reasonable?
PROFESSOR JONES: It's got to be per question.
DR TORTEROLA: Yes, I was more inclined with the number that Professor Jones suggested. I would like at least to be 100 pages.
THE PRESIDENT: 100 pages?
DR TORTEROLA: Yes. I think otherwise, for 24 [questions], 50 pages is going to be too short.
THE PRESIDENT: You say 100 --
PROFESSOR JONES: The problem is, if you get 100 pages and you decide to do half a page on all the questions except
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13:09 $\quad 1 \quad$ one, we'll get a whole pile of crap on the one you
2 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 hear Guatemala's views."

So on that question, for example, would you want us to skip it? Would you want us to briefly summarise our position?
THE PRESIDENT: It is not expected that you provide an answer. If you wish to provide an answer, you are welcome. This is one of the examples where I think one question was more addressed -- because we have clear what one party says; we'd like to have a reply by the other, because it's not clear to us what the other party thinks.
PROFESSOR BOO: If I may suggest, it might be even better if you go by the different sections, because we categorised them in different sections. So you decide which of those questions you want to tackle more or less. Because there are six sections. So just seven or eight pages per section, or whatever it is.
THE PRESIDENT: You were working two months on your submissions; we were two hours on these questions. These don't mean to be a straitjacket. But this reflects our concerns, our areas of concern. So to the extent it is possible, please follow the logic that is there. Don't feel you are in a straitjacket and you need to answer all of them. You've got some freedom and liberty to address them as you see fit.

And please make it something -- I don't want to
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```
impose a limit of three pages per question. There's
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\mathrm{ 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 --
DR TORTEROLA: We have another hearing next week. We had
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13:21 1

```
a hearing before. And we have a hearing with Ms Menaker
on 29th August. So we have a very --
THE PRESIDENT: It shows how successful you are!
DR TORTEROLA: Yes, and how much we will need to work during
    the summer as well.
THE PRESIDENT: I hear you. It's no different here.
    So it stays 20 days?
DR TORTEROLA: We would like that, yes.
THE PRESIDENT: Ms Menaker, 20 days? That's what was
    agreed.
DR TORTEROLA: For?
THE PRESIDENT: For the revision, to review the transcript.
    And we've learnt how important that is. So please do
    check all the figures!
    Now, the real important time period is: how much do
    you need, after you have reviewed the transcript, to
    produce these answers to the questions? (Pause)
    Dr Torterola.
DR TORTEROLA: I would like to hear, if possible, from
    Ms Menaker first, if she can suggest a date. Maybe they
    are as busy as we are. Otherwise I will go with my
    proposal. But maybe if she would like to volunteer
    first.
THE PRESIDENT: Would you like to volunteer first?
MS MENAKER: Sure.
```
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limited to the record, the arguments we've been making; the other side will be on notice that those legal authorities, if admitted, will be used. So I don't see the necessity or advantage of having a reply, and certainly not setting out with the expectations that we would have a reply now.
THE PRESIDENT: Why don't we set a limit also for these applications. We don't want them to arrive at the eleventh hour.
MS MENAKER: Yes, exactly.
DR TORTEROLA: I am not concerned, as I said before, with
the length of the legal authorities applications, if that is the issue. Some of the questions, it is the first time that we are confronting them, and we really would like to have the possibility -- I don't think that it's a question of time, because 15 days will change nothing, and it will provide security to both sides. I don't see what the problem is if we can submit a short -- say 30-page -- reply in the next 15 days after the first submission has been submitted.
(The members of the Committee confer)
THE PRESIDENT: The Committee does accept that there be replies: very short, very brief, very to the point. So choose the points where you want to file a reply.

Be sure that these are questions which really hadn't
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[^1]been dealt with before. So this is not like endless 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. DR TORTEROLA: Yes, regarding translations. I don't know what the proposal was, but we can submit in English. I don't know when is that, you would like to submit the
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MS MENAKER: And since we won't be drafting simultaneously, how much after the second submission? Is it still the same rule that we've used?
THE PRESIDENT: What do you do?
MS MENAKER: Normally we have ten business days.
THE PRESIDENT: Ten business days, and you simultaneously file then the translations of both answers --
MS MENAKER: Correct, yes. The first one will already --
THE PRESIDENT: -- the first and the reply. Okay?
DR TORTEROLA: That's correct for us, yes.
THE PRESIDENT: Very good.
How much in advance do you want to set the cut-off date to ask for leave to submit the new authorities? (Pause)

MS MENAKER: We would propose splitting it. So a month.
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MS MENAKER: Yes, and just the date? (Pause)
DR TORTEROLA: That is one week after you make the decision whether you are going to be accepting those legal authorities or not.

THE PRESIDENT: I think we'll make just one decision. Assuming they were accepted, what you would like to submit in reply, and then we'll see. Because otherwise we'll be running --
DR TORTEROLA: What we are saying is that a week from the moment in which you make the decision on which are the authorities that are being introduced. It's a proposal just to have that. (Pause)
THE PRESIDENT: So you make submissions for leave to introduce responsive legal authorities a week later, and the Tribunal decides. If we decide not to have the main legal authorities, of course the responsive or reply would also fall away. Okay?
MS MENAKER: Okay.
THE PRESIDENT: That way you don't keep us working around the clock on these decisions.

DR TORTEROLA: It's fine with us. Thank you.
THE PRESIDENT: Good.
(A discussion took place off the record)
THE PRESIDENT: So 27th October for the reply submission. MS MENAKER: Madam President, can we expect that on the
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13:27 1 Obviously each party would have to do the research to
2 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? THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

```
legal authorities, you won't give us a date for them,
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.
    Ms Menaker?
```


## THE PRESIDENT: Good

Anything? Anything? Good.
I do have a question for both parties, and I always ask this question: at any point during these proceedings
has any party suffered any kind of violation of their due process rights; and if so, when did it occur, and can this Committee do anything to cure the defect?
Mr Torterola?
DR TORTEROLA: I'm not aware of any in what concerns to me. It has been a very good hearing in which very interesting topics have been discussed that are very important not only for the parties but also for the future of the ICSID system and its reliability.
So -- I speak for myself; I think I speak for my client. If that's not the case, we are going to let you know very quickly. But I don't have any procedural issues that I could complain about. I think that you handled the hearing very elegantly and with a deep knowledge of the topics that we have discussed. So in my regard, it has been one of the best annulment hearings in which I have participated. So I have no complaints about it.
THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Dr Torterola.
Ms Menaker?
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you came a long way too. I'm so sorry for not having expressed that. So sorry. I do thank you also for coming here and being present.
MS MENAKER: Thank you.
THE PRESIDENT: So sorry. That was very insensitive.
Sorry.
Okay, that's it.
( 1.36 pm )
(The hearing concluded)
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13:34 1 MS MENAKER: Thank you. No, we have no due process concerns. We thank you for the organisation and the conduct of the hearing and your attention throughout and questions.
THE PRESIDENT: Excellent.
The thank you of course goes to the interpreters, thank you for all your hard work; to the court reporters. (Interpreted) We thank the interpreters, we thank the court reporters: excellent work as usual.

Thank you all to the participants from Guatemala for 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 cooperation, do you want to speak to each other and see if you can agree on a deadline for cost submissions?
MS MENAKER: Sure. Okay.
THE PRESIDENT: Yes?
And I didn't thank TECO for coming over. Of course, I was thinking of Guatemala, so far away, but of course
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[^0]:    MR GOSIS: I was referring specifically to not the issue of 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.
    THE PRESIDENT: 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?
    DR TORTEROLA: Would the Annulment Committee provide us with guidance on what would be reasonable for the

[^1]:    did have one minor question. The table that you 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? beforehand, there will be no surprises, because we are

